

"A THREATENED DISGRACE AND HOW TO AVERT IT."

(From the *Toronto Advertiser*.)

The discussion with respect to the Marquis of Lansdowne has established by the clearest possible evidence the fact that our future Governor-General is a harsh and arbitrary landlord, and a mean, selfish, narrow-minded man, who when the question of alleviating the condition of the Irish tenantry came up in the Imperial Parliament, allowed his prejudice and interests as a land-owner to overcome his patriotism and sense of justice. We are glad that Mr. Gladstone has chosen this kind of man to fill the post of society figure-head at Ottawa—heartily glad of it, for the reason that such an appointment is well calculated to disgust Canadians with the whole rotten system, and strengthen the feeling in favour of Canadian independence.

Meanwhile all the toadies and lick-spittles, the snobs and snobesses in the country are getting ready to pay homage to this worthless, pampered aristocrat. The *Globe* and *Mail*, agreeing for once in their lives, are bealavering the Marquis with their sickening gush, and emitting columns of loyal rant and cant in adulation of this vile extortioner—who comes here to recruit a fortune exhausted by extravagance and dissipation with the 50,000dols. per annum which Canadians are fools enough to squander on these titled idlers. But this will not suffice we suppose.

Lansdowne will want to make a vice-regal progress through the country—at the Country's expense of course—and the next thing will be that our "loyal" City Council will be called upon to vote a large appropriation for his entertainment, and to buy champagne for all the snobs and ward politicians. We hope the citizens will protest against any such misappropriation of the public funds, and in such unmistakable language that no city father when afterwards called to account for his vote can plead ignorance of the wishes of his constituents. There ought to be an end of this business of taxing poverty to gorge wealth; of taxing industry to feed idleness; of taxing the widow's mite and the orphan's crust, to pamper the swollen pride of an aristocratic pauper; of wringing its scanty earnings from the hard hand of labour, to minister to the ostentatious gluttony and debauchery of a "noble" do-nothing and his attendant pimps and parasites. There must be an end to it now for ever, and Lansdowne is a very good man to begin on. Let the citizens—those who are not "in society" and who have no share in courtly revelries and cannot hope to bask in the smiles of vice-royalty—do their duty, and tell their aldermanic representatives plainly that a vote of money to entertain Lansdowne means the loss of their votes at next election. "Not another cent from the city coffers for vice-regal junketings." would be a very good election cry.

ALEXANDER SULLIVAN ON MIGRATION IN IRELAND.

It was recently announced that Bishop McCormack would shortly visit this country in behalf of the Catholic Bishops of Ireland to raise money to aid in the scheme of migration among the Irish peasantry, for which Parliament not long ago voted a large sum. Alexander M. Sullivan, of Chicago, the President of the Irish National League, who is at present on a visit to Manhattan Beach, New York, was asked by a reporter, last Sunday, whether the League had received any official notification as to when Bishop McCormack would arrive here.

Mr. Sullivan replied in the negative, and added: "Should Bishop McCormack come here on that mission, he will not do so under the auspices of the League."

"Will he not then receive the support of the League?" was asked.

"Certainly not," was the answer. "No one will win the co-operation of the League who does not come to this country on League business, no matter whether his mission be to lecture or collect."

"Is not the League in this country in favour of Mr. Parnell's migration scheme?"

"Yes, it most heartily favours it, but our method of co-operation is to take the necessary action to increase the political power of the Irish people, so as to enable them to compel the English Government to do its duty in the premises. The purpose of our agitation is not first to show how England fails to do her duty, and then to collect money to save her the trouble and expense of doing that duty. On the contrary, we propose to show her outrageous neglect of the duties of Government in Ireland, and to compel her to disgorge, for the alleviation of Ireland, at least a portion of what she has stolen from Ireland. We favour migration in Ireland, the expenses, however, to come—as they should come—out of the English treasury."

"Have you seen certain charges in some of the Western papers that Mr. Egan and yourself were engaged in a plot to blow up the Welland Canal?"

"Oh, yes; I have read the articles."

"Have you made any reply?"

"No; it was not necessary to notice the charge. It was utterly beneath notice; only a lunatic could believe it."

[We quite agree with Mr. Sullivan that a movement to collect money in Ireland or America to help the English Government to migrate the Irish people would be a mistake. It would be a movement solely for the benefit of landlords. The purchase and migration money for Irish farmers must come out of the English treasury, where their earnings have gone for centuries. Mr. Alexander Sullivan speaks with judgment and he expresses the sentiments of the Irish people of America.—Ed. *Pilot*.]

The insignificance of Errington is proven by his quick disappearance from public view. A few months ago, his name was on every page. Truly, he went up like the rocket and came down like the stick.—*P*

FATHER FERRIS'S CASE.

(The *Nation*, Sept. 8.)

THE most notable eviction for many years was that of last week at Castlelyons, county Cork, when the Rev. Thomas Ferris, P.P., was turned out of house and lands.

As the circumstances of this case cannot be too widely made known, we shall summarise them from the reports in the Cork papers. The landlord is a Mr. John Walker Perrott, of Monkstown. The farm in question contains about fourteen acres. Griffith's valuation of it is £11 5s. The rent charged for it was £19 10s 10d, or nearly double the valuation. The house, in which the various parish priests of Castlelyons have for half a century resided, was built by one of them some fifty years ago. It has been the custom for each incoming parish priest to pay to the outgoing one a substantial sum for the good-will of the residence, and Father Ferris himself actually paid £225 to his predecessor in occupation for that house. Finally, the premises are held under a lease, some forty years of which have yet to run. Had not the Land Act cruelly excluded leaseholders from its rent-fixing provisions he would by now, in all probability, be paying a greatly reduced rent, instead of being an evicted tenant; since the house, for the good-will of which he had paid, must unquestionably have been treated by any Land Court as his personal improvement, and allowance must have been made for it in the judicial rent.

So far for the situation of affairs when the Land League movement began. Three years ago a meeting was held at Castlelyons at which it was resolved to pay no higher rents than Griffith's valuation. Father Ferris assented to that resolution, and acted up to it manfully. During the intervening period he repeatedly tendered the arrears at the Government valuation, but they would not be accepted. A writ was at length issued; the holding was then put up to auction by the Sheriff, and the tenant's interest bought in for the landlord at a nominal figure. On the deed from the sheriff an ejection decree was sought, and the result was the bringing together, on the Thursday of last week, of a force of four bailiffs, fifty policemen, and forty foot-soldiers, to drive the parish priest of Castlelyons from the residence to which his moral title is as clear as noonday. The resolute priest, acting up to his principles, once more declined to pay what he considered an exorbitant claim for rent on his own improvements, left his comfortable dwelling at the demand of the law, and proceeded to instal himself in a half-built mud hut which was in course of erection in the chapel-yard for his reception. It should be noted also that by the Sheriff's sale Father Ferris not only lost all legal interest in his holding, but lost too, by legal confiscation, the £225 he paid in respect of the house, minus only the comparatively trifling sum claimed as rent and refused for the last three years.

From this case we learn in a most forcible way the striking injustice done by the Land Act in excluding leaseholders from those of its provisions which make the nearest approach to securing equity for the Irish tenantry. The parish priest of Castlelyons had before him on the one hand the choice of paying a heavy rent for a dwelling which neither the landlord nor any of his predecessors built, and for which the priest himself gave a large sum, and on the other the loss of his entire interest in house and land, with residence in a mud cabin for probably the remainder of his days. He chose the latter alternative; and there are probably few people in Ireland, save landlords and their hangers-on, who will not honour him in their hearts for doing so, and hold him to be a man every inch of heroic mould. What Mr. Perrott hoped to gain by his obstinacy is by no means clear. We may take it for granted that a dwelling-house built by a parish priest for occupation by himself and his successors is greatly in excess of the requirements of a fourteen-acre farm; therefore the landlord's chances of getting a tenant willing to pay him £19 odd yearly for the place are small indeed. Even if that were not so for the reason mentioned, there are other reasons which suggest that Mr. Perrott may go whistle for a £19 rent. Anyone who has even a faint idea of Irish Catholic feeling must know well that the most inveterate landgrabber if a Catholic would draw the line at taking a house and land from which a priest had been evicted. We believe that most Irish Protestants would also refuse to become the successor of an evicted priest. Mr. Perrott may think of working by the aid of Emergency men, and if so we wish him joy of all the profits he will thus realise. But, whatever Mr. Perrott's projects may be, we repeat that this case brings out under a fierce light the monstrous injustice done by the Land Act to leaseholders. We believe, too, that it will powerfully tend towards procuring an early remedy for that injustice, and that thus the spirited action of Father Ferris will have earned the lasting gratitude of that large class of tenants. In conclusion we echo with unflinching confidence the rev. gentleman's prediction that when landlordism is out of the country, there will be priests in Ireland and a house and land for the parish priest of Castlelyons.

Cardinal Manning has been kind enough to say that he would be willing to grant the Irish nation as much self-government as is possessed by an English city! His Eminence is certainly to be thanked. Let us, however, inform him that the Irish nation and an English city do not stand on precisely the same level as regards their claims to self-government, and that the Irish people are well aware of the fact, if he be ignorant of it, and are, accordingly, determined to seek, until they get it, for much more than the degree of Home Rule with which the inhabitants of an English city would be content, or to which they would be entitled. We observe that his Eminence has, in this connection, been repeating what, with all respect for the exalted office he holds, we must call the stale rubbish that the dissolution of the hated Union would mean ruin not only for England but also for Ireland. How any intelligent person can honestly hold this opinion in face of the prosperity of Ireland during the eighteen years of its legislative independence and of the ruin wrought here during the last eighty years of absorption with England, entirely passes our comprehension. We must confess we expected better from Cardinal Manning.—*Nation*