

# THE CATHOLIC RECORD

Published Weekly at 44 and 46 Richmond Street, London, Ontario.

REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVES, Editor.

REV. WILLIAM FLANNERY, Author of "Mistakes of Modern Ireland."

THOMAS CORRY, Publisher and Proprietor.

Agents for the Catholic Record: Messrs. L. K. King, John N. King, and L. K. N. King are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and to transact all other business for the Catholic Record.

Agent for Alexandria, Glenora, and L. K. N. King, Mr. Donald A. McDonald.

Advertisements—Ten cents per line each insertion.

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

Correspondence intended for publication, as well as that having reference to business, should be directed to the proprietor, and must reach London not later than Tuesday morning.

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

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

## Catholic Record.

London, Sat., August 24th, 1889.

### LORD CHURCHILL'S PROGRAMME.

Lord Randolph Churchill's speech at Birmingham has brought dismay into the ranks of the Tories, but more so in those of the Liberal Unionists. The Tory elements of Central Birmingham have given him such a reception as to produce the conviction that he does not overrate his strength in that constituency, and he declares that the Tories have no need of yielding to the domineering spirit exhibited by Mr. Joseph Chamberlain and the Liberal Unionists. He maintains that they can win the seat for a candidate of their own party. While this is believed to be quite true most of the Conservative journals, from the Times down, fear that this action will lead to the disruption of the coalition, and they are abusing Lord Randolph. But he cannot be controlled, and he proposes towards Ireland a conciliatory policy which is decidedly contrary to the Coercionist course of the Irish Secretary and the combination. He acknowledges that there are "unpleasant features" about the treatment to which Irishmen are subjected, such as "evictions of tenantry on a large scale," and "the continual sending of Irish members of Parliament to prison." He does not like to see the "violent conflicts which had taken place between the police and the people of Ireland, and the grave indication that over a very large portion of the country the Government does not think it prudent to allow public meetings to be held."

He added: "In no period of the world's history has a policy of police conciliation the discontent of the people. It is rather to the legislation of a conciliatory character to which they ought to look, to legislation which should show to the Irish people as we have trusted the English and Scotch."

He proposes an Imperial loan of £100,000,000 to enable tenants to purchase their holdings, thus creating a peasant proprietorship on a large scale, and a system of local government. He declares that the rule of Ireland, which produces wholesale evictions, the imprisonment of popular representatives, and advocates of better government, is brutal and savage, and therefore not calculated to produce peace and prosperity.

Lord Churchill evidently feels sore because he is not taken into the Cabinet, yet there is a large section of the Conservative journals which declare that his policy is that of the great bulk of the Tory party, for the settlement of the Irish problem. The Nationalist press put no confidence in his Lordship's offer, first because they want Home Rule as a reality, and not the fiction of local government, and that they will gain their point is evident from the growth of Liberal sentiment among the people of England; and, secondly, because they believe that Lord Randolph's programme is merely a policy propounded as a scheme for getting into office, which would be laid aside as soon as its purpose were attained. The Nationalists cannot be induced to abandon Mr. Gladstone by any such delusive promises, especially as they know that they are on the eve of victory. Lord Randolph's meanderings will have the good effect of disorganizing the corrupt coalition which is endeavoring to pacify Ireland by means of savagery and brutality, and in this way it will result in good.

The closing words of his speech would be as an olive branch held out to Ireland, if only the Irish people could trust Lord Churchill, but they have not confidence in his disinterestedness. He said:

"He hoped at no distant date to see Ireland not only prosperous, but free—free in the full and proper sense of the word—free as the English, Scotch and Welsh are free. Then a strong conviction of the benefits, and a strong affection for the ties of unity with Great Britain would pervade and fill Irish minds; then the memories of former strife between the nations would be forgotten, and our children would wonderfully inquire how it happened that for so many years Ireland was a source of danger and distress to the British Empire."

"There's a clean pride and a dirty pride. It's a clean one as makes us refuse to cringe to the square. It's a dirty one as makes us think we're to 'git it' mak' butter for them."

### LORD CLANRICARDE'S AGENT SHOT AT.

A cable despatch tells us that Lord Clanricarde's agent, Mr. Tener, was shot at by one or two men on the night of the 11th inst. He was, however, not injured. It is lamentable that this system of outrage should be resorted to again in revenge for cruelties practiced upon tenants, but the vindictiveness and brutality with which the Marquis and his agent have carried on their work of extermination makes it not to be wondered at that some one of those who have been irreparably injured by the utter destruction of their property, and by being thrown out on the roads to perish should seek to revenge himself on the most heartless among the heartless landlords of the unhappy country. Only a short time since the tenants made reasonable offers for the settlement of their rents, provided that those who had been evicted should be reinstated, but, in spite of this, seven families were evicted on the 26th ult. with all the brutality usual on the estates of this Marquis. Two boys, aged thirteen and fifteen respectively, were very badly treated, being struck with a hammer, so that one of them was obliged to jump from a two-story window to escape. Before his leap, he was bruised by blows of the hammer on his head and hands.

The Portmarna Board of Guardians passed resolutions strongly condemning the "injustice, cruelty and savage barbarity of Lord Clanricarde, his agent, and the Government" in regard to these evictions. They declare that it pauperizes the union and increases the rates, and they appeal to the Poor Law Unions of Ireland and the electorate of England to use all their influence against so diabolical a policy towards a thrifty, honest and unoffending tenantry. The only opposition to this indignant protest was offered by Tener, the agent, himself, who is a dishonest spendthrift from whom his creditors cannot get their just demands, yet he has been appointed by the Government as a magistrate for the district, and he is *ex officio* one of the guardians of the poor.

Lord Clanricarde's conduct towards his tenantry has before now caused him to be denounced both for cruelty and dishonesty even by the Times as a "public nuisance and a public danger," and with such cruelty have his clearances been carried on that Chief Justice Pilles said in Court that he was doing "the devil's work," yet in this kind of work he is aided by the power of the Government, which places at his disposal the soldiers of Her Majesty for his diabolical purposes.

The evictions which have been lately carried on on this estate have been particularly heartrending. The tenants, anxious for peace, offered the extreme amount which they were able to pay, namely one year's rent, for a temporary respite. A force of forty policemen, a company of forty Scotch fusiliers, and a band of emergency men formed the attacking party. One tenant, Diamond, was at his breakfast of potatoes with his family when they arrived, and all were driven out, together with their furniture, and their table was overturned. In the house where the two boys were injured, the tenant's wife's mother was in a dying state when the eviction was begun, and the very unusual thing occurred, much to the dissatisfaction of the emergency men under Mr. Tener, that the Divisional Commissioner Byrne, who directed the whole proceedings, was moved with pity, and would not allow the dying woman to be dragged out. Two comfortable and well-built cottages belonging to two industrious tenants named Mincage and Twoby were pulled down and left a heap of ruins, while their wives and families took refuge under such shelter as they could get in an old barn and under an upturned cart.

Much as it is to be deplored that the tenantry should have recourse to evil means for revenge, the feeling of vengeance is a natural result of such proceedings as have taken place under Mr. Tener's direction. In the work of eviction it is his part to command the Emergency men, the most brutal of the three classes of which evicting forces are made up.

### THE MINISTER OF JUSTICE ON MR. GRAHAM'S PETITION.

In an important document addressed to His Excellency the Governor-General Sir John Thompson gives his opinion on the application of Mr. Hugh Graham, of the Montreal Star, to have the Jesuit Estates Act and the Act of Incorporation of the Jesuits referred for adjudication to the Supreme Court of the Dominion. As Minister of Justice he reviews the circumstances under which it is proper that such a reference should be made, and shows that they do not occur in the present instance. As regards the incorporation of the Jesuits, he points out that Mr. Graham offered no objection and did not ask the interference of His Excellency, until long after the matter had passed beyond His Excellency's control, nor did he petition for interference with the Estates Act until after the Government had signified its intention to allow it. The object of a reference by the Governor-General to the

### Supreme Court, he explains to be the obtaining of the advice of the court in

regard to the constitutionality of his own ministry. It would, therefore, be the proper course for Mr. Graham to follow to ask the Attorney-General of his own Province to prosecute the Jesuits if they had violated the provisions of their Act of Incorporation, or if they had in any way forfeited their corporate rights. If this were proved against them, not only would they cease to be a corporate body, but the Estates Act would itself be null and void.

Had Mr. Graham done this, the matter would ultimately come in proper course of law before the very court to which he desires it be referred in an unprecedented and improper manner. The matter in question could be brought before the Supreme Court of the Dominion only on appeal, and as it is not in this form that the petitioner seeks to bring the matter forward the Minister of Justice recommends that Mr. Graham's request be not complied with.

The cheque of \$5000, deposited by Mr. Graham to secure to the Government the expenses of the reference, is to be returned to him.

The Mail, speaking of the minister's able document, without publishing the document itself, declares that it is simply a repetition of the arguments with which the public are familiar through the columns of the Conservative journals. It virtually acknowledges that it has never ventured to publish these arguments itself, even for the purpose of refutation. Such is the manner in which the Mail furnishes reliable news to its readers.

The Globe also endeavors to belittle the document by asserting that "the minister, in fact, chaffs Mr. Graham," and "treats as farcical" his petition. Sir John Thompson's document is an able and serious presentation of the case, but we presume that even the serious exposure of the false grounds on which a farcical petition is founded may in a certain sense be regarded as ridiculous or chaffing the farcical petitioner. It must be borne in mind that even at the bogus Equal Rights Convention, Mr. Graham's petition was regarded as a farce. This being the case Hon. Minister of Justice necessarily "chaffed" Mr. Graham, merely by telling the truth.

### THE MANITOBA AGITATION.

Mr. Martin's utterances on the abolition of the French language and of the separate school system of Manitoba do not, after all, indicate that the Greenway Government intend to adopt the no-Popery cry as their party shibboleth. Mr. Greenway, on being interviewed by a reporter, is said to have stated that Mr. Martin's pronouncement is personal and that he did not give the sentiments of the Government. Mr. Greenway denies that he made the statement, but the reporter insists upon the accuracy of the report. There seems, therefore, to be some doubt that the Manitoba Government intend to accept the dictation of the fire-breathing Balfour Dalton McCarthy; nevertheless, Mr. McCarthy has expressed his intention to stir up all Manitoba by making a speech in every constituency against Jesuits, separate schools and the intolerable French language.

It is to be presumed that Mr. McCarthy has discovered that he has been playing a losing game in Ontario. It has been proved that the French schools in this Province are making all the progress which can be reasonably expected in both languages, and the Minister of Education has announced his intention to encourage the study of English in them, while refusing to ostracize French, or to keep the French children in ignorance until they are thoroughly acquainted with English literature, on the principle of keeping children away from the water till they have thoroughly learned how to swim. The separate schools in Ontario are also on too firm a basis to be made inefficient by any of Mr. McCarthy's efforts, and as to the Jesuits they are to be allowed to exist, and the Orangemen who imagined, that in accordance with Dr. Will's theory, they might shoot Jesuits with impunity, have unwittingly made the discovery that Jesuits have civil rights, and that the laws will afford them as much protection as is accorded to the rowdies of the lodges. They are, of course, railing at Lord Stanley and the Government for giving them this lesson, so roughly, and Mr. McCarthy seeks his consolation in far-off Manitoba. The Mail, too, is rapidly ceasing to fire its shots at the Jesuits of Ontario and Quebec. It finds that it has spent much bad powder to no purpose. It has discovered that even though it be true, as it so wisely put the matter, that "Jesuitism is not Roman Catholicism," that Roman Catholicism will not abandon an illustrious and highly appreciated association of priests to the tender mercies of persons of the stamp of Drs. Wild, Hunter and Carman and Bishop Usher. The Mail, too, having failed, to enlighten Ontario and Quebec, has betaken itself in earnest to obtain a following in Manitoba.

It is not yet certain that the Greenway

### Government will adopt the leadership

and platform of Mr. McCarthy, but Mr. McCarthy is not so sure of his own leadership. As he indicated that he would resign if the Government adopted Mr. Martin's no-Popery platform, it is possible that they have determined to adopt it. Mr. Prendergast is Provincial Secretary, and he represents the French element of the Province.

The Toronto Globe, while expressing itself in favor of the supposed new programme of the Manitoba Reform Government, in itself, advises Mr. Greenway to proceed very cautiously. The population of Manitoba is of a very mixed character. Religiously, the last census shows 87,798 Protestants, 14,651 Catholics, 543 Jews, 45 of no religion, 5,619 with religion not given; but in nationality there is a great diversity, there being 20,840 persons whose language is neither French nor English, 23,949 of English origin, who, with 3,597 English half-breeds, make a population of 29,546 who may be accounted of English origin. There are 21,180 of Irish, 25,676 of Scotch, 178 of Welsh, origin. Those of French origin number 6,821, who, with 4,369 French half-breeds, make a French population of 11,190. The Globe considers it very uncertain that the foreign population will join in a movement which is aggressively English; and as the English population is very evenly divided between the two parties, Conservative and Reform, it cautions Mr. Greenway not to enter upon an aggressive policy, unless he be assured that it will prove successful, lest the Conservatives of the Province regain power, and the position of Sir John Macdonald be thus much strengthened.

Further, the Globe reminds the people of Ontario that the question is one for Manitobans, and not for Ontarians, to settle. On this point it has the following sensible remarks:

"The matter, however, is one for Manitobans. Ontario is not charged with the government of that Province. Attempts to regulate its affairs from this Province will be met with a sharper 'mind your own business' than ever came from much-learned Quebec. There are, indeed, those who seem to presume that Ontario—may, a very small portion of Ontario—is entitled to play Mentor and Bully to the other Provinces. Fortunately, the people of our excellent Province have better sense than to approve the impudence that courts the snub."

We hope that the Globe is correct in saying that the "meddlers" constitute but "a very small portion of Ontario," but we must say that in our opinion they are much too numerous, though we are loath to believe they form a majority in the Province. It is well for such to be occasionally snubbed, and the snub which has already been given to them for their interference with Quebec was richly deserved. We trust that Manitoba will administer to them a dose of the same kind.

The Catholic school systems of Ontario and Manitoba have their justice not so much in the will of the majority as in the inalienable right of parents to educate their children in the religion to which they conscientiously adhere. Even Protestants now very generally acknowledge that children should be educated religiously. Many Protestant ministerial associations, both in the United States and Canada, have pronounced upon this, and in Canada it is but a few months since a deputation of ministers waited upon the Hon. Mr. Ross to urge a sort of compulsory religious curriculum in the schools. Their conduct was indefensible, unless religious teaching be expedient. The Hon. Mr. Ross very properly would not adopt the course urged upon him, because of the great diversity of belief among children who attend the public schools; but, even as the school system now stands, religious teaching is recognized to some extent. The Bible is used as a text book, and the schools are opened and closed with prayer.

From all this we may justly infer that Protestants as well as Catholics recognize the importance of religious teaching; but Catholics hold to it strongly with well defined conscientious conviction. If Protestants were universally of the opinion that there should be no religious teaching, but that children of all denominations should agree for peace sake to suppress religious teaching in the schools, the question would then be: "Is it fair to force our opinion on this subject down the throats of our Catholic fellow citizens? Is it just to deprive them of their right to teach their religion in schools which they are willing to support from their own pockets, merely because we think it would be well to have all the children educated in the same school-rooms?"

We maintain that no greater injustice than this could be inflicted on the Catholics, whether of Ontario or Manitoba. We believe that children will not be too moral or too religious, with all the religious teaching we can impart to them, and we wish not to be impeded in giving them a thoroughly religious education. That Catholics have strong convictions on this subject is evident from the fact that in the United States, while they are by law compelled

### to pay for the education of the children

of their Protestant fellow citizens, they

pay an extra tax from their own pockets for the religious education of their own. We maintain that such a state of affairs is an outrageous injustice inflicted upon a respectable minority, simply because the majority are intolerant. The intolerance is all the more outrageous from the fact that the Protestant majority are in reality convinced that a religious education is a desideratum. In endeavoring to deprive Catholics of it they must be influenced only by an insane hatred against the Catholic Church. Yet this is the evil and the injustice which the fanatical party desire to introduce into Manitoba and Ontario. It is well for the Catholic minorities in these two Provinces that there is a Protestant minority in Quebec which is in precisely the same position with ourselves; for the fanatical proposals cannot be carried out without exposing the Quebec Protestants to the same injustice to which the fanatics wish to reduce the Catholic minorities here mentioned. It was not the love of justice or of equal rights which impelled the bogus Equal Rights Convention to abstain from putting the abolition of separate schools on their programme, but, avowedly, fear for the situation of the Protestants of Quebec.

Like the separate school systems of Ontario and Quebec, that of Manitoba is guaranteed by the Act of Confederation. This guarantee is part of the Confederation compact, and the principle of "public policy of the Dominion," on which the Mail and Rev. D. J. Macdonald, of Toronto, insisted so strongly, and which was inserted in the petition for disallowance of the Jesuit Estates Act, is justly applicable here. As the fanatics maintained this principle, it meant that "public policy" demanded that the Jesuits should be branded as immoral. It was a matter of "public despotism" instead of public policy; but the principle, as applied to the continuance of separate schools, whether in Manitoba or Ontario, means that the rights of three minorities should be regarded, those of the Catholics in two Provinces and of the Protestants in one. We maintain, therefore, that Mr. Greenway's cabinet should not be permitted to tinker with the Act of Confederation at the risk of destroying the whole Confederation compact, and of endangering the rights which have been assured to minorities wherever separate schools exist in the Dominion or wherever they may be instituted in future. The question is not one for Manitoba alone to decide, as the Globe maintains, but for the whole Dominion. Let those who maintained that Quebec had no business to pass the Jesuit Estates Act, on the pretence that it was *ultra vires*, unite in telling Manitoba that she must not pass Acts which are altogether *ultra vires*.

THE FREE PRESS ON "PAPAL AGGRESSION."

The Free Press of this city says "it would be well to know just what the members of the Ontario Legislature have to say on the Jesuit Estates Act." By all means let them record their opinion on the subject if they will, but as this will not affect the result they might as well give their opinion at the same time on some other matters of equally general interest—for instance, the kind of weather which will be allowed in Quebec next year, the height to which the tides may rise in future in the Bay of Fundy, and other matters which equally concern the Ontario Legislature. But the trouble with the Free Press is "the Minister of Justice." It acknowledges that "it may not be possible to undo what has been done or to expunge from the Canadian statute books the sign manual and permission of the Pope," but it is possible by some sort of unexplained future combination to make Jonahs of Sir John Thompson and Mr. Mowat, and to throw them overboard to appease the ire of the parsons and Orangemen.

It is easy to understand why the Minister of Justice comes in for so large a share of wrath. Some one must be sacrificed to satisfy the Moloch of fanaticism, and out of the one hundred and eighty-eight members of the House of Commons who voted that Quebec has the rights of a Canadian Province, Sir John Thompson, besides being a Catholic, has dealt to the fanatics some hard blows from which they have not recovered. The Free Press is quite willing that Sir John Thompson, Hon. John Carling, etc., should be condoned easily—though they are certainly, as members of the Dominion Cabinet, equally responsible with Hon. J. Thompson for the allowance of the Quebec Act, and though the Orange Grand Lodge resolved at Godorich, that Protestants who voted for it are more guilty even than the Catholics. The Free Press also very strongly hints that special vengeance should fall upon Mr. Mowat's head for the passage of an Act over which that gentleman had no control whatsoever. There can be no other object in its proposal that the Ontario Legislature should declare its opinion on an Act of the Legislature of

### Quebec. But that there may be no doubt

of the matter, it lets the rest of the

bag in the following style:

"It (Ontario) will demand at its next session that opinion should be taken on the whole question of Papal aggression, no matter in what quarter it may have presented itself. And it is the fear that it will be done, the knowledge that it will be done, that causes the Globe to cry *peccavi* and to tell us that the discussion on the Jesuit Estates is 'played out.'"

It is clear, then, that the object of the Free Press in harping upon this subject, is simply to make political capital to Mr. Mowat's embarrassment, out of a question with which it does not concern either Mr. Mowat or the Ontario Legislature to interfere. Dishonesty of purpose could not be more plainly manifested; and the honesty of the Free Press may well be questioned in its attack upon Sir John Thompson, for it knows well that the Minister of Justice is altogether independent of any influence it can exert.

But cannot the Dominion be governed without Catholics at all? For example, might not Quebec be treated as the parish of the Protestants? Might she not be ruled by a clique of Ontario persons? And might not Catholics in Ontario and the other Provinces be entirely deprived of the franchise?

It is needless to say that though we know there are people of Ontario who would be delighted with such a state of things, it would be no easy matter to bring it about. Such persecution did exist in Great Britain during the last and in the first part of the present century, but even when such was the policy of England at home she did not attempt to introduce it into Canada. The climate and surroundings of this country are not favorable to the growth of such despotism. Class ascendancy is a dying plant now, even in Ireland, but on the free soil of North America it would not thrive for a single day.

At a recent period in this century one penal law was passed by the British Parliament. It was success fully defied, and not even an attempt was made to enforce it, down to the time when a few years afterwards it was wiped from the statute book by almost a unanimous vote. Even, as both Sir John Macdonald and Hon. Edward Blake said in our House of Commons, the British Parliament and people were ashamed of it.

In Canada the case is very different from that of Great Britain. Catholics are almost 43 per cent. of the population, and on such a proportion of the people it is useless to attempt to impose penal laws or restrictions. Catholics must, therefore, and will, exercise their influence in the government of the Dominion, and no Government can be carried on without them. No attempt to deprive Catholics of their influence in proportion to population can succeed, and the Free Press ought to know that even though it may follow the Mail's lead, and join in the No-Popery crusade of which the latter journal is the chief spirit, its efforts will only be followed by disaster to itself and to any party which may follow such leadership. We do not believe the Conservative party will do so, but it may become a necessity for that party to repudiate formally the Free Press as the Conservative organ of the West, and to establish in London a respectable Conservative journal like the Toronto Empire, which was established on the ruins of the Mail. The Mail, which takes up or lays aside a policy on "commercial principles," has surely not found its course to be commercially profitable, or it would not have made the abject bids to become once more a recognized organ of one party or the other, which it made even since it donned the garments of pseudo-independence. It plainly enough offered itself, more than once, to the highest bidder, but both parties received its overtures with chilling contempt.

The past history of the Free Press would lead us to expect from it a better spirit than it has exhibited of late. At a time when there was more likelihood than now of the success of a no-Popery cry, the Free Press boldly abandoned its party rather than adopt a war-cry which was calculated to divide Canada by a disastrous dissension arising out of differences of race and creed. We regret to see it now adopting a contrary course, which will end in failure, as it did before with those who adopted it. The Catholics of Canada are, on the whole, pretty evenly divided between the two great parties which are contending for the mastery, just as Protestants are. On the political questions of the day there is, naturally, as much diversity of opinion among Catholics as among their Protestant fellow citizens, and as a Catholic journal the Record casts no blame upon the adherents of either party. In fact, both parties proved by the almost unanimous vote of the House of Commons on the Jesuit Estates Act that they could rise above the petty consideration of making political capital out of the ravings of bigotry, when it was desired to force them to brand a stigma upon an illustrious and virtuous order of priests. The ablest statesmen of the country showed that they were not to be moved

by an insensate uproar to deal unjustly with one of the Provinces, and, indeed, with the whole Catholic population of the Dominion; and both parties deserve all credit for their patriotic action. We have no reason, therefore, to accuse one party, more than another, for the baseless and dangerous anti-Catholic movement which has been initiated by some heads from both; dangerous, we call it, not that we fear its consequences, but because it endangers the peace and well-being of the country.

But our friend with the Jewish *protonoma*, in his new-born zeal for Protestantism, tells us that the Jesuits' Estates Act is a "Papal aggression." Wherein is the aggression? Is it that it attacks the Queen's sovereignty? The Queen's representative in Canada and the ablest constitutional lawyers in the country assure us that it does nothing of the kind. Is it because it names the Pope? Lord Stanley and the constitutional lawyers, again, are our authority for saying that the Pope is only mentioned in it historically and as the arbitrator chosen by the parties who have a financial interest in the Act. As the Pope is a certainly historical personage, there can be no great aggression in naming him historically. Is it because it apportions property to one or more religious communities? The Ontario Government have also very recently made property apportionments to various religious denominations, and no Ontario man has made complaint; though this was more the business of the people of Ontario than any apportionment of property made by the Quebec Legislature. Besides, it must be remembered that the property was apportioned in order to compromise a moral claim, and we are told by Lord Stanley that similar moral claims have been frequently recognized and compromised by the British Government. It is, indeed, not long since the Ontario Legislature compromised a moral claim in its disposition of the Mercer estate. On what principle can the right of the Quebec Legislature be questioned to do similarly? Is it because the Jesuits are immoral? But the immorality of the Jesuits has not been proved, and no less an authority than Lord Stanley has assured the public that he has good reason to believe the Jesuits to be fully equal in morality to those who presented the petition against them. We may add to this our own opinion that if a comparison were rigidly made, the petitioners might be made to blush at the result.

In the Jesuits' Estates Act there is no aggression. The aggressiveness is altogether on the part of the noisy agitators who have maligning a virtuous and illustrious community, and who have endeavored to violate the compact by which the Provinces of the Dominion have had their autonomy secured to them. The Free Press and others who are making the Jesuits' Estates Act a pretext for exciting dissension are very apt to find their weapon of offence a boomerang which will inflict more injury on those who use it than on those at whom it is aimed.

### £500 FROM AN ENGLISHMAN.

Did the Home Rule agitation in Ireland produce no other result than what has already been accomplished, its presence in Great Britain should be considered as a national blessing. Hitherto for centuries the English and Irish people were strangers to each other and knew as little of each other's character and feelings as though they lived thousands of miles apart and not under the same skies and surrounded by the same waters. The latter believed that the English people were stolid, brutish, un-Christian tyrants, the enemies of the faith and the traditions of Ireland; whereas the former were taught and made to believe that the Irish were a superstitious people, steeped in ignorance and barbarism, ever quarrelling among themselves, and it was a heavenly blessing and a mercy that the British Government was able and willing to care for them and prevent them from self-destruction. By the advent of the agitation for Home Rule in Ireland the true state of things began to dawn on the English mind. Irish orators were invited to address English audiences in large cities and country towns. English representative men crossed the channel and visited Ireland to be able to see and judge for themselves. Irishmen of distinguished talent and irreproachable reputation, who had suffered in Balfour's dungeons for the crime of having spoken at a public meeting, addressed enthusiastic audiences and made a profound impression on the British public. On the other hand, the representative men who visited Ireland on the part of guides and of liberal associations in England brought back to their fellow countrymen the news that the sufferings and degradation of the Irish people had not been half told. They had themselves been present at eviction scenes. They had seen the inhuman, devilish work of the crowbar brigade in levelling houses and tearing down the roof-trees that sheltered the aged and the infirm.