

The Catholic Record

Price of Subscription—\$1.50 per annum.
United States & Europe—\$2.00
Publisher and Proprietor, THE CATHOLIC RECORD, LTD.
Editors: Rev. James T. Foley, B.A.
Rev. Thomas Coffey, L.L.D.
Associate Editors: Rev. D. A. Casey,
Rev. J. J. O'Connell, L.L.D.

Advertisements for teachers, situations wanted, etc., 50 cents each insertion. Remittance to accompany the order.
Approved and recommended by the Archbishop of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, and St. Boniface, the Bishops of London, Hamilton, Peterborough, and Ogdensburg, N.Y., and the clergy throughout the Dominion.
Messrs. J. J. Neven, E. J. Broderick, M. J. Hagarty, Geo. S. Cotter, Mrs. W. E. Smith, Miss Sara Hanley, Miss O. Harringer and Miss B. Saunders are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all business for THE CATHOLIC RECORD.
Obituary and marriage notices cannot be inserted except in the usual condensed form. Each insertion 50 cents.
Subscribers changing residence will please give old as well as new address.
In St. John, N.B., single copies may be purchased from Mrs. M. A. McGuire, 149 Main Street.

LETTERS OF RECOMMENDATION

Apostolic Delegation,
Ottawa, June 13th, 1905.
My Dear Sir:—Coming to Canada I have been a reader of your paper. I have noted with satisfaction that it is directed with intelligence and ability, and above all, that it is imbued with a strong Catholic spirit. It strenuously defends Catholic principles and the best interests of the country, and the welfare of religion and country, and it will do more and more as its wholesome influence reaches more Catholic homes. I therefore earnestly recommend it to Catholic families. With my best wishes for your work, and best wishes for its continued success. Yours very sincerely in Christ,
DONATO, Archbishop of Ephesus,
Apostolic Delegate

University of Ottawa,
Ottawa, Canada, March 7th, 1900.
Mr. Thomas Coffey:
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 strong 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,
D. FALCONE, Arch. of Larissa, Apoc. Deleg.

LONDON, SATURDAY, APRIL 4, 1914

IRELAND

On the world's stage, these days, Ireland is in the limelight. Every newspaper in the civilized world is giving to Ireland and the Irish question a good deal of space. Prophecy is at all times dangerous. In the midst of such startling developments it is particularly so for us who write a full week ahead of the date that the paper bears. It is quite safe, however, to give a glance at the past. The path of English rule in Ireland is strewn with promises—broken promises. In 1800 she said in effect to Catholics: Support the union and you shall be immediately emancipated. Lecky, in his "History of Ireland in the 18th Century" (vol. v. pp. 428-29) says:

"We have seen that it had been the first wish of Pitt and Dundas in England and of Cornwallis in Ireland to make Catholic Emancipation a part of the Union; and when this cause was found to be impracticable, there is good reason to believe that Canning recommended Pitt to drop the Union until a period arrived when it would be possible to carry the two measures concurrently. Wiser advice was probably never given, but it was not followed, and a Protestant Union was carried, with an understanding that when it was accomplished the ministry would introduce the measure of Catholic emancipation into an Imperial Parliament. It was this persuasion or understanding that secured the neutrality and acquiescence of the greater part of the Irish Catholics, without which, in the opinion of the best judges, the union could never have been carried."

At the beginning of the century, the population of Ireland, roughly speaking, was about 5,000,000. Of these 5,000,000, 4,000,000 were Catholics, 600,000 were Protestant Episcopalians and 400,000 were Presbyterians or members of other Protestant denominations, but mainly, in fact almost entirely, Presbyterians. The 4,000,000 Catholics had no more to do with the government of the country than a community of mice might have to do with the government of the cats. By law they were excluded from Parliament, from the Judicial Bench, from the Vice-Royalty, from the rank of King's Counsel, and from other important positions; in practice, they were excluded from everything.

Emancipation came in 1829. "What you refuse," said Henry Grattan, "refuse decently; what you give, give graciously." Emancipation was neither refused decently nor given graciously. The 40s. freeholders had been allowed to exercise the franchise so long as they had voted at the bidding of the landlords. At the Clare election, under the influence of O'Connell, they defied the landlords. They were disfranchised on the instant.

"The 40s. freeholders were first elected for electioneering purposes. As long as they allowed themselves to be driven to the hustings like sheep to the shambles without a will of their own, all was well; not a murmur was heard. But the moment these poor people found out the value of their tenure, the moment they exercised their power constitutionally, that instant they are swept out of political existence."—Lord Anglesey quoted by Sir Spencer Walpole in his "History of England."

It was not until 1884 that the English and Irish franchisees were assimilated—that the Irish people got a fair chance of making their voices

heard with effect at parliamentary elections.

"In 1838, four years after emancipation, there was not a single Catholic judge or stipendiary magistrate. All the high sheriffs, the overwhelming majority of the unpaid magistrates and of the grand jurors, the 5 inspectors-general, and the 82 sub-inspectors of the police, were Protestants. The chief towns were in the hands of narrow, corrupt, and for the most part intensely bigoted corporations. For many years promotion had been steadily withheld from those who advocated Catholic Emancipation, and the majority of the people thus found their bitterest enemies in the foremost places."

The foregoing is a quotation from Lecky.

Let us give one incident of the Tithe War. At Doon, in the county of Limerick—where the population was: Catholics, 5,000, Protestants, 1, the person demanded tithes of the priest; the priest refused to pay. His cow was seized and put up for sale. Never was a cow put up for sale under such extraordinary circumstances. There was upon the field—keeping the ground as the saying is—a strong police force, a troop of the 12th lancers, five companies of the 92nd Highlanders, and two pieces of artillery.

The Church of Ireland was disestablished in 1869. Lord John Russell said: "Your oppressions have taught the Irish to hate, your concessions to brave you. You have exhibited to them how scanty was the stream of your bounty and how full the tribute of your fear."

Students of history do not need Gladstone's admission that the disestablishment of the Irish Church was the result of the fear inspired by Fenianism.

The Land League, says Barry O'Brien, to whom we are indebted for much of the matter of this article, was an organization than which there seldom existed in any country one more lawless or more violent. But Mr. Gladstone said: "I must make one admission, and that is, that without the Land League the Act of 1881 (Land Act) would not at this moment be on the Statute book."

Steadily for one hundred years have the Irish struggled toward freedom. Never in all that time has the English democracy realized how intimately bound up was their cause with that of the Irish Nationalists. The House of Lords, always the implacable enemy of Ireland's hopes, has been shorn of its power. The friends of Ireland and the friends of the democratic cause need not fear the puny attempts of Tory military snobs to arrest the cause of Irish nationality irrevocably bound up as it is with that of English democracy.

Furthermore, the factious and seditious spirit that owes its origin to Tory snobbery in the army and elsewhere is not likely to find favorable ground for development in the sober second thought of Englishmen when they consider such cold facts as T. P. O'Connor points out in his recent cable letter:

"It is a fundamental, though often forgotten fact, of the Irish question that there is only one minority in Ireland that is oppressed, and that is the minority of Catholics and Nationalists that lives in these four counties."

"I recall, just passing, for I do not want to arouse any further bitterness in this bitter struggle, that 2,000 working men, and even women, were assailed, wounded, and driven from their work and their bread only two years ago in Belfast on no ground but because they were Catholics and home rulers."

"If such an attack had been made on Protestant working people in Dublin it would have been regarded by the world as such an example and proof of hopeless want of the spirit of religious and political toleration that home rule could not have survived it."

A SELF-CONFESSED SLANDERER

The Ogdensburg News of March 25 gives an interesting story of the "Rev." Benjamin Clearmont, one of those reckless and villainous slanderers who pose as ex-priests. Evidently the audience gathered to hear the "lecture" had little sympathy with the vulgar and obscene calumny that is not only not offensive but very welcome to certain "pious" ears. The upshot of his pious efforts is best told by the following affidavit.

"I, Benjamin Clearmont, being duly sworn sayeth that my name is Benjamin Clearmont. I was born at my mother's house at Geneva, Switzerland. I was never a Catholic priest. I was altar boy for eight months at St. John's church at Quebec under Father Guideau when I was fourteen years of age. I left the Church in 1905. I have been lecturing for one year to obtain revenge for myself or at the request of Orangemen of Canada. I have given eight lectures. The lectures I have

given are true. There are some things I have said in these lectures that I can't prove according to law. I cannot mention any sister or convent that I believe to be bad. I cannot mention any priest whose character I believe to be bad or questionable. The reason why I believe the Catholics to be a menace to the country is that they will not recognize any Church but the Catholic Church, and the lack of free speech. The bills that were circulated in Potsdam were directed to be circulated by Davis Gardner of Methodist denomination, pastor at Peninsula Point. I am a regularly ordained Baptist minister. Was ordained in the Baptist business room at Montreal in 1909. I am not to continue to lecture any more. I decided so last night, unless called for a word or two in a church. I have slandered the Catholics and the Catholic Church by the lectures I have given and the bills I have caused to be circulated, and I ask their pardon and to be forgiven. My present age is thirty-three years. On this date I went up to the hall at 7 o'clock p. m. to sell tickets. I was caught by someone—a stranger unknown to me. I was dragged into a car, held down on the seat, struck on the head several times and choked. They said they were taking me away to hang me or pitch me into the river or pull my limbs apart. They took me into the house about a mile away. I was there about a half an hour with a dozen unknown people around me. Then I was discovered by the police and brought to this hotel and asked for a notary public to make this statement, which I do now on my own free will to show the people of Potsdam that I am willing to repair any wrong I have done, which statement is made before Mr. Dewey and Mr. Murphy.

(Signed) BENJAMIN CLEARMONT.
Witnesses, F. L. Dewey, C. A. Murphy, Notary Public.

I hereby authorize the publication in the press of the above affidavit so the public may know that I am sorry and have repented for what I have done. March 24, 1914.

BENJAMIN CLEARMONT.

CONDITIONS IN PORTUGAL

"When Dom Carlos and his son were butchered in a public square, Lisbon paid no more attention to the matter than if it were only two pigs that had had their throats slit. Indeed an English tourist who asked a respectable shopkeeper in the Rocio what had happened was told, with an evil smile, that it was nothing—only two fine large porkers that had just been killed at the end of the street. Had the queen and her son afterwards been dragged naked up the Rua Augusta, and been decapitated in the Praça de Dom Pedro, there would, I am convinced, have been no surprise and no emotion—only an ugly, silent leering. Only one newspaper spoke of the tragedy, the Lucta, which dismissed it with several sarcastic lines in a column dealing with petty thefts and minor accidents. Not a word of human sympathy anywhere for the boy King or his mother. Only one newspaper had a black border next day—it was the organ of Senhor Franco, the Dictator. Not a single shopkeeper put up a shutter, or marked in any other way his sense of the occasion. Three or four balconies were draped in black; they all belonged to court furnishers."

We quote these words from the pen of the well-known press correspondent, Francis McCullagh, in an article in the Nineteenth Century for January. They present a picture of present day Portugal which clearly indicates that there must "be something rotten in the state of Denmark." Patriotism would seem to have become extinct in modern Portugal and a sordid selfishness became enthroned as the motor power of the nation. It is not a question of Royalty versus Republicanism. In neither Portuguese aristocracy nor Portuguese democracy can any ground be found for enthusiasm over the future of the nation. Both seem equally apostate to the interests of their country, both are equally degenerate.

Under royalty indeed the municipalities enjoyed many privileges which have been wrested from them by the new regime which has gone like a steam roller over all local liberties. To day the members of local municipalities are no longer elected. Parliamentary elections have now become a sham and a scandal. The 75 per cent. of illiterates which Portugal contains have all been struck off the voting list because they are illiterates; and of the remaining 25 per cent. the 15 per cent. of royalists are also disqualified on the ground that they did not make application for the right to vote.

Before the Republic came into existence the Republicans advocated liberty of the press and kindness to political prisoners. It has now suppressed every non-Republican newspaper in Portugal and it has filled the prisons with prisoners who are sometimes kept a year without trial. Sir Conan Doyle, in a letter to the Times, courteously drew the atten-

tion of the Portuguese government to the state of affairs; he was immediately set upon by the semi-official Mundo and accused of being a hireling of the monarchists. When the Duchess of Bedford began her prison campaign she was described in the same organ as an Irish Roman Catholic tool of the Jesuits. When this question was discussed in the British Parliament, Dr. Costa, from his place in the Portuguese chamber, made the statement that in England prisoners are sometimes hanged first and tried afterwards.

Before the revolution the Republican orators thundered against the wealth of the monasteries. Now that the government has taken over all the monasteries the report is given out that the monks had practically no property and every attempt to get a statement on the subject has been ignored.

The muzzling of the press has been carried out relentlessly by Dr. Costa. A Republican journalist, Senhor Homen Christo, a man recognized for uprightness, published damaging disclosures about Dr. Costa's private character and political honor. Dr. Costa had him arrested, suppressed his paper and drove him out of the country. Lately Dr. Costa has been accused in the most categorical manner and by the most trustworthy people of being involved in irregularities in connection with the sale of government lands in S. Thome. All the non-Republican papers which gave currency to the charges were at once suppressed. A distinguished economist, Senhor Roque da Costa, in the Lisbon Journal of Commerce, maintained that there is no such thing as a surplus despite the assertion of the Premier to the contrary. He was soon afterwards lodged in jail.

Individual liberty is trampled on. The civil carbanos of Dr. Costa enter houses when they like, make searches, effect arrests and carry off documents though they themselves possess no warrants, have no insignia of authority and wear no uniform even.

A number of judges who refused to stand for dictation from Dr. Costa were punished by being banished to Goa. Illegal prosecutions are directed against Monarchists, Radicals, Socialists, etc., and condemnations passed on false evidence, insufficient evidence or no evidence at all. Courts-martial are always at work. Lawyers who dare to defend alleged Royalists are grossly attacked by the newspapers and the mob. Monarchist prisoners, not yet convicted, are torn from the hands of the police and maltreated to such an extent that some of them are injured for life.

That the comparatively small clique of Dr. Costa can commit such crimes against liberty without provoking a storm of popular indignation is the most lamentable feature of the case. It can outrage the feelings of the devout peasantry, of the army, of the legal and medical professions and of the diplomatists, yet no protest is ever made save to some disgusted foreign journalist, who is implored in a heated but cautious whisper to "write up" the matter in the English press. Priests have been arrested in the churches because, in speaking of the regeneration of the world by Christ, they did not mention Afonso Costa as well.

The congregation, strong Catholics all of them, looked on sheepishly while their revered padre was dragged away by the hair of the head. Francis McCullagh, who is our main authority for this account, recites instances of outrages committed against the medical fraternity, the navy, the diplomatists, all of which have been received with similar pusillanimity by the members of these various bodies. Evidently if the injured people abjectly acquiesce in seeing their sacred rights wantonly trampled on by a clique who form but a minority in the country, they can scarcely appeal for sympathy to other nations. Their listless attitude can awaken abroad nothing but disgust.

The chances for a Royalist restoration are not alluring and, even if it were effected, it does not appear that it would be a gain to the country. In the last days of the monarchy Portuguese politics were a sink of corruption and it would appear that the revolution had proved a boon to many of the old "bosses" and wirepullers. Half of them became ardent Republicans and entered the service of the new government; the other half, driven into exile, are doing more swindling there than they ever did at home. Some of them, who left Lisbon without a penny of their own, are now substantial persons in Paris and the

French watering places. They are making a fat living off the poor dupes who contribute towards the restoration of Dom Manuel. Of the £100,000 contributed during the last three years towards the re-establishment of Manuel on his throne the vast bulk has found its way into the pockets of these exiled "bosses." Some of the bankers and telegraph clerks in Spain have been heard to express amazement at the immense sums of money coming to obscure royalist agents, and at the large proportion of these sums which always go straight into the recipient's pockets. For these folks exile is a more profitable business than restoration and it may well be questioned if they seriously desire a restoration.

The success of the Republican clique, both in the beginning when it seized the reins of power and during its despotic rule, is due to the hopeless inertness that pervades the body politic. Centres that are notoriously Royalist and where the old king was popular, Braga, Coimbra and the north for instance, were silent over the death of the old King and gave no sign of encouragement to the new King. The Houses of Parliament, though both dominated by Royalist majorities, registered no protest when a few days after the murder a procession of 5,000 people headed by Afonso Costa went to lay wreaths on the tomb of the regicide. Again, when the government opened what it called a Museum of the Revolution, and one of the Cabinet Ministers, Bernardino Machado, escorted bevy of school children through it in order to show them Buica's carbine, the blood-stained garments of former conspirators, the shattered skulls of anarchists, and other relics of the same nature, Portugal as a whole took the sickening exhibition as a matter of course—until the London Times condemned it. School children have been paraded through the streets under the eye of the Minister of Public Instruction, each child wearing on its breast a medal bearing the inscription, "No God; No Religion." And yet their parents, who in the main profess Catholicity, uttered no protest.

Evidently religion as well as patriotism has decayed. But it must not be forgotten that this decadence has not sprung into existence with the coming of the Republic. This demoralization has favored the schemes of the Republican clique but the Republicans did not create it; they found it awaiting them. It grew up under the monarchy.

The alliance between State and Church accounts in great measure for the decay of religious fervor. The Church has been for the last hundred years regarded by the State as a department as completely under its dominion as the Foreign Office or the Home Office. Up to a few years ago there was keen competition among the sons of the nobility for the good salaries in the Church; their ardor was dampened only when the government reduced the salaries and emoluments attaching to these offices. For nearly a hundred years the Crown claimed and exercised the right of nominating to bishoprics, priories, canonries, parishes and to every species of ecclesiastical office. And it is obvious that no candidate could hope for promotion unless his qualifications proved acceptable to the civil authorities. Pius IX., in 1862, invited the Bishops of the country to visit Rome for the canonization of the Japanese Martyrs, but they did not go nor did they send an explanation. Only two of the Bishops attended the Vatican Council. To one familiar with conditions these incidents awaken no surprise. The seminary education was under the supervision of the government. The government reserved to itself the control of the appointment of the professors, the subjects to be studied and the selection of text books. Such conditions were plainly not in the interests of the formation of a clergy who would be consumed with fervor for the welfare of religion. And the present decadence of religion may be traced no doubt to this subordination of the Church to the State.

The decadence of national vigor is traced to two factors: 1. The excessive drain made upon the manhood of the nation by exploration, colonization and war. 2. The adulteration of the race by East Indian, Brazilian and especially by negro blood. To the importation of slaves, however, is due a great loss of national vigor. At one period the whole white manhood of the country seems to have been engaged in war, commerce, discovery or colonization and slaves

were freely imported from Africa to till the soil. In Lisbon we are told that at one time the proportion of slaves to freemen was as one to ten. And a writer who is regarded as worthy of credence estimated that in the sixteenth century the slaves formed one-sixth of the population. These slaves merged with the native population. "One can still see," writes Francis McCullagh, "all over the South the woolly hair, dark skin, and other characteristics of the negro race. Priests, farmers, village shop-keepers, noble ladies, the most unexpected persons, will be found to bear the tell-tale marks which would be a serious handicap to them in Virginia, U. S. A., but which do not matter at all in Portugal. . . . The contamination of the lower orders took place centuries ago, but the contamination of the upper classes is still going on. During the past century there has been a steady stream homewards of Brazilian capitalists with woolly hair and a suspiciously dark complexion but also with plenty of money. These returned exiles had never any difficulty in buying titles of nobility and in allying themselves by marriage with the old aristocracy."

This introduction of negro blood would seem to account for the absence of a healthy reaction among the people and for the lowering of the moral and physical tone of the nation.

Evidently in neither the religious nor the national field is the outlook for Portugal an encouraging one. The policy of a Bismark might very well prove the salvation of the country.

THE OTTAWA CITIZEN SWALLOWS ITSELF

Not satisfied with becoming deservedly famous as a maker of paradoxes, the Ottawa Citizen is now developing a most wonderful aptitude for swallowing itself, paradox and all. Because we ventured to question the veracity of a Citizen article which aimed at showing that the Catholic Church was opposed to Irish Home Rule, that journal accuses us of "daring anyone to tread on the tail of our coat." We are sorry if we have offended our contemporary, and we hasten to assure it that we had no intention of twirling our shillelagh, holding as we do that hot words never strengthen an argument.

In its article, "Leaders in Ireland," to which we referred in our issue of March 21st, the Citizen, in our opinion, made certain definite charges against the Catholic Church. Sheltering itself behind the authority of Redmond-Howard, the nephew of the Irish Leader, it argues that Protestantism and progress are synonymous terms, whilst clericalism, that is, Catholicism, is, of its very nature, reactionary. "The Home Rule movement has been founded, inspired and championed almost entirely by Protestants." "Nowhere is there such a strong parallel to the revolt of Ireland against the bureaucratic regime of Imperialism than in the revolt of England against the clerical domination of Rome." "Of the great leaders in Ireland, O'Connell is the exception to the rule of Protestant leaders. He is said to have done much to make Home Rule a clerical movement." "Certain powerful movements in Ireland to-day owe their direction and inspiration to men who have come into almost direct opposition to the Church." "Home Rule would be a mild form of republicanism. Republicanism is not in favor with the clerical party in France. The Duke of Norfolk is a powerful Catholic peer. He is opposed to Home Rule." If these statements mean anything they mean that the Catholic Church is opposed to Home Rule. We took issue with the Citizen on this point, and endeavored to show that such was not the case. We reminded the Citizen that, granted the majority of the Irish leaders were Protestants, they could effect but little without the support of the people. And if the people were "priest-ridden," and the priests were opposed to Home Rule, we asked the Citizen to explain how it was that the Protestant leaders had the united support of the Catholic people. We maintained that the fact that the majority of the Irish leaders were Protestants clearly proved that the Church did not unduly influence the current of Irish political life, as had it done so, these leaders would never have been accepted by the Irish people. Viewed from whatever standpoint the charge of the undue exercise of clerical power in Ireland falls to the ground. Either the people are not "priest-

ridden," or the Church is not opposed to Home Rule. If the Citizen wants to have it both ways it is up to it to explain how it happens that, if the priests hold the people in leading strings, they should support Home Rule, whereas the priests themselves oppose it.

The Citizen complains it has been misunderstood. It never implied that clericalism was the controlling force behind Home Rule. No indeed, it did not. It tried hard to prove just the opposite. And it is exceedingly wroth at us for disagreeing with it. The obvious duty of the Citizen, then, was to prove our contention wrong. Instead of which our contemporary first gets angry at us, and then agrees with us, thereby swallowing itself. The Citizen claimed that the Gaelic League and the Co-operative Movement were opposed by the Church. We proved very conclusively that both the one and the other owed much of the success they had attained to the loyal support of the priesthood. The Citizen now agrees with us. We contended that there is no justification for the charge that the Church unduly interfered in Irish politics, advancing as an argument the well-known fact that bishops, priests and laity stood loyally by Parnell after he had been condemned by Rome in the interests of England. The Citizen sees in this "a delightful paradox." It would be such did we subscribe to the theory that a bishop or a priest ceased to be a citizen. But when Irish ecclesiastics stood by Parnell in defiance of Rome, they did so in their capacity as citizens protesting against English Tory interference exercised through the Vatican. When circumstances forced them to take sides against Parnell they did so on moral grounds, and in no way left themselves open to the charge of meddling in a purely political question in their capacity as clerics.

The Citizen is all in a muddle about affairs in the Green Isle. It blows hot and cold at once. It agrees with us that many priests have helped to promote the democratic movement in Ireland. In the next breath it hints at the coming together of "all the forces of clericalism and Conservatism in Ireland," and instances as an example the fact that "Mr. William O'Brien and Tim Healy have led their clerical faction out into the open—in direct opposition to Home Rule." Will the Citizen please give a list of the clerics that belong to this O'Brien-Healy clerical faction? We know whereof we speak when we say that it cannot name a solitary Irish Bishop or more than half a dozen priests, none of them of any prominence. Clerical faction, indeed. Why, one of the leaders of this "clerical faction," Tim Healy, is the very man who denounced the scheme of proportional representation in the Irish Senate as calculated to give the bishops a controlling voice in the election of that body. And the Ancient Order of Hibernians, which is popularly supposed to be pledged to exterminate all "heretics," has been denounced in all moods and tenses by the leaders of this "clerical faction," moryah. The Citizen would be well advised to confine itself to generalities. It is not one whit more happy in its selection of an example of a "clerical faction" than it was when it instanced the Gaelic League, founded and mainly directed by priests, and the Co-operative Movement, whose vice-president is the Jesuit, Father Findlay, as typical of "certain powerful influences in Ireland to-day that owe their direction and inspiration to men who have come into almost direct opposition to the Church."

There is one other little matter upon which we venture to seek enlightenment from the Citizen. If Home Rule is a democratic movement, and "Protestantism and progress must logically go together," how happens it that the Protestant Church in Ireland is opposed to Home Rule? Is this another paradox? But the entire line of Citizen argument is a collection of like contradictions. O'Connell, it tells us, did much to make Home Rule a clerical movement. And yet O'Connell said he would as soon think of taking his politics from Constantinople as from Rome? Home Rule means "Rome Rule," and yet the Duke of Norfolk, "a powerful Catholic peer," is opposed to Home Rule, and clericalism and Conservatism are in alliance in Ireland? The Church does not take kindly to republican institutions, and yet nowhere does the Church show such vitality as under the Stars and Stripes? No, dear Citizen, the Church is not conservative in the anti-democratic