

faith and unity. Those who try to avoid either alternative—rationalism or Catholicism—must remain hung-up, so to speak, in mid-air, like Mahomet's coffin, between the mutually repellant poles of a Yes and No—of a negation of and an affirmation of the authority of the Church of Christ, not indeed to make the faith, but to propose and define the faith originally revealed by God.

More Outrages

When history has repeated itself in given circumstances fifty times, it is tolerably safe to predict that in similar circumstances it will repeat itself once more. One does not need to be a prophet or the son of a prophet to foretell thus much. Hence we took few risks when, a few months ago, we predicted that the approaching campaign for Home Rule to Ireland would be met by a bountiful crop of the usual mostly bogus 'agrarian outrages'. It is generally no easy matter to make the most moral and least criminal part of the British Isles yield a sufficient record of 'outrage' for the purposes of an anti-Irish political campaign. When (as in the early eighties) a Cabinet desires a catalogue for a fresh Coercion Act, it is reduced to making 'outrages' out of the whistling of Harvey Duff by a small boy, or out of an adult's smiling in a threatening manner at a 'peeler', or 'blowing his nose in a disrespectful manner' in the presence of another sensitive minister in the force. Or a Sergeant Sheridan and his uniformed 'pals' may obligingly perpetrate a convenient number of genuine outrages in their district, and then 'discover' them with rare acumen, and swear a number of innocent men into long terms of imprisonment. This, however, is neither a very safe nor popular method of swelling the statistics of Irish 'agrarian outrages' since the sensational exposures of 1902. In fact, the whole principle of 'faking' outrages for political purposes has fallen into considerable disrepute since then. It is now abandoned to the rag-tag-and-hobtail of the Irish 'yellow' press and party, and to a few of their echoes on the other side of the water.

They, however, are venomously inventive—as we predicted they would be. And if we were to credit their fairy-tales of a far-off land, Ireland is just now spotted over with a rash of 'agrarian outrage'. The stories of the 'outrages' are in nearly all cases generous generalities. They occur on a big scale, at no address, and their perpetrators have no local habitation or a name. For all their Argus eyes, the police are in a state of baptismal innocence as to knowledge of this newspaper 'outbreak'. So are the coroners, the justices, the judges and juries. And still like snowflakes fall over numerous counties the white gloves, that intimate the absence of criminal business assize after assize. The great and sudden moral slump is visible only to the yellow eyes of the initiated. Mr. Bryce (the late Chief Secretary for Ireland) poked the ribs of the outrage-mongers with gentle raillery at the farewell dinner which was given to him a few weeks ago at the Manchester Reform Club. We quote a part of his discourse from the 'Weekly Freeman' of February 2:—

If they were to believe all that was seen in the newspapers, or in some newspapers, they would think Ireland was in a state of suppressed insurrection, that the law was not enforced there, and that the whole country was given up to riot and violence. He was sorry to say there were some people in Ireland, ably seconded by some people in the English press also, who endeavored to represent the very worst about other people in Ireland, and who, whenever any little unfortunate incident occurred, endeavored to magnify it. A curious incident illustrated the way in which news from Ireland was given to the people of England. He alluded to a long letter of one and a half columns in the London "Times" a few days ago dilating upon a newspaper report of something that had happened at an eviction. The right hon. gentleman quoted the original allegations, and the authentic facts as supplied to him at the Castle, adding that it was the latest occasion on which

incidents in Ireland could be exaggerated when they were seen through partisan spectacles, and through the imagination of a newspaper reporter. He asked his audience when, in future, they read news of that kind, not to believe half, or a quarter, or, perhaps even five per cent., without some further investigation.

Five per cent? Well, many of them (as our columns have from time to time shown) are like the tales of old Lafeu's traveller, who 'lies three-thirds'—and 'should be once heard and thrice beaten'. They are the tribute that falsehood and injustice pay to reason, and right all the world over, from Paris to Timbuctoo. The lion, says Newman, 'rends his prey and gives no reason, but man cannot persecute without assigning to himself a reason for his act. His very moral constitution forbids contentment with mere brute force.' Hence when in France a 'machine' sets about the destruction of religion, or in Ireland seeks the perpetuation of an ancient wrong, reasons must be found which will furnish an apparent justification for their respective campaigns. And (as 'Mr. Doctey' remarks somewhere) they must be 'good, varchous raisons', too. And where the 'good, varchous raisons' fail, they are speedily found by the ready resort of misstatement and defamation. Against the Papacy, said Luther, 'I esteem all things lawful'. Against religion, says the Radical-Socialist 'Bloc', 'we esteem all things lawful'. Against Ireland's right to manage her own internal affairs, says the 'yellow' 'Bloc' in the Western Isle, 'we esteem all things lawful'. And as the truth does not happen to suit, 'vive le mensonge!'—hey, for a bold, thumping lie! Like the brazen termagant in Sheridan's play, the faction that Tammanies Ireland 'has a free tongue and a bold invention'. But, like her, they overdid it. The inscription on the gates of Busy-rane ran thus:—On the first gate: 'Be bold'; on the second gate: 'Be bold, be bold, be evermore bold'; on the third gate: 'Be not too bold'. The 'yellow' Irish Tammany has been too bold. It has overdone the 'outrage' ruse. And now it cries 'Outrage' to a wilderness of contemptuous incredulity. Even the cable-demon fails to echo their cry.

CHRIST-HUNTING IN FRANCE

A LAWYER ON THE SEPARATION LAW

Mr. Edgar H. Gans, a well-known and highly esteemed lawyer, recently gave, by request from the Baltimore 'Sun,' an account of the so-called 'Separation' Law in France from the standpoint of American law. His article was published in the 'Sun' of December 26, 1906. It has just been republished in pamphlet form by the International Catholic Truth Society, and makes an interesting review of the effort of the Radical-Socialist 'Bloc' to 'make an end of Christianity' and 'hunt Christ' out of France. The article runs as follows:—

The general impression on this side of the water seems to be that the separation of Church and State in France is like the separation we have in the United States, and many persons, who have not thoroughly studied the question, wonder why Catholics are opposed to the bill and have been instructed by the Pope not to organize religious associations under its provisions.

The truth is that there is no possible similarity in the condition of things in the two countries. Separation in the United States has the approval of Catholics; in France it has the condemnation of all. Why this difference?

Separation in the United States.

In the United States we have written constitutions which are superior to all legislation. Every legislative act must be in accordance with the constitution. If it is not it is utterly void and of no effect and will be so declared by the courts at the instance of every one whose constitutional rights are invaded.

In France, as in England, there is no constitution in this sense. The action of Parliament is supreme and no court can set it aside as unconstitutional.

WHENEVER you see a Smiling Woman, think of HONDIA-Lanka Tea! It always gives pleasure.

"HONDEE Lankka" is see so-much used tea of see family. Madam, she praise it—so get it "tee bon"!