

and recognise his worth. Well-informed secular journalists bear out what we have already published concerning him. A striking corroboration is found in a letter from the Rome correspondent of the *Manchester Guardian*, of March 23. He says:

"An authoritarian Government such as that of Signor Mussolini could not fail to make itself felt in regard to some matters which Liberal Governments have generally preferred not to touch.

"Although neither a Clerical nor a bigot, Mussolini made it clear from the first days of his conquest of power that the Catholic religion would in future receive very different consideration from the Government to that which it had received in the past. The crucifix was replaced, near the King's portrait, in the school halls. Religious instruction in the elementary schools was given special attention by the Minister for Education. The name of God appears frequently in Government manifestos and proclamations. And in many public celebrations Mussolini and his Ministers prayed in public. The belief is prevalent among the lower classes that Mussolini goes to Mass every morning before commencing work.

"Break With Freemasonry.

"Fascism has, moreover, officially broken with Freemasonry, an act which has won it the sympathies of the Vatican and the Catholic Partito Popolare. It is premature to state, as some papers have done, that the Roman question has thus come much nearer to a solution. Probably Signor Mussolini makes no such claim. In doing homage to the Catholic religion he shows his desire to increase the respect for moral values. In a country like Italy the lower strata of society lack all other bases of moral and political discipline.

"Apart from these general tendencies, the Government has begun to take action by police ordinances against immoral literature and pictures. Immediately after the war Milan especially became a busy centre for the publication of loose novels, of mediocre and worse literary quality, with offensive illustrations. Certain writers secured a period of fame and profit by playing down to the vulgar tastes of war profiteers, cocaine victims, and the cafe-concert public. The police have now proscribed and confiscated a great part of this literature. Some police commissioners have gone even further in their campaign; there are towns, for example, in which Casanova's *Memoirs*, Colette Willy's *Vagabonds*, and Maupassant's *Bel Ami* are proscribed. The protests of the press have been heeded by the Government, and it may be hoped that in future the rigors of police action will fall only on morally equivocal works of no literary importance."

### The Free State Constitution

Supporters of Document No. 2 protest that the Treaty did not give Ireland everything that was her right. That is certainly true, but by the same reasoning Document No. 2 stands condemned, for it gave Ireland, in name only, more than the Treaty. De Valera's oath differed from that of the Treaty only by a quibble, as Cardinal Logue said. Document No. 2, in spite of the claims of its friends, left the Ulster question exactly where it is, and with less hope of future settlement. How far-reaching the much-abused Treaty was may be seen by the fact that it has had no small influence in arousing the Canadians to a sense of the independence that is really theirs. South Africa also realises the importance for her of the explicit recognition of the national independence of the Irish Free State, and it may even happen in time that there will be found in New Zealand men and women strong enough and noble enough to imagine that they too are fit for something better than being pawns in the hands of politicians directed from Downing Street. In the *Nation and Athenaeum* for March 31, we find the following reference to the bearings of the Irish Treaty on the affairs of the Dominions:

"The constitutional status of the Irish Free State will be fertile of action and counter-action between the Dominions. A sign of this is the lively interest taken in Ireland in the circumstances of the Canadian Halibut Treaty and the evidence from Ottawa of a similar in-

terest in the Irish constitution. When the Canadian Government overbore Sir Auckland Geddes's resistance and successfully insisted on the solitary signature of M. Lapointe, the Canadian press hailed the new Treaty as the first-fruits of a virtually independent treaty-making Power. If this is an overstatement it has still more of the logic and facts on its side than the conservative criticism and explanation. The King appears to have unreservedly taken the advice of the Canadian Government, who sought the issue of full powers to its representatives. Meanwhile, Major Power, a Quebec member, has brought forward a resolution inviting the House of Commons to affirm that henceforth Canada, except in case of invasion, cannot be committed to participation in war without the authority of her Parliament. The occasion of the resolution derives from Mr. Lloyd George's recent action towards Canada in the Near Eastern imbroglio, but the text of the resolution is the text of Article 49 of the Irish Free State Constitution. These matters are followed attentively in Ireland. The difference of opinion on the Anglo-Irish Treaty arose in part from some misconception of the extent of the implied powers flowing to Ireland from it. The difference between Document No. 2 and the authority exercised by Mr. Lapointe in the course of his day's work becomes the shadow of a shade. Add Sir Clifford Sifton's programme and it virtually disappears. Such events may smooth the way to peace in Ireland, of which steadily maintained optimistic reports deriving from the South of Ireland and from, it may be assumed, Republican sources, are still current this week. The presence of Monsignor Luzio in Ireland will add some popular credit to these rumors. The journey to Rome of two Republican envoys of protest was apparently skilfully availed of by the Holy See to send Monsignor Luzio to Ireland on what is described as a private mission which does not exclude peace objects."

### O'Higgins on de Valera's Conduct

In the course of a second interview Mr. Kevin O'Higgins (whose aged father was recently assassinated by the Irregulars) threw further light on the quibbling which has marked de Valera's conduct ever since the Treaty was ratified by Dail Eireann. Dealing with the conditions which led up to the signing of the Treaty, Mr. O'Higgins said:

The situation was well understood by the Cabinet of Dail Eireann and by Dail Eireann itself. Mr. de Valera had made it perfectly clear by explaining to us in private that "it had really boiled down to a question of what we were going to sell the cow for."

Now I do not want to be taken as blaming Mr. de Valera for giving up the "Republic," as he did when he spoke to us of "selling the cow," and more particularly when he drafted Document 2 (of which I spoke last week) as his ideal settlement. (I think that was a necessity of the situation, and the only course consistent with his own interpretation of the Dail oath). I merely wish to emphasise the fact that he did quite definitely abandon the "Republic," and, consequently, has not the right to talk about it now, still less to use it as an excuse for plundering the Irish people and burning their homes.

It is true that in public Mr. de Valera had not been as outspoken as he was in private. In public, he had merely said "We are not Republican doctrinaires," and "we do not negotiate to save faces." This was the diplomatic intimation to the British that "the cow" was for sale. It follows, then, that Mr. de Valera's quarrel with Michael Collins and Arthur Griffith was not based on the fact that "the cow" had been sold. It was a question of the price. Mr. de Valera's price was Document No. 2, with its oath to "recognise the King of Great Britain as Head of the Associated States" (Ireland being one of these States), and its yearly money vote to the King's personal revenue in token of that recognition.

And Mr. de Valera, author of Document 2, who was "not a Republican doctrinaire," who merely took the Dail oath as "a pledge to the people to do the best he could for them," who "would never put himself in

**OVERCOATS**  
**For Men & Boys**

Large Selection  
Great Values

**Simson's**

Clothier & Mercer  
Feilding