

**The Catholic Record**  
Published every Friday morning at 486 Richmond Street.  
THOS. COFFEY,  
Proprietor and Proprietor.  
Annual subscription, \$2.00.  
Six months, \$1.00.  
Single copies, 10 cents.  
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 the 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, very sincerely,  
Yours,  
+ JOHN WALSH,  
Bishop of London.

MR. THOMAS COFFEY,  
Office of the "Catholic Record."  
Bishop's Palace, Kingston, Ont., Nov. 1882.

#### LETTER FROM BISHOP CLEARY.

DEAR SIR:—I am happy to be asked for a word of commendation to the Rev. Clergy and faithful laity of my diocese in behalf of the *Catholic Record*, published in London with the warm approval of His Lordship, Most Rev. Dr. Walsh. I am a subscriber to the *Record* and am much pleased with its excellent literary and religious character. The judicious selection from the best writers supply Catholic families with most useful and interesting matter for Sunday readings, and help the young to acquire a taste for pure literature.

I shall be pleased if my Rev. Clergy will commend your mission for the diffusion of the *Record* among their congregations. Yours faithfully,  
JAMES J. CLEARY,  
Bishop of Kingston.

MR. DONAT CROWE, Agent for the CATHOLIC RECORD.

### Catholic Record.

LONDON, FRIDAY, FEB. 23, 1883.

#### BISHOP IRELAND ON INTEMPERANCE.

Bishop Ireland has rendered many inestimable services to the country at large and to his Irish fellow-citizens in particular, but if we mistake not, his greatest service to America is his war on the vice of intemperance, whose sad consequences have been so very often discussed. Often, however, as has the subject of intemperance in all its due aspects been discussed, it will, we think, now bear renewed reflection. Let us therefore, in brief, follow Bishop Ireland in his treatment of it. The learned prelate begins by a question as trenchant as it is certainly appropriate. Amid the general ruin and devastation caused by drink, he asks, "How fare the Irish people?"

Before proceeding to answer this question of vital interest not only to all men of Irish blood and origin, but to their fellow men of every other race, Bishop Ireland very tellingly alludes to the ties binding America to Ireland. "A thousand ties," says the good bishop, "bind us to them; the greater number of us are part and parcel of them; our labors are cast amidst them." This, he maintains is a propitious time, it is an era of Irish patriotism. The virtues and the sufferings of the Irish people never before awakened such universal interest as they have of late.

"The day, in the designs of Providence is manifestly dawning," says the bishop, "when the tears of centuries shall be dried, and their hearts throbb at last under the influence of unalloyed joy. To hasten their deliverance, friends and patriots are on hand in numbers, each one with his remedy for the ills of the Irish people. I have my remedy, and I will publish it to the world—Total Abstinence. I pronounce the word with deep love, because of my faith in the remedy, and my hope that it shall be applied."

Desirous, however, of removing misapprehension as to his position on the subject of intemperance in its relation to the Irish race, Bishop Ireland points out that the Irish do not drink more alcoholic liquors than others, in fact they drink proportionately less in Ireland than the English or Scotch do in England or Scotland. But he adds:

"I must not be misunderstood. The Irish people do not drink more alcoholic liquors than others; they drink proportionately less in Ireland than the English or the Scotch do in England or Scotland. Poor consolation, however, if I am sick—to be able to point to a neighbor yet sicker than I. And this much remains true: Alcohol does more harm among the Irish people than it does among others, because the warm nature of the Irish people yields more readily to its flames, and in the wreck which follows they have more virtues to sacrifice. Nor do I mean to say that intemperance is the sole cause of their woes; yet this much is true: It is a great cause of woe to them, and

were it once a mere memory of the past, other causes would not long linger among them."

Who will deny the truth and justice of these observations? What friend is there of old Erin who will not agree with Bishop Ireland when he declares, that if there is a man who should curse alcohol it is he who loves sincerely the Irish people? and what man in America, we may ask, has shown greater love for the Irish than Bishop Ireland? He has shown for them not love in mere speech, but love in deed. He knows them well and loves them too when he tells us that the "picture of their virtues entrances and that they are the most liberty-loving people on the earth." "Eight hundred years," he says, "of oppression have left no mark in their freeman hearts. Generous—the will is ever beyond the means; selfishness melts and vanishes beneath their soft skies. Brave and spirited—battle fields tell their valor, as the counsels of nations speak their wisdom. Pure in morals—the gem of purity nothing can snatch away from the coronet of the isle of virgins and martyrs. Such are the children of Erin."

Who will rise to controvert the Bishop's statement that a fit fuel for the flame was this Irish nature with its fiery blood and noble aspirations? We give his own words: "A fit fuel for the flame was this Irish nature, with its fiery blood and its generous aspirations. Its virtues were turned by the demon into stumbling blocks. Alcohol was made a token of friendship, a sign of joy, a proof of liberality. Advantage, too, was taken of the misery resulting from foreign oppression. Alcohol is a fount of Lethe; a draught from it drives away care and thought. Thus, alcohol was the titillation in joy and sorrow. Poets praised it, and harpers awakened from their chords songs in its honor. At the christening and the wedding, at the meeting and the parting, at the funeral and civic feasts, alcohol appeared. High and low, leaders and followers paid homage to it. This has been Ireland's curse, and he who still loves alcohol joins hands with Ireland's most bitter foe."

Having premised so much Bishop Ireland deals with the evils of intemperance in Ireland itself. He quotes Mr. A. M. Sullivan to show that while drink in one year (1877) in that country absorbed fifty-five millions of dollars, absentee landlordism drew from it but twenty-five millions. He also repeats the statement of Mr. Villiers Stuart, M. P. for Waterford, made some time ago in Dublin that "one half the amount of what was annually spent in drink in Ireland, would, if annually applied for the purpose, buy, in fifteen years, the fee simple of all the farms in Ireland. Bishop Ireland holds that if intemperance were suppressed, courts and jails might in the old land be closed.

"If in other countries," he states, "seventy-five to eighty-five per cent. of crime results from drink, I would not fear to say that in Ireland ninety-five per cent. or more would be the correct figure, so good are the Irish people without whiskey—so bad with it. Lord Morphet, when secretary of Ireland, during Father Mathew's crusade, gave these astonishing statistics: Of cases of murder, attempts of murder, offenses against the person, aggravated assaults, there were in 1837, (before Father Mathew's labors) 12,006; in 1838, 11,058; in 1839, 1,096; (crime diminishing as temperance prevailed) in 1840, (the hey-day of total abstinence) 173. With whiskey, 12,006; without whiskey, 173! Between 1838 and 1840 the public houses where liquors were retailed in Dublin had lessened by 237. As a consequence the persons imprisoned in the Bridewell (the principal city prison) had fallen in a single year from 136 to twenty-three. More than 100 cells in the Bridewell being empty, the Smithfield prison was actually closed. Recently Baron Dowse has declared from the Bench: 'Drink is at the bottom of nearly all the crime in Dublin.' If crime has increased in Ireland since 1840, it is because Father Mathew's spirit no longer rules the country."

We will not follow the learned prelate through his discussion of the sad effects of drunkenness on the

Irish in England. He adduces figures that are simply appalling to show the degradation into which many thousands of them are there reduced through liquor. But let us give due attention to his statement of the evil worked on the Irish in America by alcohol. In a land the very richest the sun shines on and with greater opportunities for the making of wealth than any in the whole world the Irish as a class are poor. It is, as Bishop Ireland says, a lamentable fact that they are the hewers of wood and drawers of water.

"Go," he says, "where the hardest work is to be done, you find Irishmen—boring in the mines of Pennsylvania, wasting away their life-blood amid the never-ceasing din of industrial machinery in New England, strewing with their corpses lines of railroads or canals. In large cities the tenement quarters are thronged with them, a family striving to breathe in each room of a building five stories high, crammed with human beings from cellar to roof. This condition of things is deplorable. Forced poverty is hurtful to soul and body. Mortality attains fearful proportions. In the tenement houses of New York 75 per cent. of all children born, die within a few years after their birth. The report of a Boston Medical Association shows, that while Irish families are far more numerous than those of native New Englanders, yet on account of greater mortality among Irish children, the New England population would keep pace with the Irish, were not the latter constantly receiving new accessions from emigration. Bad ventilation and alcoholism, adds the report, are impairing fearfully the general sanitary status of the Irish people. No influence for good, social or political, can they have amid this poverty. What room for evils of all sorts, physical and moral! Well, what is it that keeps the Irish people in these low social conditions? The saloon. Thither goes the money earned at the sweat of their brow; thence do men issue, broken down in health and strength, to swell the lists of idlers and paupers. Our disgrace and our misfortune in America is the number of Irish saloon-keepers. I blush for the old race whenever I walk along the streets of our cities and read over doorways Irish names prefacing, so seldom the words 'Bank,' 'Commission House,' 'Dry Goods Store,' so often the words 'Saloon,' 'Wines and Liquors,' 'Imported Liquors.' To what base uses noble names have come!"

The Bishop invites us to compute in any one city the sums of money spent by Irishmen in Irish saloons, and assures us that the results of the computation will excite in us feelings of the deepest alarm. He himself mentions the fact that in one western city of America there are 1,500 saloons kept by Irishmen for the benefit of Irishmen.

"Allow," says Dr. Ireland, "the average receipts for each saloon to be \$15 per day, you have an annual expenditure for liquor, by the Irish of that city, of \$8,212,500. Add to these sums the value of time lost through drink, of wages unearned because men visit saloons, and \$12,000,000 per annum is not too high a figure to represent the annual losses to the Irish of one city. Repeat the calculation with due proportion from St. Paul to New York, from Boston to Philadelphia, and you will know why we are poor."

The bishop goes on: "It is idle to talk to advise the people to secure homes of their own, to leave the crowded cities, to gain by labor and economy a competence for themselves and their families; we must lay the axe to the root of the evil, first teaching them to shun the saloon which is swallowing up their earnings."

He then proceeds to make reflections that no man can gainsay in reference to Irish criminality. Here are his words:

"The list of culprits with Irish names appearing before municipal courts, filling the municipal jails and reformatories, strike us with horror. Well they may. Let us tell the truth—the world is telling it for us; but the world tells it for our shame, while we will tell it that the world may no longer be able to tell it,

Irish names, doubly more than our due proportion in American cities will allow, are inscribed on court registers. What a shame for the Irish race! What a disgrace to religion! We could defend them, if comparisons can be deferred. The most shocking sins of the land are absent from Irish homes. Weighed before God in scales of perfect justice, these Irish crimes are often slight and pardonable before crimes of more favored classes who are not dragged into court. But what of this in the public mind? Who will explain as we do or see as we do. The shame and scandal remain. Have you studied the causes of these crimes? I have tried to study them, and in large cities I have questioned judges and police officers, and here is the fact: Ninety per cent. at least of all Irish crimes are traceable directly or indirectly to drink. The power of rum to produce crime, great among all elements of the population, attains special proportions among the Irish. As things are, we appear far more criminal than we should be. Suppress rum, and no other element of the population compares with us in freedom from crime."

These are reflections that we venture to earnestly commend to all our readers. We commend them specially to friends of and workers in the cause of total abstinence, that their usefulness may be increased and their energy redoubled in a cause that deserves to enlist the noblest efforts of Christian men.

#### THE CRISIS IN FRANCE.

The inability of the French Republic to meet the exigencies of the present situation in France, has now become evident to the world. That so-called republic, having degenerated into a despotic democracy with hatred of divine authority as its basis, is now in a condition truly deplorable. The strongest men in the country have formed governments that have lasted for brief periods, and then died ignominious deaths. The time of the legislature has for the past four years been spent not in devising measures to promote the real interests of the nation, but to deprive it of the beneficent effects of solid religious conviction and the strength of active religious life. The republican chiefs, whatever their natural abilities—and many of them have been endowed with great natural talent—have shown no real capacity for statesmanship. If they had the gift of political foresight, or the strength of sound political conviction, they could never have entered on, or having entered on it, pursued the course of suicidal folly that has disgraced French politics and humiliated the French nation during the past few years. Instead of those solid measures of domestic legislation demanded by the people, they have had war declared on monks and nuns, and the schools made godless. The French nation is essentially Catholic, but its rulers under the so-called republican regime have sought to make it not only anti-Catholic, but anti-Christian. They have been united in one thing only, hatred of religion, some hating it to a greater degree than others, but all determined in their opposition to its growth and progress. Could any statesman expect a country to flourish under such a policy. A government with a weak and fiftful domestic policy can never expect to have strength in its foreign policy. France has exemplified the truth of this principle in a very emphatic manner during the past twelve years. Its domestic policy has been singularly weak and unsound, and its foreign policy has suffered in consequence.

The radical chiefs are now reduced to a political impotence as deplorable as it was unexpected by them. None of them cares to undertake the responsibility of forming a Cabinet to govern the country even for a few months. There is discord in their ranks and the most judicious and far-seeing of French politicians, men of conscience and conviction, of whom there are not a few who favor the republican form of government for France, foresee that the republic, as at present constituted, cannot last. It is really doomed. But will its fall be accompanied by those scenes of violence that so often mark political changes in France? This is indeed a question of importance and interest to thoughtful Frenchmen and to the friends of France amongst other nations. We cannot venture on an answer, but feel satisfied that if the impending revolution in France be marked by violence, the disorder will assume proportions of the most alarming character. Radicalism may, in a general disruption certain in that eventually to come, for the moment, triumph. But as it has no cohesive force to keep its repellant elements together for any time, it cannot come out of the struggle victorious. It must die. Now we say is the time for French Monarchists and lovers of order to unite. They surely see by this time the evil effects of their past divisions. If they now have the patriotism to unite and consolidate their forces, victory complete and glorious in all its consequences must be theirs.

#### ARCHBISHOP LYNCH ON IRELAND.

His Grace of Toronto has added another to many claims on the gratitude of the Irish people at home and abroad by his recent letter on the present state of that unhappy country. His Grace in that letter lays down certain statements borne out by the whole history of Ireland. "If mere animals," says Dr. Lynch, "were treated as those human beings (the Irish) are, philanthropic societies would have good reason to enter a prosecution against the barbarous authors of such cruelties; and still they continue in the nineteenth century, and are even partially condoned by some, because practised on the mere Irish." His Grace further states that "a government which permits and landlords who carry out deeds of oppression so barbarous, will meet a just God, who will vindicate, even in this life, the ways of His holy Providence towards the poor."

After dealing briefly with the question of emigration, the Archbishop speaks of the wonderful change in the climate of Ireland that has taken place within a half century. "There are now," he says, "constant rains and fogs, so that certain crops do not mature as formerly. Wheat is uncertain, potatoes more so, apples which ripened in Ireland fifty years ago, now shrivel on the trees. The moisture of the earth is destructive to the hoofs of the sheep and they rot in thousands. There is not enough of sunshine to dry the turf which is the fuel of the poor. This state of things will become the normal state of Ireland."

What now is to be done to make that island habitable and fairly prosperous under its changed circumstances? This is a very important question, and His Grace deals with it with that fullness and exactitude to be expected from a mind so clear and far-seeing. Dr. Lynch proceeds to show that Ireland could be made a prosperous country by the extensive planting of trees. That country, he points out, known in ancient times as the "Forest Island," and is particularly adapted to the growth of trees. He suggests that the government should appropriate to the people lands fit only for the cultivation of trees and even grant premiums for the planting of them. Thus, as the learned prelate maintains, Ireland would in twenty years be supplied with fuel, and the beginning of a trade in timber that would afford remunerative employment to its people. He also suggests the stocking of the lakes and rivers with fish, not for the use of the wealthy, but for the peasantry, as a means of providing cheap and nutritious food for the masses of the people.

Coming to the land question, His Grace advises the division of large farms into tracts of reasonable extent and their sale to the present tenants. This could, of course, be effected only through action on the part of the government, but the Archbishop of Toronto shows by two instances in the history of the Papal government that there are times when government must intervene between the owners of land and the peasantry for the protection of the latter and thereby secure the promotion of public interests. The Archbishop further shows that the prosperity of the country could be enhanced by the draining of the land under government supervision. On the subject of the revival of commerce in Ireland, His Grace takes ground that every Irishman, whether protectionist or free trader, will, for the time being, at all events approve. "Let the women of Ireland," he says, "keep to their resolve neither to wear or buy for themselves or their children anything that is not manufactured in Ireland, and their decaying and abandoned industries will revive and flourish, and render the country prosperous."

On the question of Home Rule, the Archbishop takes, as might be expected, a very decided attitude. He resumes the whole argument in one brief sentence, wherein he declares that Ireland should not be governed, as hitherto, for the benefit of England alone. That is certainly the manner in which Ireland has been hitherto governed. There has been in legislation touching on Irish inter-

ests no regard shown for their interests in themselves, but only in so far as they are connected with English security and English advancement. Ireland cannot be governed justly or properly without an Irish Parliament. Mr. Gladstone has himself declared as much, but the Earl of Derby, now a member of his Cabinet, affirms that Ireland cannot have Home Rule. Mr. Forster had previously taken similar ground. So that even the Liberal leaders, with all their boasted friendship for Ireland, are by no means a unit on the grave question of home government for that country. This is a question that must soon call for practical and final solution at the hands of British statesmen. If it be not solved in the true interests of Ireland, there must, of necessity, take place that very disintegration of the empire they now apparently dread so much.

#### MAYOR BEAUDRY.

There will be, it appears, an exciting contest for the Mayoralty of Montreal. The Irish Catholics of that city felt that it was their time to elect one of their number to the Chief Magistracy of the metropolitan city. For one reason or another they could not decide on a candidate on whom they could unite their suffrages. This is their misfortune, not their fault. The great difficulty with our friends everywhere is that they permit themselves to be too easily divided from merely local causes. It is to be hoped that before another year elapses they will see their way towards uniting on some strong Irish Catholic candidate for the Mayoralty. Meantime they have an important duty to perform. There are now two candidates in the field for the office, Mayor Beaudry and Mr. Henry Bulmer. Of the latter gentleman we know only this, that he was a strong sympathizer with the Orangemen of Montreal in their outrageous attempts to defy law and order in Montreal in 1877-78. Is he, therefore, we ask, a fit person to fill the Mayor's chair of that great city. What claim does he advance for the position? None, but that he is an Irishman, and that this year it is the turn of an English-speaking citizen to fill the position of Chief Magistracy of Montreal. Mr. Bulmer's plea that he is an Irishman is not in our estimation any reason why he should be made Mayor of Montreal. He is by the accident of birth an Irishman, but by every circumstance that contributes to make a man, is an enemy of his race.

Mr. Bulmer's friends argue that it is the turn of an English-speaking citizen to occupy the position of Mayor. This we admit, but Mr. Bulmer's own friends have always drawn a line dividing the English-speaking citizen of Montreal into classes, Protestant and Catholic. With them it is always Protestant first. Very little if any regard have they for the Irish Catholics of Montreal, except when they can use them for their own purposes against the French Catholics of that city.

Mayor Beaudry offered, we believe, to withdraw if an Irish Catholic should take the field. No Irish Catholic has yet done so, or is likely to do so. We therefore believe the duty of our Irish Catholic friends to give hearty support to Mr. Beaudry. He has shown himself worthy of his trust. His enemies have nothing to allege against him but his firmness in upholding the law.

We heartily commend him to the support of the Irish Catholics of the city of Montreal. Nothing but division amongst them can prevent his election.

#### RUSSIAN CATHOLICS.

From Russia there comes good news in relation to the Catholics in that empire. A reform demanded by justice and the true interests of the country is about to take place in relation to Catholic officers in the army. These officers form an important minority in the body of Russian military commanders, but have hitherto been to a very great extent excluded from promotion even when promotion was justly merited. This exclusion arose from the settled policy of the government itself to keep Catholics in the background in the Imperial army. But besides the exclusion of Catholic officers from promotion, Catholics have had to complain of another grievance. Catholic students in the military colleges who passed their examination with distinction could never hope to enter the imperial guard or the artillery service. The students of the orthodox faith always had the preference.

The government is now engaged in preparing a measure whereby this injustice will be removed.

It may be truly stated that the Catholic element in the army will be found one of the surest and most reliable in every sense against the attacks of nihilism.

Washington, when President, had a full-length painting of Mary Immaculate hanging at the head of his bed, saying to the future Archbishop of Baltimore, the Most Rev. Ambrose Marchal, D. D.: "I cannot leave the Son without honoring the Mother."

#### HERR WINDTHORST.

Harper's Monthly for February contains an article on "German Political leaders," which we can commend for personal and reflection. The writer is by no means friendly to the church, but is led to pay a just tribute of praise to Herr Windthorst, the leader of the Catholic party in German politics. The writer in Harper's introduces his sketch of Windthorst by the following reference to the great contest in the German diet in which that distinguished man has so prominently figured:

"The earliest, the fiercest, and the bloodiest (combat) was one which was only renewed, not begun, which the historical reader will easily trace back to the middle ages, the great national duel between Kaiser and Pope, between Ghibelline and Guelf, between the just claims of the state and the arrogant pretensions of the Church."

This is simply disingenuous. In the recent struggle in Germany the church advanced no pretensions whatever. Its privileges were most unjustly violated and its liberties ruthlessly trampled under foot. The Church stood on the defensive, and Cæsarism to-day recoils before its unyielding tenacity and indomitable firmness of purpose. If the writer of "German Political leaders" took the trouble of attempting to define what he terms the "just claims" of the state and the "arrogant pretensions" of the church, he would, we feel inclined to believe, discover, before he had proceeded at any length with his investigation, that all the justice was on the side of the church, and the arrogance and injustice on the side of the state.

The following is his appreciation of Herr Windthorst: "This struggle, resumed ten or fifteen years ago, in form the same, though under conditions different, united the Catholic Deputies into the Parliamentary centre. But it did more than that. Besides a party, it created the leaders of a party, and leaders who for eloquence, audacity, adroitness, are the peers of any men in the House. The first of these, far above all rivals, is Windthorst. Puny in size, almost deformed, ugly as Socrates, he is an antagonist before whose wit the boldest Deputies tremble, and under whose assaults even the great Chancellor loses his coolness and self-command. As a tactician, he is unsurpassed. Starting as the chief of a small and proscribed faction, he has built it up to be the most numerous party in the House, and, holding the balance of power, wields it with the skill which O'Connell made famous in the House of Commons. But he is something besides a mere wit or Parliamentary athlete. Short, crisp, pungent retorts are indeed his chief arms of controversy; but he is also a politician of culture and real statesmanlike ability, and can discuss public topics from an elevated intellectual plane. That his success in serious methods and sustained efforts has been less frequently demonstrated may not even be a fact of his own preference, though the habit of his mind suggests such an inference. It may be—and the supposition is reasonable—that the nature of his task, or at least his views of it, has imposed another policy upon him as a tactical necessity; for, cut off as he is by the character and the relations of his party from an active share in creative legislation, he is practically confined to the work of criticism, of more negative opposition; and this, of course, is best performed, not by sustained and elaborate strategy, but by sudden dashes, by brisk and audacious dashes, in every part of the field."

It is he makes a parliamentary bargain with the government or another party, he exacts and receives the equivalent in advance."

Windthorst, like every judicious Parliamentary leader, has a lieutenant, the Baron Schorlemer Alst. "He was formerly," says the writer in Harper's, "a brilliant officer of cavalry, and the soldier may still be detected in his appearance, but not in his oratory. He does not speak, as one might expect, in a dashing or reckless manner. His delivery never suggests the trooper with waving plume and eager sabre charging a hostile squadron on the battle field, vent-