

promising hostility to priestcraft and all its ways and wiles. Deliver your Ulsterman from the fear of Romish tyranny, and he would accept "Home Rule" to-morrow.'

*

This stale and hollow talk about 'Romish tyranny' and intolerance in Ireland has been many times refuted, but never, perhaps, more completely and effectively than in the case of this ill-starred deliverance of the Belfast divine. The refutation has come, too, not from indignant Irish Catholics, but from Irish Protestant M.P.'s—men who for years have lived, and moved, and had their being in the very thick of this 'Romish tyranny.' And here is what they have to say. Captain Donnellan, M.P. for East Cork, taking occasion to refer to the matter in the course of an address to his supporters, remarked that the recent contest had served a useful purpose, for it had completely disposed of the fiction of Catholic intolerance in Ireland. 'Very few Irish Protestants, he was happy to say, were misled by it, and English Protestants were now, as a rule, too well-informed to be any longer frightened. Nevertheless, a case such as his would help to dispel any lingering doubt that some few Protestants might still have on the subject. As they were all aware, he stood there as an Irish Protestant, and as an Irish Protestant he had hitherto been invariably returned unopposed during the space of nearly twenty years to represent one of the most Catholic constituencies in Ireland. When a contest was forced upon him, who were the first to stand solidly at his back? The Catholic clergy of East Cork. It would be well indeed if Protestant Antrim would take a lesson from Catholic Cork in religious toleration. The catch-cry of "No priests in politics," would always meet the reception it deserved from the Irish people, and it would be an evil day for the country when the Irish clergy ceased to exercise their rights as citizens in the country of their birth.'

*

Mr. Swift MacNeill, M.P., one of the ablest and most respected of the Nationalist members, is still more pointed and emphatic. In a letter to the London *Daily News*, he thus gives Dr. Hanson his final quietus: "Dr. Hanson's fear of 'Romish tyranny,' in which he desires English Protestants to participate, in the event of the establishment of Home Rule, if I may say so in all courtesy to an old acquaintance, is unworthy of him. Taylor, a Protestant writer in his *History of the Civil Wars of Ireland*, says in reference to Irish Catholics: "It is but justice to this maligned body to add that on the three occasions of their obtaining the upper hand they never injured a single person in life or limb for professing a religion different to their own. They had suffered persecution and learned mercy, as they showed in the reign of Mary, in the wars from 1641 to 1648, and during the brief triumph of James II." I, myself, am one of the Irish Protestant minority, the son and grandson of Irish Protestant clergymen of the late Established Church. What a victim of "Romish tyranny"—this is what Dr. Hanson calls his "bogey"—I have been, the representative in the House of Commons for four and twenty years of South Donegal, the most Catholic constituency in the British Empire, for which I have been returned by the Catholic Bishop, priests and people of that constituency. I am the holder of a chair in the National University of Ireland, an institution mainly established for the purpose of enabling the young people holding the faith of the great mass of the Irish people to receive the advantages of University education without any violation of conscience or danger to truth or morals. The authorities of that University have placed not me only, but several other Protestants in positions of trust for the teaching of their students, and have within the last few days appointed me Clerk of Convocation, an officer one of whose duties is to act as assessor to his Grace the Chancellor, the Most Rev. William Walsh, D.D., the Catholic Archbishop of Dublin. Oh! the horrors of "Romish tyranny!"

*

We can heartily forgive Dr. Hanson for an outburst which has evoked such a magnificent tribute to the tolerance of Catholic Ireland.

Signs of Life

'Cast thy bread,' says sacred Scripture, 'on the running waters; for after a long time thou shalt find it again.' For many a day the *N.Z. Tablet* has been sowing the seed of a 'divine discontent' with the condition of things under which Catholics have to bear such a heavy and unjust burden for the education of their children; and it would seem that the healthy public opinion which this paper has aimed at fostering among its readers is once again—as in earlier days—beginning to find voice. The revival of interest on the education question is shown on every hand. In Dunedin, as the outcome of the speeches on the subject made at the recent gathering of the Christian Brothers' Old Boys' Association, an interesting contro-

versy has arisen in which the Catholic position is being vindicated by Mr. J. B. Callan, Jun., with vigor and spirit, as well as with conspicuous ability and effectiveness. In Wellington, the correspondence columns of at least one of the dailies are literally filled with a discussion of the subject; and the energy with which the Catholic apologists have thrown themselves into the contest may be gathered from the representative letters which we publish on another page. Throughout the Dominion—as the result of the deliberate and considered utterances of his Grace Archbishop Redwood and of Bishop Grimes, and of the able Pastoral of Bishop Cleary—leading dailies have devoted editorials to the question, and in every way given the subject prominence. Here and there, in the course of some of the discussions, a little warmth may have been manifested—but that is a small matter. Where is there heat there is movement, and where there is movement there is life. On this vital matter, anything is better than stagnation. No man worked his way anywhere in a dead calm.

*

As a sort of corona to the Wellington controversy, Professor Mackenzie, of Victoria College, who has got the secularist 'microbe' very bad, has published a pamphlet entitled *Defence of the Secular Solution*. Professor Mackenzie is a Professor of English, though one would never have guessed it from a perusal of his pamphlet. Here, for example, is a specimen of 'English as she is wrote' by the Professor: 'It is the business of the Churches to indicate the divine implications of what the social conscience and an enlightened consensus of opinion pronounce good, true, and beautiful. In the name of all that is 'English' what does he mean by 'divine implications' in this portentous deliverance? And, apart from the English of the sentence, the Churches, by this time, are quite as likely to know what their 'business' is as is our agnostic Professor. It is the 'business,' presumably, of a Professor of English to teach English; but if he must leave his last, at least he might be modest enough to avoid heavy dogmatism of this order.'

*

Professor Mackenzie's main contention is that secularisation of education is inevitable, because of the divided state of religious opinion—that it affords 'a working compromise'—that it ensures us against sectarian strife—that it is necessary, in a word, in the interests of peace. 'Peace!' Do these upholders of secularism really delude themselves into believing, or think they can delude others into supposing that we have peace under the existing system. 'Peace'—while Catholic Bishops and Catholic laymen, whenever opportunity offers, are proclaiming with all the emphasis possible, their sense of the tyranny and injustice inflicted upon the Catholic body; 'peace'—while Anglicans and other non-Catholic bodies are working as they have never worked before to secure a radical alteration of the system; 'peace'—while our papers, as at Wellington, are full of wordy warfare and discussion—some of it of a by no means temperate character. It is—to borrow a phrase from Professor Mackenzie—'consummate nonsense,' to describe our existing system as 'a working compromise.' It is not a compromise at all—it is a surrender, total and complete, to the secularists. Having got all they wanted, and having absolutely nothing left to fight for, they sit back contentedly, and blandly tell us that the maintenance of the present system is necessary 'in the interests of peace!'

*

Other points in Professor Mackenzie's pamphlet have been fully and ably dealt with by the local correspondents whose letters we reproduce. We may, however, dwell a little on a very glaring inaccuracy which occurs on the very first page of his pamphlet; and that, too, on a point which he regards as fundamental. In addition to playing, in this pamphlet, the rôle of theologian, philosopher, moralist, scientist, and politician, Professor Mackenzie also sets up as an authority on history. With what looks suspiciously like the 'pride that apes humility,' he describes his competency as a historian in the following terms: 'Those of us who, in our modest way, are students of history—ancient and modern, sacred and secular—know something of the normal course of events in connection with the rise, progress, and triumph, as well as the decline, disintegration, and fall of human institutions.' And then he goes on to perpetrate the following blazing inaccuracy. After asserting that all Churches were originally the servants of the State, he continues: 'The history of the Christian Church is no exception to the rule. An institution that began in the service of the State (the italics are ours) gradually acquired such power and influence that it eventually employed the State in its service. The servant became master and vice versa.' What are we to think of a University Professor who can gravely attempt to palm off on the public