have canvassed for a boycott of Catholics as Catholics. Persecution—always the besetting sin of Protest-antism—is the first and last aim of the P.P.Ass. Cowards, liars, calumniators of the dead, hired mudslingers and scavengers, there is nothing short of murder they would stop at where we are concerned. Even the most plausible of them are not to be trusted. They smile and smile and be villians; they make fair public professions; they disavow any hatred or animus; but all the same they will call on Protestant employers and tell them to dismiss their Catholic hands. will even threaten and try to blackmail those who defy them; and unfortunately not many have the moral courage to do so in this parson and wowser-ridden land of ours which in their lying way they call a Protestant country. Fair words, conciliation, moderation are lost in dealing with them. Be sure that there is not one of them from Auckland to the Bluff who does not approve of every dirty trick done by the horsewhipped cad, and their only regret is that he was found out. For honest business men there is but one way of dealing with the scoundrels who come blackmailing them, and that way is the order of the boot, conferred with as much vigor as possible. However, let us examine their boycotting scheme and see if it be any more respectable than the rest of their known activities.

Boycott is, we all know, derived from the name of a certain obnoxious Captain Boycott in Ireland. Generically, like wars and strikes, it is an organised endeavor to secure by force, physical or moral what cannot be got by persuasion. It is a sort of reprisal. For instance, in Ireland people used to say to a shopkeeper: "Give up supplying the landlord or we will no longer deal with you." Similarly we may say to our bookseller: "If you continue to sell filthy Protestant 'literature' we Catholics will not buy from you." But, properly speaking, boycotting means an organised conspiracy of a number of persons who combine to force a person or persons to do something by making the person or persons suffer in some way until he or they yield. In this way it was used by the plundered Irish tenants against the landlord classes who had the might of England behind them, as had every band that ever persecuted the Irish people. Mainly by boycotting the Irish secured the unity and the power that in time smashed landlords. If we may digress let us note that in order to save the landlords England tried every means that she is trying to-day to save the Orangemen, and England was beaten. It is clear that the boycott was used in Ireland against an absolutely unjust and despotic system and by a poor people who had no other weapon at their command. But we must admit that even then there were abuses of the boycott. Even under the best circumstances it lends itself readly to abuse. It may easily become a means of persecution and au outrage against justice. Consequently, though right in principle, its morality will in the concrete depend circumstances.

Restricting Principles

From Father Hull's Civilisation and Culture, we gather the following clear summary of the principles which determine the lawfulness of a boycott:—
(1) The grievance must be real. Something is

done which is unfair and wrong, so that it is almost

a duty to secure redress.

(2) The method of boycott must be reasonable and just, and must have some direct connection with the grievance. For instance, it must not consist in burning down a man's house or attacking his life; for such actions are always wrong in themselves.

(3) The boycott must not involve injustice against other and innocent parties; it must be free and spontaneous, and not the substitution of one tyranny for

another.

(4) It must not be extended to a whole class un-

less the whole class is guilty.

(5) It must not be too far-fetched. There must be some natural connection between the grievance and the reprisal. Thus it is fair to refuse to buy books from a man who sells anti-Catholic filth; but it would be wrong to boycott him for his religious or political

Applying the foregoing principles to the P.P.Ass. method of boycott, we find that the followers of the calumniator of the dead have not a single justifying circumstance on their side. They have no grievance, and no excuse but that of religious bigotry. Their methods are neither just nor fair. They attack innocent parties, and they attempt to blackmail or boy-cott those who will not obey them. They exercise They exercise tyranny of the worst and most cowardly kind. boycott is extended to a whole class, not with the object of securing a redress but with the aim of persecuting members of the Catholic Church. It is exercised for no other reason than that Catholics are Catholics, and that bigotry pays a few scoundrels who would not be tolerated in any civilised and rightly governed country in the world. They try to defend themselves by lies which, however they may deceive hysterical old females of both sexes and rabid parsons who can preach no other Gospel than "To Hell with the Pope," all intelligent people know to be lies. In a word, the P.P.Ass. boycott which is now exercised against Catholics in New Zealand and Australia, under the so-called Government of Hughes and Massey who both owe their position to the work of rabid No-Popery agitators, is base, immoral, and tyrannical. On the whole, it is a fair sample of the sort of British Fair On the Play that Catholics are at present enjoying in most parts of the Empire under the flag that men were forced to fight under for the abolition of despotism and the maintenance of equal rights for all. we who defend our rights against the bigots are blamed for speaking out too boldly. But we would have those who imagine that our defence of our rights has anything to do with the matter, remember that long before we came to the Tublet the P.P.Ass, lecturer had begun his calumnies in the Dominion, and that for some mysterious reason the Government permitted him to carry on his campaign during the war when it was desirable that there should be no dissension. If any person will explain to us why the Government tolerated-and by its silence encouraged-that campaign we shall be grateful. Our own opinion is that the present "statesmen" were at the back of the nefarious plot from first to last. It would be indeed interesting to publish the sources of the P.P.Ass. funds. We may say that we are not without some knowledge on that head.

HOW SINN FEIN METES OUT JUSTICE.

"Received through the medium of the Irish Volunteers the sum of £1.752, being the amount recovered by them of the money stolen at Killonin on April 2, 1920."

Such, says the Irish Bulletin, was the receipt, signed by Mr. H. C. Linton, general manager G.S. and W. Railway Co., and dated July 20, 1920, which was handed by the manager to a clergyman who stated that he was acting purely as an intermediary, and who called at the manager's office and handed him notes for the amount

At the same time the clergyman presented a statement indicating that the Republican police had traced and arrested the robbers who had held up the G.S. and W. Railway pay train at Killonin (Co. Limerick), removing a large cure of means. ing a large sum of money.

The Republican police recovered £1,780 10s, from which was deducted £28 10s, expenses incurred in tracing the thieves, and, it was stated, if information was given at once as to the exact amount stolen probably the whole amount would have been recovered.

It was pointed out that the matter had involved considerable effort and personal danger to the young men who recovered the money, and who were inspired in the difficult work purely by ideals of social order and justice. Such action, it was further stated, when militarist efforts were being made to destroy the economic life of the nation might be taken as proof of "clean and straight justice to all within the Irish Republic."

Manufacturers of Electric Toasters, Radiators, Ovens, Caliphonts, Etc. (Iron, Steel and Oven Works), Salamander Ranges, used by Australian and New Zealand Defence Departments, New Zealand Railways, Hotels, Etc. Roberts Ltd.