

The Catholic Weekly Review.

A JOURNAL DEVOTED TO THE INTERESTS OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN CANADA

Reddite quæ sunt Cæsaris, Cæsari; et quæ sunt Dei, Deo.—Matt 22: 21.

Vol. III

Toronto, Saturday, June 22, 1889.

No. 19

CONTENTS.

NOTES.....	280
CONTRIBUTED ARTICLE.	
The Jesuit Mission in Perth.....	D. 201
The Clun Na Gael.....	208
The Legend of the San Graill.....	300
The Anti-Jesuit Agitation.....	291
The University of Ottawa.....	300
The Romance of a Jesuit.....	290
I Don't Care.....	295
Father Egan and the Rev. Mr Percival.....	292
List of Ordinations.....	300
EDITORIAL—	
Prof. Huxley on Agnosticism.....	290
The Church and Progress.....	290
Modern Civilization.....	296
A Rebuff for the Ritualists.....	297
The Queen v. the Bishop of London.....	297
The Mail and Mercier medals.....	298
Dangerous Newspapers.....	298
Mon and Things.....	299
Book Reviews.....	291
Correspondence.....	291
PORTLY	
A Legend.....	Adelaide Procter. 283

Notes.

The Archbishop of Dublin contributes to the June number of the *Contemporary Review* a remarkable article regarding the present position of the agrarian question in Ireland. Dr. Walsh lays before the public the true state of things which surrounds the settlement of the difficulties between landlord and tenant with a force and lucidity and authority which must make clear to the English people on which side must rest the responsibility for the continuance, if it is to be continued, of the wretched land war which these many years has been waged between landlord and tenant in Ireland. His Grace recounts the efforts he made to effect peace in the summer and autumn of 1887, in May, 1888, and now in 1889, and shows how, in nearly every instance, they were rejected by the land-owners, while, on the other hand, they were, with scarcely an exception, acceptable to, and desired by, the supporters of the cause of the tenants. In season and out of season for some time past His Grace has endeavoured to bring about a conference between representatives of the landlords and tenants who would meet together in a spirit of mutual concession for the purpose of discussing the situation and of arriving at some fair and feasible method of settling the Irish land question. The Archbishop has also urged the setting up of a tribunal of arbitration for the settlement of disputes between landlords and tenants, surely a practical suggestion, and one which the Government would gladly, it is believed, see both parties agree to.

The Archbishop's proposals meet with general approval from the Government journals, but the question is a practical one, and something more than an abstract acceptance of his views is demanded if any practical good is to come of the matter. The real point is whether or not the principle of arbitration will be accepted by such land-owners as the Clanricardes and Lansdownes. If not, if they spurn the approaches of the Archbishop towards effecting a basis of settlement, then will the responsibility be upon them for the con-

tinuance of the eviction miseries and outrages which are daily witnessed in Ireland. "I deem it a duty," His Grace writes, and his prudent and statesmanlike words will not fail of effect upon the mind of the public "to exhaust whatever influence I may happen to have with the tenants of Ireland in endeavouring to induce them, in restraint of every feeling of resentment, to maintain their present most praiseworthy attitude of conciliation. The more steadfastly they maintain this attitude the more forcibly must it be brought home to the honest public opinion of England, by the persistent refusal of their oppressors to submit the cases in dispute to the test of an impartial arbitration, that Irish tenants are even now abandoned by English law as victims to a system of oppression which their oppressors themselves practically treat as incapable of justification before an impartial tribunal, but against which, unhappily, the law provides no remedy."

The announcement of the presentation by Mr. Hugh Graham, of Montreal, of a petition to the Government to refer the Jesuits incorporation and indemnity acts of the Quebec Legislature to the Supreme Court for an opinion as to their legality, appears to have been unwelcome intelligence to the members of the Anti-Jesuit Convention which met last week in this city. It was a political trick, they professed to think, or a device of the Jesuits. It is just possible they were helped to this conclusion by the fact that Mr. Graham's journal, the *Star*, has opposed the present agitation as unwise and unpatriotic, and advocated instead the submission of the constitutionality of the acts to the Courts, or some other common sense method of stopping all this nonsensical anti-Jesuit fan-fare.

Mr. Graham's proposal was one, however, which at this late date, unfortunately, could not be acted upon. Had it been submitted earlier, that is, before the Minister of Justice made his report to the Privy Council, the public might have been spared this prolonged anti-Jesuit agony. But the Jesuit Bills are now law, and will be acted upon by the provincial ministry as soon as the resources of the Province will admit of the payment of the grants. As the *Montreal Gazette* has pointed out, appeals for disallowance are useless; petitions to the courts are too late. The judgment of the Supreme Court, if given now, would be extra-judicial and non-effective. The Government had no doubt of the law and its duty in the matter, and therefore there was no case to bring before the Supreme Court. As Sir John said at the Albany Club dinner in this city a few days ago, appeals to the Government, to the Supreme Court, or the Privy Council, are foolish, because they must prove to be futile, for the reason that the only body which is competent to reverse the Quebec Legislature's legislation is the Quebec Legislature. In Mr. Graham's case the deposit of a \$5000 cheque does not facilitate matters, since the Government could not take the money of a private citizen to pay the cost of a public service. Nor could it stultify itself and nullify the will of Parliament by reversing the policy it resolved on, and which has been ratified by the Parliament and by the ablest legal authorities in the House of Commons.