

The Catholic Record

Published every Friday morning at 42 Richmond Street. THOS. COPPEY, Proprietor and Proprietor.

Annual subscription, \$2 00. Six months, \$1 00. Arrears must be paid before the paper can be stopped.

LETTER FROM HIS LORDSHIP BISHOP WALSH.

London, Ont., May 23, 1879. DEAR MR. COPPEY—As you have become proprietor and publisher of the CATHOLIC RECORD, I deem it my duty to announce to its subscribers and patrons that the change of proprietorship will work no change in its objects and principles; that it will remain, what it has been, thoroughly Catholic, entirely independent of political parties, and exclusively devoted to the cause of the Church and the promotion of Catholic interests.

Yours very sincerely, JOHN WALSH, Bishop of London.

MR. THOMAS COPPEY, Office of the "Catholic Record," St. Mary's, Halifax, Nov. 7, 1881.

I have had opportunities during the last two years or more of reading copies of the CATHOLIC RECORD, published in London, Ontario, and approved of by His Lordship the Right Rev. Dr. Walsh, the Bishop of that See. I beg to recommend that paper to all the faithful of this diocese.

Catholic Record.

LONDON, FRIDAY, MAR. 31, 1882. THE REIGN OF LEO.

Leo XIII. has now occupied the Roman See for more than four years, and has, during that brief period accomplished so much for the church and for society as to be entitled to rank with the greatest of the Pontiffs who have filled the chair of Peter. Every one remembers with what solicitude all true Catholics looked upon the election of a successor to the immortal Pius IX. There were fears, not unfounded, that the freedom of the Sacred College might be interfered with, that the conclave might be forced to adjourn to some place beyond Italy, where many of its members could not perhaps attend, and that there might be a long and dreary interregnum in the Pontificate. Amongst non-Catholics, especially those of the infidel stamp, there was a general feeling that the time had come to do away with the Papacy as an obstructive to progress, and that the Italian kingdom owed it to its own sense of self-preservation to insist upon it that no Pope should be elected in Rome except upon the condition of the acceptance of the law of guarantees, renouncing all right to any but spiritual dominion. They fondly hoped that the crisis had arisen wherein even the spiritual sway of the Roman Pontiff would be first circumscribed, then gradually lessened, and finally destroyed. But their hopes were doomed to a disappointment only surpassed by the general joy of the Catholic world when the peaceful and unanimous election of Leo to the vacant throne of Pius was announced. It augured well for the new reign that, though begun amid gloom and doubt, from a worldly point of view, its very inception should diffuse a gladness and hopefulness through the Christian world it had not felt for years. Non-Catholics, whatever the character of their hostility to the Papacy, whether active or apathetic, saw with surprise the marvellous display of vitality in Catholicism evinced by the unanimous election of the new Pontiff. Once again their hopes were blasted. The new Pontiff had hardly ascended the throne when Catholics saw, with a just satisfaction, that, added to unequalled intellectual power, Leo brought to the Pontificate that administrative capacity, demanded by the exigencies of the church and the unsettled and threatening condition of European society. During the four years of his reign the Holy Father has been untiring in his efforts to promote every interest of church and of society. Again and again has he during that brief, but busy and eventful period, raised his voice to point out to all peoples and governments the principles which underlie social order, and set forth the claims and titles of the church to veneration and obedience, if society is to be preserved and temporal happiness and the security of nations ensured. His Encyclicals are replete with matter pertaining to the every vital interest of the human family. In one we see socialism, communism and Nihilism, exposed and condemned; in another Christian Philosophy commended and its diffusion

on the principles of St. Thomas earnestly urged upon the Catholic world, in another the nature, sanctity and conditions of Christian marriage expounded and defended, in that issued last year on the feast of St. Peter and St. Paul, the origin of the rights and duties and the different forms of political authority clearly explained, and lastly, in that lately issued to the Italian bishops the necessity for the education of the clergy, the support of the Catholic press and the organization of Catholic societies, and insistence upon the restoration of temporal independence of the Popedom all set forth with vigor and precision. His spiritual administration has been marked by two general Jubilees which have been fruitful in good results to all classes of christian people. A good understanding has been at length reached with Prussia. The outlook for the church in the Czar's distracted dominions is brighter than it has been for a very long period. Everywhere, in a word, through the luminous foresight, sagacious and far-reaching policy of Leo, has been, in a brief period, accomplished a gigantic work of true and tangible progress in the reformation and exaltation of human society. That this illustrious Pontiff may be long spared to rule over the church of God is the heartfelt wish of every devoted child of Holy Church and of every friend of an enduring social happiness.

PROFESSIONAL POLITICIANS.

One of the evils of the representative form of government is its illegitimate product, the professional politician. The system itself supposes the existence of no such person. In its eyes every citizen is a politician in the sense of his obligation to duly exercise civic rights and his eligibility to the various positions of trust it establishes. The caucus, the convention, the boss, the ward king and the professional politician, are all entities that have taken being through a singular perversion of the mechanism of constitutional government into a direction the system was never intended to follow—not to the just operation of the system itself. In the old country it requires money to become a politician—here the requisites in many cases are brazen impudency, shameless hypocrisy, and ignorant assumption. All the chief towns of the United States especially are pestered with professional politicians fully possessed of these enviable qualities. Our large cities too, could, if called upon, supply a formidable quota of the same unsavory class of citizens. So great is their influence, so much dreaded is their contact that respectable, honest and patriotic men abstain from that active participation in all the details of self-government so necessary to ensure a due administration of justice and adequate protection to life and property. Enter our civic municipal bodies and you will look in vain, though there are in both countries many honorable exceptions, for the representatives of position, capacity or honest labor. We have been always in favor of giving the workmen, the mechanic and the agriculturist, as large a share as possible in the government municipal and legislative of the country, and we are firmly convinced that until the true and honest workmen of America acquire that influence under our representative forms, of which professional politicians have robbed them, the liberties of the people are in constant danger. The professional politician is not a new product. He was known and he flourished in Greece and Rome. He brought foreign domination on the former, and imperial tyranny on the latter. He lived and ruled in the free republics of medieval times, till they fell under the blighting influence of his sway and ignobly perished. His record in the old world and in the new, in days gone by and times present, is one of plunder, fraud and treachery. He is an enemy to free government in its best sense, for he makes it odious to the honest, burdensome to the laborious, unbearable to the patriotic. His successes being all due to his systematic disregard of truth and honor, serve to bring constitutional government into contempt, and gen-

erally pave the way for some form of despotism. He is a standing menace to popular liberty which cannot endure unless based on truth and honor. Every good citizen should resist him; for apathy in dealing with such men is simply criminal. The professional politicians in America are now a numerous and powerful class, but can be overcome by a judicious combination of the patriotic elements of society. Some such combination will soon be an absolute necessity, unless the highest and most responsible offices in national, state, and municipal administration are to be the undisputed prey of soulless adventurers whose dominant passion is greed of office, a passion they gratify in detriment of every interest that patriotism should seek to conserve and promote.

HENRY LONGFELLOW.

The death of Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, which occurred on Friday last, removes from the sphere of earth the greatest of American poets. Mr. Longfellow was born in Portland, Me., on the 27th February, 1807. He graduated at Bowdoin College in his seventeenth year, and in 1826 was raised to the chair of modern language and literature in that institution, with the privilege of preparatory foreign travel and study. He remained in Europe till 1829. In 1835 he accepted the professorship of modern languages and belles lettres in Harvard University, again visiting Europe and returning in 1863. He withdrew from the professorship in 1854; fixing his residence still at Cambridge. He visited the old world again in 1868, everywhere receiving marks of honor earned by a long and brilliant literary career. Mr. Longfellow was a copious writer and true poet in the best sense of the term. His diction is simple, his imagery chaste and often sublime. He sung of the beauties of nature, the endurance and the valors of man, and the affection of woman, bringing into noble relief the sacrifices and heroism which make their godlike, with an exquisite delicacy and charming finish that give his name immortality. When the sweet and teaching pathos of "Evangeline" and of "Hiawatha," the quaintness of "Miles Standish," and the historic precision and poetic beauty of the "New England Tragedies" are forgotten, the language itself will disappear. Longfellow's death is the source of genuine regret, for he was a poet whom all loved and revered. But his works and merit will ever live to endear his name to a people whose origin, history and heroism he celebrated, and whose glories he enhanced by his noble verses.

A SORRY SPECTACLE.

The continued incarceration of the Irish suspects without trial or formal condemnation is a mockery of justice before which pale the worst deeds of violence of feudal times. Let Whigs talk no more of the days of Star Chamber, the days of the tonnage and poundage tax, the days of passive obedience and divine right. They have themselves perpetrated on Ireland in the latest of their Coercion Acts, an outrage for which there is no parallel even in the annals of that unfortunate country itself. The worst days of the Tudors and Stuarts in England were never disgraced by the pusillanimous and hypocritical violations of right and justice which the present Liberal administration has visited upon unhappy Ireland under cover of Acts of Parliament. When Lord Beaconsfield in dealing with Ireland ever resorted to measures of severity towards that country, Liberal orators and newspapers were busy and apparently earnest in denunciation of his course. They appealed to every feeling of the Irish people which severity could arouse and injustice heighten. On bended knee they promised Irish support were to them extended that grievance after grievance would disappear and injustice no longer becloud the land. The Irish, though often deceived, put faith in these promises, and have met with a perfidy and ingratitude unknown and unheard-of in the whole history of representative government. For several months the freely-chosen

representatives of three important Irish constituencies have been kept in prison, and a large portion of the Irish people in consequence deprived of Parliamentary representation. As well might those constituencies be disfranchised as to return members who are not permitted to sit in Parliament. The British Parliament, as to its Irish contingent, no longer even nominally—it never did really—represents the people of Ireland. It cannot, therefore, claim that in justice it should rule a people who have practically no voice in its councils. Its present position in dealing with Irish questions offers a sorry spectacle. Better far for the sake of truth and honesty that Ireland were deprived altogether of representation, than to be now privileged with one that is fragmentary and unable to press the just claims of Ireland to fair and legitimate consideration.

JESUIT THEOLOGY.

The Christian Guardian has evidently a very high opinion of M. Paul Bert. Who is Paul Bert? He is, we regret to say, an atheist of the most pronounced character. His hostility to Christianity is so bitter and uncompromising that M. Gambetta gave him a portfolio in that cabinet of his, whose career was so ignoble and fall so inglorious. The Guardian's laudation of M. Bert convinces us of one sad fact to which occasional perusal of its columns unhappily gives more ample evidence, viz. that that journal is ever ready to make common cause with any one, be he Jew, Atheist, or Mussulman, provided he be a hater of Catholicism. No matter how shameful the life, unprincipled the public career, or mendacious the assertions of the enemy of Popery, he finds in the Guardian hearty and openly-avowed fellowship. Weak, indeed, must be that cause whose advocate seeks alliance with the unbelieving and blasphemous. On the authority of M. Paul Bert the Guardian, speaking of Jesuit Theology, made in a late issue the following statements: (1) that John Peter Gury, a member of the Society of Jesus, in his compendium of Moral Theology "enunciates views concerning lying which Ananias and Sapphira would have thought liberal;" (2) that Gury declares that a mental reservation removes all criminality; (3) that he teaches communism pure and simple by holding that a man in extreme necessity, no matter what causes the necessity, may take the property of another and not be guilty of theft.

We happen to have at hand an edition of Father Gury's works, published at Ratisbon in 1874, and are, therefore, in a position to know what that eminent theologian actually teaches. In the first volume of his Moral Theology, pp. 207-8, we find a whole chapter devoted to the subject of lying which the Guardian would do well to peruse and take to heart. Father Gury defines a lie as an expression contrary to the mind of the speaker, with the intention of deceiving, and declares "that lying, properly speaking, is always in itself bad, so much so that it is not permissible to avoid death itself by its instrumentality." He considers the lie in three lights—prejudicial, officious, and jocose. The first he declares mortal or venial in its sinfulness, according to the damage inflicted and the urgency of the obligation of reparation it involves. The second is, he affirms, to be per se venial inasmuch as it occasions no grave moral disorder. Lastly, the lie which, uttered through levity and for mere amusement, without inflicting damage on any one, he calls jocose, but does not excuse it from sinfulness, pronouncing it a venial transgression. If Ananias, Sapphira, the Christian Guardian or any one else consider these views on lying "liberal," we bid them hearty welcome to the consideration. When the Guardian declares that Father Gury states any form of lie to be "excusable," he must have himself very "liberal" views on the subject, for when he made this statement, as he did on the 8th instant, he did so either in ignorance of what Father Gury actually said, or in wilful and deliberate misrepresentation of that distinguished author. Now,

in regard of mental reservation, Gury states that reservation is either properly or improperly mental; properly when the meaning of the speaker cannot be at all apprehended—improperly when from certain peculiar adjuncts and circumstances that meaning may be arrived at. To the first species of reservation he declares it is never permissible to have recourse, the second, which is not a real concealment of truth and which he carefully distinguishes from equivocation, it is sometimes permitted by reason of a just cause to employ. This just cause may be the good of individuals, families, or society at large—which often requires the guarding of a secret against inquisitiveness and malice. The writer in the Guardian, like every other man entrusted with business and professional secrets, has had, we believe, on many occasions in the course of his life, to resort to this species of reservation, and rightly felt that in doing so he did no wrong. Yet to find ground for vituperation on the Jesuits he consorts with Paul Bert to distort what one of their ablest theologians lays down, and draws calumnious inferences from this very distortion.

On the question of Communism the Guardian is particularly unfortunate. He has evidently never read Gury or he would not associate the name of that theologian with Communism. On pages 214-5, vol. I, of the Ratisbon edition of Gury's work on Moral Theology, he will find an able, emphatic and unanswerable condemnation of Communism and Socialism. In the matter of extreme necessity and its excusing theft, Father Gury states (1) that extreme necessity is that in which life itself is in danger, (2) that in such a condition, a man may without sin take from his neighbor, when he cannot possibly get it otherwise, just what is necessary, and no more, to relieve him for the moment and save his life. This very principle the Guardian will find laid down or implied in every system of jurisprudence that obtains in the civilized world. It has no affinity with communism or socialism, invades no right of property—simply declares the right under the social pact of every man to his life. It has, therefore, reason, justice, humanity in its favor. The Guardian has done by its article of the 8th inst. an injustice which we expect it not to repair. Reparation is something unfortunately unknown in the journalism of the sectaries, whose principal weapon against Catholic truth is deliberate falsehood, of which we claim to have this day clearly convicted the Guardian.

A MISAPPREHENSION.

We give place with pleasure to the letter of "A Hamilton Land Leaguer," to be found in another column. Our correspondent places his views clearly and ably before the public, but is, as we think a careful perusal of our article to which he refers, under a serious misapprehension as to the views it sets forth. We are by no means in favor of dropping the land agitation till its objects are fully attained. We, however, look upon the complete success in the very near future of that movement as so certainly assured, that we should deem it unfortunate for Ireland's best interests if, after success had been achieved, the splendid mechanism of the land organization were not employed to secure for Ireland some measure of home government. We therefore view with pleasure the revival of discussion on this vital subject. We are well aware that this question cannot, and feel it should not, take exclusive prominence in Irish politics till the ownership of the soil is finally and irrevocably fixed in the people who till it. We, however, hail its revival with pleasure as preparatory to the struggle which must inevitably follow the land agitation. No true Irishman could look upon that revival with other feeling than those of reprobation, if brought about to diminish the enthusiasm and distract the energies of the people in the struggle now being bravely maintained by the Land League.

THE LAND QUESTION.

EDITOR CATHOLIC RECORD.—In your last week's issue, under the heading "A live question again," I was sorry to see you countenancing a revival, at present, of what some seem to think would be the most direct means of making Ireland prosperous and happy, viz: the attainment of Home Rule. It is truly discouraging to see some portions of the Irish people in Canada and elsewhere so careless or unmindful of their duties to the country they seem anxious to benefit, as to urge a total disregard for the efforts of those truly patriotic men and women who have proven by their deeds that the land question is and should be the only living one concerning Ireland, and one which should be adhered to by every lover of that country, until its objects are accomplished, and I am sure, together with many of Ireland's friends, that other happy results will necessarily follow. Since the inauguration of the Irish National Land League, I have followed, with pleasure, your noble defence and able arguments in support of Ireland's demand for the lands for the people, and now in the heat of the struggle, with our best men in goals, our press gagged, our country under martial law or worse, and with the sympathies of an astonished and admiring world before us, I think we would be unworthy of the name of men were we—particularly our press—to step into a new path and thereby put our people, as their enemies would be only too happy to see them, in two hostile camps, which effect the resurrection of the Home Rule movement will be sure to have at the present time. With what amount of consistency the promoters of such a course can advance their arguments I am at a loss to know. Do you, Mr. Editor, in supporting it, want to give your readers and the enemies of the Land League to understand that the men who have risked everything, even liberty itself, have been engaged in a futile and lost cause? Would you teach the people of Canada that the Irish people were wrong or else have failed in their demands? Have American contributions and efforts on behalf of the land serfs of Ireland, been a foolish and needless attempt, or do you wish to convey the idea that the Land League was fostered, nourished and encouraged not for its avowed purpose, but merely to afford the promoters of Home Rule a compact and extensive organization for the purpose of launching once more on the sea of public opinion their ship of Home Rule for Ireland. I think that, were you to consult Ireland's interests by asking a verdict of the inhabitants of that ill-governed Ireland, the farmers who have to contend against a land system which has received the condemnation of the civilized world, you would not allow your valuable journal to become an advocate of laying aside the present popular and just movement for a myth called Home Rule. If you grant Ireland Home Rule tomorrow, are the inhabitants of that country going to have the chains of landlordism in any way loosed thereby? Allowing England should grant Ireland all the legislative independence we enjoy here in Canada—which she never will willingly—are the landlords to be made to release their iron grip on their tenants? To come home to ourselves, with our complete and satisfactory system of government here in our young Dominion, would we tolerate such a monstrous, despotic, feudal system for a week? If the land system in Ireland be wrong, if it has been the means of causing Irishmen to leave their country in cargoes or go to the poor house, if it has kept the Irish people in actual slavery and sent them in droves throughout the civilized world, without education, without any idea of trade, business or commerce, and if they have arisen like men and true Christians and determined to bury forever landlordism and all its accompanying horrors, is it not worse than criminal on our part principally here in Canada, now that it has been made a parliamentary matter, to raise aloft an opposition banner and thereby assist the enemies of Land Leaguism and detract from the popular cause, which has been admitted on all sides—even by its enemies—a just one, but which has not yet accomplished the end its promoters had in view. When the Irish people, through their representatives, assert before the world that the land question is a failure, or that they have accomplished their laudable purposes, and that they will throw aside every other political consideration for the now desirable boon of Home Rule, then should we in Canada, who watch with anxiety the course of events in Ireland, assist them by every means consistent with the laws under which we live, but never till then let us be the means of dividing our sympathies and substantial aid from that noble, worthy and patriotic movement which has done so much towards making the Irish people a unit and yet promises to be the instrument of accomplishing the ends for which it was organized. You assert, Mr. Editor, that "O'Connell, when setting on foot the Repeal movement, had nothing of the splendid organization now at the disposal of those patriotic Irishmen, who desire once more to make Home Rule a live question. They have at hand the machinery of the Land League in Ireland and America." With due respect, Sir, will you be kind enough to lay before your readers the names of those representative Irishmen who wish to make this "a live question" at present, and also explain by what means they are going to acquire the machinery of the Land League in Ireland and America before the objects for which that organization was established are accomplished. And, in conclusion, also make known why you advocate laying aside the Land League—as your views would certainly necessitate—and its objects, for a very uncertain boon, and before the obtaining of which Ireland would be compelled to undergo another long and troublesome agitation. Thanking you for your space, I remain, A HAMILTON LAND LEAGUER. Hamilton, March 27th, 1882.