

the outbreak and success of the Revolution. The Revolution, nevertheless, as M. Taine also narrates, found the Church in France engaged in good and holy work consistent with her Divine origin.—But to return:—Protestantism, having been stamped out in France, however it was stamped out there, still remained dominant in England, and thence the infection of atheism was carried to France and Italy. Voltaire, the apostle of Continental atheism, was the pupil of Bollingbrooke, and thus the origin of the Revolution may be traced to English Protestantism of which Bollingbrooke was a product.—In what degree may ignorance excuse calumny and falsehood, barefaced lying, indeed, we may say, of a particularly malignant type? "France and Italy have both rebelled against the Pope and his religion," says our unscrupulous contemporary. "Why we again ask does this happen? Not because of Protestant heresy, but simply because of the corrupt teaching of the Church of Rome and the godless lives of her clergy." There is not a word of truth in this paragraph, and part of it is foul calumny—barefaced lying, indeed, as we have said. France and Italy have not rebelled against the Pope and his religion; the vast majority in both countries remain faithful Catholics. The teaching of the Church is the teaching against which Christ promised that the gates of hell should never prevail, and which consequently could not become corrupt;—and to say that the clergy of France and Italy lead godless lives is a foul calumny, a barefaced, impudent lie, in fact—to call a spade a spade and tell plain truth. We do not know whether this can be excused by ignorance or not, we say; but if so, it must be by ignorance of an extreme kind. To be excusable, the man making such a statement must have been ignorant that it was a gross thing to make it concerning men of whom he was conscious that he knew nothing. We for our own part know nothing, for example, of the editor of the *Presbyterian*, of whom or what he is. We, however, know that we would, therefore, to all intents and purposes, be lying did we assert that he was a thief or an adulterer. Nay, we should not even venture to assert that he was a liar, had he not written himself down as such plainly in black and white. Our contemporary has a word or two to say concerning the Catholic governments of Italy, and especially that of the Pope, that may be allowed to pass as based also on want of information. Some of the governments in question, including that of the Pope, were remarkably good governments. It is patent to the whole world that the condition of Italy under them was infinitely more prosperous than it is at present. Under their rule, the misery now rife in the unfortunate country was completely unknown. But does our good contemporary himself really understand what the Christianity of the New Testament is? Referring to the Catholic Church, he says. "It is only from that Church that the Freemasons of Rome and Italy get their conceptions of Christianity, and it is not too much to say that it is not the Christianity of the New Testament that these godless men want to destroy, but the false representation of it which it is no great wonder they have learned to hate."—Is it then an anti-Christ that the New Testament speaks of as exposed to the hatred of the world?—We need not, however, be too hard on this poor fellow. The Bishop has frightened him out of his wits, and he may rationally claim indulgence. Still there are limits to everything, and no excuse can be made for foul-mouthed calumny. Even the ignorance in which the *Presbyterian* brings false charges against the clergy of France and Italy is culpable, though on all other points it may be admitted as pleading in his favour.

Colonial Notes.

THE quarterly meeting of St. Mary's Branch, No. 193, of the Hibernian A.C.B. Society was held at 8 o'clock on Monday, 29th December, in the Catholic Boy's Schoolroom, Timaru. There was a goodly number of members in attendance. V.P. Bro. T. Sheehy occupied the chair. The routine business having been dealt with, Dr. Thomas' application for the medical attendance of the society was considered and unanimously accepted, and a number of members requested that their names be placed on his list. The nomination of officers for the ensuing half-year then took place, and will be balloted for at the half yearly meeting on the 8th of January next. One candidate was proposed for membership. The quarterly accounts amounting to £33 15s were passed for payment. This concluded the business of the evening. The usual vote of thanks was passed to the chairman, and the meeting terminated.

Mr. E. R. Bust, Secretary to the Auckland Trades and Labour Council writes as follows to the local Press:—"Sir,—Seeing that about half a century since our then meagre populace was threatened with the influx of an undesirable class of criminals, in protesting against which they spoke with no uncertain sound, to the lasting benefit of all classes of colonial society, I trust you will lend your loud voice and liberal columns in defending the people's rights, by denouncing General Booth's proposed scheme of shooting out all the worst of his irredeemable criminals to our peaceful shores, and thus prevent him transforming our dear adopted land, for the prosperity of which our sires have had to fight and toil, to bleed and die, into a veritable convict station, which must endanger the true manhood of

our sons, and the much desired refinement of our daughters. By inserting the following letter to General Booth, and requesting all classes to co-operate with us in taking prompt action to prevent this much-blessed Britain of the Southern Seas becoming the very hot-bed of infamy, you will confer upon a thankful public a lasting favour, and obtain their unfeigned appreciation." If only as a specimen of English composition, this appeal is worth preserving. "This much-blessed Britain of the Southern Seas" is, in particular, a delightful inspiration. Will General Booth, in one sense or another, lend our Britain an additional blessing?

Every honest supporter of the cause of Home Rule, and all who value the honour of Ireland (says the *Wellington Post*), will rejoice in the result of the election for North Kilkenny. It is the first Irish constituency to pronounce judgment on Mr. Parnell's audacious assumption of the right to still lead the Irish Home Rule party, and it has emphatically declared that by his immoral conduct, social improprieties, and treachery, he has forfeited the position, and that the Irish leader must be a man of moral worth, untarnished character, and unalloyed personal honour. His betrayal of his friend's wife is an offence which must appear particularly heinous in an Irishman's eyes. The electors of North Kilkenny have done their duty to their country and its cause by rejecting Mr. Parnell's nominee by a majority of 1146. . . . The result of this election will, we hope, end the discreditable attempt of Mr. Parnell to subordinate a great National cause to his own personal ambition, and convince him that the country desires he should retire from the position he has disgraced, and relieve the cause he professes to be devoted to from the incubus of his prominent association with it. Ireland has to choose between Parnell and Home Rule. Kilkenny has struck the true key-note.

The overwhelming defeat of Mr. Parnell's candidate in the Kilkenny election should (says the *Auckland Star*) bring the deposed Irish leader to his senses. The electorate only contains about six thousand voters, and the Parnellite candidate would have all the support that the landlords could give him, Lord Salisbury having sounded the key-note of the Conservative policy in his encouragement to the minority to carry on a faction fight. The majority of eleven hundred for the candidate favoured by the party led by Mr. Justin McCarthy ought to convince those members who have set Mr. Parnell above the cause of Home Rule that, however grateful the Irish people may be to Mr. Parnell for his past services, they will not countenance his conduct in splitting up the party to prevent him from suffering the penalty of his own social misdeeds. The Kilkenny election appears to have been accepted as a test, and its verdict will probably lead to an early re-union of the Irish members, working in harmony with the English Liberals. Mr. Parnell has brought additional humiliation upon himself, but no one can pity him under the circumstances.

It is highly fortunate (says the *Dunedin Star*), that a representative Irish constituency should have been called on at the present time to pronounce upon Mr. Parnell's extraordinary attitude, and it must be matter of rejoicing to all true friends of Ireland that the opportunity has been so properly utilised and an obvious duty so unequivocally performed. It would have been a great pity if Mr. Parnell had been able, owing to absence of a testing opportunity, to go on asserting that Ireland was with him in his preposterous claims; it would have been a far greater pity if, when the opportunity arrived, his assertion had been proved accurate. His expressions of bumper confidence after the elevation may be taken for what they are worth, which is assuredly not much; nor are we inclined to attach great weight to the reports of a possible reconciliation and reunion between the new and the "lost" leader of the Home Rule party. The idea, mentioned in a cablegram, that Mr. Parnell should retire from the present Parliament and be re-elected leader of the party, is absurd, and does not solve a single difficulty. Mr. Parnell's presence in Parliament may be undesirable, but it is at least a less violent outrage upon public opinion and the fitness of things than his continuance as leader of an important political party whose trust he has wantonly betrayed. Possibly the notion is that, as extra parliamentary leader there would be no necessity for his coming into personal contact with Mr. Gladstone and other Liberal leaders who decline the honour of further political relationship with the co-respondent in O'Shea v. O'Shea and Parnell; but Mr. Gladstone's casuistical tastes are hardly likely to go the length of submitting to such a device. The plain fact is that the Home Rule party have to choose between Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Parnell—between the statesman who has made the Irish Nationalist cause a living reality and the politician who has struck it a cruel blow. We trust we are safe in taking it for granted that the choice has really been made in the direction indicated by the result of the Kilkenny election.

This world is neither wise enough nor charitable enough (says the *Dunedin Globe*), to refrain from visiting the sons of champions upon the cause they have espoused, and there are many who will do their utmost to make Home Rule suffer for the iniquities of Parnell. This is manifestly unjust, for while that cause is closely identified with that statesman's career it has no connection with violations of the seventh commandment. Home Ruler is not a synonym for adulterer. At the same time it may be urged, and justly so, that a certain amount of suspicion must attach itself to a cause which so warmly commends itself to one who has shown himself to be dead to all moral sense and to every principle of honour. It would therefore be well if Ireland were united in condemning in unmistakable language the actions with which Parnell has stained their name, for until his abominable conduct has been repudiated by his countrymen, a bar sinister will rest upon the escutcheon of Home Rule. There is no nation in the world more noted for its gallantry and chivalry than the Irish, and we feel certain that not even the love of Home Rule will permit them to tolerate in their leaders those vices which would