

ishing woollen industries of the West and South, the trade in cattle, salt meat, wool, and (in 1831) the rich and flourishing tobacco-growing industry of the South?

2. Was it 'priestcraft' that robbed Ireland, in 1800, of the Grattan Parliament, which had given her the one bright gleam of prosperity that she has ever known since the English connection? History says that no Catholic had act or part in the black and wholesale 'bribery, force, and fraud' by which traitors sold their bleeding country 'as Judas sold his God.' That foul transaction and its fouler methods were devised by a British Prime Minister (Pitt), and carried out by a British Viceroy (Cornwallis). It cost from first to last £21,053,000, every penny of which had to be paid by the ruined and betrayed country. It was opposed by the overwhelming majority of the Irish people, including numerous Orange lodges; and the descendants of Pitt's purchased Irish tools are now the Tammany that rules the country from Dublin Castle.

3. Was it 'priestcraft' that, between 1800 and 1887, passed more than a hundred Coercion Acts for Ireland? The terrible and almost incredible nature of those Coercion Acts will be dealt with in a volume that will shortly be published at the office of this paper.

4. Was it 'priestcraft' that, since the Union in 1800, has ruled Ireland, not (as New Zealand is ruled) in accordance with the wishes of the majority of its people, but according to the dictation of a numerically small 'garrison' or ascendancy faction of landlord capitalists and their tools, alien in race and faith to the vast bulk of the population? Is it 'priestcraft' that, to this very hour, makes non-competitive positions of honor and emolument and power under the Government the close preserve of one particular creed, and which admits Catholics practically only when they are 'tame'—that is, renegades to their faith or to their country? Is it 'priestcraft' that so bars Catholics from employment in the municipalities of Derry, Belfast, Armagh, and Portadown, and in certain railway corporations, that Parliament has had repeatedly to interfere—even as late as 1907, and against a tremendous clamor—to abate the scandal in some slight degree? The details of this grave scandal have already been sufficiently placed before our readers. In the parts of Ireland where 'priestcraft' is alleged by the *Courier* writer to 'rule,' no such scandals prevail, and Protestants are treated with great generosity by elective public bodies in the matter of place and salary. We have in our possession figures covering a great part of Ireland, and in due course these will be placed by us in book-form before the public.

5. Is it 'priestcraft' that has filled the scandalously overmanned and over-paid Irish Bench with strong political partisans, nearly all of them of one particular religious faith? Here again we write with the figures before us. Is 'priestcraft' responsible for the maddening wrongs that are, even to this very hour, perpetrated by open and shameless jury-packing? It was this crying scandal, together with the deplorable and bitter partisanship of Irish judges, that (as English Lord Chief Justice Denham officially declared) made the administration of justice in Ireland 'a mockery, a delusion, and a snare.' It so happens that the Irish priesthood have all along opposed these bitter scandals. Frantic opposition to reform in this direction has all along come from the side that cries out against 'priestcraft.'

6. Was it 'priestcraft' that passed the terrible Irish land laws since the Union? North-east Ulster was happily protected by 'the Ulster Custom' (which had the force of law) against landlord tyranny and rapacity. Not so the rest of Ireland. Was it 'priestcraft' that four times confiscated the property of Irish Catholics before the Union, and many times since? Was it 'priestcraft' that furnished bayonets to Irish landlords to confiscate over and over again (even within the past few months) the tenants' interest in Irish land, and the vast property created by the farmers—estimated by the Right Hon. Mr. Shaw Lefevre at more than one-half of the total capital value of all the land in the country? Did 'priestcraft' make those laws which brought about the series of famines that, between the Union and 1880; slew, in round numbers, two million persons? According to the great statistician Mulhall, 1,225,000 persons died of famine in the first fifty years of the late Queen Victoria's reign. But there is worse to tell. These famines were all artificial. The two millions died in the midst of plenty. Was it 'priestcraft' that, in every one of those famines, sent the bayonets of the soldiery to seize for rack-rents, and exported before the eyes of the starving people (even in the famine of 1879-80), food that had been raised by them in sufficient quantity to have prevented a single death by hunger? Was it 'priestcraft' that (according to Mulhall) evicted, in the first fifty years of the late Queen's reign, 3,668,000 persons from their homes, at the point

of the bayonet, threw sick women, dying men, and infant children by thousands on the unsheltered roadsides in the bitter northern winters, and confiscated in a wholesale way the farmers' interest in their holdings and the property created by them? Did 'priestcraft' pass the Incumbered Estates Act in 1849—an Act under which millions of pounds of values created by Irish tenant farmers were seized by the Crown and auctioned in 'garrets' (as they were termed) in Dublin City? Was it 'priestcraft' that made people flee from such an oppressed country, or drove them out by great 'clearances,' till the population reduced from nearly nine millions in 1845 to only a little over four millions in the present year? Is it 'priestcraft' that makes Ulster the greatest sufferer by emigration? Is it 'priestcraft' that enables the landlords, to this hour, to levy rents on values created by the tenants, and to sell (and for payment for) these same values? It so happens that the Irish priesthood all along opposed these various forms of capitalist tyranny. The people who fought savagely inch by inch against reform were those who make pious protestations against 'priestcraft.'

7. Was it 'priestcraft' that (according to the economist Lough) moved the British Government to exact in taxes over £200,000,000 in repayment of 'the trivial relief' of a famine loan of £4,500,000 in 1846-7? Is it 'priestcraft' that makes the British Government overtax Ireland to the tune of nearly three millions a year above her taxable capacity, according to the 1896 report of the Financial Relations Commission, composed entirely of Englishmen of the first eminence in the world of finance? Was it 'priestcraft' that clapped £3,000,000 a year additional taxation on an impoverished country just after the great famine of 1846-51? The population of Ireland has been halved in fifty years, but its taxation has been doubled. And (as a table before us shows) a vast proportion of that increased taxation has been expended in finding more places and bigger salaries for the favored creed and the ruling caste. All this plunder and extravagance have been steadily opposed by the Irish priesthood. The defence of over-taxation and these crying administrative scandals comes from the party who cry out against 'priestcraft.'

We might give eye-opening details regarding the tithe war; the tithe proctors; the tens of millions of money that, during the nineteenth century alone, were dragged from the unwilling Catholics of Ireland for the maintenance of an alien creed; and the insurrectionary storms that were raised by sworn 'loyalists' when it was proposed to relieve Catholics of these terrible burdens. If any clergy has added to Irish poverty and discontent, that clergy is not the Catholic. On the contrary, it is largely due to their noble efforts that the position of the Irish people is becoming more tolerable, and that they are nearing the dawn of a better day. (1) To the intense chagrin of the great Irish Tammany, the Irish priests have ever been on the side of democracy and for the extension of popular rights. (2) They spurned the offer of Government salaries, and preferred to remain poor among the poor, who love them as the apple of their eye. (3) Of all the clergy in Ireland, they are relatively the least numerous and the least costly to their people. At the end of the year 1904 there were in Ireland 3542 priests (unmarried, of course) for 3,301,661 Catholics. That works out at one priest for every 934 Catholics. Deducting members of Religious Orders and priests engaged in teaching, there were 2714—that is, one in every 1206. According to the *Irish Church Directory* (Anglican) for 1903, there were 1724 Anglican clergymen in Ireland for 581,089 Protestant Episcopalians—which works out at one for every 331. There were 800 Presbyterian clergymen for 443,276 Irish Presbyterians (one for every 554); while the Irish Methodists had one clergyman for every 248 adherents. And counting in the families of the non-Catholic bishops and clergy, we arrive at a grand total of some 11,000 persons that have to be supported by the 1,086,371 Protestants of all sorts in 'the most distressful country,' as against the slender ecclesiastical households that are maintained by nearly three and a half millions of Catholics in Ireland. (4) Bitter an enemy as Fréde was of the Irish people and priests, he made a glowing eulogium of the purity of Irish Catholics, declared that crimes against morals are almost unknown among them, and added that this happy state of things is, to their eternal honor, due to the influence of the Roman Catholic clergy. The Blue Books before us show that Ireland is, in the matter of sexual crime, a model to the nations, and this despite the relatively low moral tone prevalent in the north-eastern counties of Ulster and (as the Registrar-General's returns, now before us, show) their high rate of illegitimate births. (5) To the Catholic clergy is also, no