

THE CATHOLIC RECORD

Published Weekly at 44 and 46 Richmond street, London, Ontario.
Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

EDITORS:
REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVES,
Author of "Mistakes of Modern Ireland."

REV. WILLIAM FLANNERY,
THOMAS COFFEY, Publisher and Proprietor.

MESSESS. DONAT CROWE, LUKE KING and JOHN NICH are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for the CATHOLIC RECORD.

Agents for Alexandria, Gienneville and London—Mr. Donald A. McDonald.

Rates of Advertising—Ten cents per line each insertion.

Approved by the Bishop of London, and recommended by the Archbishop of St. Boniface, the Bishops of Ottawa, Hamilton, Kingston, and Peterboro, and leading Catholic Clergymen throughout the Dominion.

All correspondence on business should be addressed to the Proprietor.

Advertisements must be paid in full before the paper can be stopped.

Persons writing for a change of address should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Catholic Record.

London, Sat., Nov. 17th, 1888.

PROTESTANT MISSIONARIES.

Canon Taylor, of the Established Church, has an article in the *Fortnightly Review* on the subject of the failure of Protestant missionaries to convert the heathen. The learned Canon declares that the vast amount of money and energy spent in Asia and Africa, on the work of evangelization, is not followed by any appreciable results. And quoting from statistics as given by the missionaries themselves, who are not likely to underestimate the results of their own efforts, he arrives at the conclusion that it would take 183 years for all the different missionary societies to convert as many as are born in one year among the non-Christian population of Asia and Africa.

Following up the lives and the history of the so-called converts, over whose actual salvation there was much jubilation and great rejoicing in Exeter Hall—and other missionary centres—it was found that there is a remarkable tendency among the converted heathen people to revert to the religion, or to the no-religion, of their forefathers. The zealous contributors in England to the missionary fund, the titled ladies and gentlemen who are in the habit of pouring out their available treasures and spending fabulous sums in the very laudable effort to spread the light and establish Christianity in heathen lands, are utterly astounded at the revelations of Canon Taylor. His truthful exposure of the true inwardness of missionary labor and its results provokes any amount of angry criticism. And he is told that Christians have to obey the command to preach the gospel to the whole world, without "troubling themselves about the result from an arithmetical point of view."

The missionary societies will collect and take good care of all the money sent in to their offices. They will have bibles of bibles without note or comment, and cartloads of tracts ready for distribution; they will have Rev. Smiths and Rev. Robinsons with wives and families, all en route by the Suez Canal, or actually enjoying themselves after a long and tedious voyage by sea and land, in opening school or leading in prayer at Coromandel, or some other lovely spot "by the South sea wave." But they are not to trouble themselves about the results in point of the numbers saved from idolatry. Were the numbers considerable, long lists of the converted, with names and places of residence, would be sent home with a great flourish of trumpets. But because the neophytes may be easily counted on the fingers of the hand, the missionaries are to be consoled with the assurance of having obeyed the command and made an effort, mathematics being left out of the question. Again, the fact is mentioned that occasionally "heathens profess conversion for the sake of the pecuniary assistance they expect to get from their evangelizers." It is not to be wondered at that conversions of this nature should be only transient, and of the shortest possible duration.

A few such conversions occurred in Ireland during the famine years. The poor starving peasantry of Connemara and the Island of Arran were lured away, at least ostensibly, from the faith and Christian practices of their fathers. They received warm clothing, abundance of Indian meal and soup at will, on condition of sending their children to proselytizing schools and of entering their names on the list of converts. But when better times came round, when the potatoe blight disappeared, and when wages could be had for honest work, the proselytizing schools were abandoned, the so-called converts made public reparation for the scandal they had given by their apostasy, and were restored once more to the Church's favor. If the conversions in Asia and Africa by Protestant missionaries are of a similar character—and Canon Taylor says they are—how is it possible to flatter ourselves with the assurance that any true or real conversions from heathenism to Christian faith were ever made in those benighted countries?

There must have been, therefore, a good deal of truth in the assertion of Musa Bhat, when he declared, in a public meeting of the Salvation Army held a few weeks ago in Toronto, that there "were no real converts in India." All those who made a pretense of Christianity

"were merely Proselytes," and although he was for many years reckoned a convert, he did not feel that he was a Christian until he joined the Salvation Army. And this is what the Church of England has come to at last. It has been petted and pampered by Government patronage and fat living, and could never reach the masses or make one convert among the Hindoo or African populations. Canon Taylor declares that the belief now gains ground that 'the Sandwich Islanders, so long cited as the best product of missionary zeal, are fast reverting to heathenish customs, and that the Abyssinians are merely nominal Christians'.

It seems after all that the large sums of money lavished on the conversion of Hindoos and Mahomedans, if kept at home, might have been laid out to better advantage and with much greater profit to society. Were the squalid hotels and tenement hovels of London and other English cities visited by the charitably-disposed—were the poor famishing children properly clad, and enticed to school and church by little presents of wholesome food, and made virtuous by separation from the vile dens in which the Whitechapel murders and other atrocities are concocted, crime would diminish, poverty be lessened, and the hells of London and Liverpool would be changed into smiling homes and terrestrial Edens.

LORD HARTINGTON IN BELFAST.

Lord Hartington has finished his tour in Ireland, which, like Mr. Chamberlain's, was confined to the little area which sends to Parliament the minority of the Ulster representatives. With the Orangemen of Belfast for his audience, he was able to get the encouragement of cheers while upholding the "practical Christianity" which is administered in Ireland by the blood-stained Chief Secretary.

His Lordship was very anxious to press upon his hearers the conviction that he is the same Liberal politician that he ever was; that his present support of a Tory Government, which refuses to grant to the people of Ireland any concession of Liberty and Home Rule, which muzzles the press, imprisons editors and members of Parliament who presume to assert that the country is badly governed, is quite in accord with the views he upheld before a Belfast audience on the occasion of his former visit to that city, views which he also upheld elsewhere, that the "Irish Land Act" should be strengthened and extended. . . . that further progress should be made, increasing and multiplying the number of occupying owners in Ireland. . . . that larger local powers of self-government should be substituted for the numerous boards which take so large a share of the administration of Ireland.

Why were these measures ever needed? and why did Lord Hartington advocate them before? Was it not, ostensibly at least, because the people were downtrodden and oppressed by the wealthy landlords who had the whole population of the country under their iron heel, and who used their power for the purpose of exterminating the tenantry? This tyranny no one denounced more passionately than Lord Hartington himself. Are not the people now suffering under the same heartless tyranny? Are not evictions carried on in the same brutal manner? Are not the old and the infirm still turned out to the roadside to die? Do the people not see their houses, built by the sweat of their brow, torn down before their eyes? Are not their crops still seized, and their possessions destroyed because they are unable to pay exorbitant and impossible rents? Why then does His Lordship now uphold the Government in the denial of remedial measures?

Let us see the reasons which he adduces for his changed course. First he tells us that in belonging to the Liberal party at the former period he belonged to "a distinctly and thoroughly Unionist party." He could not support Irish demands for justice, unless it were distinctly understood that the union between Great Britain and Ireland should be maintained.

Such a statement of principles is quite worthy of being enunciated by the friends of a Turkish or Chinese despotism, but it will not and it should not be accepted by any party living under a constitutional Government, such as Great Britain is supposed to be. "A just king setteth up the land." Lord Hartington has often proved that Ireland has been crushed, instead of being "set up." If then this is the result of Union, a true Liberal would say: "Away with such a Union! a Union which oppresses only, and which depopulates the kingdom, is not worth preserving." "In the multitude of people is the dignity of the king; and in the small number of the people is the dishonor of the Prince." Proverbs xiv, 28. The object of good government is the amelioration of the condition of the people, not their oppression, impoverishment and extermination, which are all that British Government has ever effected in Ireland.

But after all it has been proved over and over again that the object of the people of Ireland is not to destroy the Imperial Union. If oppression is necessary, the concomitant of Union, the Union ought to succumb; and it is true that from time to time it has so appeared. So

persistently have the British Government and Parliament refused to listen to the story of Ireland's wrongs, that Irishmen have despaired of obtaining a remedy, except by gaining complete independence; but this was the remedy of despair. Now the case is different. The English people have shown lately so much good will towards Ireland, that the Irish leaders do not dream now of the disruption of the Empire. They expect to gain redress by the methods which are in accordance with the fundamental principles of the Constitution. Lord Hartington misrepresents the case when he tries to confound the Irish cause with that of revolutionists who seek to dismember the Empire.

Another fallacy of His Lordship, though not original with him, is couched in the following terms:

"I do not think that it is an impossible condition to ask the great Liberal party to desist from aiding and abetting the disloyal party from a desire to extort by force that which they could not obtain by reason. . . . I do not think it an impossible condition at all to ask that before the Unionist party embark again in great schemes of legislative reforms for Ireland both the Irish Nationalist party and the Liberal party of England should show some signs of an intention to conduct an agitation which they have a perfect right to conduct within the limits of law and the lines of lawful and legal constitutional agitation."

This whole argument is based on a falsehood, but even if the statements of fact were perfectly true the conclusions would be quite unwarranted. Take human nature the world over, and it is too much to ask that men should first content themselves under cruelly oppressive measures, before their complaints against such measures be listened to; and it is equally against the interests of the Empire that such a course should be followed by men who are called statesmen. It may be that in Timbuctoo or Ashantee human nature is so degraded that it can endure the regime of a brutal absolute despot, but it is a disgrace to our civilization that a man of Lord Hartington's antecedents should ask white men to do similarly. The Irish cannot be expected to content themselves with the regime that has been inflicted upon them, until every spark of noble spirit be quenched in their souls; and would it be to the advantage of the British Empire to reduce them to such a condition before admitting them as freemen to an equality with their fellow-subjects of England and Scotland? Would the prestige of the British Empire be any more glorious, if the soldiers who shed lustre on British arms in the Crimea, in India, France, and Spain became as spiritless as the Bechuanas or Hottentots? But there is no fear that the Irish will become thus degraded. The enthusiasm they exhibit, in spite of unjust laws, in holding their meetings of remonstrance and defiance against oppression shows that it would be easier to change the course of the Niagara river than to make them indifferent to the sufferings which their fathers and mothers, their brothers and sisters and children endure from bad laws cruelly administered. And for this Lord Hartington stigmatizes them as disloyal. He should remember the aphorism of Junius:

"The subject who is truly loyal will neither advise nor submit to arbitrary measures." If this be true, the Irish who defy these measures are more loyal than Lord Hartington, who advises them. Lord Hartington's statement of the case is equivalent to saying that Ireland must never have her grievances redressed, for, notwithstanding his denial of the fact, the conditions he wishes to impose are impossible; impossible without a new creation of man.

Lord Hartington's sincerity in proposing such conditions? We cannot believe that he is. He cannot be ignorant that the only excuse which can be offered and which is offered for the perpetuation of the present Coercive Policy of the Government is its half-paraded success; and almost at the very moment that Lord Hartington was thus asserting that the laws are systematically violated and defied in Ireland, Secretary Balfour was telling another audience that the Government policy has been so wise that Ireland is at this moment in a most peaceful and law-abiding condition—so peaceful as it was in 1831! Thus do Coercionists refute each other. Lord Hartington's reasons for Coercion are, therefore, merely pretences resorted to in the desperation of a bad cause. As a matter of fact Ireland is not in a lawless condition. On the contrary, in almost every county, and especially in those counties where the administration of the laws has been most brutal, the absence of serious crimes from the calendars of the courts has been a subject of surprise to the judges. The crimes in those counties have been the crimes committed by the landlords and the police, the protectors and officials of the Government, who have with impunity despoiled the people of their property, and robbed and murdered them at will.

Further, Lord Hartington declares that the British Parliament is quite ready and anxious to remedy all Ireland's wrongs, and that the Government are ready at any time, even at the present time, to propose adequate remedial measures—always

under certain conditions—the conditions being this time that the Irish members of Parliament give them their support! If this be true, why do they not now apply their panacea? They need not wait for the support of an Irish party, for they have a majority at their backs at present. Besides they are never tired of telling us that the interests of the minority in Ireland are of far greater importance than those of the majority, and even this is stated by Lord Hartington in the very speech now under consideration. Why was not a remedy offered in 1881, when the country is acknowledged to have been in a peaceable state? The truth is that Parliament has never shown a willingness to listen to Irish complaints, nor is it likely to do so. There are too many great issues before the Imperial Parliament to allow them to consider even the salient points of Ireland's case, still less the details which must necessarily be taken into account before the Irish problem can be solved. The solution of the question must be the work of an Irish Parliament.

His Lordship states another reason why Home Rule should not be granted. He says that an Irish Parliament would be controlled by disloyal men. This is merely a disguised way of putting forward his "impossible conditions." The Irish Nationalist majority are called disloyal because they state their grievances at all. Let them have in their hands the power of remedying them, and there will no longer be such reason for disloyalty as exists at present. The British Parliament has long been trying to make the Irish loyal by oppressing them. Would it not be well to try another method now? Would they not be more likely to be loyal if they were once made aware that they were living under a paternal Government, rather than under a Government which extracts from its subjects the last penny of their earnings for the benefit of a pampered class, of which Clanricarde and Massarene are fair specimens?

THE TIMES' WEAKENING.

The Times has received a humiliating check in its career of forgery and fabrications against Nationalist members of Parliament. It stated that Mr. Finucane, M.P., advised blacksmiths "not to refuse to shoe the horses of land-grabbers and exterminators, but to shoe them, driving, at the same time, nails in their quick." These words are said to have been uttered by Mr. Finucane in a speech at Windy Gap, Clare County, on the 30th of September, and indignant comments on this gentleman's cruelty have been made by the Tory press throughout England, Ireland and Scotland. Mr. Finucane has addressed a letter to the Times characterizing the statement as an "infamous falsehood," and he challenges Mr. Balfour to prosecute him if he believes the assertion to be true. He has besides threatened the Times with a prosecution for libel. The "thunderer" has thought it prudent to moderate his thunder in consequence, and has not only published Mr. Finucane's letter, but has so far eaten humble pie as to apologize for its statement. On this Mr. Finucane withdrew his prosecution. The Times was very reluctant to apologize, nevertheless the apology was very explicit. It said: "We are bound to accept the very explicit contradiction of Mr. Finucane and Mr. O'Mara and regret that a report should have found its way into our columns which, upon investigation, appears to have been founded upon the statement of persons present at the meeting, not upon what the reporters personally heard." It appears, therefore, that the reporters who took notes of the speeches had not the passage, but that it was purposely intruded into Mr. Finucane's speech. But, of course, the Times was perfectly innocent in this garbling and falsification!

Mr. O'Mara, mentioned by the Times, is High Sheriff of Limerick. He also wrote to the Times on the subject. The Times had said that Mr. O'Mara endorsed Mr. Finucane's brutal advice; but Mr. O'Mara states that no such language was used in his hearing, so that it "would be impossible for him to have endorsed it."

THE CHURCH OF OUR LADY OF MOUNT CARMEL.

On Sunday, 25th of the present month, this grand new edifice, the crowning effort of the zeal and industry of the good pastor of Mount Carmel, Rev. M. Kelly, and his faithful people, will be solemnly dedicated to the service of Almighty God. Among the many new and beautiful edifices that have been erected recently in the diocese of London, this structure will hold a prominent and creditable place. We will refer to it at greater length after the opening. His Lordship the Bishop of London will officiate, and preach a sermon in the morning. Rev. John Brennan, of Picton, diocese of Kington, will preach in the evening. We hope the occasion will draw forth the entire Catholic population of that district, thus testifying their appreciation of the noble work of the good pastor of Mount Carmel and his devoted flock.

HARRISON ELECTED.

The Presidential election is now over, and Grover Cleveland shares the fate of all defeated candidates. From being honored and looked up to as the arbiter and controller of a nation's destinies he retires into private life, and becomes once more a mere individual citizen. General Harrison, of Indiana, the nominee of the Republican party, by a considerable majority of the votes of his fellow-countrymen, is elected to the exalted position of President of the United States. Various causes are assigned for the defeat of Mr. Cleveland and the Democratic party which he represented. Up to a very late period his re-election was considered almost certain. The leading politicians of the Tory stripe, both in Canada and Great Britain, favored his candidacy, and prognosticated his second term of presidency as a foregone conclusion. The Secretary of State, Mr. Bayard, was always favourably disposed towards the Conservative parties both here and in the mother country. American fishing vessels were brought into our ports and detained by the Canadian authorities, for some slight infraction of the fishery laws, and Secretary Bayard was accused of pusillanimity in that he did not adopt prompt and vigorous measures of reprisal. Then a treaty was proposed and Mr. Joseph Chamberlain was appointed by Lord Salisbury's government to meet the representatives of the American people, while Canada was represented by the Hon. Charles Tupper. No more unpopular man could have been selected than Chamberlain, the shameless deserter from the Gladstone party and the enemy of Home Rule for Ireland. He had been a life-long Liberal in politics, and a staunch supporter of Mr. Gladstone, until the critical moment when his vote and influence would have turned the scales in favor of Home Rule. But that vote and that influence, to the amazement of Gladstone and Parnell, swung round to the opposite side, and crushed the hopes of the Irish people, at least for the time being, of reaching the goal of all their national aspirations, when it was almost within their grasp. This act of treachery on the part of Joe Chamberlain can never be forgotten and may hardly ever be forgiven by the Irish people at home or abroad. But it was rewarded by the Tory Government which he had served. He was selected as the trusted ambassador of the British Government and invested with plenipotentiary jurisdiction to negotiate a Fishery Treaty with the United States Government. It was surmised from the very beginning that the National League's influence would be employed either to frustrate or to annul any treaty that Joseph Chamberlain would have a hand in begetting. So far, however, both President Cleveland and Secretary Bayard were in high favor in Downing street. The question of Free Trade, which the Democratic party championed, was another inducement for England to use whatever influence it could exercise in obtaining a victory for that party and a new lease of power for Mr. Cleveland. But to succeed in winning a majority, British, or pro-British, influence alone would not suffice. The whole Irish vote, or at least a very considerable portion of it, was requisite to turn the scales on the day of election. Meanwhile a Republican majority in the Senate had rejected the Fishery Treaty, and thus secured for their party the adhesion of all such as were opposed to Joseph Chamberlain and English Toryism. Not to be outdone in patriotism, and to offset the claims of the Republican party, President Cleveland issued the retaliation message, at which Canada and England were very much alarmed at first, but after a short time recovered their equanimity, especially when it was clear to all that such a message was a mere electioneering dodge. Cleveland, however, by its issue suffered deeply in the estimation of all true statesmen and especially of his British adherents. Whatever of popularity he gained by it among the masses of Irishmen and their sympathizers was again destroyed by the publication of Lord Salisbury's letter to Mr. Murchison, advising the latter that all true Britons should vote for Cleveland, or something to that effect. Lord Salisbury, in his capacity of British Minister at Washington, made a most serious blunder, and both parties tried to profit by it. He was foolishly led into expressing his opinion and publishing to the world that British interests would be subserved by the triumph of the Democratic party. Such a revelation from an English statesman could have only one result, that of alienating a vast amount of influence and solid support from Mr. Cleveland and his party. The latter was furious. He ordered Lord Salisbury to take his papers and leave the country.

Never in the history of England was an accredited minister to a foreign court so indignantly treated or so summarily ejected. And the flutter created by it in diplomatic circles is not set at rest so far. Grover Cleveland did not gain much by it one way or the other. In his efforts to pander to the British and to conciliate the Irish vote he failed most ingloriously. President Cleveland

fell between two stools. And few men in misery to-day have less sympathizers in misfortune than President Cleveland in his gubernatorial defeat. A small majority of Irish votes gained by the insane cry of the famous three R's lifted him into power in 1884; a large plurality of the same votes in this year of grace has called upon him "to step down and out." Leaving the questions of Free Trade and Protection aside, there is a lesson and a warning, both for English and American statesmen, in the results of the late Presidential election. May both nations profit by it for their own good and for the good of humanity.

A CONTEMPTIBLE PROCEEDING.

A piece of the most contemptible persecution has been perpetrated by a very full bench of magistrates at Ennis. No fewer than seventeen justices of the peace took seats beside Mr. Chas. Kelly, the County Court Judge, for the purpose of hearing the application for the renewal of the license of Mr. Dennis McNamara. The large number of magistrates present is sufficient evidence that special orders for their attendance were given by the Government, and for what noble purpose? To deprive a staunch and respectable Nationalist of his license, merely because he could not be intimidated from selling Nationalist papers. A more despicable act could not be perpetrated even by the despicable Government of Lord Salisbury; and for the purpose of doing this it was necessary to trump up a charge against the applicant, Police Inspector Hill, of course acting under instructions, opposed the granting of the license on the plea that Mr. McNamara is a man of bad character, a man who only a few days ago received from the public a testimonial of their regard and respect, in the shape of a gift of £100, to remunerate him for the losses he has sustained under the Government persecution to which he has been subjected.

That the magistrates did not believe the accusation brought against Mr. McNamara is evident from their conduct on the occasion; for they offered to give him the license if he would agree not to sell Nationalist papers, terms which he indignantly rejected. They told him that the papers contained illegal matter, but he replied very properly that he did not consider them illegal; for if they are illegal why does not the Government suppress them?

The Judge acted the part of a thorough partisan. He said: "You came up here to ask a favor from the Crown and you defy it," as if the granting of licenses were so specially a favor of the Crown that none but partisans of the Government must be allowed to obtain them. Another evidence of bad character, equally conclusive with that already mentioned, was brought forward; namely, it was charged against Mr. McNamara that he had posted on the sacred Court House a green poster headed "Forgeries Commission," and containing the announcement that Mr. McNamara would furnish papers to the public containing full reports of the State trials going on in London! This was characterized as an attempt to bring the law into contempt. How would the people of England or of Canada endure such a travesty of legal justice, attacking the liberty of the press, and of political opinion?

THE WHITECHAPEL MURDERS.

Several horrible murders of a most atrocious character have occurred lately within a few weeks of each other in a populous district of old London, named Whitechapel. The victims in all cases have been young women of the abandoned class. Every possible effort that police ingenuity could devise has been made to discover the cruel and savage hand that imbued itself in the bloody work of mutilation and death. But all to no purpose. Even when all else failed the chief of London city police, Sir Charles Warren, had recourse to the use of blood hounds, in the vain hope of tracking the murderer's feet. Who the assassin may be is still a profound mystery. A lull in the work of assassination occurred a few weeks since, and excitement began to diminish. The reign of terror which had come down upon the entire female population of London city seemed nearing its end, and the people of Whitechapel began to breathe freely, when suddenly on last Saturday morning the whole neighborhood was again alarmed by the news of an additional murder of a woman, the details of which surpassed in blood-curdling heinousness even the barbarous atrocity that attended the previous murders. The name of the latest victim of the murder fiend is Lizzie Fisher. She had a room in the house where she was murdered. She carried a latch key, and no one knows at what hour she entered the house the last night of her existence. No noise was heard during the night, and nothing was known of the murder until the landlady went to the room early next morning to ask her for rent. The first thing she saw on entering the room was blood and limbs torn from the victim's body scattered about the apartment. There is no possibility of discovering who

the murderer is, nor can the slightest clue be detected that would lead to the suspicion of the fiend that committed foul a crime. All this very sad index and speaks volumes for the state of morality that obtain just now in the great and lighted metropolis of the British Empire. Of the five millions of people who inhabit London, scarcely one million attend any church on Sunday. What becomes of the other millions? Would the money spent on foreign missions better employed at home. Would the army of preachers sent to evangelize the Hindoos and the Turks have something more practical to attend to at the very doors. England is reckoned the most civilized, the most bible reading, the most enlightened, and the freest Christian country on the face of the universe, and here its very centre, in the midst of all wealth and splendor, and mighty power for good, crime and ignorance of God's first laws reign supreme. Where we would expect Christian virtues to shine forth stars in the firmament, horrid vice lurks and crime abounds. Truly is London a great, the modern Babylon! What can save it from the utter ruin and desolation that overtook the older Babylon and other cities now in ashes? What but the aid which Almighty God applied to Rome and Athens. The preaching of Christ Crucified, the blood of martyrs, the courage of St. Paul to stem the torrent of iniquity, and the voice of a prophet crying out to all that a day of reckoning and retribution "is at hand both for individuals and for nations, for God now declares unto men that all should everywhere penance." (Acts xvii, 30)

EDITORIAL NOTES.

MR. SPURGEON has a poor idea of kind of Christianity prevailing in England, especially among Baptists. From *Daily News* we learn that at the twelfth meeting of the Evangelists' Association he delivered himself as follows, to amazement of the listeners: "Do not let us upon England as a Christian country. It is a great mistake to think that if it were living in old heathen land again, spoke to a minister the other day, asked him if some of his people were Christians, and he replied, 'No, they just heathen.'"

IN THIS issue we reproduce from a Catharine's paper a report of a discourse delivered by the respected and distinguished parish priest of that town Sunday last. The sermon was a timely one, and few there are, indeed, will not entertain feelings of kindly regard towards the Rev. Father for uttering such noble and Christian sentiments. has become the fashion for a few called ministers of the gospel, who profess to spurn congregations, to occasionally indulge in tirades against the faith of the Catholic neighbors, with a view to draw crowd and stir up enthusiasm. We take the rebuke of Rev. Dean Harris will be to convince our Protestant friends that the time has come when such un-Christian conduct deserves at their hands condemnation of the most pronounced character.

CARDINAL LAVIGERIE's mission against the slave trade has been very successful, rousing the Governments to new efforts for the suppression of the traffic. In House of Lords, on the 6th inst., Mr. Salisbury said Germany had invited England to co-operate with her in the work of preventing more effectively the exportation of slaves from and the importation of arms to East Africa. England promised to aid in the work, as it was accordance with her traditional policy. The proposed measures would be effected by a naval force and not a military force had also agreed to render assistance, and would send a man-of-war to co-operate with the German and English vessels in a blockade against slave arms-bearing vessels. The vessels foraging the blockade would have the right search vessels under any flag.

THE United Ireland, of Dublin, expressed indifference at the result of the Presidential election, as it has friends in both camps. Harrison, the paper thinks, owes his election to the Seckville affair, as the voters suspected President Cleveland being friendly with Lord Salisbury. While it is flattering to the Irish to be able to turn the scale in such a contest is also humiliating and menacing America. The Irish vote exists as a separate and menacing factor in American politics, because the fact that Ireland without Home Rule ranks as a spearhead in the relations between the English speaking races. It would be cheap America to establish Home Rule in Ireland, even at the cost of a war with Great Britain. We need not comment on the value to England of the settlement of Irish question.

A legacy of £2000 has been left to Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, Miss Anna Skerrett, dated of Miss Skerrett, who was murdered in San Francisco some years ago.

It is proposed to dedicate the new Catholic University in Washington on Oct. 6th, 1889. The curriculum will be decided on this month. The Bishops will charge of the theological department.