

THE CATHOLIC RECORD PUBLISHED WEEKLY BY 333 BICKMEYER ST. LONDON, ONTARIO.

GEN. JOHN F. COFFEY, M. A., L.L.D., EDITOR. TERMS: 60 CENTS PER ANNUM IN ADVANCE.

GENERAL AGENTS: Messrs. Donat Crowe and Luke King, OTTAWA AGENCY: F. J. Coffey, General Agent, 74 George St.

Approved by the Bishop of London, and the Bishops of Ottawa, Hamilton, Kingston, and Toronto, and leading Catholic Clergymen throughout the Dominion.

All correspondence addressed to the Publisher will receive prompt attention.

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

Catholic Record.

LONDON, SATURDAY, APRIL 23, 1887. NO CAUSE FOR DESPAIR.

One of the objects of the Tory coalition in Britain is, without doubt, to drive the Irish people into despair, and from despair into violence and crime.

But it is with the Church of England we have to deal, and not with the Church of Germany. Let us see how this act of the Church of England accords with the "modern claims of Anglicanism."

There is already a patriarch of Jerusalem acting under authority of the Holy See. There is another claimant to this office in connection with the Greek schismatical Church of Jerusalem, deriving his authority from the impudent claim of Henry VIII.

We do not wish to cast any reproach upon the personal character of the Queen and we have in these articles on Anglicanism nothing to do with the Queen's civil rule. The claim, however, which is made for her, that she is the Supreme Head of Christ's Church, whether in England or Jerusalem, is unfounded either in holy scripture, tradition or common sense.

Will it be denied that such supremacy of the Sovereign exists? Is it true the thirty-seventh article of the Church of England says: "We give not to our Princes the ministering either of God's Word, or of the Sacraments, which thing the Injunctions also lately set forth by Elizabeth our Queen do most plainly testify."

"The Queen's Majesty hath the chief power in this Realm of England, and other her Dominions, unto whom the chief Government of all Estates of this Realm, whether they be Ecclesiastical or Civil, in all causes doth appertain, and is not, nor ought to be, subject to any foreign jurisdiction."

We believe that the Coercion Bill will become law, we believe that—despite the protests of outraged humanity and injured liberty—despite the appeals of reason, justice and truth—despite the warnings of history and the counsel of good sense—this bill will be placed on the British statute book.

times indicate the near approach of the solution of the Irish problem on the basis of justice and equality. We believe that the day is at hand when the English and Irish nations, that have so long hated each other and struggled against each other, are about to be united in a friendship that will endure for ever, a friendship that will ensure everlasting greatness to the British empire, and liberty, prolonged to the day of doom, to humanity at large.

MODERN CLAIMS OF ANGLICANISM.

III. THE QUEEN'S SUPREMACY.

The following item is at present closing the round of the press:

"The Rev. G. F. P. Blyth, Archbishop of Vancouver, has been presented with the vacant Bishopric of Jerusalem. He will be consecrated by the Archbishop of Canterbury. The appointment has hitherto alternated between the British Government and the Emperor of Germany, but the latter having refused to make an appointment the right devolved upon the British Government."

Among the vagaries of Anglicanism, the portion of the above statement which is in accordance with truth is one of the most ludicrous. It is a fact that through jealousy of French influence the British and German Governments agreed to appoint alternately a successor to St. James the Apostle, who first filled the see of Jerusalem. The absurdity lies in this, that the successor of the English Bluebeard, Henry VIII., and of the German infidel, Frederick II., should claim, by virtue of their office, the right to name an Apostle's successor!

But it is with the Church of England we have to deal, and not with the Church of Germany. Let us see how this act of the Church of England accords with the "modern claims of Anglicanism."

There is already a patriarch of Jerusalem acting under authority of the Holy See. There is another claimant to this office in connection with the Greek schismatical Church of Jerusalem, deriving his authority from the impudent claim of Henry VIII, and later of Queen Elizabeth, to be the Supreme Head of Christ's Church. Where? In England, or rather in the British Empire. But Jerusalem is not in the British Empire. Where then is "the right" of the British Sovereign to appoint a Bishop of Jerusalem, even if there were no previous occupant of the See?

We do not wish to cast any reproach upon the personal character of the Queen and we have in these articles on Anglicanism nothing to do with the Queen's civil rule. The claim, however, which is made for her, that she is the Supreme Head of Christ's Church, whether in England or Jerusalem, is unfounded either in holy scripture, tradition or common sense.

Will it be denied that such supremacy of the Sovereign exists? Is it true the thirty-seventh article of the Church of England says: "We give not to our Princes the ministering either of God's Word, or of the Sacraments, which thing the Injunctions also lately set forth by Elizabeth our Queen do most plainly testify."

"The Queen's Majesty hath the chief power in this Realm of England, and other her Dominions, unto whom the chief Government of all Estates of this Realm, whether they be Ecclesiastical or Civil, in all causes doth appertain, and is not, nor ought to be, subject to any foreign jurisdiction."

This is not a mere platitude, nor does it mean merely that the Sovereign has temporal authority over Ecclesiastical as well as lay persons. It means that the Sovereign is as supreme in the spiritual rule of the Church as in ruling the nation.

Keeping in view this dogmatic teaching, surely the compilers of the "Articles of Religion" might have added the Church of England to the list of peccant churches, contained in the 10th Article, if they had been blessed with a modicum of modesty.

"As the Church of Jerusalem, Alexandria and Antioch, have erred; so also the Church of Rome hath erred, not only in their living and manner of ceremonies, but also in matters of Faith."

To be convinced that we have not misinterpreted the thirty-seventh article, we need only consider the force of the words employed. All causes are declared to appertain to the Queen's Majesty, ecclesiastical and civil; and the jurisdiction of the

Pope is entirely set aside with the declaration:

"The Bishop of Rome hath no jurisdiction in this Realm of England. Of this Queen's authority in all causes it is farther said it is not, nor ought to be subject to any foreign jurisdiction."

There is no exception, the authority is therefore supreme; and the same is declared by the Act of Supremacy, which is thus formally sanctioned by an act of the Church. This supremacy is even made a matter of religious faith by being incorporated into the Articles of Religion. The absurdity of this is recalled only by the blasphemy of thus endeavoring to pass on the public as a divine dogma a doctrine which is contrary to the spirit as well as the words of Christ, and which is reprobated by the unmistakable teaching of tradition and reason.

The evidence that our interpretation is correct does not end with what we have already advanced. Even while the article in question endeavors to minimize its absurdity by keeping away from the "Queen" the right to preach and administer sacraments, it is only on the Queen's authority that it presumes thus to limit her powers! It expressly states that this "thing the Injunctions also lately set forth by Elizabeth our Queen do most plainly testify."

Further on we are told that the prerogative attributed to the Queen, and the only one so attributed, "has been given always to all godly Princes in holy Scriptures by God Himself; that is, that they should rule all estates and degrees committed to their charge by God, whether they be ecclesiastical or temporal, and restrain with the civil sword the stubborn and evil doers."

The thirty-sixth article affords further proof of the same. The form of "Consecration of Archbishops and Bishops, and ordering of priests and deacons" must certainly depend on the will of Christ who instituted the priesthood. It is readily understood that, provided the Church of Christ preserves the essential form used by our Lord Himself, and by His Apostles, she may ordain such symbolical rites as she deems suitable to preserve respect for the sacred orders so conferred. The essentials must, however, originate with our divine Saviour, for it is He who "gave some Apostles, and some prophets, and other some evangelists, and other some pastors and doctors, for the perfecting of the saints, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body of Christ."

From Acts xiv, 23, and II Cor. vii, 19, we learn that the Apostles used a form for ordination. They "ordained to them priests in every church, and prayed with fasting, and commended them to the Lord in whom they believed." So also a "brother (Barnabas) was ordained by the Churches, companion of our travels."

How then shall we characterize the deliberate act of the Church of England, laity and clergy, transferring from the Apostles and their successors, the power conferred upon them, to the English Parliament, with the "Virgin Queen" Elizabeth at its head? The thirty-sixth article expressly says that the forms of consecration and ordering of priests, etc., "set forth in the time of Edward the Sixth, and confirmed at the same time by authority of Parliament, doth contain all things necessary to such consecration and ordering," and that "whoever are consecrated or ordered according to the Rites of that book . . . we decree all such to be rightly, orderly, and lawfully consecrated and ordered." Then, not only all this, but the entire doctrine of the Articles "is approved and allowed to be holden and executed within the realm by the assent and consent of our Sovereign Lady Elizabeth, by the grace of God, of England, France (?) and Ireland, Queen, Defender of the Faith, &c." and all this is confirmed "by the subscription of the Archbishops and Bishops of the Upper-houses—and the whole clergy of the Nether house in their Convocation." A. D. 1571.

These absurdities are rendered still more glaring by the cath which every Anglican clergyman of every degree, from deacon upwards, is obliged to take. It may be seen in the form of ordination of deacons: that "no foreign Prince, Prelate, State, or Potentate, hath, or ought to have, any jurisdiction, power, superiority, pre-eminence, or authority, ecclesiastical or spiritual, within this Realm." Surely, the apostles, sent by Christ to preach his gospel "to every creature," and "to teach all nations all things whatsoever I have commanded" would have been badly received in England if such a law had been extant in their time.

St. Augustine preaching Christ to King Ethelbert, and St. Patrick to King O'Leary (Laghair) would have been deservedly "restrained with the civil sword" as "stubborn and evil-doers" if the principles of the Book of Common Prayer had only been known in their days.

Behind all this there is a history; and that history shows us that the authority of the Sovereign in purely religious matters was greater than the prayer book would fain let us know. Of course, in this age of "constitutional" or "limited monarchy" the power of the Sovereign is much modified by the power of the people, or of the Houses of Parliament. Still the principle is the same, whether the supreme power be attributed to the Sovereign King, or the Sovereign People. The commission given by Christ to His Apostles was "teach all nations to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." The commission given by the Church of England to her ecclesiastical "teach Kings and nations, the things which by their royal decrees, and Parliamentary enactments, they shall tell you they wish to be taught."

ity, if it is a necessity; I detest and I condemn the device, if it is the only opportunity that justifies the most extraordinary legislation which the British people are now called upon to sanction.

These generous sentiments, the outpouring of a heart true to freedom and to constitutional government, as opposed to Algerine despotism, have awakened the chords of Canadian sympathy for the suffering land that has given us a million of our people. The French and the Irish races in Canada are bound together by ties of closest friendship. They are together fully one half of the entire population of the Dominion. Both ardent lovers of rational constitutional freedom, they have here to fulfil a great mission in the interests of humanity, civilization and Christianity. Standing side by side, shoulder to shoulder, heart to heart, they form an unsurmountable bulwark of Canadian freedom. Bound together in that sacred cause, they will, no man who calmly surveys the situation in Canada at this moment can deny, truly, nobly, heroically if need be, fulfil the mission of peace and progress given them by Him to whom they daily pray, "Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven."

SAVE ME FROM MY FRIENDS.

Well, indeed, might the Governor-General of Canada utter this trite and well-worn but apt and expressive prayer. His Canadian friends have undertaken to deny that he is a cruel evictor of robbed, starved and helpless tenants. These shallow-minded antagonists of human rights, who know nothing and care less for Ireland and the Irish race, are ever ready to rush, like the fools they are, to the defence of titled despotism and gilded injustice. We have no desire to do wrong to Lord Lansdowne. We have, however, in our duty as a journalist, who respects authority but loves justice and humanity more, we have charged upon him the guilt of being an evictor of Irish tenants, and being, as such, an unfit person to longer continue at the head of Canada's government.

FRENCH CANADA AND IRELAND.

There has ever dwelt a deep and heartfelt sympathy in the breast of French Canada for Ireland. The fathers of the French Canadians of to-day fought side by side with Irishmen for the glory of the Frankish name, and the last generation of our French fellow citizens, who after a prolonged and bitter struggle won for themselves and their posterity the blessings of free constitutional government, had no more steadfast, earnest or powerful friend in the British Parliament than the immortal O'Connell, Liberator of Ireland. The memory of his services to the cause of freedom in Lower Canada is yet green in the hearts of the countrymen of the Pleasid, the Papineaus, the Lafontaine and the Cartiers, who have shed lustre on that most interesting portion of the new world. The legislature of Quebec last year voted its cordial endorsement of the Gladstone Home Rule Bill, and, this year, votes its condemnation of the Salisbury scheme of coercion in terms of vigorous indignation, becoming champions of outraged liberty.

"That this House desires to express feelings of the most profound regret that a measure of extreme coercion had been introduced into the Imperial Parliament—a measure utterly at variance with the spirit of the age, and entirely opposed to the rights and privileges of common humanity. This House desires to place on record its strenuous protest against the threatened cruel encroachments on the liberty of Her Majesty's subjects in Ireland, and hopes that the arbitrary and unjust measures will be withdrawn."

"That in the opinion of this House it would be a gracious act on the part of Her Majesty's government in this year of the Queen's jubilee to grant to Ireland a liberal measure of self-government similar to that which obtains in all of her Majesty's self-governing possessions throughout the world, and it is earnestly prayed by this House that the principle of Home Rule may be conceded to Ireland at the present session of the Imperial Parliament."

It was a French-Canadian alderman, Mr. Grenier, who introduced and carried through the City Council resolutions emphatically reprobating the Coercion bill as a measure subversive of the liberties of a large portion of Her Majesty's subjects, and renewing the already expressed opinion of that important body "that the most effective means of securing the prosperity and loyalty of the Irish people, and thereby assuring the stability of the Empire, will be found in granting to that people such measures of Home Rule as Canadians enjoy, as, while gratifying the natural, the national aspirations of Ireland, will also be consistent with the integrity of the Empire."

It was another French Canadian, a leader among his people, the Hon. M. Chapleau, who at a dinner given him at Montreal on the 11th inst., spoke these touching words of sympathy for Ireland: "I will now speak of the Irish question and ask what is to be the end of the exciting and tragic drama which is now being played in the United Kingdom, a drama where the plot is the subjection or the liberation of a nation. I feel with Ireland in her aspirations. I weep with her in the agony of her sufferings. I plead with her for justice, for pity, for humanity. Born, brought up and educated with proud notions of the British constitution, that sublime charter of free humanity; breathing that atmosphere of independence which surrounds and permeates this free land of America, I cannot realize that a nation in the world can be condemned and put in bondage. I regret the neces-

year, and to the fact that tenants like Mr. Kilbride and Mr. Dunne, with very large sums sunk in their holdings, would not voluntarily make such enormous sacrifices as their eviction involves, were they not convinced of the justice of their case and of the urgent necessity of standing by the poorer tenants."

Lord Lansdowne has nothing to gain by equivocation or false statement on the part of his friends. There is but one course open to him, if he desires to remove the odium attaching to his name, in the old and new worlds, that of beginning at once to deal justly by his tenants.

A DEVICE OF THE ENEMY.

The enemies of the Irish cause in Canada affect to believe that Lord Lansdowne is in danger of personal injury at the hands of some indignant Irishman. Strongly as the Irish people of Canada and their right-thinking neighbors and fellow-citizens of every other origin reprobate the action of Lord Lansdowne in ordering evictions from his estates, they more strenuously reprobate personal insult or violence offered him or any one else in the sacred name of Ireland. Such outrageous resorts are, in the eyes of the Irish race, sacrilegious attempts upon the patriotism that is their pride and their glory. No Lord Lansdowne has nothing to fear at the hands of Irishmen in Canada, or elsewhere, save the condemnation of his iniquitous policy in the execution of the exterminating part of Irish landlordism. There are no Irish designs on his person or his life. The Irish people know too well—they had their higher motive to abstain from crime—the use their enemies would make of an attempt on the Governor-General of Canada.

An informer, in Dublin castle, was the author of the Phoenix Park massacre, but for many months the whole Irish nation had to bear the odium of the awful deed. Verily there must be a Carey somewhere in the neighborhood of the Dominion capital, as will be seen from the following Associated Press despatch which appeared in the leading dailies in New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Chicago, St. Louis, Pittsburg, Brooklyn, Kansas City and Buffalo on the 13th instant:—

Ottawa, April 12.—Lord Lansdowne, the Governor-General of Canada, has declared himself regarding the report that Sir John Macdonald had received advice from England that danger threatened Lord Lansdowne on account of evictions on his Irish estate, that dynamite was to be resorted to for the purpose of blowing up Rideau Hall, and that the advice suggested the placing of a strong guard over the Governor-General's residence until the threatened danger had passed. Last night the Governor-General, who thereupon refused to have a guard or anything else, stating that when he found it necessary to have protection he would ask the Imperial government to recall him. A sharp lookout is being kept by the Dominion police for suspicious looking strangers.

"We have reason to know that the vindictive eviction of Mr. Denis Kilbride on the Luggacurran estate is already ringing in the ears of the Governor-General of the Dominion. It is impossible that our kind-hearted people, who number a third of the whole population, should long tolerate a Governor-General who executes this savage vengeance upon Mr. Kilbride for siding with his humble brother tenants against their tyrant. The money that hires the brutes who backed Mr. Kilbride's furniture to pieces with hatchets and sledge hammers is Canadian money. We refuse absolutely to believe that that generous-hearted Canadian Parliament, who have time and again expressed their sympathy with the Irish struggle, and who, in 1880, voted £200,000 for the alleviation of landlord-created famines, will endorse that the name of their free land should be sullied by association with Lord Lansdowne's inhuman destruction of the homes of Luggacurran. We published a few weeks ago the startling list of reductions decreed by the Land Commissioners at Abbeyfeix on the estates surrounding the Luggacurran estate. The fact that Mr. Kilbride's valuation is \$242,400, while the rent is £700, conclusive evidence of the extent of the suffering on the Lansdowne estate is no less appalling. A sentence of destruction against a man for seeking an alleviation of 30 per cent. upon such a rent is a sentence of the deepest dye; and although the Luggacurran people had to suppress their wrath and submit to the outrages of the emergency rabble as best they could, there will be no government proclamation or bottled guns to prevent a million of Irish Canadians from bringing the emergency men's master to book for the infamies he is perpetrating with Canadian money."

United Ireland counts not in vain on Canadian Irish sympathy. The London correspondent of the Globe, who had conversation with Mr. John Dillon on the subject of the Lansdowne evictions, says: "I may further mention that the eviction of Mr. Kilbride has been followed by that of Mr. J. W. Dunne, the largest tenant on the property, who rents over 1,200 acres and has paid over £1,300 a year rent. To-day and next week the same treatment will be extended to other and smaller tenants. I may also say that I have had the opportunity of discussing the question with several other members of the Irish party, and that their statements all point to the determination of the leaders of the league to fight out the struggle to the bitter end. As proof of the excessive character of the rents exacted they point especially to the large estates since the fall of prices last

year, and to the fact that tenants like Mr. Kilbride and Mr. Dunne, with very large sums sunk in their holdings, would not voluntarily make such enormous sacrifices as their eviction involves, were they not convinced of the justice of their case and of the urgent necessity of standing by the poorer tenants."

Lord Lansdowne has nothing to gain by equivocation or false statement on the part of his friends. There is but one course open to him, if he desires to remove the odium attaching to his name, in the old and new worlds, that of beginning at once to deal justly by his tenants.

A DEVICE OF THE ENEMY.

The enemies of the Irish cause in Canada affect to believe that Lord Lansdowne is in danger of personal injury at the hands of some indignant Irishman. Strongly as the Irish people of Canada and their right-thinking neighbors and fellow-citizens of every other origin reprobate the action of Lord Lansdowne in ordering evictions from his estates, they more strenuously reprobate personal insult or violence offered him or any one else in the sacred name of Ireland. Such outrageous resorts are, in the eyes of the Irish race, sacrilegious attempts upon the patriotism that is their pride and their glory. No Lord Lansdowne has nothing to fear at the hands of Irishmen in Canada, or elsewhere, save the condemnation of his iniquitous policy in the execution of the exterminating part of Irish landlordism. There are no Irish designs on his person or his life. The Irish people know too well—they had their higher motive to abstain from crime—the use their enemies would make of an attempt on the Governor-General of Canada.

An informer, in Dublin castle, was the author of the Phoenix Park massacre, but for many months the whole Irish nation had to bear the odium of the awful deed. Verily there must be a Carey somewhere in the neighborhood of the Dominion capital, as will be seen from the following Associated Press despatch which appeared in the leading dailies in New York, Boston, Philadelphia, Chicago, St. Louis, Pittsburg, Brooklyn, Kansas City and Buffalo on the 13th instant:—

Ottawa, April 12.—Lord Lansdowne, the Governor-General of Canada, has declared himself regarding the report that Sir John Macdonald had received advice from England that danger threatened Lord Lansdowne on account of evictions on his Irish estate, that dynamite was to be resorted to for the purpose of blowing up Rideau Hall, and that the advice suggested the placing of a strong guard over the Governor-General's residence until the threatened danger had passed. Last night the Governor-General, who thereupon refused to have a guard or anything else, stating that when he found it necessary to have protection he would ask the Imperial government to recall him. A sharp lookout is being kept by the Dominion police for suspicious looking strangers.

"We have reason to know that the vindictive eviction of Mr. Denis Kilbride on the Luggacurran estate is already ringing in the ears of the Governor-General of the Dominion. It is impossible that our kind-hearted people, who number a third of the whole population, should long tolerate a Governor-General who executes this savage vengeance upon Mr. Kilbride for siding with his humble brother tenants against their tyrant. The money that hires the brutes who backed Mr. Kilbride's furniture to pieces with hatchets and sledge hammers is Canadian money. We refuse absolutely to believe that that generous-hearted Canadian Parliament, who have time and again expressed their sympathy with the Irish struggle, and who, in 1880, voted £200,000 for the alleviation of landlord-created famines, will endorse that the name of their free land should be sullied by association with Lord Lansdowne's inhuman destruction of the homes of Luggacurran. We published a few weeks ago the startling list of reductions decreed by the Land Commissioners at Abbeyfeix on the estates surrounding the Luggacurran estate. The fact that Mr. Kilbride's valuation is \$242,400, while the rent is £700, conclusive evidence of the extent of the suffering on the Lansdowne estate is no less appalling. A sentence of destruction against a man for seeking an alleviation of 30 per cent. upon such a rent is a sentence of the deepest dye; and although the Luggacurran people had to suppress their wrath and submit to the outrages of the emergency rabble as best they could, there will be no government proclamation or bottled guns to prevent a million of Irish Canadians from bringing the emergency men's master to book for the infamies he is perpetrating with Canadian money."

United Ireland counts not in vain on Canadian Irish sympathy. The London correspondent of the Globe, who had conversation with Mr. John Dillon on the subject of the Lansdowne evictions, says: "I may further mention that the eviction of Mr. Kilbride has been followed by that of Mr. J. W. Dunne, the largest tenant on the property, who rents over 1,200 acres and has paid over £1,300 a year rent. To-day and next week the same treatment will be extended to other and smaller tenants. I may also say that I have had the opportunity of discussing the question with several other members of the Irish party, and that their statements all point to the determination of the leaders of the league to fight out the struggle to the bitter end. As proof of the excessive character of the rents exacted they point especially to the large estates since the fall of prices last

A STEP IN THE RIGHT DIRECTION.

The labor agitation has, whatever its enemies say to the contrary, done much good for the masses in America. True, it has not been unattended with evil, but no great social movement can well, in the world's present condition, be carried on to success without certain individual losses and hardships. Taken as a whole, it has achieved valued successes, without inflicting on any part of the community marked injustice or suffering. Anything of injustice or suffering that may have been caused by the labor movement, is due, not to government of the movement, but to the haste, passion and irreflexion of men who cannot be governed, even when they know that self-control is the key to success. One of the evils of which the masses in New York and other cities have long and till now fruitlessly complained, is the tenement house enormity, whereby the poor were crowded into traps of sin, crime and death, because of capitalistic extortion, greed and rapacity. A paragraph, taken from a leading American journal, now assures us that, in so far as New York is concerned, this evil has spent its force:—

"The extension of the tenement house system in New York is to be forbidden by law. Hereafter not more than two families will be permitted on the same story, and the new houses must be adapted to the regulation. This marks a distinct advance in the conception of the right and the duty of the State to regulate such matters. Thirty years ago the evils of the system were as visible as they are to-day. But it was then claimed that the landlord had a right to build such houses as he wished, and that the State could not interfere in the interest of either health or decency to prevent his doing what he pleased with his property. And it was argued that any such interference would be to the injury of the working-classes, by increasing the cost of house room. But the way of these economic notions is broken. It is felt that the State cannot afford to confine itself to the functions of the policeman, and that a rise in the cost of house room will be compensated by the rise in wages needed to pay for it. Indeed it always was absurd for economists of the English school, who held that the cost of necessities determined the rate of wages, to assume that an increase in the cost of any necessary would leave wages as they were."

This reform must be extended to other cities. Had it been carried out years ago, how much of crime, misery, death and degradation would have been spared humanity in these centres of population? The time has surely come in the New World, as it came long ago in the old, for society to teach the landlord that as a member of the body politic he could not do as he liked with what he complacently termed his own, but enjoying as he does the protection of the laws and administrative strength of that body, he must employ his property to the furtherance of the public and general welfare, not in the repression or degradation of his fellow-men.

CANADA CONDEMNNS COERCION.

This new notion of self-governing people has done itself imperishable honor by voting during the week just ended endorsement of Ireland's striving for Home Rule, and condemnation of Lord Salisbury's Algerine code of coercion. We have always felt proud of Canada, but never prouder than—never as proud as—we feel to-day. Canada has discharged her duty to the empire and to humanity, by its reprobation of that savage measure of repression. By a happy coincidence three Canadian legislatures just fresh from the people have, in the same week, pronounced condemnation on Balfour's blood-thirsty Crimes act. From the Parliament of the Dominion of Canada, representing eleven Provinces, extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific, the cable has conveyed to Lord Salisbury an indignant protest against coercion, and a warm, emphatic endorsement of Home Rule. Mr. Curran's resolutions were as follows:—

"That the Parliament of Canada in the year 1882, adopted a humble address to Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen, expressing the hope that a measure of Home Rule would be granted to Ireland, and

"That in the year 1886, by resolution of the House of Commons of Canada, the sentiments of said address to Her Most Gracious Majesty were earnestly reiterated and the hope expressed that a measure of Home Rule satisfactory to the people of Ireland would be passed by the Imperial Parliament, and

"That such measure of Home Rule has not been granted to the Irish people, but on the contrary there has been introduced into the Imperial House of Commons by Her Majesty's Government a Coercion Bill, enacting the most stringent coercive measures for Ireland by which the Irish people will be deprived of rights most dear to all British subjects.

"That this House has learned with profound regret of the introduction into the Imperial House of Commons of the Coercion Bill above mentioned, and protests against its adoption as being subversive of the rights and liberties of Her Majesty's subjects in Ireland.

"That this House again expresses the hope that there may speedily be granted to Ireland such a measure of Home Rule as is enjoyed in the Dominion of Canada, which, whilst satisfying the national aspirations of the people of Ireland for self-government, shall also be consistent with the integrity of the Empire as a whole.