

thought, and to entertain high purposes. . . Not least upon us is laid the apostolic injunction to think on those things which are of good report. Perennial is the command; perennial are the rewards, written large upon individual character, and upon the lives of those intrusted to our care." The lesson is such that those who run may read. Dr. Truby King sets it forth in the following brief but meaning words: 'This, surely, is the point of view which we should impress upon our inebriate patients—that their ultimate redemption from vice and disease must rest largely with themselves, and that while in the Home they must be equipping themselves in body, mind, and morals for an outside environment full of pitfalls and temptations.' But there's the rub. Which of us has not known inebriates to rise, by grace and personal effort and watchfulness, superior to temptation? But the heart-breaking feature of this mysterious failing is the way in which it plucks the eyes out of some men so that they cannot see or realise their state, and are satisfied and soak their swill, without effort and with little remorse, till the undertaker plants them in the drunkards' unhonored graves.

## ATTACK BY A 'DEFENCE' ASSOCIATION

### CHARGES AGAINST AN IRISH PRIEST

The following further correspondence on the subject appeared during the past week in the Dunedin 'Evening Star'.

Sir,—Some years ago Sir Edward Fry laid down to lawyers on both sides of a commission of inquiry this golden rule of discussion: 'So conduct the case on either side as to generate the maximum of light and the minimum of heat.' If this sound maxim had been followed by the officials of the organisation which calls itself the Protestant 'Defence' Association, they would never have let loose the hot tornado of violent personal invective which swept through two of your columns on last Saturday. I happen to have a slight acquaintance with the president and the secretary of that society, and I fancied that they, at least, had a sufficient measure of self-respect to avoid associating themselves with the authorship of a letter containing nearly a hundred lines of mere vulgar and irrelevant abuse.

Personal vituperation may be a part of the new system of 'defence' devised by the 'Defence' Association, but it will not defend them against the obligation, to which they are both morally and in honor bound, to either prove or withdraw the fearful accusations which they launched, in your issue of August 27, against Father Denis O'Hara, a parish priest in Mayo, Ireland. These charges were set forth in detail in my two previous letters. Briefly stated, they run as follow:—That Father O'Hara organised a criminal 'conspiracy,' 'trumped up false accusations,' and suborned perjury in order to injure a police constable.

I have already twice called upon this 'Defence' Association to make good their fearful attack upon the personal character of Father O'Hara. Each of my challenges has been followed by certain curious and significant facts. Here are some of them:—

First Curious Fact.—Not so much as the ghost of an attempt has been made by the 'defenders' to sustain their quoted attack upon Father O'Hara.

Second Curious Fact.—From the moment that I challenged them to proof of their accusations, the terms 'conspiracy,' 'trumped up,' and 'false accusations' have not been mentioned by them even once. These expressions have suddenly become 'tapu.' And there has been no whisper, not a breath, about subornation of perjury.

Third Curious Fact.—Since the publication of my demand for proof of their shocking accusations against a popular and greatly respected clergyman there has not appeared in either of the lengthy communications of his assailants so much as a sentence, phrase, or word that, by any stretch of legitimate interpretation, could be taken

To Mean Criminal 'Conspiracy,'

'trumping up false accusations,' or suborning perjury. On August 27 the bold 'defenders' were positive to the point of enthusiasm when they fired their volley of accusation at Father O'Hara from behind a hedge. Why did they take so promptly to their heels as soon as a friend of Father O'Hara stood up and faced them? Why

can they no longer write down the words criminal 'conspiracy,' 'trumping up false accusations,' and subornation of perjury, and couple them with the name of Father O'Hara?

'Why, oh why  
So enchantingly shy'

on these matters, yet so voluble on others that are beside the present issue? There must be an adequate cause for this sudden dumbness that has seized our gallant defenders! What is that cause? I shall pause for a reply.

It is obviously

#### No Proof of Criminal Conspiracy,

malicious lying, and subornation of perjury to assert (even on the strength of a 'faked' or garbled quotation) that Father O'Hara spoke to a witness in connection with the case. So (according to Chief Secretary Wyndham's statement of June 20) did a Protestant police inspector. And the same is done without the suspicion of felony, by police and lawyers in Dunedin every day in the ordinary course of their duties. Neither does it prove Father O'Hara to be a criminal conspirator, a har of diabolical malevolence, and a suborner of perjury to assert (1) that the incriminated constable was 'tried' twice, and (2) that at the first 'trial' it was decided that 'there was not a single word of truth in any of the accusations' laid against him. The first of these two statements is untrue; the second (to which I may again refer) is a fabrication. (1) I have all along stated that the constable was 'tried' by one and only one properly-constituted 'Court of Inquiry.' This is precisely what Chief Secretary Wyndham officially declared in the House of Commons on June 20, 'There was,' he said, 'no second Court.' And again: 'There was no second Court of Inquiry. The first inquiry was an investigation, not on oath.' (I quote from the 'Weekly Irish Times'—one of the extreme organs of the Orange party in this case—issue of June 25, p. 2.) There was therefore only one 'trial.' That 'Court of Inquiry' found the constable guilty on two serious charges, one of them being, according to Mr. Wyndham, a charge of 'gross immorality.' That judgment constitutes and remains a legal presumption that the charges referred to are true in point of fact, and not 'trumped up.' And this legal presumption must endure until set aside by a higher or at least equal court. (2) Under pressure from the Orange members of Parliament, Mr. Wyndham improperly over-rode, without a fresh trial, the verdict of a regular and

#### Properly-constituted Court of Inquiry.

But he expressly declined to question the truth of any part of the evidence adduced at the trial. His interference was based on an interpretation of the evidence and on alleged 'new facts,' and not on any lack of truth in the evidence. Father O'Hara calls for a fresh trial. The Irish Nationalist party demand it. The constable's Orange friends in the House decline to do so. Their attitude is rough on the constable, who, if innocent, should in justice be afforded an opportunity of clearing his character. (3) But even if the charges against the constable were proved by a dozen courts to be untrue, it would obviously not follow that Father O'Hara 'trumped them up,' or that he entered into a criminal 'conspiracy' and suborned perjury to compass the man's ruin.

I may add that during the whole course of the agitation of the lodges against Father O'Hara, the Orange members, even when under the protection of parliamentary privilege, never accused him of 'trumping up' the case against the constable or of inciting witnesses to commit perjury. And in the midst of the 'midsummer madness' (as it is called), the brethren in Ulster did not go the length of accusing Father O'Hara of criminal 'conspiracy,' 'trumping up false accusations,' or suborning perjury. These shocking accusations have been imported into this controversy by their brethren of the 'Defence' Association in Dunedin.

Our bold 'defenders' have, however, elected to run away from their own published statements in this connection. I now, for the third time, invite them to pluck up their courage, and either establish their accusations by adequate proof or manfully withdraw them. If they adopt either course, well and good. If they do not, I shall claim the privilege of a further word upon the matter.—I am, etc.,

EDITOR 'N.Z. TABLET.'

September 12.

Cardinal Gibbons, on July 14, celebrated the eighteenth anniversary of his elevation to the Cardinalate, and on July 23rd completed his seventieth year. The Cardinal is in excellent health—his eye bright, his step alert, and his intellect unimpaired.