

consulted, by no means sustained D'Aubigné's statements. The historian of the 'Dark Ages' finally dismisses both him and his 'authority' with the following broadside: "M. D'Aubigné seems to think that whatever has been once said by ignorance, fraud, or folly, may be said again with impunity. He gave an 'authority'—why, so did Robertson, and Henry, and Warton, for various absurd falsehoods, as has appeared on turning to those authorities; but some things are so plainly false, that one does not need to look at the authority on which they are stated. If M. D'Aubigné had said, that by some singular infelicity the Saxon Reformer had been educated in an atheistical manner, and until he was twenty years old had been studiously prevented from coming to the knowledge of the fact that the Bible existed—that he had been kept by his father in the woods, never taught to read, or allowed to go to church, or converse with Christians—if M. D'Aubigné had told us even this, strange as it is, upon respectable contemporary authorities, it would of course be our duty to look at them; but when the story is told of a young gentleman whose religious education had been particularly attended to, and who had of his own free will been working hard at Occam, Scot, Bonaventure, and Thomas Aquinas, it is too much. We do not need to look at the authority. We can only lament the pitiable ignorance of the writer who could repeat such nonsense." (*Dark Ages*, p. 547).

The Press and Home Rule

Our New Zealand Conservative press still keep prosing away about the difficulties in the way of Home Rule. In reality, they are all in favor of the principle of Irish self-government—at least, in a vague and inarticulate sort of way, they convey that impression—but being Conservative papers, with a proper regard to their traditions, they are not in a position to take a strong line on the question. Consequently, we are treated to a series of milk-and-watery, non-committal, yes-no deliverances, irresistibly suggestive of the aphorism that speech was given us to conceal our thoughts. The latest to fall into line is our esteemed contemporary, the *Otago Daily Times*. The *Dominion* professed to be worried about the financial aspect of the problem; the *Christchurch Press* was afraid Mr. Redmond was aiming at separation; the *Otago Daily Times*—so far as we can gather anything definite at all from its article—is uneasy in its mind about the fate of Protestants and of Ulster under Home Rule. In the name of all that is reasonable, what stronger or more explicit pledges and guarantees could be asked for than those that have been given by Mr. Redmond. Here are his own words as uttered in the House of Commons during the debate on the Address-in-Reply on February 15:—"As to intolerance, he asserted with emphasis that no man who knew history could bring a charge of intolerance against the mass of the Irish people, and he would not accept a solution of the problem which they had to solve if under it oppression or injustice could be perpetrated. "What," he asked, "was Parnell's answer? Whilst he denied, as I do, indignantly, the possibility of such a thing, he said:—

"If it happens then your Imperial supremacy would be effective. I understand the supremacy of the Imperial Parliament to be this—that it can intervene in the event of the powers which are conferred being abused. We, Nationalists, can accept this Bill under an honorable understanding not to abuse these powers. We pledge ourselves in this respect for the people of Ireland not to abuse these powers, but to devote our energies and influence to prevent them being abused; but the Imperial Parliament will have at its command the powers which it reserves to itself, and it will be ready to intervene in the case of every grave abuse of that kind."

"I say (continued Mr. Redmond) to those few men who are not content to rest in confidence on the history of the Irish people, and on their justice, but who want some assurance, that nothing of this kind could happen. I point to the continued supremacy of the Imperial Parliament, and I say that the oppression of Protestants is just one of those things which the supremacy of this Parliament would be used, and should be used, to put down." If such an assurance as that does not satisfy the critics, what would?

"Apropos of Ulster, the *Otago Daily Times* seems disposed to favor the suggestion of Mr. Balfour—first seriously put forward, we believe, by the *Spectator*—that Ulster should have a separate Parliament all to itself. Such a proposal is based on an imperfect knowledge of the facts—the truth being that Ulster, taken as a whole, is very nearly half Catholic, and that an Ulster Parliament, on any ordinary basis of representation, would certainly contain a majority of Nationalists. So long ago as June, 1884, the *London Times* pointed out that: "The truth is that Ulster is by no means the homogeneous Orange and Protestant community which it suits the Orangemen to

represent it. In some counties the Catholics are in a large majority, and it must be acknowledged, we fear, that the Nationalists have a much stronger hold on many parts of Ulster than it is at all satisfactory to contemplate." And in a recent article in *Reynolds' Newspaper*, after quoting population statistics from the Official Census returns for 1901, Mr. Redmond says: "From this it appears that, so far from Ulster being Protestant, it is, taken as a whole, 44.1 per cent. Catholic. Five out of the nine counties are overwhelmingly Catholic. In two out of the four counties where the Protestants are in a majority, the Catholic minority is over 45 per cent.; and, in two others, the Catholic minority is over 31 per cent., in the one, and over 20 per cent. in the other; whilst, in the city of Belfast, the Catholic minority is over 24 per cent. of the population. Protestant Ulster is, therefore, practically circumscribed to the counties of Down and Antrim and the city of Belfast, where the Catholic minority averages from over 20 to over 31 per cent. of the population; and South Down and West Belfast each returns a Catholic Nationalist member of the House of Commons."

"In the face of these facts," he continues, "can Ulster truthfully be termed a Protestant province? We hear much of the necessity of a separate Parliament for Ulster, with the object of protecting Protestants. Surely, if any Protestants might claim protection in Ireland, it is not those in Ulster, but in the south and west, who are in such a small minority. But would an Ulster Parliament fulfil its object? Why, unless the entire basis of representation be changed, such a Parliament must inevitably contain a majority of Catholics or of Nationalists."

Mormonism in England

There was a time when Mormonism was considered mere matter for joke and burlesque; and readers of Artemus Ward will remember the genial showman's entertaining description of 'A Visit to Brigham Young.' "In a privit conversashun with Brigham," he says, "I learnt the follerin fax: It takes him six weeks to kiss his wives. He don't do it only onct a year and says it is wuss nor cleanin house. He don't pretend to know his children, there is so many of 'em, tho they all know him. He sez about every child he meats call him Par, and he takes it for grantid it is so. He say he 'don't have a minit's peace. His wives fite among themselves so much that he has bilt a fitin room for their speshul benefit, and when too of 'em get into a row he has 'em turned loose into that place, where the dispoos is settled accordin to the rules of the London prize ring. Sumtimes they abooz hisself indivoonly. They have pulled the most of his hair out at the roots, and he wares many a horrible scare upon his body, inflieted with mop handles, broom-sticks and sich. Sumtimes when he went in swimmin they'd go to the banks of the lake and steal all his close, thereby compellin him to sneak home by a sircootius rowt, drest in the skanderlus stile of the Greek slave. I find that the cares of a married life weigh hevry onto me," sed the Profit, "and sometimes I wish I'd remained singel."

But to-day the Mormon propaganda is a sufficiently serious matter—at least in England—and Protestants there are naturally and rightly raising their voices in vigorous protest against the recruiting work that is being carried on by the agents of the sect. The following incident, recorded in the *London press*, is a sample of the sort of thing that is going on. Three years ago a Mr. George Wyld married an American girl of twenty-six. After he had lived with her in London for six months, he accepted an appointment at head waiter in a Hong Kong hotel at £9 per week. Having left his wife, who was in a delicate state of health, at home, he kept up an affectionate correspondence with her, and sent her £30 per month, hoping that in the course of time he would be able to take and work a restaurant in London. About a fortnight ago he returned to the metropolis only to find that his wife had disappeared from the house in Maida Vale, Edgeware road, having gone off with the Mormons and taken with her his little boy, who was born during his absence. The husband is now about to pay a visit to Utah in quest of them. If he meets with the particular Latter Day 'Saint' who has thus wrecked his home, the long-haired one will probably strike trouble.

The Mormon campaign has reached such dimensions that the subject has been brought under the notice of Parliament, and the Home Secretary is making official inquiries into the matter. In the meantime some of the Mormon leaders have published a defence of their propaganda. One of them, Mr. S. Norman Lee, in a letter addressed to a Liverpool paper, states that they do not advise emigration; that the sect has no emigration fund, and does not assist anybody to leave the country; that there are no secret Mormon rites, but that, on the contrary, all their rules and books are offered for sale to the public; that