

The Catholic Record

Published every Friday morning at 428 Richmond Street.

Annual subscription..... \$2 00
Six months..... 1 00

ADVERTISING RATES.

Ten cents per line for first, and five cents per line for each subsequent insertion. Advertisements measured in non-pariel type, 12 lines to an inch.
Contract advertisements for three, six, or twelve months, special terms. All advertisements should be handed in not later than Tuesday morning.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

All matter intended for publication must have the name of the writer attached, and must reach the office not later than Tuesday noon of each week.

THOS. COFFEY,
Publisher and Proprietor.

LETTER FROM HIS LORDSHIP BISHOP WALSH.

London, Ont., May 23, 1870.
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 one 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."

Catholic Record.

LONDON, FRIDAY, JAN. 14, 1881.

THE TEMPORAL POWER OF THE PAPACY.

The Papacy as a temporal sovereignty disappeared in 1870. No one then looked, and no one now looks on that disappearance as final. Surrounded by faithless men who, in the name of diplomacy, guided the destinies of the Italian peninsula, the temporal sovereignty of the Holy See had for years before its suppression but small chance of subsistence. The defeat of the revolutionists of '48 was not of that crushing character required to give new lease of life to the government, whose permanency they had threatened. The Kingdom of Sardinia became from that date the hotbed of revolutionary societies. The emissaries of these organizations found their way into every portion of the peninsula, from Calabria to Savoy. They labored incessantly in season and out of season to stir up in the public mind a spirit of disaffection against the existing order of things. Every town soon had its organized band of revolutionists in constant communication with headquarters. The Kingdom of the Sicilies and the Papal States were made special objects of attention by the leaders of the revolutionary party. Their purpose was to destroy monarchical government in these territories. But the more easily to accomplish this purpose, they declared themselves in favor of Italian unity under the rule of the Sardinian King. They represented the necessity of an Italian union to make Italian influence felt in Europe. Nor were their appeals to national vanity unanswered. Many men of sound religious convictions and honest purposes were inveigled into support of it not co-operation with, the revolutionary organizations by the specious reasoning of the advocates of unification. The abuses of government in the smaller principalities of Italy were grossly exaggerated in order to excite indignation at home and sympathy abroad. The Emperor of the French lent himself to the support of the schemes of Count Cavour, the able but unscrupulous minister of the Sardinian King. Cavour aimed at nothing less than acquiring for his sovereign, through the instrumentality of the revolutionary societies, complete domination in the Italian peninsula. The support of the French emperor once secured, the task was a comparatively easy one. The smaller sovereignties fell into the grasp of Sardinia almost without a struggle. The Kingdom of the Two Sicilies itself was so honeycombed with revolutionary organizations that the resistance offered even there was but nominal. The Holy Father having very limited resources and a small armed force made a vigorous and partially successful defence of right against might. He had, however, to lose a portion of his states. The remainder he succeeded in preserving intact for ten years more. But the withdrawal by France in September, 1870, of the troops whose presence were the best guarantee of French determination to uphold the right and dignity of the Holy See, gave the revolutionists too good an oppor-

tunity to be lost—of destroying the temporal power. We know too well that they succeeded. But success never abides with injustice. Hardly had the Sardinian King entered into possession of the Papal States, when the very organizations which had given him the throne of an united Italy, sought to undermine that throne. He had served their purpose, and they were resolved on his destruction. Death, however, removed him before the revolutionists could ruin him. His son and successor is, however, at their mercy. Recent events show the weakness of his government. It has neither the respect nor confidence of the Italian people. The latter were led to believe that when the governments they had so long lived under were abolished an era of undiminished prosperity would set in. Instead of prosperity, the people have found, as results of unification, beggary and taxation. The generation which enjoyed the benefit of the older regimes has not yet passed away. Its influence is daily growing. Against its advice and against its warnings many of the best youths of Italy were drawn into revolutionary schemes, whose total failure now exasperates the nation.

There was nothing in the former condition of things to prevent an Italian union, somewhat similar to that formerly obtaining in Germany. There was, above all, no necessity to secure the destruction of the Papal sovereignty to bring about Italian unity. A right understanding of the state of affairs previous to 1848, will show that the temporal sovereignty of the Holy See was Italy's best safeguard against foreign aggression. The existence of that monarchy secured Italy immunity from the dangers which threatened so many other States. At home the Italian people were strong and united in the possession of one government whose influence overshadowed that of all the others in the peninsula—abroad safe in the protection from foreign spoliation which the maintenance of the Papal monarchy by the plighted faith of the whole continent guaranteed and provided. Italy before the so-called unification was arbiter of her own destinies. Now her affairs are discussed in Congresses composed of representatives of foreign powers. The oppressed in any one of the Italian states had then but to appeal to the Holy See to secure justice. Now the appeal must be made to all Europe, and Europe has been deaf to appeals for justice for nearly a century.

The activity of the revolutionists on the one hand, and the discontent of the great mass of the Italian people on the other, lead us to believe that there are in store for this storied country changes as radical as any it has ever yet witnessed, and amongst these changes there is one which we make no doubt will be welcomed by all classes of Italian patriots as a boon to the people and to society—the establishment of the grand old monarchy of the Popes—a monarchy to which mankind and civilization owe more than to any form of government that has ever ruled the destinies of any portion of the human family.

ORGANIZED.

The Home Rule party is evidently well organized for the Session of Parliament just begun. Mr. Parnell was present at the opening of the houses, and was most enthusiastically received by his friends. He may, however, be at any time recalled to Ireland by the court now trying him for sedition and conspiracy. His place will, in any such eventuality, be filled by Mr. Justin McCarthy, the well known journalist. Under Mr. Parnell, or his first lieutenant, the Irish party will be enabled to do much good for their suffering country. The landlord press has entered on a course of vilification and slander of the Irish people with the view of prejudicing the British public mind against the Irish tenantry. The misrepresentations of this venal press will be repeated on the floor of Parliament. It is well for Ireland that she has now so many able and fearless representatives to plead her case and rescue her people from the infamy which slander would fasten on her brow. We confess that we

feel proud to see the Irish party so well prepared for the struggle. From the first day a vigorous fight must be made for Ireland's rights. The time for any half-hearted measures has passed. Every man who represents an Irish popular constituency, owes it to his people to attend regularly in his place and give his vote wherever his vote is wanted. The government and measure must be made by judicious amendment as acceptable as possible to the Irish people. This can only be done by maintaining a regular and effective organization throughout the Session. We are happy to see the Irish party so well organized at the start, and hope its unity may be preserved unimpaired for years to come—till an Irish Parliament meets in Dublin.

THE QUEEN'S SPEECH.

The British Parliament re-assembled on the 5th inst., about one month earlier than usual. The summoning of Parliament, at a time so unusual, is due to the critical situation in Ireland. The policy of the government towards the Irish land agitation during the Parliament was apparently so unsettled that the people lost hope of seeing the Liberal administration introduce a just and comprehensive measure of land reform. The speech from the Throne deploras the condition of Ireland and makes promise of some measure of land relief. For the details of this measure we must wait till the Premier brings the subject before Parliament. Nothing but a radical scheme of reform—a scheme framed to secure the rights of the tenantry while protecting the just claims of the landlord—will satisfy Ireland. Experience has proved the utter worthlessness of half-hearted measures of reform in this direction. The Irish people have had more than enough of such spiritless legislation. They want protection against rapacity and injustice. They have no desire to invade the rights of property. But they are determined to permit no class of men to trample them under foot and rob them of sustenance in the name of property. The present disturbed state of Ireland affords ample, and to us convincing proof, of the destructive tendencies of the present land system. If the landlords be the class of good, kind, and merciful people their defenders and apologists would have us believe, they would surely devise some means of allaying discontent amongst the tenantry. Instead of endeavoring, by co-operation in some scheme of popular improvement, they ask the government to make war on the people. Was there ever injustice more monstrous? The people have resolved that there must be no more famines in Ireland—a country than which there is none more richly blessed by heaven. They see and fully understand the causes which led to former distress and decide on removing these causes. They even seek the co-operation of the landed interest in this work of national regeneration. They meet, however, with but little encouragement from this body. Long accustomed to dominancy, the landlords of Ireland vainly imagined in the earlier stages of the present land agitation that they had but to fall back on British military prowess to keep the people in awe. The good sense of the Irish people has clearly demonstrated the fallacy of reliance upon arms and troops to perpetuate injustice. The government now owes it to the whole country to bring down a very comprehensive measure of land reform. Ireland will be satisfied with nothing less; the empire cannot be said to be in safety with anything less. It is certain that any broad and generous scheme of reform, will meet with the most determined and relentless opposition from the landlords in both Houses, but particularly in the Upper Chamber. Already the Earl of Beaconsfield has sounded the key-note of opposition. If defeated in what we trust will prove his just and benevolent purpose of removing Irish discontent and misery by the action of the Lords, Mr. Gladstone should appeal to the constituencies to "encourage," in the words of Mr. Bright, the hereditary chamber. Such an appeal would receive a most hearty response, and render the righting of Ireland's wrongs an easier task than ever.

FEMALE EDUCATION.

The *Advertiser*, in some comments on a recent article in the *Bystander*, makes certain statements on the subject of female education to which we are bound to take exception. We are not by any means of one mind with the writer of the article in the *Bystander* for January—but consider certain of his deductions, to which we may at some future time refer—more reasonable than those of our city contemporary. The latter sets out with the declaration that it is "unable to see why there should be any distinction of sex in the educational provisions made by the state for the young people of Canada." Well, we are still worse off, for we can see no reason why the state as such should have anything to do with the education of our young people. But as the state advances its claim to the exercise of such a right and as a majority of the people sustain and accept its claim to the exercise of this presumed right, we are with a large and growing minority bound to make the best of an uninviting situation. The state makes very little, if any, distinction between the sexes in its educational system, and herein lies one of the most radical defects of this much vaunted system. The education of women is a matter of the highest importance to society. But woman has in society a sphere to move in quite distinct from that in which man must move. Her education must, therefore, differ from that of the male sex. Man moves in the outer world, woman in the inner or domestic circle. Her influence in society is greater than that of man. The right exercise of this influence cannot be secured without a thorough and efficient training of the faculties and exact guardianship of the conscience of the female child. Her education should, in fact, commence at a very early age. The development of her mental powers should be encouraged by a judicious stimulation of her dormant industry and gradual disclosure of her latent energy. Her power of retention should be in a special degree fostered and enlarged, the subject matter of her studies carefully selected and no effort spared to place her under the care of competent teachers. Competency in the teacher should be viewed in its proper light—that of capability to guide the heart and conscience of the pupil as well as to cultivate her intellectual growth. With Catholics, we beg to inform the *Advertiser*, it is not "taken for granted that the woman need not know as much as the man: that girls should leave school earlier than boys: and that while at school their course of study should have regard to their filling an ornamental rather than useful position in society."

We look upon the want of mental training in women as, if possible, more detrimental to society than such a want in men, and we have often deplored the carelessness of many parents in giving their daughters the advantages of a good education. Holding as we do the opinion that that nation is happiest wherein the status and influence of woman is highest, we will be always found in firm advocacy of the most thorough education of the female sex. But we will ever, to our utmost, oppose any system such as that advocated by our friend and contemporary, a system already established in the neighboring republic, and productive, not indeed, of the "ornamental" woman, whom the writer in the *Advertiser* dreads so much, but of the cultured woman of little heart and no conscience. If women desire to know as much as men who graduate in universities, there can be no objection to their acquirement of this knowledge. There are many institutions in the country where they can reach this desirable end without being compelled to lead what for ninety-nine out of every hundred young ladies of Canada would be a most distasteful, if not pernicious life. We are opposed to the co-education of the sexes, not on the grounds attributed by the *Advertiser* to the opponents of co-education. We are opposed to it because it deprives woman of the training her calling imperatively demands. Women are not called on to live the life of labor which men

must of necessity lead. Their calling is one of a different character. They may, and, indeed, often must, work to secure a livelihood—but their work is, in very few instances, similar to that followed by men. By all means let women be well educated. Let the state make liberal grants for the maintenance of establishments for the higher education of women. But let there be no such thing as a forced system of co-education similar to that obtaining in the High and Normal Schools. These schools meet, and in the opinion of some but imperfectly, the present exigencies of certain classes in our social system. An extension of the co-education of the sexes into a University training, would, in our opinion, be disastrous to the best interests of the people for generations to come.

IN A TERRIBLE RAGE.

That mild and sweet-tempered journal, the *Christian Guardian*, has at length yielded to temptation and burst into a rage. What sorrow will it not cause the brethren, male and female, to witness such a fall from grace. The sleek and unassuming godliness of our contemporary must have received a rude shock to produce such a fit of temper. But there is cause for his anger! Our friend has actually read a letter of Arch. bishop Lynch on the Irish question, and grown frantic. By some amongst his prayerful constituency the writer in the *Guardian* may be consigned to the stool of repentance for eye reading a Popish archbishop's letter. His only excuse in that case will be that he found it so utterly wicked as to enrage him. And enraged he certainly is or pretends to be. He fairly foams at the mouth over what he considers the perversity of the Archbishop's letter. It is "disloyal," "disgraceful," and "communistic." From our knowledge of the Sectaries and their scribes we were at first led to infer that the man of the *Guardian* must have seized on the bishop's letter to swell a perhaps attenuated subscription list. We never knew one of that ilk to work himself into a fury against Popery but with some mercenary object in view. It may be, and for the credit of journalism, trust it is otherwise with the *Guardian*. But the writer in that journal must be a man of the most narrow and illiberal type. His illiberality is rendered all the more gross by his ignorance, while his mendacity is as atrocious and scandalous as writer could be guilty of. The Archbishop's letter is a temperate expose of the case of Ireland. As a good citizen and loyal subject of the Queen the Archbishop deemed it his duty to lay before the public the causes of Ireland's misery, and to point out the remedy for that misery. He has done Ireland, Canada and the whole empire good service by his letter. But frankness is a quality evidently unknown to the *Guardian*. The hypocrisy of the camp-meeting is too deeply ingrained in that journal to permit its admiring such a noble quality. But let it rest assured of one thing. It may foam and rage over Dr. Lynch's able letter, and its subscription lists may swell through its base appeal to the vulgarst species of fanaticism. The Irish question must, however, be settled, and settled in the manner pointed out by the Archbishop of Toronto.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

THAT popular and excellent monthly, the "The Harp," has appeared for January. It is full of most interesting reading matter. Published by John Gillies, Montreal.

Our Quebec letter of this week contains an unusually interesting item of Catholic intelligence: the *modus operandi* of the preliminary trial of the cause of the Beatification and Canonization of the first Bishop of Quebec.

The proprietor of the New York *Herald* is evidently feeling the effects of the "Boycotting" treatment which is presently being administered to him in the States—when he has been obliged to go so far from home for support. A correspondent writes from Quebec to say that lately—for the first time—a third-of-a-column advertisement dilating on all the excellences of Mr.

Bennett's sheet, real and imaginary, has appeared in a local paper there.

The scandal given by one professing to be a practical Catholic, is terrible to contemplate, when by it he keeps others from embracing the true faith. Many people judge our religion by the bad example of worthless Catholics, rather than by the edifying, holy example of practical Catholics. As they look up to our faith as something we regard more than our lives, they do not understand why Catholics could even be human beings.—*Catholic Columbian*.

Those who sneer at the power of public opinion may find an illustration of what it can do in the case of Chief Justice May. Nothing but public opinion forced that insolent despot of the bench to relinquish his purpose to sit at the State trials, and use every means in his power to secure a conviction. But after the Boycott business it is hardly necessary to point out what public opinion may accomplish.—*Pilot*.

"We are sorry to say no satisfactory explanation has been yet received from Mr. VanMeter, as to his alleged loss of a bank draft crossing the English Channel. We do not want to be hard upon him, as we were against his scheme; but his story is a very lame one. And whether he is dishonest or not, he certainly is not a man to be entrusted with sums of money.—*Christian Guardian*.

We took occasion some time ago to let our Protestant friends know what manner of man was Mr. Van Meter. The information we possessed concerning him we received from some of the leading Protestant weeklies of the United States. These papers denounced him as a humbug, and warned the people to shun him. But all to no purpose. It is most singular that any mountebank who wishes to raise money can succeed if he only sits down and prepares a paper on the evils of "Romanism." He commits this to memory, struts into the lecture field, promises grand awakenings from "Popish idolatry," and the hearts and the pockets of a goodly number of people are opened to him. It is to be hoped that this last occurrence will have a salutary effect.

SIR WILFRED LAWSON, in the course of a speech on the Irish question at Carlisle, said that he hoped the Government might succeed in the pacification of Ireland, but it looked to him that so serious was the situation that this would be the last chance they should have in their lifetime of settling Ireland upon a basis of peace. We could not go on as we had been doing. Things were getting too bad; it was a regular scandal to Europe, and a danger to everybody concerned. We had tried to rule Ireland for six hundred years, and had totally failed. We had a rebellion there every eight or ten years, and two armies to keep up—one a military force and the other the constabulary—to keep the people in subjection. It was a heart-rending state of things, and it could not much longer go on. If we could not pacify these people, we could not go on insisting on holding an unwilling nation under our control; and if it came to a question of separation or subjugation, then, far rather than see his fellow subjects in Ireland drenched in blood and crushed down by military, he, for one, would heartily go for separation of that country from England.

The following considerations on the present condition of Irish affairs we clip from the *Philadelphia American*: "Mr. Parnell and his associates of the Home Rule party have adopted a very pronounced and radical programme for the regulation of their conduct during the coming session of Parliament. They are quite justified in so doing. Experience has taught them that extreme measures only will arouse the attention of the English people, and convince her hereditary and elective legislators of the necessity of action. Therefore they mean to offer wholesale obstruction to every kind of legislation, unless satisfactory measures are offered for the restoration of peace and contentment to the Irish people. The Liberals are not prepared to offer what Ireland will regard as satisfactory measures. All that they propose, is such restrictive legislation as will make the Irish tenant's position a more tolerable one. They will give him fixity of tenure, at a fair rent, and with free sale of his tenant right and unexhausted improvements. "It is toward some law of this kind," says *The Spectator*, "that all opinion is gravitating." But the Irish opinion organized in the League is not gravitating toward it. On the contrary, it regards it as one of those sopps by