

## The Catholic Record

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.  
United States and Europe—\$2.50.  
Publisher & Proprietor, Thomas Coffey, L.L.D.  
Editors (Rev. James T. Foley, B.A.,  
Thomas Coffey, L.L.D.,  
Associate Editor—H. F. Macdonald,  
Manager—Robert M. Burns.

Address business letters to the Manager.  
Advertisements for teachers, situations, etc.,  
etc., etc., 50 cents each insertion. Remittance  
must accompany the order. Where Catholic  
Record Box address is required send 10 cents to  
pay expense of postage upon replies.  
Obituary and marriage notices cannot be  
inserted except in the usual condensed form.  
Each insertion 50 cents.

The Catholic Record has been approved and  
recommended by Archbishop Falconio and  
Bishop, late Apostolic Delegate to Canada,  
the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa,  
and St. Boniface, the Bishops of London, Hamilton,  
Peterborough and Oshawa, N. Y.,  
and the clergy throughout the Dominion.  
It is St. John, N. B., single copies may be pur-  
chased from Mrs. M. A. McGuire, 245 Main St.  
and John J. Poirer.

In Sydney, N. S., single copies may be pur-  
chased at Murphy's Bookstore.  
In Montreal single copies may be purchased  
from J. Milloy, 241 St. Catherine St. W.  
In Ottawa, Ont., single copies may be pur-  
chased from J. O'Brien, 141 Nicholas St.  
The following agents are authorized to  
accept subscriptions and canvass for The  
Catholic Record:  
General Agents: M. J. Haggarty, Stephen V.  
James, Vincent S. Cox, Miss Norine Connor,  
Resident Agents: Miss Marie Saunders, Syd-  
ney; E. E. Connelley, 141 10th Ave. West, Van-  
couver; B. C.; Elias Johnson, 20 Rochester St.,  
Ottawa; Mrs. J. E. Smith, 223 St. James St.,  
Montreal; B. P. O'Leary, Leblond, Sask.; Miss  
Hogan, 387 Langside Street, Winnipeg,  
Man.

LONDON, SATURDAY, MAY 21, 1921

A PRONOUNCEMENT ON  
DIVORCE

Since writing the articles on  
divorce in last week's issue of THE  
RECORD, the Anglican Synod of the  
Diocese of Huron was held in London  
and the Bishop of Huron made a pro-  
nouncement which in fairness to  
him we shall quote in its entirety  
before commenting thereon.

"His Lordship," reports the Free  
Press, "expressed the attitude of the  
Church against relaxation of the  
divorce laws. On this subject he  
said:

"We rejoice that marriages legally  
contracted in this country can no  
longer be dissolved at the behest of  
any religious communion. To break  
up legally constituted families  
merely on a religious technicality,  
was a monstrous thing, and wholly  
contrary to the teaching of Christ.  
To do so in His name was simply  
defiant impiety and a blasphemous  
attack on His sacred character. The  
recent judgment of the Privy Council  
has put an end to that. No more in  
this Dominion can there be the dis-  
solution of a legal marriage or the  
declaration of its nullity simply on  
religious grounds. That kind of  
divorce is now at an end, and we are  
thankful for it.

"Secondly, the proposal to change  
the divorce law, and especially the  
possible extension of the grounds for  
divorce, is in suspense. So far no  
action has been taken, but it does  
not follow that the matter is dropped  
or that no further effort will be made  
to modify the existing law. We must  
therefore be vigilant. The Christian  
conscience of Ontario is fairly roused  
and action has been taken by most  
communities in protest against any  
extension of the grounds for divorce.  
The Social Service Council of Canada  
has taken similar action. One com-  
munity has been quite lavish in the  
distribution of pamphlets upon the  
subject. Perhaps the value of the  
pamphlets outside the communion  
itself would have been much  
enhanced if a certain underlying  
animus had been absent from them,  
if the statement of the position of  
some other communions had been more  
accurate, and above all if its  
own attitude and record in this  
Dominion as to the indissolubility of  
legal marriages had been less repre-  
hensible.

"Nevertheless we rejoice that we  
are all united against any extension  
of the grounds for divorce. So long  
as we are united in our opposition I  
doubt if any Government will defy  
the united Christian sentiment of the  
province. But we must be watchful.  
In this, as in all else, eternal vigi-  
lance is the price of safety."

In this belligerently grateful  
expression of the attitude of his  
Church the Bishop of Huron

(1) Misrepresents Catholic Decrees  
of Nullity.

(2) Exalts the "legal" status of  
marriage above "religious technical-  
ities" and "simply religious  
grounds."

(3) Insinuates that "the state-  
ment of the position of some other  
communions" is inaccurately set  
forth in the Catholic pamphlets on  
Divorce.

(4) Either entirely misapprehends  
the question in issue in the proposed  
divorce legislation, or deliberately  
evades it.

Each of these calls for a few words  
of comment.

1. When the Catholic Church or  
the Province of Quebec is con-  
cerned such rhodomontade as  
that in the first paragraph of  
the bishop's pronouncement has  
often been heard in Ontario, but  
usually from Twelfth of July  
"orators," or from platforms when  
political exigencies make pandering  
to ignorant prejudice expedient, or  
from the meaner sort of mountebank  
pulpiters.

Suffice it to say that the Catholic  
Church either in Quebec or else-  
where has never dissolved a valid  
marriage. This fact is undisputed  
and indubitable. The Bulletin of

the Church of England Council for  
Social Service, from which we quoted  
last week, emphatically asserts "the  
undisputed fact that the Christian  
Church has never at any time recog-  
nized divorce and flatly refuses to do  
so now. For the Christian Church  
divorce simply does not exist." The  
writers in the Bulletin certainly  
included the Roman Catholic Church  
in this statement of the historic atti-  
tude of the Christian Church. They  
set forth Catholic doctrine on divorce  
in clear and unmistakable terms.  
Their sincerity, their earnest and  
enlightened zeal for the maintenance  
of Christian marriage intact, make it  
very difficult to think they would  
have any sympathy with the Bishop  
of Huron's misleading rhetoric.

From the petition to the Senate  
from the Anglican Diocese of  
Niagara we quoted an extract last  
week where the petitioners clearly  
state that the Church of England  
does or has done precisely what the  
Catholic Church courts of Quebec  
have done, namely, by Decrees of  
Nullity declared invalid marriages  
null and void.

By the marriage legislation of the  
Province of Quebec, as interpreted  
before the recent Privy Council  
judgment, such Church of Eng-  
land Decrees of Nullity received  
exactly the same consideration as  
those of the ecclesiastical courts of  
the Catholic Church. And the civil  
courts, if asked to do so, would have  
given civil effect to such decrees.

Moreover, it is the invariable  
practice of the Catholic Church to  
exhaust every possible means to  
induce a legally but invalidly  
married couple to validate their  
marriage. If they refuse to do so  
the Church cannot compel them.  
Those who delight in distortion of  
facts and calumny when the  
Catholic Church and Quebec are in  
question are careful not to mention  
the significant fact that, through the  
influence of the Catholic Church, the  
principals in the Tremblay-Despatie  
case were living quietly together,  
their marriage validated, long before  
the Privy Council handed down its  
decision on the legal aspects of the  
case. The truth about the Quebec  
"divorces" would spoil the rhetoric.

2. Perhaps the most amazing  
thing in this amazing paragraph is  
the good Bishop's exaltation of the  
State and his contemptuous relega-  
tion of Religion to innocuous  
desuetude so far as Christian  
marriage is concerned. That blessed  
word—"legal." He revels in it,  
thanks God for it.

If the Bishop's See were in Turkey  
would he as zealously uphold the  
"legal" right to keep a harem? Yet,  
the State as such, has just the same  
right in Turkey as in Canada to  
determine the status of Christian  
marriage. It may make polygamy  
"legal"; but that does not alter the  
law of Christ as to marriage.

Or, without going so far afield,  
let us take Bishop Moreland's recent  
pronouncement on conditions in the  
States.

"Lustful males," writes this Pro-  
testant Bishop of Sacramento  
"marrying for physical satisfaction  
chiefly, cast off wives as if they were  
kept mistresses. . . . Selfish women  
. . . are encouraged under our  
laws to sell their bodies to the  
highest bidder, yet continue to  
move in society as respectable  
women."

Such is the magic of that blessed  
word—"legal." Its all perfectly  
legal. Yet Bishop Moreland has the  
audacity to find fault with it "simply  
on religious grounds!"

The Californian Bishop forges the  
time when "the ideal of true  
marriage" (not "legal" marriage be  
it noted) "will fade from the con-  
sciousness of the American people  
and be replaced by a kind of barnyard  
morality."

What matter so long as the  
Church keeps its impious hands off  
the sacrament "legal" marriage.

"Even now," continues the Bishop  
of Sacramento, "our young people,  
knowing that the law permits con-  
secutive polygamy, enter into the  
married state with the deliberate  
purpose of breaking it off, should the  
first attempt be unsatisfactory, and  
of drawing another ticket in the  
lottery."

Why not? They are all perfectly  
"legal" marriages. But they are not  
Christian marriages. And we have  
infinitely more respect for Bishop  
Moreland who denounces these  
"legal marriages," as is his right  
and duty in virtue of his episcopal  
office, than we have for his brother  
bishop who exalts "legal" marriage  
and virtually abdicates his episcopal  
office in favor of the State, and  
glories in the shame of doing so.

8. When the Bishop of Huron says  
or insinuates that the position  
of some other communions is in-  
accurately set forth in the Catholic  
pamphlets, he is presumably refer-  
ring to his own communion and  
to Father Mahoney's pamphlet.  
Father Mahoney quotes from the  
Anglican Bishop of Toronto when  
addressing the Synod on divorce. No  
inaccuracy there; the Bishop's very  
words are quoted. Then he gives  
the gist of the resolution of the  
Synod of the Diocese of Huron which  
recognized adultery as the "scrip-  
tural cause" for divorce and opposed  
any extension on the grounds on which  
divorce might be granted. No alle-  
gation that the press report of the  
proceedings was inaccurate.

In view of the Anglican statements  
we have already quoted in which the  
Catholic doctrine is unequivocally  
set forth as that of "the  
Christian Church" in all ages,  
we recognize that there are  
those within the Anglican com-  
munion who would repudiate the  
resolution of the Bishop of Huron  
and his Synod. But then which  
party expresses the "official" po-  
sition of the Anglican Church? Could  
the Bishop of Huron himself state it  
"more accurately"? Of course  
everybody knows that there are  
conflicting beliefs within the  
Church of England in Canada  
(and elsewhere). And it is these  
conflicting beliefs that make the  
selection of bishops so difficult.  
If the "Protestant" and "Catholic"  
forces are nearly equal the man of  
strong convictions and clear-cut  
principles must stand aside while  
some prudent nondescript is  
accepted as a compromise. So that  
those who believe that they  
belong to "a branch of the  
Catholic Church" pay no atten-  
tion to the official pronouncements  
of such bishops and appeal to tradi-  
tional Catholic teaching and practice.  
Those who do so might object to  
Father Mahoney's statement of the  
"official teaching of the Anglican  
Church," though we think they  
would easily admit while deploring  
its accuracy.

The Bulletin of the Church of  
England Welfare Council says:

"Without going at all deeply into  
the subject it may be said briefly  
that this doctrine and discipline rests  
upon the passages in the Gospels  
of St. Matthew (19: 3-12) and St.  
Mark (10: 2-12). A study of these  
passages cannot possibly lead to any  
conclusion other than that our Lord  
taught unequivocally that the re-  
marriage of divorced people is  
ipso facto adultery. It must be  
carefully noted that Christ did not  
say that under no circumstances  
should a separation take place in  
case of the adultery of one of the  
parties to the marriage. He merely  
says that re-marriage after divorce  
entails adultery. It is hard to see  
how any dialectical agility can  
possibly read any other meaning into  
His words. At any rate the Chris-  
tian Church has always taken that  
view and it remains the undisputed  
law of the Church to this day."

Father Mahoney, we are sure,  
would have been delighted to cite  
this and similar pronouncements  
had they been available when writ-  
ing his pamphlet. They concede the  
whole thesis he set himself to prove  
from Scripture. We should imagine  
that those who claim that Christ  
taught the direct antithesis should  
be grateful not to be called upon to  
make a difficult exercise of "dialectical  
agility" in reconciling contradictions.  
Though registering his complaint  
of inaccuracy the Bishop of  
Huron in his "expression of  
the attitude of the Church" really  
throws no new light on the position  
of that communion of which the  
author of "Marriage and Divorce"  
paid him the natural even if mis-  
taken honor of being an official  
spokesman.

4. The question raised by the  
proposed Divorce legislation is not  
primarily or chiefly, in fact not at all  
that of extending the legal grounds  
for Divorce. There is no divorce  
law at the present time in  
Ontario, and therefore no legal  
grounds for divorce. Those who  
desire divorce in Ontario must secure  
it through a special act of Parlia-  
ment in each case. Though practi-  
cally limited to cases of infidelity  
Parliament is not restricted to this  
reason when considering the merits  
of an application for divorce. This  
was the course of procedure in  
England until 1857. The passing of  
a divorce law recognizing adultery as  
a legal ground for absolute divorce  
and giving the civil courts jurisdic-  
tion in the premises was the first  
breach in the dyke that protected

England from American conditions;  
it is now sought so to widen that  
breach that British and American  
divorce legislation will be practically  
identical. Is there any well-  
grounded hope that the consequences  
will not be identical also? If we  
in Ontario take the same first step  
what rational hope is there that the  
same fatal consequences will be  
avoided? The question for the  
Christian conscience of Ontario is:  
Shall we now, blind to the lessons  
of experience, deliberately place  
ourselves on this downward  
incline? If we do it is idle to  
salve our conscience with futile  
protests against the "extension of the  
grounds for divorce."

"DEMENTED RED INDIANS"  
IN IRELAND

Brazen denials of notorious facts  
had pretty nearly petered out in  
England as a face-saving device on  
the part of those responsible for the  
terror in Ireland. But Lord Par-  
mour's exposure in the House of  
Lords of the murderous orgy at  
Castleconnell will go far to shame  
the effrontery even of a Greenwood,  
and tax the capacity for evasion of  
the shifty demagogue who as Prime  
Minister must bear the chief respon-  
sibility for the Government policy in  
Ireland.

Shocking as it must be to Eng-  
lishmen of civilized instincts, the graphic  
and unquestionably accurate narra-  
tion of facts by the venerable old  
surgeon, Lord Parmoor's brother, is,  
alas, an old and stale story of the  
commonplaces in terror-ridden but  
heroic Ireland. And to Irishmen  
abroad it is but an English confirma-  
tion of the harrowing stories reach-  
ing them daily from Irish sources.  
The Irish abroad had never a doubt  
of the truth of their information, the  
stark horror of the stories, quite evi-  
dently had its origin not in the  
imagination but in actual experience.

Not that it is new nor that it  
is exceptional but that its shame is  
brought home to Englishmen beyond  
the veil of shameless denials, is  
what makes Lord Parmoor's public  
exposure of the Castleconnell affair  
important. That the House of Lords  
adopted the resolution demanding an  
impartial inquiry is significant.

Referring to the official apologies  
for such acts, apologies which dis-  
grace the name of England quite as  
much as the acts themselves, the  
Daily News asks,

"How long will the public con-  
science submit to an attitude of  
mind so impudently callous and so  
morally humiliating to the English  
nation?"

And this fearless exponent of  
honest English opinion indicates the  
answer:

"The facts are becoming so notor-  
ious that we do not believe it will  
be possible for the Cabinet much  
longer to evade the inevitable con-  
sequences to its character and its  
prestige."

The editorials on the subject which  
we reproduce from the Manchester  
Guardian and the N. Y. Nation reflect  
the opinion of a large proportion of  
the English and the American  
people.

## HOW TO WARM THEIR HEARTS

BY THE OBSERVER

London, May 9.—(Canadian As-  
sociated Press)—Sir James Craig,  
the Ulster leader, speaking at a meeting  
at County Down, announced that he  
has taken steps through the British  
colonial office to invite the premiers  
of all the British overseas dominions  
to come to Belfast to witness the  
opening of the new parliament for  
the north of Ireland. They would  
witness a spectacle which would  
warm their hearts, said Sir James.

Some time ago, Sir Hamar Green-  
wood, Irish secretary, expressed the  
hope that the dominion premiers  
would be present at the opening of  
the new Irish parliaments, but  
subsequently questions in the house  
revealed that no official invitation  
had been extended to the dominion  
premiers.

Sir James Craig is either a humor-  
ist, or a fanatic. Whichever he may  
be, there is not much in the politics  
of himself and his little company of  
north-easters to warm the heart of a  
Canadian.

Let us see. The little legislature  
in which he hopes to be the leader,  
will have no power to pass on excise,  
customs, militia or police laws; nor  
laws respecting post office or harbors,  
or general taxation, or savings banks,  
or harbors, or harbor or coast lights,  
or buoys or beacons, or old age  
pensions, or trade agreements with  
other countries or with other parts  
of Ireland; or public records; or  
weights or measures; nor will it  
have any general power of legislation  
in respect of education or of real  
estate.

A Canadian premier, whether pro-  
vincial or federal, would find it hard  
to warm his heart at such a slender  
blaze. Sir James would do better to  
invite the wardens of our County  
Councils, or the mayors of our incor-  
porated towns; for they would find  
in the glorified debating society  
which is about to be set up at Bel-  
fast, something to remind them of  
dear old Canada. But I should not  
advise him to write the mayors of  
our larger cities. What could a  
mayor of such a city as Montreal or  
Toronto find to impress him in the  
truncated little legislature at Bel-  
fast?

If it were not the latest chapter in  
a long-drawn-out tragedy, the thing  
would be amusing. The Act is called  
"The Government of Ireland Act,  
1920." It has been advertised  
all over the world as a grant of self-  
government. It contains no powers  
of self-government; it continues  
the bureaucracy of Dublin Castle  
almost intact.

The essential subjects of self-  
government are (1) Land; (2) Trade;  
(3) Taxation. In respect of all these,  
the two legislatures to be set up in  
Ireland have no power. Imagine a  
legislature which cannot control the  
registration of the public records of  
its country; which cannot negotiate  
a trade agreement with any other  
country, nor even with the other  
legislative division in its own  
country; which has no control of  
the levying of taxes, nor of the  
spending of them; which cannot  
control the appointment of the  
police or the magistrates, or the  
judges, in its own country.

What a glow comes to the  
Canadian heart at the contemplation  
of North-east Ulster in this ecstasy  
of legislative bliss!

Sir James Craig must be delighted  
at the prospect of leading a mock  
Parliament at Belfast. North-east  
Ulster does not want self-govern-  
ment; it wants the bureaucracy,  
which plays its game to its perfect  
satisfaction; and the bureaucracy  
remains. The last thing in the  
world that Sir James Craig wants is  
to have to do with responsible  
government. The North-east Ulster  
idea is not responsible government;  
it is irresponsible government.

But, if he were to look carefully  
enough in Canada, he might be able  
to find some men who would enjoy  
the Belfast farce, and for the same  
reasons which warm Sir James'  
heart when he thinks of it.

Canada and her provinces have  
had responsible government for a  
long time; but it would be a mistake  
to suppose that every Canadian loves  
it. We have still in Canada a  
considerable number of people whose  
ideal in government is to have all  
things done at London; and who  
think the most important thing that  
is done in legislation in this country  
is the giving of His Majesty's assent  
to the bills passed by both Houses.

There are people in this country  
who regard Canada as an outpost of  
England, and who would gladly see  
some of the powers of self-govern-  
ment, so hardly won and so grudgingly  
conceded, given back into the  
hands of the oracles of Downing  
Street.

Now, Sir James Craig might  
recruit his tourist party amongst  
that comparatively small, but hard-  
dying, section of the Canadian  
people.

He might make his first inquiries  
in Toronto; and it is quite possible  
he might be able to find there as  
many hearts as he could reasonably  
expect to heat up with the small fire  
that is to be kindled in "The Parlia-  
ment of Northern Ireland."

## NOTES AND COMMENTS

AS IS WELL known the State of  
Maryland was originally a Catholic  
colony, established by Royal Charter  
in the reign of Charles I, with the  
express purpose of not only afford-  
ing a refuge to the much-persecuted  
Catholics of England, but also of  
securing freedom of conscience to all  
professing the Christian name who  
might seek asylum within its borders.

An event reminiscent of that  
epoch-making charter which, as we  
learn from Baltimore papers, is to  
take place during the present  
summer, should have the effect of  
impressing upon the brilliant minds  
of the American people a sense of  
their obligation to that Lord Balti-  
more and his associates who first  
conceived and put into practice the  
principle which is now generally  
regarded as the very corner stone of  
the Constitution. "Upon the banks  
of the St. Mary's river, in the soil of  
Maryland, amid the wilderness of  
America," says Davis, the historian of  
the Proprietary, "they planted that

seed which has since become a tree  
of life to the nation, extending its  
branches and casting its shadows  
across a whole continent."

THE COMMEMORATIVE event referred  
to is the presentation of two Indian  
arrows to King George which will be  
placed in his hands at Windsor castle  
by a representative of the Society of  
The Ark and The Dove from Mary-  
land. The presentation is in com-  
memoration and perpetuation of an  
obligation undertaken originally by  
Lord Baltimore himself of sending to  
the King two arrows as rent for the  
whole province of Maryland, and the  
Society under whose auspices the  
presentation is to be made is com-  
posed of descendants of the men and  
women who came over on two ships,  
The Ark and The Dove, and became  
the first white settlers of the "fair  
demesne."

IN COMMISSIONING Sir Arthur New-  
holme, Professor in Johns Hopkins  
University, to be the bearer of this  
token to the king, the Rev. James  
M. Magruder, Governor of the Society,  
said: "We send by your hand to  
His Majesty, King George V., two  
Indian arrows in token of our loyalty  
to those principles of liberty that  
our forefathers brought with them  
to these hospitable shores two  
hundred and eighty-seven years ago.  
And in delivering these arrows to  
the king, may I request that you  
proffer our hope to His Majesty that  
Maryland and England, the United  
States and Great Britain and Ire-  
land, may ever stand side by side  
and shoulder to shoulder in what-  
ever sacrifices may be needed through  
the coming years for the advance-  
ment of that liberty wherein Christ  
has made us free."

IN VIEW of these words the event  
may be said to have something more  
than mere historic interest, in-  
dubitable as that is. It is at all  
events a timely reminder to the  
people of the United States as to  
whom they owe all that is best and  
most enduring in their national life.  
The Catholic builders of Maryland  
laid a foundation which even the  
subsequent intolerant Puritanism  
that invaded the colony failed to  
destroy. The great principle  
imbedded in it by Lord Baltimore has  
proven stronger than the vitiated  
ideas of human liberty which, trans-  
planted from the England of Crom-  
well, found lodgment on Massachu-  
setts Bay, and overflowing its  
original boundaries spread like a  
plague over the whole Thirteen  
Colonies. "The Revolution of 1688  
in England made itself felt in Mary-  
land," said Judge Watkins in endor-  
sing the commission to King George.  
"The colony was taken out of the  
hands of Lord Baltimore, and a  
Royal Governor was placed over the  
province. Governor Copley came to  
St. Mary's. The Assembly met.  
Religious freedom was overthrown."  
This is a view of the matter which  
was discreetly kept in the background  
during the recent Mayflower Terce-  
nary.

TO THE series of centenaries men-  
tioned in these columns a week or  
two ago as being celebrated in Italy  
during the present year is to be  
added that of the Great St. Dominic,  
founder of the Order which bears his  
name, and propagator of the  
devotion of the Holy Rosary. In  
commemoration of this interesting  
event the Commission of the National  
Congress having the celebration in  
charge has presented to the Holy  
Father a beautiful bronze replica of  
the tomb of the Saint. This presen-  
tation was made in the name of the  
archdiocese of Bologna, over which  
Pope Benedict formerly presided.  
St. Dominic is one of the great  
names in the Church's calendar, and  
in these days of unrest and weakening  
faith it is fitting that his memory,  
who did so much in his own day to  
stimulate faith and piety, should be  
kept in the forefront.

DURING THIS year also occurs the  
fiftieth anniversary of the proclama-  
tion of St. Joseph as Patron of the  
Universal Church, and by the express  
desire of His Holiness special cere-  
monies were held throughout Italy  
in preparation for the Feast, 19th  
March. A novena of unusual solemn-  
ity terminating with the singing of  
the Te Deum broke in upon the gloom  
of Passion tide in order to do honor  
to the Head of the Holy Family.  
Devotion to St. Joseph is now general  
throughout the Church.

Who but a poor man can realize  
the wealth of joy and bliss in the  
prayer of St. Francis of Assisi—  
"My God and my all."

## AMERICAN COMMISSION

## ON CONDITIONS IN IRELAND

CHAIRMAN HOWE. I think we will  
accept all these historical data as  
valid. I was thinking about some-  
thing contemporary.

THE WITNESS, MR. GINNELL, M. P.  
The cotton and the glass industries  
have been suppressed in the same  
way. Ireland has peculiar ingredi-  
ents for the manufacture of fine  
glass, and factories have been estab-  
lished at Birr and other places,  
where for some time a great variety  
of glass was produced. The products  
of these factories was a very high-  
grade glass which was much in  
demand for exportation. As soon as  
the industry began to flourish, the  
English Parliament prohibited Ire-  
land from exporting glass to any  
country whatever.

Q. CHAIRMAN HOWE. You mean to  
say that if a person started a glass  
factory or a cotton factory today in  
Ireland, the British Parliament or  
the British Board of Trade would  
prevent it? A. Yes, they would by  
their force overwhelm us. They  
would stifle us out.

Q. You mean that Ireland should  
be able to protect herself against  
such competition by necessary  
tariffs? A. Yes, certainly.

Q. COMMISSIONER ADDAMS. Mr.  
Ginnell, how many members who  
were elected to the British Parlia-  
ment and instead became members  
of the Irish Parliament are still free  
—still at large? A. I do not know.  
People in Ireland do not know  
because there are so many of them  
on the run. They cannot appear in  
public. A rough estimate would be  
—well, 78 seats were filled by Repub-  
licans. In four or five cases one  
man was elected for two seats. In  
our circumstances we cannot adjust  
that. So that we really had 68 men  
for 78 seats. Of those 68, Pearse  
McDermott, member from East Tipper-  
ary, as fine a young man as I have  
ever seen, died in an English prison  
in March, 1919. Terence MacSwiney  
died after a seventy-four day fast in  
an English prison. There are two  
gone. Roughly, perhaps, twenty  
others are in prison, twenty are on  
the run from the police, and the  
remainder are trying to mind their  
business as well as they possibly can,  
either their own or their country's  
business.

Q. CHAIRMAN HOWE. What kind of  
legislation did that Parliament pass?  
A. It was constructive legislation.  
We could not take up anything like  
a code of laws. The only thing we  
could do was to adopt a code of jus-  
tice as much in harmony as possible  
with the old Gaelic system, the old  
Brehon laws, which have prevailed  
in Ireland from before the dawn of  
history. We intend our Republic to  
be a cooperative commonwealth as  
much as possible. That will be in  
strict harmony with the old Brehon  
system as it is expounded in five  
large volumes.

Q. CHAIRMAN HOWE. What do you  
mean by a cooperative common-  
wealth? A. I mean that we look to  
a future Ireland where most of the  
branches of business will be carried  
on by a cooperative system. By that  
we hope to escape from the difficul-  
ties of countries in modern times  
with labor problems.

Q. That is along the line of indus-  
trial democracy? A. Along the line  
of industrial democracy. In connec-  
tion with that, I think I ought to  
mention to the Commission that I  
wrote a book in 1894, published by  
Fisher Unwin, on the Brehon laws.  
The Brehon laws began in pre-his-  
toric times. In old manuscripts  
which we have in vellum they have  
come down to us. They begin in  
language which few living men are  
able to translate.

Q. Who conceived the idea of a  
cooperative commonwealth? A. We  
did.

Q. The Irish Parliament was dedi-  
cated to that form of government?  
A. Not expressly, but all understood  
that that was what it would prob-  
ably become.

Q. COMMISSIONER ADDAMS. You  
consider that the future state in  
Ireland will be along the lines of the  
present cooperative movement in  
Ireland? A. It will. You may be  
told by someone after me that the  
cooperative movement itself will be  
a solution for all difficulties. We  
are told that these cooperative soci-  
eties formed in Ireland would solve  
all of our problems. We knew that to  
increase the farmer's income from  
the soil while the landlord was over  
him would only increase the wealth  
in the landlord's pockets. The only  
thing to do was to clear out the  
landlord and brush him away. And  
to increase the wealth of the people  
by the cooperative movement while  
England is over us will only increase  
the amount of money that will flow  
into England's treasury. It will do  
us no good. That is my answer to  
cooperation alone. We look for great  
things from it in a free Ireland, but  
nothing from an Ireland ruled by  
strangers. Now, on a subject on  
which you have questioned me,  
Bazile says: "Every nation has  
formed for itself some favorite point,  
which for it becomes the criterion of  
its happiness." So have we. We do  
not interfere with the English nation  
or any other nation forming any  
point it pleases as the criterion of its  
happiness while we are allowed to  
have the criterion of our own happi-  
ness.

Q. COMMISSIONER ADDAMS. Was  
the Home Rule Bill discussed during  
your membership in Parliament, Mr.  
Ginnell? A. Yes, I was there during  
the whole of it, madam. I have  
stated a good number of instances to  
you to prove that English policy in  
Ireland is a continuity, that its pur-