

The Catholic Record
 Published every Friday morning at 46 Richmond Street.
 PUBLISHER AND PROPRIETOR,
 THOMAS COFFEY.
 Annual subscription..... \$2 00
 Six months..... 1 00
 Single copies..... 25
 Advertisements must be paid before the paper can be stopped.

LETTER FROM HIS LORDSHIP BISHOP WALSH.
 London, Ont., May 23, 1879.
 DEAR MR. COFFEY.—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 aims 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 to the promotion of Catholic interests. I am confident that under your experienced management the RECORD will improve in usefulness and efficiency; and I therefore earnestly commend it to the patronage and encouragement of the clergy and laity of the diocese.
 Believe me,
 Yours very sincerely,
 + JOHN WALSH,
 Bishop of London.

Mr. THOMAS COFFEY
 Office of the "Catholic Record,"
 FROM HIS GRACE ARCHBISHOP HANNAN.
 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. Mr. Walsh, the Bishop of that See. I beg to recommend that paper to all the faithful of this diocese.
 + MICHAEL HANNAN,
 Archbishop of Halifax.

LETTER FROM MGR. POWER.
 The following letter was given to our agent in Halifax by Mgr. Power, administrator of the Archdiocese of Halifax.
 St. Mary's, Halifax, N. S., June 30, 1882.
 DEAR MR. WALSH.—It is with pleasure that I give my approval to the work in which you are engaged, as I have always considered the "Record" to be a valuable and truly Catholic paper, deserving of every encouragement and support.
 From my long personal knowledge of your high character for integrity, I can cheerfully recommend you to those on whom you may call, in the course of business, as a person in every respect worthy of confidence.
 Hoping you may obtain a long list of subscribers, and wishing a blessing on your good work,
 I am, sincerely yours,
 PATRICK MGR. POWER,
 Administrator.

Catholic Record.

LONDON, FRIDAY, JULY 21, 1882.

THE TURKMAN AND HIS RELATIONS WITH EUROPE.

The Egyptian difficulty is but another phase of what is well known, in political and diplomatic circles throughout the world, as the Eastern question. When the Berlin Conference assembled to arrive at some final arrangement touching that question which for more than three centuries has distracted and disturbed all Europe, the status of Egypt with its important political bearings, was not considered. The condition of Egypt was then unsettled, and those blessed with foresight did not fail to perceive that the day was at hand when the position of that country should be clearly defined and placed on a basis to afford security to European interests of all classes.

The Conference might then more easily than it can now be done, have decided on some satisfactory solution of the Egyptian problem. The opportunity was, however, lost, much to the pleasure of the Porte. The latter might, with the Russian army within easy march of Stambul, have been forced to a line of action in regard to Egypt which its own obstinacy and the conflicting interests and claims of rival European powers must now render very difficult of attainment. Turkey is, as well through principle as by tradition, hostile to foreign intervention either in its domestic affairs or in its relations with subject territories such as Egypt. Nothing but the presence of immediate danger can effect a change of Turkish policy in this direction. With their apparent inactivity and indifference, Turkish diplomats often achieve and have of late especially achieved many signal triumphs. They well understand the jealousies and conflicts of the various European powers, and know how to set one against the other to their own advantage. When, at the inception of the present Egyptian troubles, all the powers of Europe seemed willing to leave their adjustment to France and England, the Porte at once took alarm and succeeded by its representations to the other powers in bringing about a Conference in which at the very last moment it refused to take part. The object of the Turkish government is quite evident. It is determined to preserve, notwithstanding the marked proof of its inability and unwillingness to govern that country properly, its dominion over Egypt. If any confirmation of this purpose were needed we have it plainly in the despatch telegraphed from Constantinople to the Turkish ambassador in London: "The Porte has learned that Admiral Seymour

has opened fire. It is superfluous to dilate upon the extreme gravity of this fact. In view of the urgency of this matter the Porte confines itself to requesting you without a moment's loss of time to make pressing representations to Earl Granville to issue orders to cease firing immediately, in order to avert still greater misfortune." The Porte is itself largely if not entirely responsible for the action of Arabi Bey in assuming an actual dictatorship in Egypt over the head of the Khedive himself. Having set its heart on the maintenance of its supremacy in that country probably through the extinction of the virtual sovereignty of the Khedive, but unable to do so directly owing to a depleted treasury, it has employed Arabi to excite the native Moslem population against foreign influence and intervention. Arabi has fulfilled this part of his mission well enough, but not too wisely. The massacre of Alexandria was an event for which neither he nor the Porte probably looked, but it has seriously injured the Turkish scheme of self-aggrandizement in Egypt. Turkey has not, however, abandoned its purpose to insist on such a solution of the present difficulty as will preserve intact its dominion over that country. In this purpose it may have the support of European powers opposed to English domination there, but it cannot now be expected that England, after having been forced to open hostilities against Arabi and his fanatical following, will readily relinquish the advantages which success must confer. The interests of Britain in Egypt are very important, but do not really demand British occupation of the country. It just government could be secured for the people of Egypt, without occupation by any European power, so much the better. The mass of the Egyptian people have been, till now, most cruelly oppressed, and though for the time incapable of self government would, no doubt, appreciate and prosper under any form of government protecting them against exactions and tyranny such as they have had for centuries to bear with. When the powers, therefore, come to discuss an arrangement of the Egyptian crisis, they should, if they desire any such arrangement to be permanent, endeavor to procure for the Egyptian population the blessings of good government, and also make certain the neutralization of the Suez Canal. This great work is one over which no individual power should exercise absolute control. It is the world's highway, and could not without manifestly endangering the peace of Europe and of the world be given over to any one government. Upon no other grounds than these can the Egyptian difficulty be settled. Settled upon this basis, with or without the acknowledgment of a nominal domination of Turkey over the country, the Egyptian question will cease to trouble the spirit of diplomatic Europe.

RESIGNATION OF MR. BRIGHT.

The retirement of Mr. Bright from the Gladstone Cabinet is one of the severest blows yet received by that administration. Mr. Bright retires, it appears, on account of the stand taken by the Administration on the Egyptian question. The views of the late Minister on the subject of war are so well known that no one can be surprised at his withdrawal from the government. His resignation at this juncture is, however, very unfortunate for the Cabinet. Its line of action in domestic affairs has been so extremely injudicious as to alienate from its support certain classes of the people whose views have much affinity with those by the profession of which the liberal leaders came into power. Nor is its foreign policy likely to gain for it new adherents. It is singularly ill-judged, weak and ineffective. Mr. Bright was in the Cabinet the representative of views held by very large bodies of the English people who will now grow cold in their allegiance to a Ministry of which he forms no part. With Ireland completely at variance with his party and his hold on the masses of England seriously loosened, Mr. Gladstone could not, at this moment, with any prospect of success,

make an appeal to the country, yet he has done things just as unlikely. We need not, therefore, be surprised if in early autumn the present Parliament be dissolved. An administration with the Marquis of Salisbury as its leader could be no worse, as far as Ireland is concerned, than that of which Mr. Gladstone is the head. The result of a general election, judging from the feeling in Ireland would tend to greatly strengthen the hands of Mr. Parnell, who more than ever since his release has proved himself a leader in the highest and most acceptable sense of the term. Mr. Parnell is reputed as having declared himself confident, in the event of an election, of carrying 78 out of the 103 Irish seats. This is by no means a sanguine anticipation, and may be surpassed by the actual results of the next contest. In England the radical party is not likely to suffer any very serious losses—and may make some surprising gains, but the Whig element there, as in Ireland, is certain to suffer for the shortcomings and omissions of the government. Mr. Bright's resignation may, in our estimation, be justly construed as the beginning of the end for the Gladstone government, for the absence of Mr. Bright from the national councils cannot just now be compensated for by the admission of any other liberal, no matter how prominent.

A FAIR QUESTION.

In view of the uncontradicted statement that the Imperial government has emphatically condemned the course of the Canadian administration in reference to the Irish resolutions adopted last spring by both houses of the Dominion Legislature, it may well be asked, are Canadians really a free people? This is a very fair question indeed, especially when we consider that the policy of Downing Street is, on the whole, to act towards this great country as if it were a mere Crown Colony. It is, no doubt, in the recollection of many of our readers that for several years after the concession of responsible government to Canada, that we had but its shadow, not its substance. From 1841 to 1848 there was little of real executive responsibility to Parliament. In the latter year there was, indeed, a decided improvement, but it can hardly be said that at any time throughout the existence of the Legislative Union between Upper and Lower Canada did this country enjoy the full benefits of responsible government. As late as 1859, when a new tariff, somewhat more stringent and protective than that previously in force, was, through the exigencies of the public service, adopted by the Parliament of Canada, the Duke of Newcastle, then Colonial Secretary, moved by memorials addressed to him by the Chamber of Commerce of Sheffield, wrote to the Canadian government intimating that under certain circumstances Her Majesty ought to be advised to disallow acts of this kind passed by the Colonial Legislature. The Canadian government of that day at once conveyed to the Colonial Secretary, in language vigorous but respectful, its view of the rights of the Canadian Parliament in that particular case, and all others similar. Amongst other statements made by the Canadian government to the Duke of Newcastle, we find the following clear and emphatic assertions of the rights of Canada to self-government: "The government of Canada, acting for its Legislature and people, cannot, through those feelings of deference which they owe to the Imperial authorities, in any manner waive or diminish the rights of the people of Canada to decide for themselves both as to the mode and extent to which taxation shall be imposed. The Provincial Ministry are at all times ready to afford explanations in regard to the acts of the Legislature to which they are party, but, subject to their duty and allegiance to Her Majesty, their responsibility in all general questions of policy must be to the Provincial Parliament, by whose confidence they administer the affairs of the country. And in the imposition of taxation, it is so plainly necessary that the administration and people should be in accord, that the former

cannot admit responsibility or require approval beyond that of the local legislature. Self-government would be utterly annihilated if the views of the Imperial government were to be preferred to those of the people of Canada."

The views thus expressed by the government of Canada met with the hearty approbation of all political parties in Canada. But the Imperial government did not, by any means, on account of the just representations of our Administration, relinquish its claims to disallow colonial legislation. The commission issued to every Governor General, till within a very recent period, contained instructions to that officer entirely at variance with the principles of self-government. If it be true, as now stated, that the Imperial authorities have disapproved the action of the Canadian government and Legislature in relation to the Irish question, they have done that which must bring them into odium with the vast majority of Canadians, and into contempt in the eyes of the world. They may claim that the grievances of Ireland no wise affect Canada, that the relations between Great Britain and Ireland concern the British government only. Any such claim is simply untenable. Canada is one of the most important portions of the empire. Whatever, therefore, affects the peace and prosperity of the Mother Country must concern the people of Canada. Besides, nearly one-fourth of the total population of the Dominion is of Irish origin and follows with deep interest every phase in the cycle of Ireland's misfortunes. And again, the neighboring republic, upon whose friendliness towards us the prosperity of Canada very largely depends, contains an immense Irish population, keenly alive to the oppression under which the old land suffers, and determined to do everything in their power to put a term to the British misgovernment of Ireland. The Irish element in the United States exercises very great influence in the direction of the foreign policy of the country. We Canadians cannot afford to have our American neighbors enemies. And enemies of ours they will be, with more or less emphasis of expression, on account of our connection with Britain, unless that country does Ireland justice. The Parliament of Canada, impressed by considerations such as these, did at its last session adopt an address to Her Majesty on the subject of Irish grievances. That address was couched in terms so respectful as to give its authors just claims to humility itself. Now we are told that instead of receiving a reply befitting the importance of the question and the dignity of the Parliament of Canada, that address has drawn from the colonial office censure and condemnation. If this be really the case, we may, especially in view of other similar actions on the part of Downing Street, ask if Canadians be a free people and our Parliament a free Parliament?

REPRESSION ENFORCED.

The repression bill, having already passed the Lords and received the royal assent, is apparently to be enforced with the utmost rigor. Thirteen counties have been already proclaimed under its provisions; in other words, at least one-half the people of Ireland are to be at once deprived of every vestige of liberty, and placed under the absolute control of the landed oligarchy. Can the government really hope by this means to restore peace and order to Ireland? Coercion had been, previous to the introduction of the repression act, confessed a failure by the Gladstone government itself. But on account of a senseless cry raised when the unfortunate outrage in Phoenix Park took place, this same government determined to go further than had ever been gone in a course reprobated by itself! It requires not the gift of prophecy to be enabled to declare that the present policy of repression will share the disastrous fate of every measure of coercion put in force by the British government. We doubt very much if a conservative government, headed by Lord Salisbury, notwithstanding his avowed support of the landed interest in Ireland, would

undertake responsibility for such a measure as that which under Mr. Gladstone's auspices has become law. A measure more unjust and unstatesmanlike, especially in the present critical condition of Irish affairs, it were impossible to conceive. It is not ruinous, but remedial legislation that Ireland requires. It is not war, it is not disorder, it is not bloodshed that its people demand. They cry out earnestly for peace, order and tranquility. The government refuse to hearken to their cries. On the government then must rest all responsibility for the anarchy and civil strife that must follow their action. The repression act is neither more nor less than an open declaration of hostilities upon the Irish people. Some of its provisions are the very refinement of cruelty and despotism. Respectable strangers visiting Ireland are not free from insult and outrage. Within a few days one of the citizens of London, Ontario, with his brother, a resident of the United States, returning to Ireland for purposes of health and recreation, has been placed in custody, and may be detained for weeks in some loathsome prison cell without a shadow of proof against him or chance of trial. There is at this moment as much security for the traveller in the wilds of Arabia as in Ireland. In the one country, the rank barbarism of the Bedouin, in the other the brutalized civilization of the informer makes life insecure and prosperity impossible. Repression, if persisted in, can only have as results, crime, confusion, anarchy. If these be the only means Britain can adopt to govern Ireland, its failure to rule the country is plainly avowed, and ample proof at hand of the justice of Ireland's claim to self-government.

GERMAN SOCIALISM.

The Federal Council of the German Empire has adopted another coercive measure against socialism, having, upon the urgent representations of the Saxon government, declared the city of Leipzig in a state of siege, and consequently subject to martial law. In spite of all the rigor employed by the government, socialism is on the increase in Germany. Thoughtful minds in that country never gave very warm approval to the repressive schemes devised to retard the growth and finally crush out entirely the socialistic element. M. Joerg, during the debate in the Reichstag on a measure specially framed against socialism, gave expression to an excellent idea, when he declared that the principles of socialism could only be overcome by the principles of Christian order. Apart from the influence of Christianity in society, there is nothing that can overcome an element so insidious and so powerful, as the socialist. Force is evidently of little or no avail in such a movement. One of the most menacing features of the socialistic agitation in Germany, as elsewhere, is that it does its work under the cover of darkness. Its central organizations, with their numerous offshoots, have disappeared from the public view. Socialism has consequently become a veritable conspiracy, fomenting opposition to constituted authority and hatred for society as at present organized. Instead of being weakened, it has gained strength by repression, spreading its ramifications everywhere, specially throughout the towns and cities. At recent elections the socialistic element has displayed an audacity, strength and organization that have enabled it to conquer ground never before entered. What is particularly regrettable in the matter is that large bodies of artisans, and men of independent means, who had previously held aloof from the movement, cast in their lot with it so soon as the government decided to adopt towards it a policy of repression. Socialism has made enormous gains by the sympathy evoked through the brute force policy thus inaugurated. But if the policy of repression has signally failed, so also has every measure of quasi reform adopted for the purpose of weakening the vitality of the party. In fact, every such partial concession made to its demands seems to give it new life, determination and impetus. Thus Vollman, a leading socialist, recently combatted the proposed

tobacco monopoly, although admitting that the scheme was in accord with Socialistic principles. The only effective resistance that can be offered to socialism is a thorough reorganization of the social system on a Christian basis. With the church restricted in its freedom, its influence curbed and the resources of religion unused and undeveloped, nothing practical or effective in the way of solid social reform can be accomplished. When, perhaps, too late, European statesmen may see the truth of this position.

THE WAR.

The bombardment of Alexandria by the British squadron under Admiral Seymour resulted in the speedy fall of the city. But before the British became masters of the place Arabi Bey gave Alexandria over to pillage and massacre. He himself escaped with many of his followers under cover of a flag of truce. The scenes enacted by the fanatical Moslems in the city were simply terrific. Not fewer than two thousand Europeans are supposed to have fallen victims to the frenzy of the Bedouins and released convicts. The Egyptian losses during the bombardment were severe but do not compensate for the many valuable lives lost during the reign of terror inaugurated especially after Arabi's departure. The city is now quiet, and condign punishment is being meted out to all apprehended in connection with the late massacre and conflagration.

The latest news from Egypt up to our going to press indicate that Arabi Bey is at the head of a large body of troops prepared to maintain a struggle in the interior of the country. If strong enough, he may attempt the destruction of the Suez canal. Nothing very definite as to his purposes is, however, yet known.

Another massacre of Christians in Cairo is apprehended. Arabi has certainly aroused Moslem fanaticism to the highest pitch. The force of events having rendered a land expedition to Egypt necessary, the government have selected Gen. Sir Garnet Wolseley to command the force. Sir Garnet entered the army as ensign in 1852. He became a captain in 1855, major in 1858, lieutenant-colonel in 1859, and colonel in 1865. He first saw active service in the Burmese war of 1852-3. He also served in the Crimea, during the Indian mutiny, and in the Chinese campaign of 1860. He was appointed quarter master general in Canada in 1867, and commanded the Red river expedition in 1870. He achieved distinction in the Ashantee war in 1873-4, and after Lord Chelmsford's defeat in Zululand was despatched to that country to take the command. He arrived, however, too late to take any active part in the struggle, the Zulus having been just the day before his arrival completely defeated at Ulundi. Sir Garnet Wolseley is an officer of merit and ability and has now a grand opportunity to achieve a lasting distinction. The action of England in entering upon the bombardment of Alexandria did not evidently meet with universal approval. In France, Russia and other European countries the course of Britain in the Egyptian crisis was, at first, looked upon with evident distrust, if not openly avowed condemnation. In America there is yet a diversity of feeling on the subject, but the general view was, till the massacre, one of sympathy with the Egyptian people. When the bombardment of Alexandria was announced, a well-known American journal thus pronounced itself:

"On Tuesday morning, England began in Egypt, by the bombardment of Alexandria, the old game of overpowering violence against right and justice. By this time, the *fellahin* general and his national army may be overpowered, and the policy of the usurper and the stock-gambler may be triumphant, in the land of the Pharaohs. But England should be given to understand that the moral sense of mankind does not maintain her in this policy, and no country has the right to speak more distinctly than our own. American influence in the affairs of the East is much more real and extensive than even Americans are aware. We are the only power which comes into contact with these Eastern people, which has not some private end to serve. It is not unnatural that the Port should turn to General Wallace as the one disinterested and intelligent spectator of the troubles