

farm at a given rent as a going concern. He erects and maintains the home and farm buildings. He drains and fences the land—in fact the owner acts as owner, and as a matter of fact he gives back to the land much of what he gets as rent. In many cases the rent simply represents 3 per cent. on the expenditure in maintaining the farm as a going concern. Compare this with the Irish system. The Irish landlord owns nothing but the bare soil—he has erected no farm buildings, he has neither drained nor fenced the land, he has made no farm roads. All this has been done not by the man who is called owner, but by the occupier. The naked truth is that the Irish landlord takes, but does not give back. He draws what is in fact if not in law a rent-charge. That is all. Not a sixpence does he spend on the land, and much of what he draws is spent out of the country. Could two systems be more unlike? The Irish system may be summed up thus—First, there is a landlord whose one object is to secure his rent, and he performs no duty to the property he owns; second, there is the occupier, afraid to improve the land because in due time the Land Commission will arrive, and in spite of Acts of Parliament will rent him to some extent upon whatever improvements he may have made; third, there is the laborer, ground to powder between the two parties—crowding into the towns or crossing the Atlantic, until there is hardly a man capable of doing a day's work left in some parts of the country. Could there be a worse system? And add to all this the miseries of a gigantic law suit going on constantly in every parish—cases dragged from court to court, with an array of lawyers and judges revelling in the spoils. No country could stand it. Ireland least of all. And it must end, for mending is impossible.

Free trade has done more than anything else to make England what England is to-day. It has done this because England is to so large an extent an industrial country. Ireland occupies a totally different position. Ireland is not industrial in the same sense as England. Ireland is agricultural. Nobody contends that free trade has benefited the agricultural districts of England as it has done in the great centres of industry. Nothing of the kind. And what helped to make England helped to unmake the greater part of poor Ireland. I am not arguing the right and the wrong of free trade. I am showing its effect upon Ireland. Along with the advent of this policy Ireland was scourged by a desolating famine—a famine which absolutely prostrated the country. But four years after these two untoward events England imposed additional taxation upon Ireland amounting to £2,000,000 per annum.

THE DUKE OF NORFOLK AND HIS CRITICS.

HIS Grace the Duke of Norfolk has addressed a letter to the Press in reply to the criticisms passed upon the recent address presented by him on behalf of the Catholic Union of Great Britain to the Holy Father. Many of these strictures were founded on false information or on reports from the so-called 'Liberal' journals of Italy, whilst others were based on a misapprehension of the position which the Holy Father occupies with regard to the Italian Government. The allegation, which was made by some newspapers in this Colony, that the Duke of Norfolk was guilty of a breach of the laws of hospitality against the Italian Government in presenting such an address, whilst on Italian soil, was founded on the mistaken notion that Leo XIII. is a subject of the King of Italy. The Vatican is beyond the jurisdiction of the Government, and is in reality a kingdom in itself, therefore the charge that the laws of hospitality were broken need not be considered.

After explaining that he was prevented through illness from replying sooner to his critics HIS Grace goes on to say:—

The following statements are absolute fabrications: That papers publishing our address had been seized; that our hotels were guarded; that the pilgrims met with hostile demonstrations in the streets; and that a British flag hoisted over one of our hotels had been lowered by us upon the birthday of the Queen of Italy as a mark of disrespect. That statements in the Press that these things had taken place should have excited no hostility towards us tends to show how artificial was the paper agitation raised. Not one of our pilgrims had to encounter the smallest sign of disapprobation or ill will. Indeed, to our English minds, it is humbling to have to contrast the calm dignity and personal friendliness of the Roman people with the distressing hysteria of so many of our friends at home.

Would it be easy to bear stronger testimony to the impossible position of the Pope and of his spiritual children than to assert, as is now asserted, that we Catholics may not go before the Head of the Church, and in his own palace of the Vatican speak to him as we spoke? 'We pray and we trust that this new century may witness the restoration of the Roman Pontiff to that position of temporal independence which your Holiness has declared necessary for the effective fulfilment of the duties of his world-wide charge.'

Does anyone believe that there is any statesman in the world who, if he is favorable to the cause of United Italy, does not, in his heart, echo our prayer? Is there anyone who gives any candid consideration to this great subject who does not know that the principal cause which makes for disunion in Italy arises from the present position of the Holy See; that it is a perpetual source of weakness, and that it is tending to take from the Italian nation the health and strength which only religion can bestow?

PROMISES WHICH WERE NOT KEPT.

When in 1860 the late King Victor Emmanuel, in time of peace, invaded Umbria and the Marshes with an army of 50,000 men, he issued a proclamation, in which he states: 'I intend to respect the right of the Chief of the Church, to whom I am willing to give, together with the allied and friendly Powers, all the guarantees of independence and security.' That promise was not kept. The seat of the Chief of the Church was not in the event respected. International guarantees of independence and security were not given to the Pope.

In 1864, in the Italian Parliament Signor Crispi said: 'The Roman Pontiff cannot be the citizen of a great State, descending from the throne on which the Catholic world pays him homage. He must be Prince and Master in his own domain, second to no one.'

It is to my purpose to quote these still unfulfilled pledges made by those who have had so great a share in the unification of Italy, because it appears to be supposed in some quarters that a demand for Papal independence means a desire for the disruption of the Italian Kingdom. This is a delusion. I am convinced that the Pope is a true lover of Italy. I do not believe he desires its disruption. No such thought is suggested by our address. For myself, I have not the remotest desire for such a catastrophe. But I share the aspiration of those who believe that the true policy for the unity of the Italian Kingdom would be for the rulers to emancipate themselves from their subjection to anti-Christian sects, and to come to terms with the Pope. For Papal independence is a claim which no Catholic throughout the world can afford to let go. In the House of Lords, in 1849, Lord Lansdowne, confirming a dispatch of Lord Palmerston's spoke to the following effect:— 'There was no country with Catholic subjects and Catholic possessions which had not a deep interest in the Pope being so placed as to be able to exercise his authority unfettered and unshackled by any temporal influence which might affect his spiritual authority.'

MISSING THE POINT.

It is we, the Catholics of England and of the world, who are struck at by such statements as have appeared during the last 10 days. Writers on these subjects too frequently appear to regard the Church as a merely clerical institution, in which the laity are reluctantly yielding to the commands and beguilements of clerical influence. They appear to forget that the vast majority of the Church is composed of laymen, of men who glory in their faith, who know what their religion means to them, and who would deplore any signs of weakness on the part of the clergy in upholding the dignity of their sacred office, in safeguarding the integrity of the Truth, or in carrying out the duties of their trust. It is the failure to appreciate this on the part of non-Catholic writers about the Church, it is this perpetual 'missing the point,' which makes so much of what they write and say appear so inept to Catholic readers.

And this bears upon the question of the temporal position of the Pope. The interests of every Catholic are affected profoundly by all that concerns the central government of the Church. It is not for us to say what arrangement with the Italian Government would be satisfactory to the Pope. It is a question which he alone can determine, to accept the Italian law of guarantee would be impossible. They guarantee nothing, and would reduce the head of the Church to the position of a stipendiary of the Italian Government. If we glance backward into history we see that the autonomy of the Pope has been accepted as a first principle of politics by the greatest statesmen of every nation, and we look forward with the certainty that time will justify the principle which we assert.

OUR DUTY.

We know that the interests of the Church are safe in the hands of the Pope, and that we can look to him with the words of Newman in our hearts: 'Our duty is not, indeed, to mix up Christ's Vicar with this or that party of men, because he in his high station is above all parties, but to look at his formal deeds, and to follow him whither he goeth, and never to desert him, however we may be tried, but to defend him at all hazards, and against all comers, as a son would a father, and as a wife a husband, knowing that his cause is the cause of God.'

To those who take a loftier and wider view than is permitted to minds cramped by sectarian animosities, or harassed by traditional prejudices, it must be a matter of deep concern that the Papacy, which is so great a force for order and stability throughout the world, should be made a cause of strife in questions round which are centred the deepest interests of mankind. If the impossible position of the Pope has been again brought back more clearly to men's minds by the outburst which has taken place, we may well rejoice at the incident, and trust it will not fade from the public mind. We may be very thankful if it is our pilgrimage which has brought about this fresh awakening, and I most warmly thank my fellow-pilgrims for having allowed me to be the spokesman before the Holy Father of their hope and prayer.

Wanted, everyone who has proved the worth of Tussicura to recommend it to their friend.—*.*

Witches Oil cures pains and aches, neuralgia, headache, sciatica, rheumatism. Price, 2s 6d. Try it.—*.*

The enormous output of McCormick machines defies the mental grasp of man. If the machines they manufacture were to issue from the gates of their works (the largest in the world), the spectators would see throughout the working day a McCormick machine emerging at full gallop every thirty seconds.—*.*

The gigantic expansion of output is not due merely to the everlasting increase of the McCormick standard of excellence higher, higher, and still higher, but to the quick intelligence of the host of farmer buyers who discern that the only profitable machine, the only reliable-at-harvest-time machine is the McCormick.—*.*

MYERS AND CO., Dentists, Octagon, corner of George street. They guarantee highest class work at moderate fees. Their artificial teeth give general satisfaction, and the fact of them supplying a temporary denture while the gums are healing does away with the inconvenience of being months without teeth. They manufacture a single artificial tooth for Ten Shillings, and sets equally moderate. The administration of nitrous-oxide gas is also a great boon to those needing the extraction of a tooth. Read advertisement.—*.*