

Catholic Record.

LONDON, SATURDAY, MARCH 26, 1887. BRITISH INDIA.

We are told that throughout India the celebration of the Queen's jubilee has been marked by much enthusiasm and genuine demonstrations of unprecedented loyalty.

"May that great Empress under whose protection religious ceremonies have been practised without molestation for fifty years, may that august Empress, Victoria, live long!

"It behoves you Aryans, one and all, to pray for long life for the Empress. May that Empress in whose Empire men of science sing with delight the manifold blessings of telegraphs, railways, and other inventions, may the Empire whose moon-like deeds spread a halo of light far and wide, may the Empress Victoria be victorious! This is my constant prayer to Shiva."

The reading of the Times' correspondence and of the high priests' prayer, recalled to our mind a remarkable article on "English rule in India," published in the April (1886) number of the North American Review.

"Every walk of life has been gradually usurped by a grasping monopoly whose boast is that they are not of the people. The children of the soil are to day, virtually, serfs, working away their lives for a scanty board.

As if this were not enough, he portrays with an unanswerable exactitude the condition of the Indian peasantry, which he pronounces "perhaps the most industrious, the most teachable, the most thrifty, the most heroic peasantry on earth."

Of the pretence that native anarchy and misrule made the "conquest" of India by the English, not merely a blessing, but a necessity, he disposes by the plain statement that it is false. He charges it

upon the English, that it was they themselves by artifices of their own, who prolonged and aggravated the native anarchy, which they now offer as an excuse for their own misrule. He points out that more than once foreign conquerors or native chiefs have suppressed anarchy in India, and, in a very short time, established their power in the people's confidence and affection, but English rule is, he holds, not yet established, "because Englishmen never conquered India either by arms or by sentiment."

After this by no means flattering admission of good derived from English occupation, he continues to substantiate his charges. He alleges that whenever the Indian population demand their rights as English subjects, they are told that India is not England, and that the Hindoos are yet in the "infancy of civilization."

Waxing warm in his indignation, the reviewer reproaches English rule in India as a tale of "ruffianism, of sorrow, and of shame." And he adds:

"Wherever you go through the vast dominions of the Empress of India you see a population starved, huddled, cowed, crest fallen, brooding thoughts of darkness or despair; while stalks hither and thither the Anglo-Saxon, riding over their breasts, spitting in their faces, spreading desolation and leaving a nightmare wherever he has passed."

He admits that there is a half truth in England's boast that she is the mother of freedom, for English liberty is a reaction against the English egoism which has made Englishmen the conquerors of nature and the oppressors of men.

We feel pleased to notice one of the concluding opinions of Amrita Lal Roy, the Indian author of the North American article, in which he says that the quarrel of the Indian people is not with the English people, but with the Anglo-Indian conspiracy against the life of India. He declares that the body of the English people themselves, the producing and useful classes, are as much as the Hindoos the victims of the organized selfishness and hypocrisy of the blustering dullards who disgrace the English name in every corner of the globe and

live on the robbing of half the world. While he does not despair of receiving justice from England, he believes that the English Parliament, as at present constituted, will do nothing for India. It has not tried to do anything since the days of Burke. It is a Parliament of idlers and snobs, with whom party gain and a mock prestige are more objects than statesmanship and the good of the people."

A STRIKING CONTRAST.

Recent advices from the Eternal City inform us of the arrival there of His Holiness, the Patriarch of the Armenians, who, in the special audience which he was to have had of the Sovereign Pontiff, was to present the august Head of the Church with a magnificent diamond ring that the Sultan of Turkey sends the Pope with an autograph letter. The venerable patriarch was at the same time to present the Holy Father with a splendid stole enriched with allegorical decorations as a testimony of his own and his people's affectionate loyalty on the occasion of the Sacrosanct Jubilee of His Holiness Leo XIII. The sharp, striking, and in many respects painful contrast between the Sultan's attitude towards the Holy Father and that of certain so-called Christian rulers of States, is fully brought out in the columns of the Turkish official journal, wherein we read: "On the occasion of his departure for Rome, His Holiness Mgr. Azarian, patriarch of the Armenian Catholics, had the honor to be received in farewell audience by His Imperial Majesty the Sultan. In this audience, Mgr. Azarian presented an address in which His Holiness protested his fidelity and devotion to the throne, and expressed in his own, and in the name of the community of which he is the spiritual head, the sentiments of love and gratitude towards His Imperial Majesty for the favors that he has never ceased to extend to the patriarch and the Armenian-Catholic community. His Imperial Majesty was thereupon pleased to express his hearty satisfaction and charged the patriarch to be the bearer of his compliments to His Holiness Pope Leo XIII. His Imperial Majesty in parting with the patriarch expressed his desire to receive him again in special audience on his return from Rome."

The patriarch, on leaving the Imperial palace, proceeded to the sublime Porte to pay a parting visit to the Grand Vezir and the other ministers. His Holiness the Grand Vezir conveyed to Mgr. Azarian the rich present that His Imperial Majesty the Sultan sends His Holiness the Pope, together with an autograph letter from His Imperial Majesty for His Holiness. Also a letter from the Grand Vezir himself for His Eminence Cardinal Jacobini, the Papal Minister of Foreign Affairs, together with the briefs and insignia of the decorations recently conferred on the dignitaries of the Papal Court. A pastoral letter announcing the departure of the patriarch and informing his spiritual children of the Imperial condescension and favor, was read in all the Armenian Catholic churches of Constantinople. The reading of the pastoral was followed by prayers for the long life and glory of the Sultan. Mgr. Azarian also transmitted an encyclical, in the same sense, to all the suffragan bishops of the Armenian Catholic patriarchate of Constantinople.

Then follows the exact text of the address presented by His Holiness the Patriarch to the Sultan. "Sire,—I hasten, above all things, to fulfil a sacred duty in expressing the ardent and sincere feelings of loyal regard that fill my inmost heart for my Sovereign, and I renew my gratitude because your Imperial Majesty has been pleased to honor me with a mission. I have, besides, the privilege of humbly declaring to your Imperial Majesty, that I have made it a duty, throughout my whole life, everywhere, and in a solemn manner, to proclaim and to impress every one with the truth of the declaration, that thanks to the benevolent effects of your Imperial Majesty all the Christian communities enjoy, throughout the empire, the favors and kindly protection of my gracious lord and Sovereign, and profess their religion with the fullest liberty of conscience. I have the honor, in conclusion, to declare to your Imperial Majesty that the Armenian Catholic community, of which I am spiritual head, and myself, will ever remain loyal to the glorious throne of your Imperial Majesty."

In the farewell discourse addressed by the Secretary of the patriarchate to Mgr. Azarian, one paragraph strikes us as worthy of reproduction:

"We wish Your Holiness a prosperous journey. Our prayers and good wishes will accompany you to the Eternal City. Be pleased to communicate to the Sovereign Pontiff information of the paternal solicitude and the equitable sentiments with which our august sovereign is animated towards all his subjects, and the religious liberty we enjoy under his glorious reign. Be pleased, at the same time, to lay at the feet of the Pontiff our affection, our obedience and our veneration for the sacred person of the Holy Father, and beg of him to grant us all his paternal benediction."

It is indeed a sad reflection on the age

we live in, that, while the Catholic Church is openly persecuted in Catholic countries like France and Italy, it should be favored and protected by the Musulman sovereign of Turkey. It is not painful to think that the once glorious Catholic house of Savoy should be engaged in hostilities with the Holy Father, and guilty of connivance at insults and outrages heaped upon him and his authority? But it is truly a lesson and a warning for that house and the faithless Catholics, engaged in persecuting the Sovereign Pontiff, that the Sultan Abdul Hamid, an infidel monarch, should do the Holy Father such signal honor.

T. M. HEALY'S PEBERATION

IN THE RECENT DEFENCE OF JOHN DILLON AND HIS PROSECUTED COMPANIONS.

In closing Mr. Healy asked: What were the rights which the law conferred on landlords over their tenants in this country? The rights of the landlord were eviction, distress and bankruptcy. Practically speaking, these three things comprised his rights. Would the crown contend that his clients had deprived the landlord of any of these? The right of the landlord is this—he is either entitled to his rent or he is entitled to his land, and when an ejectionment was brought against a tenant, in that ejectionment there is no demand for the rent, although the tenant can save his right to his holding by paying his rent. Every right of the landlord which the law gave him remained unimpaired and untouched by the plan of campaign; yet when certain moneys were collected for a defence fund the crown says that this money must belong to the landlords, and is his "rent." That was the issue the jury had got to try. There was nothing whatever in these transactions to show that this money belonged to the landlords, or anything whatever to give it the character of rent. But it would be said the position of the striking trades unionist and the striking tenant was wholly different, for it was said the discontented workman did not keep his master's factory while the tenant stuck to his farm. He would show them the fallacy of that argument. The Irish tenant was no longer a tenant; the Irish landlord was no longer a landlord. Mr. Gladstone had made the very title of landlord almost a misnomer. The landlords do not exist in Ireland, because they have been practically abolished by section 8, sub section 9, of the land act of 1881, whereby

THE TENANTS' RIGHTS

to their improvements were established. That the tenants alone gave the soil its value who would deny? Indeed there was also a provision in the land act that the landlords could exclude tenants from their best provisions where they could show that the improvements on the lands were made by themselves—that is on what were called "English managed" estates. As far as he knew, there was not a single estate in Ireland, from the North to the South, where any landlord proved that his estate was an English managed estate. Since the 22nd of August, 1881, therefore, at one stroke the entire of the improvements on a farm have passed to the tenant as a right, and all that remains to the landlord is a certain charge arising out of the land. This was what the crown called in the indictment a contract. There was no contract, and but for what his lordship had ruled he would have read from the very eloquent speech of Sergeant O'Brien what he had said about the contract, but he would only have to do so in his own poor words. But the jury had not to find whether they were or were not contracts, or whether contracts were broken or that attempts were made to break them. He said that since the passing of the land act the landlord and tenant were no longer in the position of contractor and contractee. The land is simply subject to an impost in the same way as income tax is imposed in the true legal sense of the term. Nowhere in the tenant's position is there any comparison between the case of the workman and the tenant, or the case of the tenant and the farmer. He thought that there would be a parity between the case of the tenant and the landlord if the workmen who struck against their master had a co-operative interest in the factory, or that it was

A LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANY

in which they were shareholders. The landlord was in the position of a sleeping partner who has a small interest in the concern, while the tenant does all the work, and all the tenants asked was, and what the traversers sought to prevent was, that no delay in paying on the 25th of March or 29th of September should extinguish his interest in his holding if his poverty was caused by bad seasons—by the act of God. They had arraigned in another tribunal the legality of the seizure which the crown had made at Loughrea, and they will come before a jury by and by (they had sought to change the venue). Those who participated in these proceedings will come before another jury after your verdict is given, and that jury will pass judgment upon the question whether our proceedings at Loughrea were legal, and whether the seizure by the crown of our goods and chattels was legal or was not. The crown in these proceedings would not be deprived of the benefit of evidence as they were there, and they can show exactly what their motives were. The traversers were prosecuted for doing exactly what Sir Michael Hicks Beach boasted to his constituents of doing—of putting pressure upon the landlords within the law who refused to make just abatements. How was the plan of campaign applied, and to whom and how many? Counsel here read from the speeches of the traversers, which, he said, proved that they were only too anxious that the landlord should come to them for their rents, like the little pig in the story who was running about with the knife and fork calling to the people to come and eat it. As to

KEEPING THE LANDLORD'S MONEY,

if it was his, Lord Dillon could tell them that he had got more rents by the plan of campaign than he could possibly have hoped at that season. What was accomplished by the proceedings? The tenants stayed in their homes, Lord Dillon was saved a fruitless war, and the government a bloody struggle. Now, remember, the tenants would not be driven out of their homes because the law said that even though from a single bad season they

were unable to pay, they should pay on the 20th of March and the 29th of September. The tenants said: "The landlord is entitled to his rent, but we are entitled to live on the soil." They said there was no sacredness about the 25th of March or the 29th of September; that the landlord was entitled to a fair rent, and that they would give it when they had it, but that they were not to be evicted because they could only pay as much rent as they had. That being so, was it not monstrous that this movement on behalf of tenants to enable them to have a respite in their homes was to be indicted as and found by them to be the result of a conspiracy? The position of the tenants was serious and extraordinary. They had had a long and terrible struggle. In the past their struggles had been marked by outrages just as the rattening movement marked the trades union struggles. The tenants were determined to live in their homes, at a fair rent, and not to be put out; and the verdict of the jury would say—and they should not be the less scrupulous in giving it because there was a doubt as to whether they had been legally emancipated at all whether this movement for the benefit of the tenant, even if the landlord was short of his money for a time, was deserving of the censure of

HONEST AND INDEPENDENT MEN.

Either they would have movements legal, honest and open, and led by honest and temperate men, or they would have the movements of the Ribbon Lodge and the moonlighter. They would have the plan of campaign or the plan of the blunderbus; and he asked them to say, knowing what they did of the history of this country, that when intelligent and honest men like his clients took up a movement of the kind, they only did so under the most terrible necessity. The tenants of Ireland had been engaged in a long struggle. The gentlemen at the bar had proposed remedies, brought in bills and resorted to Parliament, and Parliament had rejected their petition. What remedies had their accusers or the solicitor general proposed? He had said that the plan of campaign was calculated to "enlave and subjugate the people." When had the government at any time proposed remedies for the betterance of the people save under the spur of outrage? The traversers proposed to substitute for that spurious constitutional agitation. The government proposed to strike that agitation down without substituting anything in its place. Kobsperre, after terrible and bloody scenes, was obliged to confess in the French Assembly, "Ah! it is not with the criminal code in your hands you will regenerate the country." It was with the criminal code in their hands that the persecutors proposed to regenerate their country. They proposed no remedies, they suggested nothing except that the tenant of Ireland should go on paying and paying his rack rent, whether he

BEQUEATH, BORROWED OR STOLE IT.

and selling it, liable to eviction if he were short a shilling in famine time, although there might be hundreds of pounds' worth of interest in his holding. He repeated that the jury were bound to remember the circumstances of the country. When in this country had any movement for the improvement of the people sprung from any other womb than the dock of Green street? Who had any movement the results of which they were now enjoying had any other place of parturition save the prison cell? He asked them as far as they were concerned not to allow this movement to be branded as illegal. They had been put into the box having been carefully chosen—some would say packed. A slur had been thrown on religion, but it was not the Catholic religion. No slur had been thrown on that religion by the choice of the jurors. The slur, if any, had been thrown on the religion of Martin Luther—the religion that had existed because of protest; and he asked the Protestants on the jury to say whether they whose religion existed in that way, and who claimed with pride to have rebelled against a spiritual sovereign, would submit their minds to a temporal power propounded by castle lawyers? Protestants of Ireland, they had been selected by the crown as the men to do the deed. But he asked them to remember their position in this country. It was a position

OF A GREAT AND GLORIOUS KIND.

Every movement for the benefit of that land had been led by Protestants, from the days of Swift, Holywell, Emmet, Fitzgerald, and of Mitchell and Butt down to Parnell at that moment. The Protestants of Ireland stood in the breach for liberty when the cowering Catholic was afraid to lift his head. And now it was on men of their religion that a slur had been sought to be thrown. He asked them fearlessly to say, on their oaths and consciences as men, that they would find no verdict for the crown. Were they never to be done with prosecutions of the men of pure and noble motives, whose every act bespoke their anxiety for their fellow's welfare, and their desire to bring relief and succor to the poor? Was right to be forever persecuted and wrong forever enthroned? Right forever on the scaffold, Wrong forever on the throne. But the scaffold guides the future, And behind the great Unknown Statues stand the shadows Keeping watch upon His own.

Indicate then the right of the Irish people to live in their own land, declare that they had been guided by the temperate and judicious advice of their leaders, abstaining from crime and anxious only for an alliance of conciliation with the English people— anxious only to put an end to the terrible war of classes which had poisoned all civic and public life in this country. On you jurymen there lies a great responsibility, and when the crown ask you for a verdict fearlessly say them nay.

Patsam's Corn Extractor

Is the best remedy for corns extant. It acts quickly, makes no sore spots and effects a radical cure. A hundred imitations prove its value. Take neither substitutes offered as good nor the close imitations of the genuine too often offered.

Cure for Croup.

Prompt relief to prevent suffocation from the accumulation of tough mucous—the formation of false membrane—and the construction of the air passage, is necessary in case of a sudden attack of croup. Heggard's Yellow Oil should be used at once, afterward's Heggard's Pectoral Balsam.

CATHOLIC PRESS.

Boston Republic.

The fact that Lord Salisbury was able to announce the appointment of Mr. Arthur J. Balfour to be chief secretary for Ireland at the same time that the resignation of Hicks-Beach was given out, furnishes additional evidence of the tenaciousness of the pretext for the latter's retirement which accompanied the official publication. The truth about the matter is that Beach withdrew from the ministry for political reasons, and that Balfour accepted his place to help his venerable uncle, Lord Salisbury, out of a scrape. Mr. Balfour is a young man of some ability as a writer, but with a limited experience in public affairs. He was assistant secretary to his uncle while the latter held the foreign office in Beaconsfield's last cabinet. Last summer he was made secretary of state for Scotland, and was taken into the cabinet. He has no particular qualifications for the successful conduct of the important business entrusted to him. If he holds any views on the Irish question, he has never disclosed them. It is safe to presume that he goes to Dublin as to the proper policy to be adopted, and ready to pursue whatever course the ministry may decide to map out. He will be simply a tool in the hands of the government, free from any personal convictions and prepared to do the dirty work of the "combine."

Catholic Columbian.

Col. Robert Ingersoll, it would seem, was quite sick last week with a trouble similar to that of General Grant. Ingersoll came near that point in the life of many loud-mouthed infidels, including Voltaire himself—that of fearing to go unprepared into eternity and of selling for a priest to afford them a chance, however slight, of keeping out of Satan's clutches.

The life and death of Henry Ward Beecher has its moral. Raised in the teachings of the New England Puritanism of his father, Rev. Lyman Beecher, of Lane Seminary, Cincinnati, he modified his doctrine from time to time, until finally he reduced the modicum of belief so fine that even Ingersoll might have sat under his seven. Sentimentalism is not Christianity. There was not much sentiment in the saying of the Saviour in the case of him by whom scandal comes. "It were better that a millstone were tied about his neck and that he were cast into the sea." Sentimentalism is among the latest delusions having Satan as their diligent propagator.

N. Y. Freeman's Journal.

On Thursday of this present week a momentous event took place in London—a very momentous event—to which certain Americans have looked forward with palpitating expectation. On that day Americans of both sexes received the crown of their hopes. For, be it known that the most cherished expectation of nearly every rich and properly brought-up American girl is to be presented at the English Court. And of every American male snob who stuffs his stocking so that he will appear to have calves, buckles on a sword and stumbles into the presence of that sovereign who hates Americans—and with reason; for who could help hating the Americans that hang on to the skirts of the Court? She snubs them whenever she can; but, still, they besiege the American Minister to present them at Court, and spend their hard-earned cash for gorgeous finery in which to bask an instant in the royal presence. What ecstasy!—what rapture filled the American bosom in London on Thursday last! How many women made themselves as indecent as they could by cutting off the tops of their gowns and adding to the length, to enjoy an instant of beatitude! And how happy shall we poor plebeians be when we get a marked copy of the Court Journal, announcing that Mrs. and Miss Hogeys, of Buzard's Gulch, Cal., were presented at Court! Life is worth living!

The Knights of Labor are not likely to be enduring.

Already indications of the breaking up of the organization are at the American have helped towards the solution of a problem which is engaging the attention of the whole civilized world. They are one of the links in a grand chain of evolution which—we hope and pray—will, the workman hearing the Church, result in peace and content. The Knights have done one good thing—they have pushed steadily in the direction of co-operation. It is a mistake to imagine that there is any radical difference of opinion between Cardinal Gibbons and Cardinal Teescherau. Circumstances in Canada and circumstances in the United States, however, are radically different.

Western Watchman.

One admission the Masons of Italy make which does infinite credit to the Church. They say: "Crash Catholicism and Christianity is no more. That is literally true. The Church is the old oak on which all the poison vines of heresy are clinging. When she falls, all fall. The preservation of the Church is the salvation of religion. 'It is Rome or infidelity,' as a prominent Jewish Rabbi said recently. The different branches of Protestantism may do much humanitarian good and their aims may be lofty as they are often disinterested; but they depend on the Catholic Church for their very inspirations; and from the Christian spirit which she keeps alive in the world they derive the means of carrying on their pious chimeras. The world will learn the great truth some day, and the day after there will be no Protestantism."

"A bill appropriating \$20,000 for the completion of the monument to Mary, the mother of Washington, at Fredericksburg, Va., was passed in the United States Senate at Washington." And yet some people say it is superstitious and "un-American" to honor the mother of God!—N. Y. Freeman's Journal.

Herrford's Acid Phosphate

HUNDREDS OF BOTTLES PRESCRIBED. DR. C. R. DAKE, Belleville, Ill., says: "I have prescribed hundreds of bottles of it. It is of great value in all forms of nervous disease which are accompanied by loss of power."

NATIONAL PILLS act promptly upon the Liver, regulate the bowels and as a purgative are mild and thorough. PROF. LOW'S SULPHUR SOAP is highly recommended for the cure of Eruptions, Chafes, Chapped hands, Pimples, Tan, &c.