

MACBETH'S COMING ON.

We clip from the Ottawa Free Press a telling little paragraph about the new anti-Home Rule invasion of Canada:

Rev. Dr. MacBeth, of Enniscorthy, is coming to Canada to talk against Home Rule for Ireland. No doubt he will be listened to with respectful attention. The friends of Home Rule in Canada do not believe in stone-throwing as a political argument, and hence there is no danger that Mr. MacBeth will be treated as William O'Brien was. But judging from the way the by-elections are going in England it would appear that anti-Home Rule missionaries are more needed on the east side of St. George's Channel than in Canada.

The cablegram which announced Mr. MacBeth's coming conveyed us the information that the learned divine was coming here to refute Mr. Wm. O'Brien's charges against Lord Lansdowne. The Irish "loyalists" must then be persuaded that the editor of *United Ireland* had a strong case, and that he produced on the Canadian public mind a deep impression, or Dr. MacBeth had not been commissioned to carry the standard of landlord infamy through Canada. We have never before heard of Dr. MacBeth, but obnoxious as his views may be to the majority of Canadians, we bespeak for him a fair hearing from all classes. He has undertaken a difficult mission in coming here to refute Mr. O'Brien's arguments, and defend Lansdowne's iniquities. But no Irish Catholic will meet him with cobble-stones. Our people will leave him to argue his case as best he may, confident that his presence here will redound to Ireland and Canada's good, showing, on the one hand, the weakness and wickedness of the landlords' claims, and on the other, keeping before the public mind of the Dominion the humiliation inflicted on this land of democratic freedom by the maintenance in its gubernatorial chair of a cruel rack renter and oppressor such as Lansdowne.

SIR GEORGE O. TREVELYAN.

The return of Sir George O. Trevelyan, who had been temporarily estranged from Mr. Gladstone, to the Liberal ranks is assuredly a just source of gratification to the friends of Home Rule. The right hon. gentleman had, in the last Gladstone ministry, held the position of Chief Secretary for Ireland—but resigned on account of differences of opinion with his leader on the details of the Irish scheme. Sir George Trevelyan's secession was painfully felt and gave a severe shock to his Liberal friends, who, at the election of 1886, suffered him to be defeated. Out of Parliament, he has had a very fair opportunity of seeing the constrained and unnatural character of the alliance between the Tories and the Liberal Unionists, an alliance which forces the latter to support every abominable outrage on constitutional liberty to which Toryism must resort for its maintenance in office. He sees very clearly that no man calling himself a Liberal and really deserving the name, no man friendly to popular institutions, can be an ally of British reactionary Toryism, typified in the person of the Marquis of Salisbury. Besides, the situation has greatly altered since the presentation of Mr. Gladstone's bill in 1886. Prejudices then aroused have disappeared, conditions then attached to the scheme have been dropped, and the main issue, that of the concession of self-government to Ireland, is now alone before the British public. The American thinks that the extent to which Mr. Gladstone has altered the situation by his concessions to the prejudices against his original bill is not appreciated generally. He now, for instance, declares that the non-representation of Ireland in the Imperial Parliament is not essential to the Home Rule idea. This satisfies many, who, like Sir G. O. Trevelyan, feared that the cutting away of Irish representation from Westminster would make Ireland too independent of British control. But more important still is his abandonment of the plan to buy out the Irish landlords with English money. The American aptly quotes an English journal to show that in the last electoral campaign "The Unionists made free use of the fear which possible loss has on the commercial mind of a nation of shopkeepers." The securities provided were ignored, and what was in reality but a very remote contingency was magnified, with a ready unscrupulousness, into an almost immediate certainty. The result was that John Bull buttoned up his breeches, put down his foot (this time he was in earnest) and said "No Majority against the government thirly."

The British nation is now delighted to find that the solution of the Irish problem will include no invasion of his purse. The landlords will have to deal with the new Dublin Parliament for the sale of their lands, but will be permitted on no account to practice extortion on the Englishman. Mr. Gladstone has, as the American states, by his recent explanations and concessions, gravely weakened the position of the Tory and Liberal unionist alliance. Sir George Trevelyan is at this moment seeking the suffrages of the Bridgeton Division of Glasgow as a supporter of Mr. Gladstone. The Tories and Liberal unionists are combining to defeat

him, but the division having at the last election given Mr. E. R. Russell, the Liberal candidate, who now gracefully retires to afford Sir George Trevelyan an opportunity of returning to Parliament, a majority of 797, there is no doubt that the late Chief Secretary for Ireland will carry the constituency by a solid vote. Here are the figures for the last two general elections:

Bridgeton (Glasgow), 1885—	
E. R. Russell (L).....	3,759
E. V. A. Maitland (C).....	3,137
Shaw Maxwell (L).....	1,156
C. & I. plurality.....	544
1886—	
E. R. Russell (L).....	4,364
C. Mackenzie (C).....	3,597

Liberal majority.....797
Sir George Trevelyan's return to the House will greatly strengthen Mr. Gladstone's hands and spread consternation among the "Unionists." The latter will, at the next general election, be so overwhelmingly snowed under, that the few who survive the avalanche will be quietly and forever relegated to back seats in the Tory ranks. The soreness manifested by Mr. Chamberlain over Sir George's return to the Liberal ranks shows the far-reaching importance of that step. Mr. Chamberlain himself is evidently again anxious to pose as an advanced Liberal, for he literally tore the government land bill to pieces and by his speech rendered its passage this season impossible.

AN OFFENSIVE TITLE.

It is well known that Mr. Disraeli was the favorite minister of Queen Victoria's latter years. He understood his sovereign's character in its every detail and minutest eccentricity. Carried into power by a large majority, in the elections of 1874, he strove to strengthen himself first with the queen, and then with the people. He never put much store by the aristocracy, whom he used at will with an evident disregard for its sentiments, prejudices and traditions. The lords were in his eyes more ornamental than useful, but the ornamental had its place, and a dignified one, in his theory of the government of the masses. He put himself right with the Queen by giving her the title of Empress of India—a worse than useless appellation—offensive to Englishmen and repulsive to the Hindoo. Never was any of his pet schemes so bitterly opposed and so mercilessly ridiculed and satirized. In the Commons the Marquis of Hartington led the opposition to the proposal, and did so with a skill and force that surprised alike friend and foe. The bill conferring the title was, however, carried through all its stages by large majorities. The wily Premier, seeing that by its passage he had lost heavily in popular estimation, sought by the adoption of a Jingo policy in foreign affairs, to play on the national pride of the English, and thus far more than make up for the loss he had had to sustain in catering to royal whims and servile womanly vanity. With all Disraeli's tact and determination this measure could never have become law but for his distinct and repeated pledge, that the title would never be used except in matters concerning India. He then solemnly declared to Parliament: "The noble lord who has just addressed us has put the case very fairly before us. He gives myself and colleagues credit for being sincere in the statements we have made, and feels that we have given honest advice to the sovereign—and that advice, I am bound to say, has been received with the utmost sympathy, namely, that the title which Her Majesty has been advised, for great reasons of state, to assume, shall be exercised absolutely and solely in India when it is required, and that, on becoming Empress of India, she does not seek to be in any way Empress of England; but will be content with the old style and title of Queen of the United Kingdom. To all purposes, in fact, Her Majesty would govern the United Kingdom as she has always governed it. Earl Cairns, in the House of Lords, declared with equal calmness: "I have to state that it is the intention of the government that the proclamation to be issued by Her Majesty under this bill shall comply literally with the engagements that have been given the House of Commons, and that it will provide in a manner analogous to the proclamation of 1801—that upon all writs, commissions, patents and charters intended to operate within the United Kingdom, the royal style shall continue as it is, without any addition. It is said that the new title of Empress of India will overshadow the title of Queen of England. My Lords that appears to me to be not an argument, but a mere figure of speech. It is difficult to answer a figure of speech, and I am at a loss to conceive how the great title of Queen of England, unchanged and unaltered and sacred in this country, and beloved by every subject of the crown, can possibly be overshadowed by the addition of a title opposite and appropriate to, and only to be used in India." These promises of the great

Tory leaders of 1876 have not been, it would appear, faithfully kept, for Mr. George Howell, Liberal M. P. for Bethnal Green, has called the attention of Parliament to the use of the title "Empress" in documents not affecting India. The title has never been popular in England, and may be dropped by Her Majesty's successor, as was the empty and offensive title of King of France, abandoned at the time of the union of Great Britain and Ireland.

RUSSIA AND GERMANY.

Late cable despatches go to demonstrate that the ever growing unfriendliness between Germany and Russia is assuming a grave and more acute form. The dislike of these two countries, for each other is not of recent date. Mr. J. A. MacGahan, the celebrated correspondent of the (N. Y.) *Herald* and *London Daily News*, once wrote: "The Russian officers have very strong likes and dislikes. For the Americans and the French they have feelings of the utmost friendliness. They speak by preference the French language; love French literature and French music; and they endeavor to imitate French ways of living. And their sympathies in the last war were altogether with France. The Germans they detest as cordially as they like the French, and indeed a Frenchman hates the German with a hatred scarcely more bitter than that of the Russian civilian or soldier. The origin of this hatred must be sought in the time of Peter the Great. When that monarch determined to introduce western civilization into his empire, he had, of course, to cast about among foreigners for the men to carry out this purpose. He naturally selected Germany as the country nearest to him, and Germans were chosen to fill the highest offices in the state, civil and military. The jealousy thus created still lasts; for many of the descendants of the Germans—although they are now, of course, thorough Russians—still occupy foremost places in the country. And thus it is that Russia is filled with hatred for Germany, that has been so often her most steadfast friend; and with love for France, that has been in past times her greatest enemy." To other causes besides that mentioned by the brilliant and lamented MacGahan, would we attribute the unfriendliness of the Russians for Germany. Russia's first and most bitter struggles were against the Teutonic race. Its most formidable foe, Charles XII. of Sweden, was himself as much of a Teuton as is today the Emperor William, and he had, in his fight against Peter the Great, the sympathy of the mass of the German people, by whom his name is to this day held in high honor. The antagonism between the two countries has grown with the advancement of Russia, and especially the erection of the new North German empire. Russian statesmen are proverbially far-seeing and penetrating. They see the ultimate purpose of Bismarck's policy, viz.: the absorption in Germany of Denmark, Holland, Sweden and Norway, beside the German provinces of both Austria and Russia, and the construction of a mighty empire that must dispute with Russia the control of Northern Europe. Had Bismarck weakened France in 1874 to the extent he desired, nothing but Russian hostility could have checked the action and successful pursuit of this policy. As it is now, he could not venture to show his hand too openly in this direction, but must content himself with an occult direction of affairs towards that special end. Russia is, however, watching his course very closely, and, in the case of German complications with France, may be depended on to take active part with the latter country against Teutonic omnivorousness.

CHURCH DISCIPLINE.

If there be any one thing which more than another proves the Divine origin and organization of the Catholic Church, it is its perfect system of internal government and discipline. This government and discipline, based on evangelical counsel, maxim and precept, is the glory of Catholics and the admiration of non-Catholics. No merely human system can effectually prevent injustice or handicap tyranny. The Canon law of the Church Roman, Catholic and Apostolic, alone metes out fullest justice to all men, however helpless their condition or humble their lot. Two things are essentially required for the dispensation of justice. The laws must be just in theory and in application, and the judges men of probity, firmness, and perspicacity. These two conditions are present in the courts of the Church Catholic. There have been, indeed, and there have been, cases of oppression and injustice on the part of individuals in the history of the church, but no man can be wronged in perpetuity by the administrators of the law and dispensers of justice in the Catholic church. He has always means of redress, and is certain of protection in the pursuit and assertion of his rights. The Holy See lends a ready and impartial ear to the plaint

of its humblest subject. No supreme tribunal on earth shows the same solicitude, tenderness and kindness in dealing with the claims and complaints of those seeking its adjudication, or those falling under its necessary action. Even its condemnations are tempered with mercy, making its very adverse judgments acceptable to those upon whom they bear. The case of Dr. McGlynn has attracted much attention from non-Catholics to Rome's methods of dealing with cases of indiscipline and disobedience. This priest had been long and favorably known for many excellent qualities of head and heart. He was in private life irreproachable; his charity to the poor knew no bounds. He had, however, in certain public utterances, taken positions, considered by his superiors either unsafe or unsound. Communications were opened with him, counsel administered in all charity, and finally direct orders issued for his regulation and guidance. Dr. McGlynn could not unfortunately see things in the light of those whom God had placed above him. He, in fact, has since openly and positively refused to see them in that light. A few foolish Catholics have combined with the miscellaneous crowd, for which insubordination even has a fascination, and talked of defiance to and rebellion against Rome. All good Catholics have been pained and horrified, and law and order loving non-Catholics disedified at Dr. McGlynn's recent ill advised course and his fraternization with the socialists, the anarchists, the moon-calls and clot-polls of New York. The American is led to say of him:

The recent speeches of Dr. McGlynn show that he must be contemplating the final severance of the ties which connect him with the Roman Catholic Church. He speaks of the Papal system in language which Protestants generally find unjustly spicy reading, but which is quite inconsistent with that idea of loyalty to the head of the Church which characterizes good Catholics. Whether his statements be true or the reverse, they are not such as a priest would make publicly if he expected to maintain his place in the hierarchy. On one point he certainly does not speak by the book, if he be repeated correctly. He says: "The only obligations I ever took upon me were to fulfil the duties of the priestly office by preaching the gospel and administering the sacraments in the place to which I belonged, namely, New York, and to teach the Catholic doctrines and never anything contrary thereto. On this ground he bases his refusal to appear in Rome before the tribunal of the Propaganda. But Dr. McGlynn certainly subjected himself to the provisions of the Canon law of his own Church, before he received the ordination which made him a priest. And that law is constructed much more to secure the authority of the rules of the Church than to defend the rights of individuals. It has recognized almost from the first the rights of the Roman Curia to exercise both original and appellate jurisdiction over all causes ecclesiastical, and to summon before its tribunals ecclesiastics charged with refractoriness to discipline, unsoundness in doctrine, or irregularity of life.

It is truly deplorable that a man with so creditable a record, and a career of such undoubted usefulness yet before him, could so far forget the sacred obligations of his character, and the duties of his manhood as to be led astray by a few brawlers and demagogues, who represent nothing but worthlessness and vice. The writer has recently had opportunity of conversing with hundreds of Americans in New York and Brooklyn, and while he found, on all sides, a kindly and generous feeling towards Dr. McGlynn, not one man attempted justification of his association with Henry George, and all reproached his disobedience to his Archbishop and to the Holy See. We sincerely trust that for his own sake, Dr. McGlynn will live long enough to regret his insubordination, and repair the scandal he has given to Catholics and non-Catholics.

THE CHRISTIAN BROTHERS.

We are pleased to see that Mr. Enright, a leading member of the Board of Catholic School Trustees of Ottawa, denies the truth of the report, that there is under consideration a proposal to disperse with the services of the Christian Brothers, now in charge of the English classes in that city. The Brothers have rendered immense services to the cause of Catholic education at the capital. They have had many difficulties to contend with; they have had even more than their share of disappointments; but their record, in that city, is there, to attest to generations yet unborn, a fidelity to duty, a self-sacrifice, and a heroic courage, which they have been grateful to belittle, overlook, or deny. The works of the Brothers speak for them, and by their works will they be judged. Our Irish Catholic fellow-countrymen in Ottawa would never forgive themselves the mistake, we had almost said crime, of parting with the Brothers, did they now listen to evil counsel pointing to so fatal a step. They have in His Grace Archbishop Duhamel a safe guide, and a sure counsellor. When he decides that the services of the Brothers are no longer required in the Catholic schools of his episcopal city, then may the Irish Catholics there take into consideration the advisability of displacing the Brothers. Meantime, foolish and

criminal it were even to heed the suggestions of malignity, or yield to the counsel of hatred and revenge in a matter of such vital import. Let the Catholics of Ottawa be guided by their Archbishop, and by him alone. He is not the spiritual ruler of part only, but of all the Catholics of Ottawa. To him then must all look in a matter of such grave moment as the education of the little Catholics of that city. We make no personal allusion, bearing in this case, when we say, that we have known in this country men finding fault with the Brothers' system of education as too religious, who never kneel in prayer themselves; of men, too, who complain that the Brothers are inferior teachers and pose as their judges of what should be the requirements of a good teacher, who, every day of their lives themselves set orthography at defiance, and turn occasionally a battering ram on syntax. Some of these men are in positions where a limited knowledge of orthography and some slight respect for syntax were not at all out of place. We cheerfully make all due allowance for the circumstances which must account for men's defective education, but such men ought, out of regard for public feeling, be very chary in condemning others in positions where condemnation is beyond their ken. Let there be fairness, forbearance, good-will and charity, let there be, above all, submission to legitimate ecclesiastical authority in the matter of education, and Catholic schools must flourish throughout the Province.

IRISH LANDLORDISM EXPOSED.

I.
We have been, from time to time, in receipt of communications asking us to set forth the true character of Irish landlordism, the foundation it rests upon, its claims and its rights. From the tenor of some of these communications, and from one verbal interchange of views with many usually well-informed men throughout the Province, we perceive that very grave misapprehension exists on this important subject. A communication, lately addressed to the *Chicago Tribune*, sums up with much clearness all the erroneous opinions we have seen written or have heard expressed on the subject of Irish landlordism. The writer declares himself at a loss to understand by what course of reasoning the *Tribune* could make it appear that the landlords do wrong in evicting tenants, who cannot or will not pay rent, and in providing them with a way to reach a country with better opportunities (1) Is it not, he asks, for the good of the evicted tenant to go where land is cheaper? Clearly it is, says the *Tribune's* correspondent, eviction or high rent or something of the kind which brings about so desirable a result. The landlord, he adds, either has or has not the right to the land. How can a man be consistently blamed for taking the full fruit of what belongs to him? Competition it is that in Ireland makes the land high, just as it will anywhere where all the land is taken up. How can an Irish landlord be blamed for taking all that competition permits, even as does an American landlord? Is he to be condemned any more than any other land owner for saying to the tenant, Pay what I ask, or go elsewhere? Since the tenant is at liberty to take the land at the price demanded or go to America, how can he justly complain? What right has he to expect or demand reduced rent when the same economic law governs his rent as governs rent in every other country. High rents then, argues the *Tribune's* correspondent, cannot be wrung from any point of view. Eviction is a necessary right to the landlord enabling him to secure his own. He has the right to do with his property what he thinks best; the mere fact that suffering results from the enforcement of his right cannot make a racial of him. There is no system of morals except possibly the poorest of Christ's teachings, that calls upon one of these landlords to give all that he has to feed the poor. Such is the line of argument advanced by the *Tribune's* landlord advocate—a line of argument false, untenable, and even blasphemous. Christ nowhere commands any man to give all he has to the poor. He gives it as an evangelical counsel, that if a man wish to be perfect he should sell all he hath, give it to the poor, and follow Him. He knew and taught the danger of riches, which make men selfish, hard-hearted and oblivious of God. His own words are at hand to prove His true meaning—words evidently distasteful to the *Tribune's* correspondent, and strange, if not wholly unknown, to the great majority of Irish landlords. It is on record in the 19th chapter of St. Matthew, that a certain young man, having approached Jesus to ask Him what good he should do, to have life everlasting, the Master answered, That he should, if he wished to enter into life, keep the commandments. Whereupon the young man making answer said that this he had done from his youth. This reply he implemented with the question: "What more is wanting to me?" Jesus said to him: If thou wilt be perfect, go, sell what thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven; and come, follow me. And when the young man had heard

this word, he went away sad: for he had great possessions.

Then Jesus said to his disciples: Amen I say to you, that a rich man shall hardly enter into the kingdom of heaven. And again I say to you: It is easier for a camel to pass through the eye of a needle, than for a rich man to enter into the kingdom of heaven.

And when they had heard this, the disciples wondered very much, saying: Who then can be saved?

And Jesus beholding said to them: With men this is impossible; but with God all things are possible.

Then Peter answering, said to him: Behold we have left all things, and have followed thee: what therefore shall we have?

And Jesus said to them: Amen I say to you, that you who have followed me, in the regeneration, when the Son of man shall sit on the seat of his majesty, you also shall sit on twelve seats, judging the twelve tribes of Israel.

And every one that hath left house, or brethren, or sisters, or father, or mother, or wife, or children, or lands for my name's sake, shall receive an hundred fold, and shall possess life everlasting.

So much for the teachings and counsels of the Divine Master. Let us now turn to the *Tribune's* demolition of the flimsy structure raised by its correspondent. The *Chicago* journal begins by reminding him, that he unwarrantably assumes the Irish landlord to be absolute owner of Irish lands. His whole communication resting on that false assumption collapses with it, when exposed, like a pricked sea bubble. Unlike the American landowner, the Irish landlord has no absolute fee simple ownership of the soil. He is but a joint tenant with the cultivator. Even according to his own title deeds, he is but the tenant in *capite* of the Crown by inheritance. The lands were donated to his ancestors conditionally, viz.: for the use of his retainers including payments and services to the Crown for all time. In early times those payments or services were grouped together under headings, such as military service, aid, relief, primrose, wardship, alienation, etc. During the Tudor period the landlords or crown tenants were, in addition to the feudal payments just mentioned, subjected to the payment of levies for war purposes—at first about one-tenth of the whole value of the tenancies, but afterwards increased to four shillings in the pound sterling of the profit of the tenancy. Under the commonwealth, the payment of this levy was by the act of 1650 made by the sub-tenant, but the Crown or State tenant, as he would then be more properly termed, was obliged to deduct the amount thus paid by the sub-tenant from his full rental. The assessment thus levied under the commonwealth amounted in England to \$2,000,000, per annum; in Ireland to \$400,000; in Scotland to \$300,000—large sums in these days. After the restoration, during the reigns of Charles II. and his brother James, the landlords were all powerful in Parliament, and used their power to repudiate their lawful old time burdens, and shift them on to the shoulders of the people. By a majority of 151 to 149 the "state tenants" in the Convention Parliament of Charles II. voted that their obligation to pay rent should be abolished and that in lieu of their taxes an "animal tax" should be levied, and the King's revenue supplemented by an excise duty "on liquors, brewed or distilled, for sale." This proceeding was iniquitous, fraudulent in the last degree and in full keeping with the infamous act of that rapacious Parliament, imposing a duty of sixteen shillings and sixpence a quarter on the importation of foreign wheat. This last fraudulent act has been repealed wholly, and the other has been partially repealed, but not to such an extent as to remedy the injustice it originated and legalized. The *Tribune* omits to mention that Irish landlordism has an origin somewhat different from its English sister-system. Its origin is one of confiscation and spoliation. From its very beginning it has treated the tenantry as a class of people having no rights. The Irish landlord, after seizing upon, legislated himself into ownership of the land of the country. The Cromwellian landlord stepped into the shoes of the old Irish landlord who had paid the Crown the feudal dues and taxes, but, like his English brother, threw upon the tenant the obligation of raising a revenue for the state. His crime was a double one—robbery first, and then extortion. All, however, of the Cromwellian landlords' proceedings were, it must be recollected, legalized by act of Parliament.

The *Sherbrooke Le Progrès de l'Est* has the following in its issue of the 15th inst.: "Among the most advocates is Mr. H. J. Cloran, of Montreal, formerly editor of the *Post*, who underwent a severe and brilliant examination, with all the spirit of his race. We are informed that more than once he caused the examiners to smile over the fine spirited manner in which he answered some of the questions. In short Mr. Cloran has upheld his reputation. To his well known and merited titles of distinguished journalist, and popular orator he can now add that of a promising lawyer. Evidently politics and law are not incompatible with certain men. Mr. Cloran is among them. We are pleased to be able to offer to our distinguished confere our warmest congratulations, and we wish for him cases and suits worthy of his merit and talents."