

theory of Colonial Constitutions) England would have no right to interfere with any Act of the Irish Government.

Under Asquith's Act, Ireland, it is scarcely necessary to say, would possess none of these powers, and Asquith's Act represented the maximum England was prepared to give a few years ago. Indeed, it represented more than the maximum, as subsequent events showed. What chance is there then for Dominion Home Rule in view of the two proposed partition settlements? What has happened to justify the hopes for such an ideal settlement as Mr. Russell proposes, or is said to propose? Is it the Easter Week rebellion? No, for the Lloyd George proposals came after that event. Is it pressure from America? Surely not, for American pressure would be at its greatest—she had so much to give—before she joined the Allies, and it behoved her much to conciliate such a large section of her people as the American Irish—a people who are ever the first to respond to a call to arms. Is it that England has become suddenly ashamed of the hypocrisy of her attitude as the defender of the small nationalities? I think not. England has always been the champion of freedom everywhere—outside Ireland. As T. D. Sullivan sang long ago—

"O, Freedom is a glorious thing,
E'en so our gracious rulers say,
And what they say, sure I may sing
In quite a legal, proper way."

"They praise it up with all their might,
They praise the men that seek it too,
Provided all the row and fight
Is out in Poland—thiggin' thu!"

In my opinion, then, there is little to justify the hopes of the friends of Ireland who expect that a full measure of Dominion self-government will be given to Ireland. We may be sure that a dozen schemes (including Mr. Russell's) were, or are, under the consideration of the Dublin Convention, and we may be equally certain that if, as a wonder, some scheme is agreed on, it will not be one for full Colonial self-government.

I have been thinking that there is a great deal of ambiguity about this phrase "Colonial self-government." In each of the two great English dominions, Canada and Australia, there are two forms of self-government. Take Australia, for example. There is the Commonwealth or Federal Government for the whole country, and each of the States has a government of its own for local affairs. It is easy enough for unthinking people to confuse the larger form of government with the smaller, both being forms of self-government as it exists in the colonies. May not something of this kind have happened in describing the proposed settlement for Ireland.

Things have come to such a pass that it is admitted there by all parties that Ireland must have some form of Home Rule. In casting about for a plan which would give her full local self-government and preserve the essential unity of the British Empire the federal system has often been discussed since the time of O'Connell. Davis favored such a scheme: so did Butt, seeing Repeal to be impossible. The question of the federation of the United Kingdom seems to be in men's minds again, as part of the larger scheme of federating the Empire. There is much to be said in favor of it. It would give Ireland complete control of her local affairs—as complete as the English people would have of theirs, or the Scotch of Scottish affairs. In this manner it would preserve the self-respect of all classes of Irishmen. They would be one of a group of sister nations united for common purposes by a federal parliament. It is said the Orangemen are not violently opposed to a settlement on federal lines, and that Carson's principal objection to Asquith's Act was that it did not fit in with such a scheme.

I have not seen any details of Mr. Russell's scheme, but I cannot help thinking from some of the names

given as favoring it, that it proposes a scheme of federation such as I have alluded to. At the present conjuncture of affairs I do not think "full Dominion self-government" on the lines enjoyed by (say) New Zealand is possible of attainment.—I am, etc.,

CH. O'LEARY.

Wairarapa, August 10.

THE WAR, POLITICIANS, AND OTHERS.

TO THE EDITOR.

The *Tablet* has had the temerity to quote a passage from Dr. O'Dwyer's Pastoral protesting against the policy of cultivating a blind, unreasoning, and unreasonable hatred of everything German, and insinuating that perhaps the German considered he had right on his side just as we considered we had right on our side. The *Tablet* should have known that such a quotation would have pained Mr. Nosworthy, M.P., who does not believe in the practice of charity, but whose bosom swells with righteous indignation and hatred of the Germans and everything German. When Mr. Nosworthy has the job in hand might he not also arraign President Wilson, who in his war speech said, "We have no quarrel with the German people, we have no feeling towards them but one of friendship and sympathy. We are glad to fight for the liberation of the German people." Does not this seem to indicate that President Wilson is using language which is tainted with sedition? If a Cork jury managed to bring in a verdict of wilful murder against the Kaiser is there not a reasonable hope that Mr. Nosworthy could have President Wilson sent to gaol for sedition? If President Wilson is fighting for the German people then he is not our ally. If he were an ally he would be preaching hatred of the Germans like Nosworthy, whose patriotism and allied propensities cannot be questioned. Like Mark Twain "I'm perturbed" over the international political situation. France is beginning to think that perhaps President Wilson is a Jesuit in disguise. It would be just a Jesuit's game to fight for the Kaiser. Has not the Kaiser the Jesuits under his control: or is he their superior general? Evidently he is not rigidly attached to one religious Order of the Catholic Church, for I see by the papers that just before the war broke out he robed himself in the garb of a Franciscan and consecrated a Catholic church in Palestine! It's a tough proposition this of locating the Jesuits. We used to think the Kaiser was a Lutheran, but he must be a Jesuit or a Franciscan. A fair amount of evidence could be adduced to show that General Sir William Robertson is a Jesuit in disguise. I have a strong suspicion, too, though I have only circumstantial evidence for my conclusions, that Rev. Howard Elliott is also a Jesuit in disguise. He is starting a campaign of bigotry that must have the effect of knitting more closely together those who are the victims of his attack. He is an organiser of the Orange lodges, but no doubt he is paid by the Jesuits as an organiser as well. His campaign will drive all honest and fair-minded men into sympathy with Catholics, as only a few of Howard Elliott's audience will be so impressed with his arguments as to believe that the Pope and not the Kaiser caused the war. Hence I say that Howard Elliott needs watching, for clearly he is an emissary of the Jesuits, and in the secret service of the Vatican, the Pope of course not being particular about his agents so long as they serve his ends.—I am, etc.,

JAMES McMANUS.

REPRESENTATIVES' MOVEMENTS

MR. RYAN—Hastings and Napier.

MR. DEERE—Auckland.

MR. HANRAHAN—Invercargill.

HAYWARD'S PICKLES ARE THE BEST.

They easily outclass the rest. If your grocer is out of stock. Try any live Grocer's shop.

S. F. ASHUR

PAINTER, PAPERHANGER, GLAZIER, ETC., 215 PRINCES ST., DUNEDIN.
Importer of Paints, Oils, Colors, Varnishes, Brushware, Paperhangings, Picture
and Room Mouldings, Sheet and Colored Glass, Etc.—TELEPHONE 1326.