

The Paris correspondent of the "Sunday Times", who is distinguished for his accuracy and constant impartiality—qualities totally lacking in most of his confreres—has been able to expose signally the manner in which the "Times" and other papers manufacture anti-Catholic news. On Wednesday of last week a number of British journals reported that M. Gaudin de Villaine had expressed regret that the French Catholics did not employ the methods of the Russian terrorists, and the "Times" was horror-struck that he should have advocated the use of the bomb in defence of religion. M. de Villaine, who is a French Deputy, did nothing of the sort. All he said, according to the "Sunday Times" correspondent, translating from the "Journal Officiel", "was that the Radical and Socialist majority vaunted to the skies Russian terrorists who used the latest developments of chemistry to further their propaganda, whilst French Catholics, who could put an end to the persecution directed against them very quickly if they had but a thousandth part of the energy displayed by the Russian revolutionaries, were resigned and submitted to their oppressors." Taking this simple truism, the "Thunderer" which has ceased to thunder to any effect—promptly twisted it into a bloodthirsty declaration of literal war on the Republic. It seems impossible for the English press to print the whole truth about French affairs; and we are surely not exaggerating when we say, that it is absolutely patent to all that there is, with one or two exceptions, a conspiracy of silence amongst the Paris correspondents of the London papers with regard to the anti-Catholic tactics of the French Government.

The fact that a story originates in Mexico, and is written by a missionary, seems now generally accepted by the American press as an a priori presumption of its falsehood. Experience shows that a similar principle may with a pretty safe conscience be applied to cable messages regarding the Catholic Church, that have their origin in Paris.

The Bumble Policy

Lord Dunraven once said something to this effect: 'There are forty Boards in Dublin Castle. One half of them exist to clean the outside of the windows of Dublin Castle; the other half exist to clean the inside of the windows of Dublin Castle. But those that clean the outside work at one time, and those that clean the inside work at a different time; and the result is that the windows of Dublin Castle are never clean'.

Which things are, of course, written for an allegory.

In a recent issue of London "Truth", Mr. Labouchere pokes the following gentle sarcasm at the forty and more bureaux of independent petty oligarchs that rule that hapless country: 'A modern Goldsmith might write of Ireland, after its long spell of Conservative Government, as a land "where Boards accumulate and men decay." If Dublin is not a "deserted" capital, its leading residential squares and streets are declining in social popularity. . . . The salaried officials swamp both town and country, increasing yearly, whilst the population decreases. Ireland has a strange past history, but its future one will beat the record, if things go on as at present. The great Land Department will have no one to give the land to, the Boards will supply an army of teachers without pupils, the members of Parliament will have no constituents, and yet no doubt the Irish question will still remain. The Irish themselves have their own opinion on the lasting nature of the Irish question. The country has always been ruled on the principles of the great Bumble towards those under his dominion. They do not ask, for more Boards, and they get them, nor for Royal Commissions, and they get them. The things that they ask

for, under the reasonable idea that they have the best knowledge of their own needs, are never given. Supposing the Bumble policy were reversed, might not the nature of the Irish question change too? It would at least be worth a trial.'

There can be no manner of doubt as to what the people ask. 'Connaught, Munster, and Leinster', said Mr. Donovan in Dunedin on last Thursday evening, 'are solid in favor of Home Rule. The majority of the Members of Parliament for Ulster are in favor of Home Rule. Eighty-five out of the country's one hundred and three representatives are in favor of Home Rule. This leaves eighteen standing out. Of the eighteen two are mere nominees, representing Trinity College. Of the sixteen that remain, four (Russell, Sloan, Glendinning, and, I think, Mitchell) are Independents, who would not touch the official party with a forty-foot pole. This leaves twelve irreconcilables. And eight out of the twelve, in the last Tory Parliament, drew Government salaries ranging from £2000 to £10,000 a year. It is easy to be "loyal" on £2000 to £10,000 a year'.

CHURCH AND STATE IN FRANCE

SOME PERTINENT HISTORICAL POINTS

In his 'Democracy and Liberty' (vol. I, p. 43) Lecky says of the Republican regime that has prevailed in France since the Second Empire met its death on the field of Sedan: 'Few French Governments have produced or attracted so little eminent talent, or have been, for the most part, carried on by men who, apart from their official positions, are so little known, have so little weight in their country, and have hitherto appealed so feebly to the imagination of the world.' Weakness or immaturity entrusted with high power is apt to play fantastic tricks before high heaven, and on occasion to hack at the personal and national rights which it is supposed to guard—just as the youthful George Washington hewed with unaccustomed hatchet at his father's cherry-tree. Lecky points out that as early as 1875 the French President assumed a position very little different from that of a constitutional monarch. Successive Governments, headed by stunted politicians of the Little Pendleton order, have steadily pursued a fatuous policy of war upon the Church and upon some of the natural Rights of Man which were respected even amidst the whirl and storm of the great Revolution—which the poet Samuel Rogers likened to the irruption of the Goths. Jules Simon denounced the Second Empire for its Caesarism. And Caesarism he defined as 'democracy without liberty.' The definition applies aptly to the present condition of things in lodge-ridden France.

From the fifteenth century till the outbreak of the great Revolution in 1789 the Catholic Church was a State institution in France. The King was the defender of its truths, the upholder of its rights and privileges—its eveque du dehors, or bishop, so to speak, in external or temporal matters. Monastic associations were, of course, subject to the Church. But certain of their temporal rights, functions, and duties were made the subject of State legislation; and the vows of professed members not alone bound them in conscience, but also gave rise to an external contract in canon law as between them and their ecclesiastical superiors, of which the civil law took strict and active cognisance. All this was brought to an end when the Revolution swept in all its fierce and headlong fashion over France. On August 26, 1789, the Revolutionary Assembly voted the declaration which severed the bond between Church and State. On February 15 of the following year (1790) an Act was passed which, so far as religious associations were concerned, marked the turning-point between the old order of things and the new. It decreed the non-recognition of monastic vows, deprived them of any binding force in law, left them purely a personal matter between the individual and his private conscience, and abolished the old legal provisions regarding cloister. The property of the Church was plundered. But the First Napoleon, recognising the necessity of religion in the country as a preventive of anarchy, entered into a Concordat by which a portion of the plundered revenues of the Church were devoted to the upkeep of the clergy and the due main-

KIA-ORA! Ehea!—Have you tried Hondai Lanka Tea? Plenty taste; plenty quality; not much price, Cock o' the North.

FOR XMAS PRESENTS—A 5lb. or 10lb. Box of Hondai Lanka Tea is always acceptable, and appreciated.