

## The Catholic Record

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

Advertisements for teachers, situations wanted, etc., 50 cents each insertion. Remittance to accompany the order. Where Catholic Record is not sent, it is required to send 10 cents to cover expense of postage upon copies.

Obituary and marriage notices cannot be inserted except in the usual condensed form. Each insertion 50 cents.

Approved and recommended by Archbishops of Toronto and Montreal, late Apostolic Delegates 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.

In St. John, N. B., single copies may be purchased from Mrs. M. A. McGuire, 249 Main Street, and John J. Dwyer.

In Sydney, N. S., single copies may be purchased at Murphy's Bookstore.

In Montreal single copies may be purchased from J. Milroy, 241 St. Catherine St. West.

The following agents are authorized to receive subscriptions and canvass for the Catholic Record:

General agents: M. J. Hagarty, Vincent S. Cox, and Miss John Dwyer; resident agents: Mrs. W. E. Smith, Halifax; Miss Bride Saunders, Sydney; E. H. Costello, 2250 4th Ave. West, Vancouver, B. C.; E. J. St. John, St. John, N. B.; Mrs. Geo. E. Smith, 2323 St. Ursula St. Montreal; R. P. O'Leary, Leclerc, Sask.; Miss Anne Hogan, 367 Lansdowne St., Winnipeg, Man.

LONDON, SATURDAY, APRIL 10, 1920

### THE SPIRIT OF MILITARY RULE IN IRELAND

Had peace been concluded before victory had been achieved, and had one of the conditions been that Germany should give Alsace-Lorraine self-government, an offer by Germany of a measure of "Home Rule" such as England now offers Ireland would evoke universal execration of Prussian perfidy.

Yet England is bound by obligations as solemn as any that could be imposed on or assumed by Germany to give real self-government to Ireland.

England solemnly and repeatedly declared before her own people and before the world that the War was being fought to establish the rights of small nationalities, to substitute Right for Might in the dealing of nations with nations; she publicly and solemnly accepted the fundamental principle that governments derive their just rights from the consent of the governed.

Moreover, for half a century Ireland fought honorably, openly, constitutionally for the restoration of her national Parliament. She won that fight. By united effort, by indomitable, invincible perseverance and persistence she won over to her side the people of England, of Scotland and of Wales. Over and over again at the polls these people gave unequivocal approval of Ireland's just and reasonable demand, legally, constitutionally presented. Finally the Bill embodying these demands was enacted into law receiving the Royal assent. There it stands as much the law of the land as ever was the Act of Union. And it is not open to the charge of being vitiated by wholesale bribery, shameless corruption and rascally venality as the Act of Union notoriously is.

And what was the result of this the greatest, the cleanest, the most marvellous triumph of constitutional agitation in parliamentary history? The open defiance of the authority of King and Parliament by an arrogant and insolent faction in North East Ulster, negotiations by them with the one great power which menaced the British Empire with destruction, the defiant importation of German rifles for an army whose avowed purpose was to resist the authority of King and Parliament.

And to all this the Tories of England lent every conceivable aid and approbation.

On this Tory campaign of vociferous approval and support of the Ulster rebels and "direct actionists" Mr. Asquith, then Premier of Great Britain and Ireland, passed this solemn judgment:

"A more deadly blow—I say it with the utmost deliberation and with the fullest conviction—a more deadly blow has never been dealt in our time by any body of responsible politicians at the very foundations on which democratic government rests."

In Ireland today the seed sown by Tory anarchy is white to the harvest; tomorrow, it may be England's turn.

And now, by the irony of fate these same aiders and abettors and fomenters of rebellion, suppressing every civil right, are governing Ireland by martial law and—giving Ireland "Home Rule!"

Those who govern England have stupendous power of propaganda especially in the English-speaking world. And it is now being exercised to the utmost; but truth is mighty, and the success of anti-Irish propaganda is infinitesimal compared with the gigantic efforts put forth. Tory chagrin at its failure in America is visible, audible, palpable.

But the Tories—for the last time in the history of England—have complete control of Parliament and Government. So Tory "Home Rule" will be enacted into law.

Why should these men who have always been, and are today, bitterly opposed to Irish self-government be so willing, so eager to give Ireland "Home Rule?"

Simply because a clause in the present Bill repeals the Home Rule Act now on the statute books. All the rest of the trumpery measure is mere camouflage for this one great Tory necessity. It is needed to mask the dishonor and perfidy they are bringing on the name of England.

And then? And then, if they dare, they will proceed to the "reconquest of Ireland" about which that undisciplined Tory organ, the Morning Post, is never done talking.

In the meantime Ireland is being deprived of every possible leader, local and national, and her people goaded into rebellion to furnish the needed excuse for turning all the engines of modern warfare, manned by the army of occupation, on an unarmed and defenceless population—so much does Tory prudence concede to the conscience of civilization.

The spirit of military rule in Ireland is the spirit of Bowen-Colthurst—who by the way is restored to liberty and to his rank in the army. Military murders are of frequent occurrence; the press agencies are silent about them. Running amuck, smashing windows, hammering on doors with rifle-butts, shooting and bombing indiscriminately—is a pastime only rarely recorded in the press. Only last week the shooting up of a village was recorded in one paper only that came under our notice; the others carrying the same despatch suppressed this item.

The English press is not so servilely "loyalist" as to think it a duty to defend by suppression and suggestion everything done by the present discredited British Government.

The Daily News keeps its readers informed of the indecencies and brutalities of military outrages in Ireland.

On March 2nd last its special correspondent sent this despatch to The Daily News from Dublin:

"In recent messages I have given details of the nightly activities of police and military raiding parties here which have illustrated to some extent the manner in which the 'jackboot' is being applied in the city of Dublin.

"Today I have collected three further instances. These I send without the names of the people concerned, which are omitted at their request but are at my disposal for publication if necessary.

"There was a man 'on the run,' a phrase which has a special significance in Ireland, who ventured to return to his home because his wife was ill and his child dying of convulsions. The first day he was back the military visited the house to arrest him. He pointed out to the officer in charge of the raiding party that there was no one in the house but himself, his sick wife, and his dying child. The officer replied that he did not care and that the husband was going out with him. The conversation took place in the bedroom, and the man was taken out by force in spite of his protestations.

"At six o'clock in the morning the mother found the child was nearly dead. She got up with her child and crawled a distance of about a mile and a half to her own people. She fainted twice on the way, and at half past seven was discovered in a state of collapse on her parents' doorstep. The child was dead, and it is doubtful whether its mother will recover.

"The second case concerns a woman who lives with her son on the outskirts of Dublin. She was asleep, and her window was open at the bottom. She awoke some time in the middle of the night to find the window being pressed up and some men getting in. She jumped out of bed with a shriek, switched on the light, and saw a lieutenant of infantry and two soldiers in the room.

"They said they had come to search the place, and started at once to overhaul the bed. The woman's son came into the room and was placed under arrest, and the soldiers ultimately left the woman in a state of collapse.

"In the third case I have had brought before my notice a house in which there were a woman and her three children was broken into by a lieutenant and a party of soldiers, who wished to arrest her husband. They entered the back way by bursting open a gate and doors leading to the house. The woman was met on the stairs by the officer and detained while the searching proceeded.

"As the officer was about to enter the room where the children were sleeping their mother begged to be allowed to go into the room with him for fear the children should be frightened. The officer replied: 'We will give you and your children something to be frightened of before we leave.'"

These things perhaps are perhaps more truly indicative of the spirit

of military rule in Ireland even than the murders which occur occasionally but all too frequently. These raids now average a thousand a week.

Robert Lynd, an Ulster Protestant and son of an Ulster clergyman, tells in the Daily News of "the lawless insolence of the authorities," and of "the policy of oppression and terror, in which has been given its head in Ireland."

But enough has been quoted to give an idea of the spirit which animates military rule in Ireland—it is the spirit of that brutal and bloody murderer—Captain Bowen-Colthurst.

More consoling and not less significant in their way are Robert Lynd's observations on the spirit of calm determination and resolute self-restraint that characterizes Sinn Féin—though he sees the danger of "a tragic clash of wills."

He writes: "The Sinn Féiners themselves are curiously philosophic about it all. They have a theory that whatever happens cannot but end in favor of Ireland. They seem to have a paradoxical belief that England cannot injure them without thereby injuring herself. They do not believe that they could defeat the armed forces that might be sent against them, but they believe that they could defeat the purposes of those who make use of the armed forces. 'If it comes to a contest of wills,' one of them said to me, 'Ireland can stand being dragged on longer than England can stand dragging us. We know, too, that the first tank brought into action in Ireland makes an end of any chance of an Anglo-American Alliance. But quite apart from that, Ireland is in an impregnable position. Our people are ready to immolate themselves than ever they were before.' It is not exactly a cheerful thought. A tragic clash between the two wills—the will to rule and the will to be free—seems at times inevitable unless the British Cabinet shows itself capable of some gleam of statesmanship."

No gleam of statesmanship pierces the gloom of the British Cabinet's Irish policy. But just as surely as Prussian militarism wrecked itself utterly on the rock of modern democracy, just so surely will the same evil spirit which now dominates and informs British rule in Ireland end in utter failure, and involve those responsible for it in merited ignominy.

### QUEER TANGLES IN ANTI-SINN FEIN PROPAGANDA

Sinn Féin has been consistently and persistently held up through all the agencies of British Government propaganda as a secret society, a society not only secret in its aims and action, but murderous in its methods. And by dint of repeatedly attributing, without a scintilla of proof, every outrage, every murder that occurs in Ireland, to Sinn Féin, they have made a more or less successful appeal to the credulity of the average newspaper reader.

The audacious effrontery of attempting to fasten on Sinn Féin "inner circles" the dastardly murder of the Sinn Féin Mayor of Cork has opened many eyes and taxed the puzzle-headed credulity of the most prejudiced.

Sinn Féin is not a society, secret or otherwise. It is a political party as open and above board in its political aims, action, and methods as the U. F. O., the Liberals, the Conservatives, the Republicans or the Democrats. It has no inner or outer circles that any political party may not have. It honors, respects, and loves its capable and loyal leaders just as other political parties do. And no party had a more loyal and capable leader than Sinn Féin in the Lord Mayor of Cork; no leader greater esteem, affection and support than the Sinn Féin accorded Mayor MacCurtain in his life, and manifested so unmistakably in his death.

That some of the murders of policemen may be political crimes is quite probable; that bands of criminals enjoy immunity is known to the world, that they enjoy such immunity because they provide the material for anti-Sinn Féin propaganda is the unshakable belief of many.

A distinguished and outstanding British statesman gives us the explanation in a few eloquent words: "Ruthless oppression, savage vengeance, frenzied crime against the law—yes, and by means of the law—legal wrong, lawless justice."

These words, though they would be summarily and savagely punished if uttered by an Irishman in Ireland today, are the words of the British Prime Minister, Lloyd George.

And another Prime Minister, Mr. Asquith, before the Eighty Club on March 9th last, thus scathingly denounced present "crimes by means of the law."

"Never in the memory of the oldest club members had the methods of Government in Ireland been so reactionary, or denial of the elementary principles of civil and political liberties so complete, so defiant, so insolent as today."

He charged also that a very large proportion of the crime in Ireland was due to the "senseless policy" of the present Government.

But Mr. Asquith would not believe what thousands in Ireland know. That was the condition of things in Ireland when Lord Mayor MacCurtain was foully murdered.

That indiscretion, even though the all-condoning excuse of "reprisal" be invoked, could not fail to give a rude jolt to costly and elaborate propaganda.

Lord Northcliffe, propagandist-in-chief, comes to the rescue: "The very able and very popular Sinn Féin leader, the Mayor of Cork, was murdered by an 'inner circle' of his own followers!" And forthwith the brilliant and malignant explanation is flashed over the world.

A Canadian Press despatch of March 30th, thus summarizes the Northcliffe Daily Mail's "information": "London, March 30th.—(Canadian Press Despatch)—Lord Mayor MacCurtain and six other prominent men who were expelled from the inner circle of the Sinn Féin and condemned as untrustworthy to the cause they had vowed to support, were doomed to death. The Daily Mail says. Of these seven, Lord Mayor MacCurtain was the first to be killed. Another, Prof. Stockley, was shot at four times, but escaped with his life. A third man, whose identity has not been disclosed, was found blindfolded, bound and shot to death in a field at Limerick. He held in his hand a rosary. The remaining four are still alive, so far as known."

"Still alive"! That is good. No; as they live, move and have their being in the fertile imagination of The Daily Mail they are not alive—not yet.

The despatch goes on to state what "appears" to have happened: "It appears," the newspaper declares, "that the Sinn Féin inner circle organized an attack on a mail van in Dublin on March 3, and the men sent to do the work secured correspondence which was being forwarded to Dublin Castle. Whether in this correspondence there was found anything implicating the seven expelled men is not quite clear, but apparently there is good ground for this view. Two days after the attempt to murder Prof. Stockley, Lord Mayor MacCurtain, who, although a Sinn Féiner, had strongly denounced the Sinn Féin campaign, was killed."

The elaborate details of the "attack on a mail van," the "correspondence" and the rest on not a scrap of evidence—all sheer suggestion.

"Although a Sinn Féiner Mayor MacCurtain had strongly denounced the Sinn Féin campaign!" How clumsy even skilled and practiced liars can be.

Sinn Féin leaders have always counselled calmness and self-restraint; have always warned their followers against playing into the hands of the "defiant and insolent" authorities; have helped in the city of Cork itself to round up criminals whom the police through impotence or design left free and unpunished.

The people of Cork know that it is an infamous lie to say that Lord Mayor MacCurtain "denounced the Sinn Féin campaign." But the whole aim and object of the propaganda has been to make Sinn Féin synonymous with outrage and murder. These MacCurtain denounced. But the press of the world would never have been informed of such denunciation unless it now suited the sinister suggestion that "Sinn Féin"—the murderous Sinn Féin of the propagandists—had slain its leader.

It seems that the Daily Mail article which is summarized in this C. P. despatch expressly states that this "inner ring" is the Irish Republican Brotherhood, popularly known as the Fenians.

The Irish Republican Brotherhood is a secret society expressly and by name condemned by the Catholic Church. No Catholic can belong to it and remain a Catholic.

The despatch concludes: "There is no doubt now in the minds of Irish officials that his murders were Sinn Féiners, acting under the orders of the inner ring of the Irish Republican Brotherhood. There may be other cases of vengeance, as it is known that as soon as being convicted of being 'untrustworthy,' a Sinn Féiner is shot by his own comrades."

Note the tissue of suggestions, without one shred of proof in any case.

But there is one main assertion on which the whole tissue of fabrication and suggestion hangs:

Mayor MacCurtain, who was murdered, an unknown man "with a rosary" also murdered, Prof. Stockley whose life was attempted, and four others were expelled from this inner or Fenian circle, and doomed to death.

The whole story is as ingenious as the Pigot forgeries, but like them it has its fatal weakness. Had the pseudo Fenians killed Professor Stockley the fabrication would have been plausible and obtain credence where the anti-Irish propaganda had prepared the ground.

But Professor Stockley is, thank God, alive and well and he comes forward to deny emphatically and unequivocally that he ever attended any meeting of Fenians with Mayor MacCurtain or without him; he asserts quite as emphatically and unequivocally that he knows nothing whatever of the Irish Republican Brotherhood.

So the main assertion of the Daily Mail, the foundation on which the whole pretentious edifice was built, is an airy nothing, a sheer fabrication of the Northcliffe imagination.

We give in another column a recent article by Prof. Stockley which shows that his political views are uncompromisingly Sinn Féin.

It will be of interest to many readers to know that Professor Stockley was a teacher in the University of Ottawa and the University of New Brunswick from 1896 to 1904. Born (1859) in Ireland of Protestant parents, he was educated at Trinity College, Dublin, became a convert in 1894, and has been Professor of English at University College, Cork, since 1905.

The people of Cork, though pretty well hardened to such tactics, are bitterly resentful of the infamous concoction of the Daily Mail; and we doubt not Prof. Stockley shares their resentment and indignation.

### THE LAWYER AND THE NEW THEORIES

BY THE OBSERVER

Revolutions, both bloodless and bloody, have always singled out some group or class in society and directed their force against such group or class particularly. Sometimes it has been a king and his favorites; sometimes the priesthood; sometimes the titled; sometimes the rich, but always some class or group has borne the brunt of the storm.

Just at this moment, the favorite object of attack is the lawyer. Generations of ridicule and misrepresentation have left the lawyer's position in society fairly intact; but he now faces his most severe trial: He is supposed to have in his possession the clue or the key to the acquisition of power; and as the hunger for money and power is spreading rapidly amongst the general public, the lawyer is in more danger than he ever was before.

If retail merchants' clubs, and labor unions, and farmers' unions, succeed in eliminating the lawyer from the law-making of the nation, they will not probably find themselves any richer so far as we can see; for whatever lawyers may have succeeded in doing, they have not been remarkable for making money. It is true there are some rich lawyers; but in proportion to the whole number of lawyers, they are fewer than in most of the other professional and business occupations.

But they are supposed to be very powerful. Perhaps they are. But what is the source of their power? People have suddenly discovered, and they tell us with an air of alarm, "Our laws are made by lawyers."

Some day soon, no doubt, if they keep on finding things out, they will discover that our houses are built by bricklayers and carpenters, and that locomotives are run by engineers. On which they will, of course, say to themselves, "Who else should build houses or run engines?" And there being only one logical answer to that, we may then ask them "Why does it surprise you that lawyers should have most to do with making laws?"

The practice of law is open to every citizen; but there is no royal road to knowledge, as Euclid is said to have told the King's son several thousand years ago. The practice of law is the application of knowledge slowly and painfully gained; it is skilled mental labor of a high order. The lawyer is an expert in an important branch of mental work.

But, say the retail shopkeepers, and the labor unions and the farmers' associations: "The laws are made for us; we lose or gain as they are good laws or bad; have we not the right to a voice in the making of them?" Of course. But, so you have the right to a voice in the building of your house; but you do not, on that account, proceed to denounce the carpenter and the plumber, the stonemason and the bricklayer. It is for you to decide in general what kind of house you want; but you do not dream of trying to build it with your own hands.

Oh, but says the new critic, (and new critics are plentiful just now), lawyers fill our legislatures and parliament, and they decide everything; and the fact is, we are tired of them; and we mean to set them aside and look after things ourselves.

Very good. And where are you going to begin? The lawyers need not worry much, so far as we can see. Lawyers, generally speaking, can take their place in other occupations, and make a success of it. Whether the general run of persons in other occupations can take the lawyer's place is another question; and the answer remains to be heard.

The lawyer is an expert in more than law. Why are lawyers sought for, outside of courts, and apart from the actual practice of law, to advocate, to represent, to argue, to lead movements, to deliver speeches, to put confused plans into practical and workable shape? Why?

Because lawyers are trained thinkers; and not only trained thinkers,—for there are many trained thinkers in many occupations,—but trained to think and to reason on many subjects; trained to take up confused and complex situations and to reduce them from confusion to order, and to bring clearness where there is obscurity.

The fact that their training and their abilities are often misused is not the question: all training and all abilities are often misused. Why are lawyers sought after as leaders?

Why do political parties so often nominate them when they are perfectly free to nominate anyone else? Why do business men who wish to oppose the passage of a new law, retain a lawyer to present their argument? Is it because they know less about their own business than the lawyer does? Usually they know a great deal more. It is because they distrust their own ability to put their views in clear, logical, forceful shape, in order and sequence; and in short, to make the best of what they believe to be a good case.

Again, it does not affect this question to say that these abilities are often used "to make the worse appear the better reason" and to bolster up a bad case. We are inquiring into the source or the basis of the lawyer's public influence. There are not more than a thousand lawyers, or so, in all Canada. Their profession is not closed to others. Any young man who will give three or four years to study and can pass certain examinations, can become a lawyer. They have, as a rule, no particular social or financial strength; nor any particular personal influence to push them along; their ranks are filled mainly with youths who come from the lowliest homes in the land.

What is the reason or source of their influence? We must seek it in the logical processes of human reason. Special knowledge, and special abilities are always in demand; and so far as public life is concerned, as its chief business is the making of laws, it is very natural and as reasonable that those who have special knowledge of laws, and whose daily work is the consideration and the application of laws, should be sought after to lead and represent others in public life.

If the main business of public life were the building of houses, unquestionably the leadership would go to architects and carpenters.

It may be that we have an undue and unnecessary proportion of lawyers in public life. But before we can intelligently correct that, it is necessary to understand how it came about, and who brought it about, and why.

At the present time, conventions of all sorts, throughout Canada, claim to have discovered that the main thing that is wrong with the country is that it is ruled by lawyers. One might suppose, to read the speeches and resolutions, that a few hundred lawyers had captured Canada by means of some marvelous strategy, or perhaps by some exercise of magic; and that they were now entrenched in power, and that the task of getting them out was so difficult as to be almost impossible.

Well, to get rid of lawyers in public life is very easy. Whenever a political convention meets to nominate a candidate for Parliament or for a Legislature, all they have to do is to decline to name a lawyer. Our impression is, however, that conventions will go on nominating lawyers pretty nearly as often as ever; and for the same reasons; namely, that, logically or illogically, most communities look upon their lawyers as trained representatives. A lawyer is always representing somebody; always clearing up confusion; always piecing together scattered and disconnected facts; always searching for weak spots and for strong points. In short, he is by profession and by training, the expert agent, representative and advocate of others and it is on that ground and for that reason that communities look to him to represent their views.

Communities can discard the lawyer if they like; but somehow, and by someone, the work which they have expected the lawyer to do, must be done.

Let us suppose, then, the lawyer dispensed with. What is proposed in substitution for the professional training; the expert observation; the trained thinking; the orderly advocacy; which have given him his present position and influence?

### NOTES AND COMMENTS

THE CHAIRMAN of the big St. Patrick's Day meeting in Toronto referred to Ireland as "the Mecca of our race," with "its crown of thorns, its Calvary and its Crucifixion." Who before ever thought of associating Ireland, far less Calvary, with Islam. The idea is fantastic, even shocking to Christian ears, but in the present instance may perhaps be attributed to simple want of reflection.

AT THE "Prophetic Bible Conference" assembled in Toronto last week one speaker said that "if the Bible is a book to be understood by men and women we must interpret it literally." After four centuries' effort to find a mode of interpretation that would square with fundamental Christian principles, and having as a result produced only a babel of conflicting views and theories, Protestantism finds itself exhausted and almost lifeless on the shores of time. Perhaps even at this late date, however, hope is not entirely dead. Literal interpretation, if only it is accompanied by a teachable spirit, might bring them nearer to the desired goal. The spectacle of the Catholic Church standing firm and unmoved from the original Rock should not in that event be lost upon them.

THE OFFICIAL Catholic Directory of the United States for the present year has just been published. As regards the opening of new parishes and missions, the erection of churches and religious institutions, and increase of membership it reveals marked advance all along the line. The number of Catholics now under the dominion of the Stars and Stripes is 27,650,204, of whom 17,735,553 are within the bounds of the United States. Considering the universality of the Church, embracing within its sheltering arms every race and class under the sun, the increase in membership of 186,229 in the United States alone is worthy of remark since immigration, which was completely shut off during the War, is even yet restricted, and large numbers of Catholics of foreign extraction have returned to their native countries.

THE STATISTICAL summary shows many other interesting changes. While the number of archbishops is increased from fourteen to sixteen, the bishops have decreased by two, owing to death. The secular clergy now number 15,889, an increase of 387, while the regular clergy have increased by 94, bringing the total up to 21,019. Seminarians now number 8,944, an increase over last year of 1,079. At the same time 148 new parishes have been established, making the number now 10,608, in addition to 5,573 missions. Free parochial schools now number 5,852, with a daily attendance of 1,701,213. Two orphan asylums were erected, making the total 296, while as it is gratifying to learn, the number of orphan inmates has been decreased to 45,687.

THESE FIGURES, as already remarked, reveal a healthy degree of material progress. From a few scattered colonies on the Atlantic

made for us; we lose or gain as they are good laws or bad; have we not the right to a voice in the making of them?" Of course. But, so you have the right to a voice in the building of your house; but you do not, on that account, proceed to denounce the carpenter and the plumber, the stonemason and the bricklayer. It is for you to decide in general what kind of house you want; but you do not dream of trying to build it with your own hands.

Oh, but says the new critic, (and new critics are plentiful just now), lawyers fill our legislatures and parliament, and they decide everything; and the fact is, we are tired of them; and we mean to set them aside and look after things ourselves.

Very good. And where are you going to begin? The lawyers need not worry much, so far as we can see. Lawyers, generally speaking, can take their place in other occupations, and make a success of it. Whether the general run of persons in other occupations can take the lawyer's place is another question; and the answer remains to be heard.

The lawyer is an expert in more than law. Why are lawyers sought for, outside of courts, and apart from the actual practice of law, to advocate, to represent, to argue, to lead movements, to deliver speeches, to put confused plans into practical and workable shape? Why?

Because lawyers are trained thinkers; and not only trained thinkers,—for there are many trained thinkers in many occupations,—but trained to think and to reason on many subjects; trained to take up confused and complex situations and to reduce them from confusion to order, and to bring clearness where there is obscurity.

The fact that their training and their abilities are often misused is not the question: all training and all abilities are often misused. Why are lawyers sought after as leaders?

Why do political parties so often nominate them when they are perfectly free to nominate anyone else? Why do business men who wish to oppose the passage of a new law, retain a lawyer to present their argument? Is it because they know less about their own business than the lawyer does? Usually they know a great deal more. It is because they distrust their own ability to put their views in clear, logical, forceful shape, in order and sequence; and in short, to make the best of what they believe to be a good case.

Again, it does not affect this question to say that these abilities are often used "to make the worse appear the better reason" and to bolster up a bad case. We are inquiring into the source or the basis of the lawyer's public influence. There are not more than a thousand lawyers, or so, in all Canada. Their profession is not closed to others. Any young man who will give three or four years to study and can pass certain examinations, can become a lawyer. They have, as a rule, no particular social or financial strength; nor any particular personal influence to push them along; their ranks are filled mainly with youths who come from the lowliest homes in the land.

What is the reason or source of their influence? We must seek it in the logical processes of human reason. Special knowledge, and special abilities are always in demand; and so far as public life is concerned, as its chief business is the making of laws, it is very natural and as reasonable that those who have special knowledge of laws, and whose daily work is the consideration and the application of laws, should be sought after to lead and represent others in public life.

If the main business of public life were the building of houses, unquestionably the leadership would go to architects and carpenters.

It may be that we have an undue and unnecessary proportion of lawyers in public life. But before we can intelligently correct that, it is necessary to understand how it came about, and who brought it about, and why.

At the present time, conventions of all sorts, throughout Canada, claim to have discovered that the main thing that is wrong with the country is that it is ruled by lawyers. One might suppose, to read the speeches and resolutions, that a few hundred lawyers had captured Canada by means of some marvelous strategy, or perhaps by some exercise of magic; and that they were now entrenched in power, and that the task of getting them out was so difficult as to be almost impossible.

Well, to get rid of lawyers in public life is very easy. Whenever a political convention meets to nominate a candidate for Parliament or for a Legislature, all they have to do is to decline to name a lawyer. Our impression is, however, that conventions will go on nominating lawyers pretty nearly as often as ever; and for the same reasons; namely, that, logically or illogically, most communities look upon their lawyers as trained representatives. A lawyer is always representing somebody; always clearing up confusion; always piecing together scattered and disconnected facts; always searching for weak spots and for strong points. In short, he is by profession and by training, the expert agent, representative and advocate of others and it is on that ground and for that reason that communities look to him to represent their views.

Communities can discard the lawyer if they like; but somehow, and by someone, the work which they have expected the lawyer to do, must be done.

Let us suppose, then, the lawyer dispensed with. What is proposed in substitution for the professional training; the expert observation; the trained thinking; the orderly advocacy; which have given him his present position and influence?

Because lawyers are trained thinkers; and not only trained thinkers,—for there are many trained thinkers in many occupations,—but trained to think and to reason on many subjects; trained to take up confused and complex situations and to reduce them from confusion to order, and to bring clearness where there is obscurity.