

THE COMPARATIVE VIRTUE OF CATHOLIC AND PROTESTANT POPULATIONS.

ARTICLE I.—INTRODUCTORY.

The statement that Catholic countries are more immoral and more criminal than Protestant countries, and that even the Catholic population of the British Empire are inferior in morality and virtue to the Protestant populations of the same dominions, is one which no amount of disproof appears capable of preventing a repetition of. It turns up in all shapes and at all times. Now in Parliament, upon some question relating to legislation affecting Catholics; now in that portion of the press which considers its mission to be the glorification of Protestantism; still oftener in the pulpit, where depicting the horrors of Romanism is another way of preaching the Gospel of Christ; and oftener still with the anti-Catholic controversialist, who continues to utter it as confidently as the mathematician uses an axiom of Euclid. Only a few days ago there was pushed into the letter-box of the writer the number for August, 1876 of a monthly publication issued by an anti-Catholic agency. In the same cover there was an eight-paged pamphlet, in which some statistics were, dishonestly, we believe, manipulated, so that at the end it could be untruly said that "apart from all religious considerations, Protestantism is the most moral and economical policy for statesmen." A short time ago in the columns of a Cardiff paper there appeared a series of articles in which the editor, replying to some able vindictory letters of the Rev. Father Williams, of Tredegar, on this subject sought to establish the truth of the statement. The effort was a piece of tenth-rate special pleading. The editor, in controversy with a Church of England clergyman, had made the statement to begin with, had been taken to task by Father Williams, and, assuming that he must be correct, and Father Williams wrong, proceeded to array the facts supporting his theory, ignoring every fact which told against it. Adopting the same principle, we would undertake to "prove" anything. As an illustration: Supposing the question were whether there were more illegitimate births in Catholic populations than in Protestant populations, and we took from the whole of Europe three towns with a view of showing the comparative morality of the people of the two religions; and supposing we were to take, say, Glenmaddy, with a population of 20,000, Newport, with a population of 16,000, Scariff with a population of 14,000, Castletown, with a population of 14,000, or any one of the many registrars' districts in Ireland, in which according to the Eleventh Annual Report (the latest issue) of the Registrar-General, not a single illegitimate birth occurred in 1874, and compared one or more of them with Aberdeen, which has a population four times as large as the Glenmaddy district has, and which, according to the latest report of the Registrar-General, could boast of over 300 illegitimate births in 1872, would it not be said that we were either not in possession of figures which we should have had, before entering upon the discussion, or that, having other figures, we dishonestly kept them back because they would not tell so much in our favour as those we published. Yet, in order to prove his case, the editor contented himself with naming three towns, the figures for which seemed to suit his purpose; and, even then, gave them from such a source, that it was almost impossible to verify them. We mention "his editorship" only to show how useless it is to argue with such controversialists, to dismiss him from our programmes, and to address ourselves to the facts. But, again and again, such statements, if not the very same, will be repeated and reproduced, and hundreds of men, whose mission and calling it is to discredit the Catholic faith, will quote them with a view of perpetuating the fiction that Catholic populations are not as moral as Protestant populations. It is the knowledge of this that induces us to endeavour to provide the antidote.

When we declare that, so far from the statement being correct, the exact converse is the case, it may be asked how it is that the untruth is so readily accepted in this country? We can only offer one justification for the English people in receiving unquestioned the slander of a faith which, for eighteen centuries, has been seeking to civilise and humanise the world. In some of the great centres of industry in this country, the number of Catholics who come within the jurisdiction of the magistracy are greatly in excess of their share of the population. We shall not undertake to satisfy anyone but ourselves that, much as we deplore the truth, it is not a disgrace to the Catholic body so much as it is a disgrace to the exterminating policy pursued for so many generations in Ireland, and to the English who, when the people they were oppressing came hither for the bread which was denied them upon their own soil, met them, whenever it was possible, with the declaration that "No Irish need apply" and, having confiscated their wealth in their own land, did all that was possible to drive them into the slums and haunts of vice in our great towns, and to convert them into a class whence come the unfortunates, who for drunkenness, or dishonesty, or crimes of violence occupy our gaols. And when they were safely landed there, what was done? Until lately in our great towns (even now, throughout a large part of the country), the Catholic, the moment he or she fell, was cut off from the only influence capable of effecting a reformation. The census is not yet taken which will justify this theory to account for the excessive percentage of Catholics among prisoners in such places as Glasgow and Liverpool. It is from the poorer classes such prisoners come, because the poor are exposed to the temptations which lead to a conflict with the authorities. If we could have a census of the population in London or Liverpool of every family which had an income of less than two shillings per week per head, the respective numbers of them belonging to the Catholic and Protestant denominations, and of proportions of the two who go to prison, there are some of the Protestant Pharisees now boasting that they are not as other men who would hide their heads with shame at sight of the virtue of the abjectly poor Catholics who are virtuous in spite of the temptations that surround them, because they are true to, and under the beneficent influence of, their faith. Until that census is taken, our theory can only be an assumption; in the meantime, the statistical and undeniable fact remains to be, to our mind, the only justification which the thoughtless reader or listener can plead for accepting as true the falsified and manipulated figures which are constantly going the rounds.

will point as one reason, at all events for the facts, to the number of poor Catholics dependent upon the relieving-officer for their daily bread. We will illustrate our position by referring to some official statistics of last year for Scotland, and we take them merely because they happen to be the only ones at hand at the moment. The total number of paupers relieved last year in Scotland was 88,577, with 52,076 dependents. Of these 13,834, and we will assume them to have been Catholics. There were, therefore, about 40,000 Catholic "dependents." Take these as representing, not the very identical individuals, but the same number of the poorer class who furnished the occupants of the reformatory and industrial schools in Scotland with inmates, and what do we find? The Protestant "dependents" (of course they would be dependents) committed to reformatories, numbered 198, the Catholics 48, making a total of 246. So it might be said that those represented by say 12,000, furnished a fifth of the whole commitments, while those representing 40,000, very little more than three times as many, furnished four-fifths of the commitments. Very nearly nine-tenths of admissions to industrial schools in Scotland were those of Protestants—the numbers being 581 Protestants, and 93 Catholics. We are convinced the whole problem of the apparent excess of commitments of Catholics is to be solved in the way we have indicated, and can be accounted for by the fact that wherever such an excess occurs it arises from the preponderance of Catholics among the wretchedly poor—a preponderance for which not very remote history only, too abundantly and shamefully accounts. Whenever there are more Catholics in prison than Protestants, let us have access to the records of your Poor-law Board and we will soon tell you the reason. It may not be the recipients of the ratepayers' "bounty" who sin unto conviction, but it is people of the same class; if the majority of that class are Catholics, as in places like Glasgow and Liverpool they are most abundantly, it is only natural to expect that they will give their share of trouble to the authorities.

In the course of last year, replying to the letter of a Birmingham correspondent, we went into this question pretty fully, and as far as the circumstances then put before us seemed to justify; but, as we have shown, the matter has cropped up again in various ways, and we purpose to go a little more completely into the fact, and to furnish the Catholic controversialist, who has so often to face the taunt embodied in the allegations referred to, with all the materials it is possible to obtain, in order to show the vast influence for good which the Catholic Church has had and continues to have upon the populations that came under her sway. In doing this, we have no desire to say one word that would pain our non-Catholic neighbours. Earnest men or earnest bodies of men, professing and conscientiously carrying out those principles of humanity which are embodied in every form of Christianity, can have no other than a good effect upon the individuals brought within their influence, or do otherwise than make any population better than it would be if that influence were absent and none so good in its place. But we should not be Catholics if we did not believe that the best of all influences for improving the character of a people is the Church, which for fifteen hundred years was the only Christian agency in existence, to which is committed even at this day the spiritual welfare of two hundred millions of the human race, and, according to Protestant authorities, at least ten millions of English-speaking people. Our object is, in the course of a short series of articles, to show the fallacy of the figures so often garbled by those who assail the Church in this one of her best claims to the veneration of the world.—Liverpool Catholic Times.

THE CARDINAL ARCHBISHOP OF WESTMINSTER ON THE STATE OF EUROPE.

AN HISTORICAL RETROSPECT.

The feast of St. Edward the Confessor was celebrated on the 13th Oct. in the Church of SS. Peter and Edward, Palace-road, London. His Eminence the Cardinal Archbishop presided over the ceremonies. The celebrant was the Very Rev. Father Kirk, Superior of the Oblates of St. Charles; Father Ryder, officiating as deacon, and Father McDonnell as sub-deacon. The assistants at the pontifical throne were the Rev. Lord Archibald Douglas and Father Andrews, Father Lescher was assistant priest, and Father Keatinge master of the ceremonies. The music of the Mass, which was most admirably rendered by an efficient choir, was Weber's in G. After the First Gospel, His Eminence the Cardinal Archbishop delivered a discourse on the text from the 11th chapter of the Apocalypse—"The kingdom of this world is become the kingdom of the Lord and of His Christ, and He shall reign for ever." His Eminence said—"The kingdom of God which is here spoken of is a kingdom in time—not in eternity. It is a kingdom on this earth. I do not undertake to expound the Apocalypse. The Holy Church has not done so, and I cannot do what the Church has not done. We speak as we are taught. We are the disciples of the Church before we are the teachers of the faithful, and as I know not what interpretation God in His providence will reveal in these mysteries of His power and of His judgment in the world signified by the opening of the seals and the sounding of the trumpets, I limit what I have to say to that which is plain and evident. The Church has a twofold mission. One part of it is to convert the souls of men one by one from a life of sin and unbelief to a life of faith and of sanctity; the other is to civilise the nations of the world who are so converted to the light of God. We are keeping a festival to-day which draws our thoughts naturally and almost irresistibly to the action of the Church in this world, and as men might say to politics. Well, politics are a part of morals, and morals are a part of religion; so they cannot be separated. This is the festival of King Edward, saint and confessor, King of England, whose reign is written in the annals of our history as the reign of a Christian prince who held his kingdom from God, who said that he would rather never reign than gain his rights by bloodshed, and who, holding his kingdom from God, reigned for the glory of God, for the effusion of the faith, for the worship of the ever-blessed Trinity in all forms of honour, for a life of charity to his people, justice among his subjects, poverty in his own person, and unbounded almsgiving—such was King Edward the Christian prince. The monarchy of England was in his person a Christian monarchy. So I will say it is still, but then it was a Catholic monarchy in the fulness of its perfection; and the body of King Edward lies in the midst of us to this hour, preserved by the reverence of the English people, and regarded in loving veneration by all Catholic subjects of the sovereignty which descended from him. That body is the object of our loving care, although the custody of it is not ours, as a memorial and a witness of what the monarchy of England was, and of what the monarchy of England in part still is, and God grant that it may be once more in its fulness and perfection. This naturally turns my thoughts to what may be called the politics of this world. They cannot be parted from faith, and they cannot be parted from the duty of every Catholic. We

are all upon our trial, not only on our own individual probation, but also with regard to what we do as subjects, and what we do as rulers, between justice and injustice, between loyalty and disloyalty. Every man is put upon trial in his day. There never has been a time when Catholics had not to choose their side. In England they have always chosen it for the maintenance of order; and it is order which at this day is threatened throughout the world. God grant that everyone who has the light of Catholic faith may be estranged with all his life and soul, from the current of lawless rebellion which is spreading on every side, and that they may be found the steadfast upholders and faithful liege servants of the constituted authorities of the world, for all authorities are of God. In order to make this clear, let us consider what the world was before Christianity; secondly, what it was under Christianity; thirdly, what it is becoming now that it is beginning to throw off Christianity; and lastly, what it may become if it should succeed in the evil endeavor of stripping the Christianity of the world of all its power and all its authority. The greatest empire the world ever saw—the most civilized, the most compact, and what approached nearest to the order of Christian civilization in its administration of justice—was the Great Roman Empire. But what was its condition in regard to three points? It was under the power of unlimited human authority. The emperors ruled with an absolute despotic power not only over the bodies but also over the consciences of their subjects. A Roman Emperor was not only King but Pontiff too. There were indeed to be found freemen in the Roman empire. The upper classes enjoyed freedom, but all below the patrician and the knightly class were either partially or wholly in a state of slavery and the slavery of the Roman Empire was such as no heart of man can conceive unless he has read and studied history. The master had power of life and death over his slave. We read in the literature of Rome that slaves have been scourged almost to death for disturbing their masters by a cough or a sneeze or any little accident in their service. Once at a banquet a guest said to the master of the house that he had never seen a man die, whereupon the latter immediately caused one of his slaves to be killed before his guests' eyes. Such was then the condition of man. Man without God is capable not only of any tyranny but of any cruelty. I will not venture to describe, even in the remotest, the immorality of the Roman Empire. If any man desire to see what it was, written by the Holy Ghost, let him read the opening of the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans. Well the Roman Empire was the culmination of such civilization as can be produced by intellectual culture and philosophy without God. At last it began to wreak its own chastisement upon itself. In the first three hundred years, while the Emperors of Rome persecuted the Christians and slew the Pontiffs, 29 Pontiffs won the crown of martyrdom, and 80 Roman Emperors died violent deaths. That great mass of corruption began to die by its own law of dissolution. For 300 years the Church of Jesus Christ spread throughout the world. Rising from the little spring in the guest-chamber in Jerusalem, the water went out as in the Prophet's vision covering the nations of the earth. Throughout the whole Roman Empire there was the foundation of new order. In vain did the Emperors endeavour to destroy the Catholic Church. Her first work was the conversion of souls, and her work of civilisation came afterwards. No sooner was the Emperor Constantine converted to the faith than he translated his throne to Byzantium, which became Constantinople, because his instinct told him he could not reign supreme in the city where the Vicar of Jesus Christ dwelt. The sovereignty of this world gave place to the sovereignty of the Incarnate Word, and from that day onwards the work of Christian civilisation spread from Rome as its centre. I would remind you that formerly the See of Peter had 23 patrimonies. Now, when we talk of the patrimony of Peter, we mean that which was robbed the other day; but there was a time when all Italy, Sicily, the coasts of the Adriatic, the coasts of Southern Gaul and all the Northern part of Africa all belonged to the Vicar of Jesus Christ as his patrimonies. In all those patrimonies the Christian law was introduced and the first germs of Christian civilisation sprang up. In these patrimonies of the Holy See the first action of the Pontiffs was the extinction of slavery, as is most beautifully shown in the letters of St. Gregory the Great. From these small beginnings grew up that Christendom of which we are a part, which to this day has lingered on, but which is now turning away from the footsteps of our Divine Redeemer. In these changes wrought by Christianity on the kingdoms of the world, we may see the fulfilment of the words of the Apocalypse. In the person of the Vicar of Christ the two-fold offices of pontiff and king are united, and because they are united in him they are separated in all others who bear authority. Alas, I know the story of Christian Europe shows that kingdoms have been torn, and rent and tossed, and that the authority of our Divine Lord has again and again been defied by kings, princes, and emperors. There have been periods of time when men suffered bondage, tyranny, warfare, and cruelty of every kind. Although these things were permitted in the Christian world, yet the supreme power was consecrated to God, and the laws of Christianity were inscribed in the statute-books of the kingdoms. But now where are we, and whither are we going? Three hundred years ago the kings of the North of Europe essayed and accomplished what no man had ventured on before. They made themselves independent of the supreme Head of the Christian Church, and claimed to be themselves supreme. Moreover, since that day other kings and princes, still retaining the Catholic faith have so contended with the supreme Head of the Christian Church on earth as to teach their subjects the spirit of rebellion against themselves. What do we behold at this moment? There is not a kingdom which is not separated from the unity of the Church. All the nations are only partially in conformity with the laws of Christianity. In education, what is called the secular teaching is the only care of the State and statesmen. The kingdoms of the world are returning once more to that order of nature from which they were redeemed, and we see at this moment that they are preparing themselves for warfare and collision. They have no tribunal to appeal to, no common law to bind them together. Force is the only arbitration which they can refer their disputes. The noble and majestic fabric of Christendom is dissolving away; unless God intervene by a miracle once more as in the beginning, it has no future. These thoughts are not out of place on the Feast of St. Edward the Confessor, who was a symbol of the unity of England. In him it reached its highest point. After him it began to be overcast, and gradually to decline until the great disruption misalled the Reformation rent England finally from the unity of the Catholic faith. At the present day the duty was incumbent on every Catholic conscience of withdrawing from every man, or congregation, or assembly of men who breathed resistance to the constituted authority over us. Peace is the tranquillity of order. Where there is no order there is no peace. Let us pray for the whole Christian world, for its whole head is faint and its whole heart is sick. The danger to be apprehended from anti-Christian education is very great; but it may even yet be averted if men are in earnest and inflexible. There is now no moral head in Christendom, and princes are tossed to and fro according as the popular will inclines. That majestic throne on which the Vicar of Jesus Christ once sat, they have done all that lies in their power to undermine and destroy, but that work is not accomplished. St. Gregory reigned

when he was at Salerno in exile, and Pius VII. in the days of his dethroned and imprisoned life continued to reign in the consciences and hearts of men. Pius IX. imprisoned as he is in his own palace, over the threshold of which, with a majestic firmness, he has never set his foot for six long years, in protest against the presence of the usurpation in the city which God has given him and to his predecessors, reigns still over the whole Church of God; more widespread, more united than it ever has been in the history of Christianity from the beginning. Let us pray that England may be restored to the unity of the Catholic faith, and that into the hearts of her people there may be poured a spirit of reparation of the Most Holy Sacrament and to the Blessed Mother of God, who has been cast out and erased from the Christianity and public worship of the majority of Englishmen. Lastly, we owe reparation to the supreme authority of the Vicar of Jesus Christ. Let us, therefore, pray for him, because upon him rests the whole burden of this mighty conflict, and in praying for Pius IX. and for England, let us invoke the intercession of our great king, saint, and confessor, St. Edward, who once reigned over England, and who still reigns in the loving hearts of his children.

RUSSIA AND ENGLAND.

THE ENGLISH PREMIER DENOUNCED AS "TRAFFICKING FOR MONEY."

The following is the substance of an article from the *Golos*, a Russian journal, which, according to the *Times*, is read by the educated and influential classes:— "For more than a year the world has been watching with alternate apprehension and astonishment the policy of the English Tory Cabinet in the Eastern Question. The journals of all countries have been at a loss to divine the object and to understand the method of this policy. The partisans of Mr. Disraeli represent him as a mysterious sphinx and as too deep and too cunning a genius to be comprehended by ordinary men. His opponents on the other hand, while they likewise regard his proceedings as incomprehensible, describe him as a Minister full of caprice and unworthy of his place at the head of the British Government. As to diplomats, they really do not know what to do with this enfant terrible, who tears all their designs to tatters, and has nothing to offer in their stead. It ought to be observed that the members of the Disraeli Cabinet are too well disciplined to inquire into the sublime secrets of their leader, and are only the tools of a policy which they do not care to fathom. Since the day of their admission to the Cabinet they have been ordered to scream at the whole world, and to try and convince everybody that the Tory Cabinet are appointed to exalt English power and lift it up from the degradation consequent upon the prolonged rule of the non-intervention theory proclaimed by the Whigs. This *mot d'ordre* was very cunningly devised by the first English Premier of Hebrew extraction; it gave the Cabinet Ministers something to do, and it diverted their attention from what their chief desired to keep to himself. Even Lord Derby, the most eminent member of the Cabinet, fell into the snare, and was so completely carried away by Mr. Disraeli's appeal to his ambition that he became a mere instrument in the hands of his chief.

Having thus shrewdly arranged the working order of his Cabinet, the Premier proceeded to carry his pre-conceived programme. Intent upon drawing the English nation after him, the phlegmatic and apathetic character of his countrymen made it necessary to get up some extraordinary excitement. For the clever, astute Hebrew this was a good opportunity to show himself a true chip of the old block. As a beginning, a scenic effect was got up in the form of a royal visit to India. What had never before occurred in the annals of British history, the Prince of Wales went to the East, where he was raised to the rank of a Native idol, the Queen, his mother, being at the same time elevated to the Imperial dignity. The scheme, which was to produce a startling effect upon the loyal sentiments of the English, succeeded perfectly. The nation applauded the genius of the Premier, the members of the Cabinet basked in the reflected rays of their chief's glory, and the Royal Imperial family were right glad at their own rise in the world. Having thus acquired a firm footing, Mr. Disraeli passed on to a second theatrical *coup de-main*. He bought up the shares of the Suez Canal, representing this achievement as an act of profound political sagacity, beneficial to the vital interests of the British nation. The sensation produced by this business stroke had hardly subsided when the Slavonic question very opportunely arose.

The feats of the Tory Cabinet now became more marvellous than ever, and last June reached their acme. Disraeli Beaconsfield, with uncommon audacity, by the single stroke of the pen and twenty Powers neutralized the action of three European Powers possessed of three millions of bayonets. The thing was done so adroitly and so boldly that the Powers did not use their might, but left the Christians who solicited their assistance to struggle on as best they could. Since that time four months have elapsed. "To a simple mortal all this is absolutely incomprehensible. Considering that Disraeli-Beaconsfield has no troops to speak of at his disposal, and that his fleet will not avail him much in solving the Continental question of the Slavonians, it is difficult to understand why the weakest of the Powers should be allowed to play such a dominant part. The thing was so very extraordinary from the outset that it naturally engendered the wish to peep behind the scenes and discover the why and the wherefore. "From the mass of surmises and suppositions, some of which have appeared in the press, while others have not, one solution of the riddle stands out prominently. It is a strange, wild solution, but according to the verdict of public opinion, it is a very possible one, and perfectly in accordance with Mr. Disraeli's character. The Tory Premier, it is contended, simply aims at using his power to get all the money he can while in office. For this purpose a triumvirate is said to have been formed. Sir Philip Rose, the intimate friend and private secretary of Mr. Disraeli-Beaconsfield, entered into partnership with the London branch of the Frankfurt and Paris firm of Erlanger. The considerable capital of the Erlangers, their connection with all European countries, their branch offices at Frankfurt, Paris, and more especially at Vienna, their influence over important journals, many of which are their property, and their *savoir faire* in obtaining useful telegrams in time—all this served to render their alliance with the ruler of English destinies exceedingly profitable from a financial point of view. "When Parliament was prorogued, the triumvirate had a few months all to themselves to satiate their financial appetite. This interval was ruthlessly turned to account. No doubt these practices will continue while the triumvirate is in power, regardless of the number of slaughtered victims and the disturbance to the commerce and industry of all Europe. "The lucrative jobbery of the triumvirate began at the time of the Prince of Wales' journey to India. On that occasion silver was depreciated in consequence of a clever alteration in the relations between India and Great Britain. The export of silver coin to Asia, which had been going on time out of mind, was artificially stopped and changed into an import. This metamorphosis was brought about by administrative measures quietly taken at

the time of the general enthusiasm aroused about the Prince's stay in India. Before any one dreamt of this financial operation the triumvirate had pocketed their profits. A great banking firm co-operating with the head of the Government, it was easy to make money, and money was made. Soon after the Suez Canal shares operation, a business unprecedented in history. The price of the shares constantly rising and falling for several weeks preceding the transfer, is in itself proof that the transaction was directed by a person who knew what was in the wind, though the rest of the world, including Mr. de Lesseps, were kept in the dark. "The third and principal operation of the financial triumvirate began in the autumn of 1875, when the Bosnia-Herzegovine rebellion assumed the proportions of a serious protest against Turkish rule, endorsed by the whole Balkano-Slavonic peninsula. The cunning and underhand dealings of Disraeli and Erlanger now had a wide field of action opened to them. A better occasion for reaping millions could not be imagined. Erlanger, well acquainted with the Russian finances and their weak points, at once perceived that immense profits might be realised if the rebellion of two Turkish Provinces could be fanned into a great political conflagration. Having the entire English diplomacy at his disposal, he could easily attain his object. Accordingly, European exchanges were kept in a constant flutter, the prices of Government and private stock going up and down and oscillating between extremes. The price of Russian securities, in which speculation raged, varied as much as 20 per cent. One of the principal aims of the speculators was to extend the period during which these little affairs could be carried on, and to suit every stroke of business to an utterance of the British Premier were remarkable for being the reverse of what friends and enemies expected. They always took people by surprise, and, devoid of all political logic, uniformly prevented the financial speculations of outsiders succeeding. "The audacity, the infamy, the trickery displayed throughout, and apiced occasionally with a seeming concession or two, were truly wonderful. Contradictions between word and deed abounded, and innumerable are the proofs in the newspapers of the low artifices resorted to. But the object was attained. Millions were made, chiefly at Russian expense. It is certain, that to rob Russia financially, though the proceeds go to a few interested speculators, must contribute to weaken our political action. "If an armistice, and subsequently a peace which shall satisfy Slavonic claims, is not speedily concluded, the only expedient left is to resort to military occupation. Directly the Russian army crosses the frontier, the Tory Cabinet will fall, because the English are neither desirous, and indeed will not carry on war. Quite the contrary, England is sure to advise Turkey to submit to the will of Europe even before the army of occupation has reached the Turkish limits."

MR. M. HENRY, M.P. ON THE IRISH LAND QUESTION.

Mr. Mitchell Henry, M.P., has addressed a letter to the secretary of the Land Conference in which he says:— "I voted in favour of Mr. Butt's bill last session, because I agree with the principles on which it is based—namely, that of giving the tenant security in his holding, and of insuring to him, so far as legal enactment can do it, the full reward of his labour, and the entire value of his capital; but no one, I believe, was more sensible than the author of the bill that it would require amendments in details, and that it did not present the tenant's case in the light most calculated to advance your objects. For my part, I share the opinion, formerly expressed I believe, by Mr. Butt himself, that Ulster tenantry right when allowed its full meaning and away provides the real solution of the Land Question. We know, however, that it is impossible on legal grounds to express in the words of written law, applicable to the whole of Ireland, that which is not written in Ulster but exists by usage and custom, lately, however, too often infringed upon. A proper substitute may, I think, be found in a system of renewable leases, provided the leases are sufficiently long and the right of renewal absolute. I have the strongest objection to any system which necessitates the uncertain defect or frequent revision of rents, and this is a defect which runs through all the Land Bills I have seen. After the deepest reflection, some experience, and after studying the subject by the light of free discussion, I venture to say that the following proposal is not unworthy of the consideration of the members of the Conference but I must premise by stating that my sympathies are with the *bona fide* agricultural tenants, and not with graziers, who hold the lands from which the tillers of the soil have been got rid of, and many of whom are rich gentlemen, who have immense tracts of grazing land, formerly cultivated, and whose only aim is to render Ireland the New Zealand or the Australia of Europe. "A Land Bill should, therefore, perpetuate the distinction between agriculturists and graziers which exists in the present bill, but I express no opinion now as to the manner in which that distinction is to be formulated otherwise than by saying that rent will probably be found to be at the bottom of it. The value of land in different parts of Ireland varies too much to allow of acreage being accepted as a test, although probably in some instances the rent and the extent of the holding might be taken together as excluding from the provisions of the bill. No enactment can, however, be satisfactory unless proper legal provision is made for working it with justice and precision. Such tribunals we have not at present. To have conferred counties in Ireland seems to me to have been a great act of folly, and the result has been uncertainty expense, and delay. In their place I would substitute a court composed of four judges, one for each province in Ireland, who should go circuit regularly and be assisted in their decisions by *skillful assessors*, after the manner of the commercial tribunals of many foreign countries. Such assessors should be chosen from persons conversant with land—tenants, agents, and landlords, in just proportions—and they would be taken from local panels. "The court thus constituted would determine all questions as to rent, sale of tenant right, and renewal of leases, as well as of all other questions not referring to the legal title of estates. "Of course, there would be an appeal from a local court to a general or full court, but after a short time, when a uniformity of general principle had been established, I am disposed to think that litigation at all between landlord and tenant would be reduced to a minimum. "It remains now to state that the main provisions of the new Land Bill would be to— "1. Entitle every agricultural tenant to demand from his landlord a lease for thirty-one years, renewable at his option at the end of that period on a revision of rent, in estimating which the tenant's improvements would be excluded. "2. The tenant to have a right of free sale of his interest, subject to a right of pre-emption by the landlord, and of objection on just grounds to an ineligible tenant. The land tribunals, with its assessors would determine any question not settled between the two parties as to rent, price of pre-emption to the landlord, and validity of objection to any particular tenant. "Objections will probably be made by some landlord and by some tenants to these proposals, but the questions we have to ask are practical measures

\* Thirtieth Annual Report of the Board of Supervision for the relief of the poor in Scotland—1874-5, pages 320-321.   
† Nineteenth Report on Reformatory and Industrial Schools, March 31st, 1876.