

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 484 and 486 Richmond street, London, Ontario.
Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

EDITORS:
REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVE,
Author of "Mistakes of Modern Infidels."
THOMAS COFFEY.

Publisher and Proprietor, Thomas Coffey.
Messrs. Luke King, John Nigh, P. J. Neven and Joseph H. King, are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for the CATHOLIC RECORD.

Advertisement—Ten cent per line each insertion, advance payment.
Approved and recommended by the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, and St. Michael's, the Bishops of Hamilton, Peterborough, and Oshawa, M. Y., and the clergy throughout the Dominion.

Correspondence intended for publication, as well as that having reference to business, should be directed to the proprietor, and must reach London not later than Tuesday morning. Advertisers must be paid in full before the paper can be stopped.
When subscribers change their residence it is important that the old as well as the new address be sent us.

LETTER OF RECOMMENDATION.
UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA,
Ottawa, Canada, March 7th, 1900.
The Editor of THE CATHOLIC RECORD

Dear Sir: For some time past I have read your estimable paper, THE CATHOLIC RECORD, and congratulate you upon the manner in which it is published.

Its matter and form are both good; and a truly Catholic spirit pervades the whole. Therefore, with pleasure, I can recommend it to the faithful.

Blessing you, and wishing you success,
Believe me, to remain,
Yours faithfully in Jesus Christ,
J. D. FALCONIO, Arch. of Larissa,
Apost. Deleg.

London, Saturday, August 25, 1900

ANARCHISTS SUSPECTED.

The authorities at Brussels are much agitated by the fear that the shah of Persia, who is now visiting that city, is still in danger of being attacked by Anarchists, and the authorities are taking great precautions to avert any danger. The police keep a constant watch on all unknown visitors, as the movements of known Anarchists arouse suspicion.

AN OBNOXIOUS LAW REPEALED.

The grievance of which the Right Rev. Mgr. Sbarretti and the people of Cuba complained so bitterly, that the decree issued last year in May, by General Brooke prohibiting ecclesiastical marriages, and recognizing only civil marriages, was against the conscience of the people and the usage of the United States themselves, has been remedied. Governor General Wood, after listening to the complaint, and consulting both the ecclesiastical authorities and political leaders, repealed the obnoxious law, and from Monday of last week ecclesiastical marriages have the same legal effect as in the United States. This decree restores to the Church the privileges she possessed before the American occupation of the island.

A UNITED IRISH PARTY.

The Nationalist party of Ireland are buckling on their armour for the battle of the next general election, and enter upon the fray with great confidence as to the result. The complete Nationalist victory throughout Ireland at the County Council elections had given rise to the expectation that the greatest National triumph ever achieved will be gained at the coming contest, as not only were the Nationalists victorious in their usual strongholds, but even in Ulster the Nationalists scored a decisive victory at the local elections, which gives promise of another triumph even in "the Black North" when the Parliamentary elections are held. At a recent great meeting held in Cahir, Tipperary, Mr. John Dillon congratulated the assembled multitude that

"It had been the first in Ireland to declare that dissent was at an end, that the convention in Dublin has buried it, and that the march of the people over all the works and strongholds of the enemies would go forward from that day as it went forward in the past, and that no carrying, no criticism, no fault-finding, would be tolerated, but that while all were welcome, irrespective of past differences, to join the National Army, the National Army would go on, no matter who stayed behind."

We are glad to observe that the reunion of the Irish parties promises to be permanent, as union is the only road to success.

VANDALISM ON THE HILL OF TARA.

It appears that some Pickwickian antiquity hunters have been actually rooting up the hill of Tara for the purpose of discovering the ancient Ark of the Covenant which some wise acres of the Anglo-Israel school assert to have been buried there.

We have, indeed, certain knowledge that the great feast of the Irish Druids was held at the Hill of Tara, and that it was there that St. Patrick laid the foundation for the conversion of Ireland by announcing the Christian faith to the King and court when assembled to celebrate the Druidic rites; but the burial of the Ark of the Covenant there is a mere fantasy, as all true archeologists are aware. The Anglo-Israel theory is founded upon just such

absurd arguments as were employed by the notorious Dr. Wilde, who asserted that the English word rectory is of Hebrew origin. The rooting up of a really historic mound to discover a fanciful antiquity is a barbarity worthy only of such archeologists as have maintained that England and Ireland were peopled by the lost tribes of Israel. Their learning is equalled only by Joe Smith who proved by his Mormon Bible that the lost Israelitish tribes settled in America.

The members of the Royal Archeological Society of England who recently visited Tara Hill have protested against the Vandalism of those who have been destroying the great mound.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

IRISH NATIONAL CHARACTERISTICS.—"Irish Canadian" says:

"I heard it said the other day that there is only one body of people more indolent than the Irish, namely, Irish-Americans. Is this true? And if so, what are we going to do about it?"

We have no hesitation in saying that the insinuation contained in the above so called saying is as false and slanderous as it is insulting to the Irish race.

We do not deny the stagnation of business, which in Irish cities is visible to even the transient traveller; but this is the result not of Irish apathy or indolence, but of the bad legislation imposed on the nation by an alien Parliament which has for its aim the suppression of all Irish industries. This has been proved over and over again by English and Irish statesmen, and is a truth which cannot be denied.

The thousands of Irish workmen who go out of the country, to England and Scotland to find work which they cannot get in their own country is a proof that they are not naturally or by inclination, idle. Among those who also remain in the British Isles we find many who like the learned late Lord Kilowen take the highest rank in their professions, and in the military professions we have Irishmen, both Catholic and Protestant, who have made themselves famous, and have brought glory to the British Empire by their bravery and skill, which are incompatible with the notion that the Irish race are naturally idle. General Roberts, French, Kelly-Kenny and others in South Africa are examples of Irish bravery and indefatigability.

As regards Irish Americans, it cannot be denied that Irish talent and energy have placed Irishmen in the front rank among men of business on this side of the Atlantic. There are scores of Irishmen, who, by their industry and energy have succeeded wonderfully in business in the United States and Canada, and we could mention many native Irishmen among the successful business men, and even among the millionaires of this continent.

Many people are apt to accept as gospel truth a saying which is uttered with brazen-facedness, such as that quoted by our correspondent; but this "saying," if we can call a mere cynical utterance by the term "a saying," whereas it has only the semblance of an aphorism, has not enough of even the appearance of truth in it to make it worthy of serious refutation.

Belonging to every nationality there are idlers, and likewise an industrious class, but we venture to assert that the Irish are equal to any for brilliancy of intellect and for industry.

SUBSCRIBER makes enquiry of us regarding the identity of one of our correspondents. He should be aware that it is not the custom for newspapers to make known the names of contributors to their columns, unless the contributors themselves choose to attach their real signatures to their letters. Neither can we afford information which it is expected will assist in their identification.

Further, we have to remark that correspondents who expect their letters to appear in our columns, should furnish us with their names and addresses, not necessarily for publication, but in testimony to their good faith. This, Subscriber has neglected to do.

THE NEW KING OF ITALY.

On the 11th Inst. the new King of Italy, Victor Emmanuel III., took the formal oath before Parliament to maintain the constitution. The ceremony

is said to have been exceedingly impressive, notwithstanding the mourning draperies with which the Senate Chamber was decorated, or, probably, the occasion which required these mourning accessories had much to do with increasing the solemnity of the scene, the benches and tribunes being covered with black, bordered with silver.

The Senators and Deputies, the

representatives of foreign sovereigns, high officials of the State, and the diplomatic corps filled the Chamber.

His Majesty was accompanied by the Dukes of Aosta and Genoa, and the Count of Turin, and all along his route from the Quirinal to the Chamber of Deputies, the booming of cannon announced his progress.

His Majesty took the oath, and delivered an address, in which he referred to the universal mourning which had been manifested by all the Courts of Europe in consequence of the sad manner of his father's death, and expressed sentiments hopeful of a long continuance of peace, inasmuch as Italy is on terms of friendship with all foreign powers.

It is worthy of remark that not a word was uttered by the King expressive of abhorrence of the crime of the Anarchists which made the throne vacant. This could not have been because His Majesty himself has any sympathy with Anarchistic methods and principles, or with the assassins of his father; but it may have arisen from fear of vengeance by that unscrupulous association, a strong condemnation of which was looked for in the inaugural speech of the young king. It remains to be seen whether this silence was dictated by cowardice or prudence.

Victor Emmanuel III. declared that he ascends the throne without fear and with a knowledge of his rights and duties, and expressed the wish that Italy should place confidence in him, though the dubious manner in which this wish was expressed gave an air of sadness to his words, which evidently referred to the irreconcilable character of the opposition to all law and order manifested by his Anarchist enemies.

The King paid a well-deserved compliment to the Queen Mother, Margherita, saying:

"In his work, my father had the assistance of my august and venerated mother. It is she who engraved on my heart and spirit, the sentiment of my duty as a Prince and as an Italian. So in my work, I shall be aided by my wife who, born of a strong race, will consecrate herself entirely to the country of her choice."

Queen Margherita is known to be a woman of fervent piety and strong faith, and she manifested frequently her noble qualities, as occasion required, and thereby was an influence for good on a government prone to irreligion. It is a hopeful sign that the new King recognizes the good and high qualities of such a mother. We hope this public recognition of his mother's virtues was not a mere compliment of the tongue, but that it will be reproduced in action, and that the new King will be a truly religious ruler, as his excellent mother is a religious woman.

We feel confident also that the young Queen of Italy, under the instruction she received when she was admitted into the Catholic Church, and guided by the good advice of the Queen Mother, will be a suitable successor to the latter in the dignity to which she has attained. If our hopes are realized, and King Victor Emmanuel acts under the benign influence of these excellent ladies and co-operates with them in the desire of governing Italy well, we shall soon see a change for the better in the people he is to govern.

Under the influence of religious teaching in the schools, the people of Italy will once more reach the high position they formerly held in the councils of the civilized world. The position of the Holy Father will also, in this case, be ameliorated, and he will enjoy the liberty of action which belongs by right to the ruler of two hundred and fifty millions of souls spread throughout all the countries of the earth.

Under the successive governments of Italy during the last thirty years, the position of the Holy Father has been intolerable. We hope that this position will be substantially changed by an agreement acceptable to both parties concerned, and that the good government of the people of Italy may be assured by the working together of the civil and ecclesiastical authorities for the good of the country, spiritual and temporal.

It is to be hoped also that measures will be taken for the suppression of the secret societies, the Mafia, the Anarchists, and others, by whatsoever name they may be called, which have already wrought so much evil. Until peace be restored between the Church and the State, these evils will not be repressed. But such a peace is impossible until the Government and the King work together in the fear of God and in the observance of God's law.

It is said that the present premier of Italy, Signor Saracco, is a good Catholic, and that he has written volumes in defence of a thoroughly Christian education. If this be the case as it has been so for over thirty years, and

if the King is really endowed with the Christian sentiments which are implied in his words uttered at the inauguration, there is good hope for Italy's future.

DECLINE IN PROTESTANT CHURCH MEMBERSHIP.

During the past year many notes of alarm were uttered at the synods and conferences of Churches, to the effect that religious fervor is falling off rapidly and that there is a decline in membership. Some of the religious papers have denied that there is any such decline, and have given figures showing a fair rate of increase; but the Christian Advocate, the leading organ of Methodism in the United States, acknowledges frankly that the decline is real, though it expresses the hope that the knowledge of the fact will lead to renewed activity in religious circles, and that as in former similar circumstances, "the year of drought was succeeded by several years of extensive harvests," the same thing may happen again. The Advocate considers it to be a startling fact that the "Methodist Episcopal Church of the United States, with nearly three millions of communicants, and a vast army of Sunday school scholars, should add less than seven thousand to its membership in 1899," and that the number of "probationers" should show a decline of twenty-eight thousand five hundred and ninety-five in the same period.

The Advocate states plainly that while "the conferences are steadily declining, population in the same territory is increasing, and that the cause of this is a growing indifference whereby districts are weakening. The districts are growing weaker because societies are becoming lifeless, and this fact is attributed to a growing listlessness among pastors and people."

Presbyterian and Baptist assemblies have made the same complaint, and by it we are reminded of the plain talk of Governor Rollins of New Hampshire who, over a year ago, declared that throughout New England, formerly the home of a fervently religious population, religion is certainly declining in the rural districts. A few months ago he said in an address before the Boston Ministers' Union:

"You clergymen are no longer the spiritual guides of the people, who now follow the religion of the newspapers. The ark has been overturned, the Bible account of creation denied, Jonah repudiated, and the anchor of the old faith has been pulled up before the sails are set for the new."

The Governor, in fact, is of the opinion that one of the causes of the decline of the sects is that the American population is itself dying out, and is only saved by the foreign immigration which is to a large extent Catholic, so that Catholics are actually taking the places of the descendants of the old Puritan settlers of the New England States. He says, in continuation:

"The best blood of the country towns of northern New England has for generations been going to Boston and New York, leaving in some places only the weaklings to do the work in the old country home. These less energetic ones have intermarried till in one town I am acquainted with in Maine, there is an imbecile in almost every family. The increase of foreign population is a gain rather than a loss to the country town, for it brings in new blood, so greatly needed, and the people are usually strong Catholics, not irreligious, and their increase is a favorable element."

It has been said on the authority of detailed statistics that the decline is noticeable in the non-Ritualistic, or anti-Ritualistic sects, while those sects, such as the Protestant Episcopal and Lutheran, which have preserved a certain amount of solemn ceremonial in their Church services, have experienced progress in their membership, instead of the falling off of which the non-Ritualistic sects complain.

It will be interesting to notice in the future how far this observation may prove correct; but we feel that there is a good deal of truth in it. By the uprooting of all those forms which gave an outward decorum to public worship violence was done to a natural yearning of humanity for the outward marks of respect, which nourish the spirit of reverence in the human soul, inasmuch as they are the external expression thereof.

LOW vs. HIGH CHURCHISM.

The stirring news which has been coming for some time past from the seats of the three wars in which Great Britain is engaged, namely, with the Boers, Chinese, and Ashantis, seems to be the chief of the influences which have caused a lull in the strife which at one time, and not very long ago, threatened even the existence of the Church of England, in regard to the Ritualistic practices in vogue in many Churches.

But if any persons imagined that the Low Church party had determined to

let their agitation drop, it appears that such a thought was a mistake.

Lord Portsmouth recently in the House of Peers, called attention once more to this much-mooted matter, by requesting the Government to carry out the resolution passed by the House of Commons fifteen months ago to the effect that if the Bishops are not able to prevent the clergy from indulging in "Romish" practices, it would be the duty of Parliament to pass an act dealing with the matter.

The Archbishop of Canterbury replied warmly to these statements and insinuations. He remarked that Lord Portsmouth implied that the Bishops had neglected to take means to put a stop to the practices complained of, which he asserted not to be the case. He said that the Bishops are doing all in their power to stop those Ritualistic practices which might tend to introduce Romish doctrine into the Church of England, and they had succeeded very well in so doing, as most of the clergy suspected of Ritualism had discontinued the practices complained of so far as they are opposed to the real usages of the Church of England. The Bishops had issued orders based upon the requirements of the Prayer-Book and the decisions of the Courts in regard to practices which are unlawful, and for the most part, their orders have been faithfully carried out. He added, however, that prudence, patience and forbearance should be shown by those who are at the helm managing the agitation against the Bishops and the Church. By prudent management more can be effected than by violent measures.

Lord Salisbury likewise took up the debate with a good deal of warmth, maintaining that the Church cannot be made Protestant by Act of Parliament, and that Lord Portsmouth is in error in supposing that this can be done. He rebuked Lord Portsmouth for implying that the matter is one for political jurisdiction.

It does not appear, indeed, that the position taken by Lord Salisbury and the Archbishop can stand the test of examination according to the rules of logic; but the arguments of Lord Portsmouth are quite as unsound as are those of his adversaries.

The Archbishop asserts that the Bishops have done all they can do or should be expected to do in the matter; but though they have issued certain decisions against what they are pleased to call "Papal" or "Romish practices," it is clear to all that their decrees were not of the judicial character which deserves to command respect. They condemned "compulsory confession," it is true, but even the most advanced Ritualists never attempted to compel confession. They have pointed out that the priests of God have power to forgive sin, both according to Scripture, and the book of Common Prayer, and that as it is not merely useful, but necessary for Christians to seek the forgiveness of their sins, they should make use of all the means left by Christ to obtain forgiveness. They have shown, what cannot be denied by any one who reads the Book of Common Prayer carefully, that the Church offers the Confession of sins, accompanied by priestly absolution, as a means by which sinners may be absolved "if their conscience is troubled with any weighty matter," and have urged on their people this mode of obtaining peace with God. This is surely reasonable, if they are really priests possessing the authority which God conferred upon the pastors of His Church. Their error consists, not in urging the people to confess their sins to a priest, but in supposing that they are themselves priests having this power. Their error is to some extent pardonable, inasmuch as the Church and the Bishops contribute towards leading them into it by using the form of ordination prescribed in the Prayer-Book for the making of Priests. Thus both the Bishops and the High Church clergy are mistaken, but Lord Portsmouth is not a whit less so, as he too maintains the Prayer Book to be the authority which should be followed, while he sets at defiance its recommendations.

In regard to the use of incense and altar lights, the Bishops have also issued a manifesto the object of which is to diminish the extent of their employment in Church ceremonial, but they have left so large a loophole for escape that their manifesto is without effect. But they profess to have studied the question carefully and to have arrived at the conclusion that these adjuncts are not absolutely prohibited by the Church; hence they virtually admit that the clergy are free to use them if they see fit.

It can scarcely be said that the Bishops have done much toward putting down the practices complained of; but on the other hand, the Low Churchmen are unreasonable in insisting that the clergy who employ these aids to devotion should cease to use them. They are certainly not contrary to Scripture, inasmuch as their use under the old law, by command of God, is sufficient to establish their utility as aids to devotion.

These are, certainly, not practices sinful in themselves, and those who think their use desirable should have the fullest liberty to employ them, if the Low Church people really believe what they so persistently maintain, that every Christian should follow his own conscientious interpretation of the Bible, as regards religious doctrine and observance. At all events it is not a very serious matter if these practices, which are certainly not condemned in Scripture or the Prayer-Book, are used for the decorous celebration of public worship. There can be no very great crime in following practices which, it is hoped, will have beneficial results if the practices are not essentially evil, as it is acknowledged to be the case in the present instance.

Lord Salisbury's position is also illogical in the contention that an Act of Parliament has no authority over the Church of England. That Church owes its existence as well as all its peculiarities of faith and discipline to Acts of Parliament passed in the reigns of Henry VIII. Edward VI. and Elizabeth, and why should not an Act of Parliament have force with it now?

The fact is the position of every party in that Church is illogical, whether that party be called High or Low or Broad. Error can never be based upon solid reasoning.

The reason on account of which both Lord Salisbury and the Archbishop of Canterbury wish to keep the matter out of Parliament must be evident to the most superficial observer. They fear that if legislation be employed to produce uniformity of belief and practice the whole question of the position of the Church establishment will be overhauled, and the result will be disestablishment. It is only by the patient endurance recommended by the Archbishop that the establishment can be maintained for a while.

For the present, at all events, the Parliamentary champions of Low Churchism have been foiled; but we notice by the most recent English papers that another effort is to be made to secure a triumph for Kenitism. Lord Portsmouth and two other Peers have advertised over their own signatures that a public movement is to be inaugurated at once to raise £20,000 to influence the impending elections throughout Great Britain, in the interest of the Kenitist party. One half of this sum has already been raised, according to what is stated on the matter; but we very much doubt that the elections will so result that the Government will be forced to adopt the Portsmouth Kenitist policy. The resolution which the House of Commons passed in May 1899, threatening legislation against the Ritualists, is well known to have been merely a blind to throw dust into the eyes of the public, and to put off indefinitely a disagreeable and dangerous agitation. If it had not been the case, it would never have passed "by a unanimous vote" of the House, that is to say "without a division."

The true test of popular feeling was the vote of three hundred and ten against one hundred and fifty-six by which the second reading of the Church Discipline Bill was defeated the very evening when the menacing resolution was unanimously passed. Besides, it must be borne in mind that all that was threatened was that in case of the failure of the Bishops to maintain discipline, "further legislation will be required to maintain the existing laws of the Church and the realm."

All this is most charmingly indefinite; for the Ritualists maintain that the existing laws sustain them; and they have very good reason on their side, for the articles and liturgy of the Church of England were purposely made so plastic that they may be made to assume any desired shape, according to the sliding rule by means of which they are tested.

It would be too much to expect either from the Kenitist champion, or the pseudo-successor of Augustine and Anselm, a respect for the laws of common politeness when they speak of the Catholic Church; nevertheless we shall remind them that such words as Romish and Romanism are undignified in the mouths of educated personages. These

are not terms which are acknowledged by the Catholic Church as applicable to her. But apart from this, the Catholic Church has nothing to do with the fanciful observances of those members of their own sect who travesty the beautiful symbolism of the Church of nineteen centuries. That symbolism is totally out of place in the Church of England, and it is indicative of small minds to persist in drawing red herrings over the track, when the question is not what are the usages of the Catholic Church, but how are their own internal squabbles to be settled.

ENGLAND'S GREAT IRISH LAW LORD DEAD.

How terribly precarious is our tenure of life, even in the most fortunate circumstances, is once again shown in the sudden passing of the great Lord Chief Justice, Charles Russell, of Killowen. The great man with no more consideration from the dread pale visitor than the poor wretch who sinks exhausted from painful labor in the bowels of the earth or plying the needle in a stifling garret. "Pale Death, with impartial foot, kicks at the gates of the palace and the door of the shilling," wrote a great poet two thousand years ago. The "lean, abhorred monster" has not changed his methods ever since; the "spirit of the age" has no concern for him. The young and beautiful move him not any more than the hideous and decrepit eyesores of humanity. The wisest and holiest of how before his stern beck as readily as the idiotic and the scolding. Death, more truly than Love, is still the lord of all; for while many may escape the one, of all earth's myriads not a single one can hope to flee from the other.

There is mourning all over England for Lord Russell. He is spoken of by the press on two continents as the great Englishman. Great he undoubtedly was, in the highest sense of that old-misspelled term—great in mind, great in heart; great in his erudition, great in his grasp of jurisprudence, great in his sympathies. But he was no Englishman. He was Irish to the backbone—Catholic to his innermost fibre. These are strange qualifications for the title of Englishman; stranger, surely, for that of the English Lord Chief Justice. England has had many men filling that exalted bench since the days of the so-called Reformation. Her Hales, her Mansfields, her Eldons, her Ellenboroughs, have transmitted precedents and traditions in constitutional and criminal law which have at once proved the bulwark of the British constitution and the safeguard of the prisoner at the bar, for all time.

But not since More's time has a Catholic Chief Justice sat upon the bench which once dared to send to prison their heir apparent and once sent the sheriff to batter down the gates of King's prison and bring forth one immured there on the King's writ, for that the House of Commons commanded it under the law of Habeas Corpus. England's Lord Chief Justice holds a higher place under the constitution than even England's Lord Chancellor; for while the latter is, by fiction of law, the "keeper of the sovereign's conscience"—truly a sinecure office in too many cases—the former is, in the last resort the keeper of the national conscience—very often the most delicate and perilous of trusts. And what a tribute to the genius and character of the Irish race in an age when the reputation of the English Bar was at its zenith, the highest honor it can hold out as a prize to lofty ambition should have been accorded to a scion of the race which for three centuries England persecuted in body and soul, tearing from his lips the cup of salvation and from his eyes the light of learning! As the Catholic and the Irishman Lord Russell was thus the avenger of his race, in a measure.

He personified the intellect that was kept in darkness and the spirit that was quenched in despair, in many and many an Irish home; and from his high days looked down a perpetual rebuke, like that of an accusing angel, upon the accused spirit that essayed the role of Pharaoh in the bright land of his nativity, and still, though with relaxed chain, holds her tight to her dreary chariot wheel.

Lord Russell belonged to an intensely Catholic family. He was nephew, on the parental side, to the eminent Dr. Charles Russell, president of Maynooth College for many years. He was brother to the Rev. Matthew Russell, Sub J. of Garret Street Church, Dublin, editor of the Irish Monthly, and to the no less eminent and saintly Sister Mary Baptist Russell. The Russells settled for six hundred years in Ireland, had maintained their Catholicity all through the centuries of persecution. Their escutcheon in that respect was spotless.

Not less remarkable to find such a man occupying the highest judicial seat in Protestant England, is it to discover also that he was a thorough believer in and advocate of Home Rule for Ireland. Lord Russell had never wavered in his devotion to that principle. Down to the day of his death he was as ardent a believer in it as in the heyday of his youth. His greatest forensic triumph was won, indeed, as an advocate defending the great spokesman of Home Rule, the late gifted Mr. Parnell, against the infernal machinations of the London Times, and its miserable agent, the self-doomed Pigott.

No greater mistake could be entertained than a belief that any influence save that of sheer personal superiority had any part in the selection of this great Irishman for the highest legal