

they have specifically studied hypnotism, agree that a subject hypnotised, while in a trance, is not in possession of his liberty. Father Guilbert writes: "The will of the operator has taken the absolute direction of all the faculties of his soul. The hypnotiser alone is therefore responsible for the acts which he orders. He is free—his subject is not." Thus, for acts committed in the somnambulistic state the hypnotised person is not legally responsible. But is he morally innocent? Archbishop Herscher's reply carefully distinguishes between cases in which the suggestion is executed (1) during the trance, and (2) in the subsequent waking state. The Church considers, he says, the two cases from different standpoints, which it is not possible to explain in detail in a short article, and which vary because of the consent, in the second case, by the subject, who performs an action, not when asleep, but when awake.

Two Cases.

Two letters are quoted to make the distinction clear. One is from a young woman who, fifteen years ago, "believing in science, and expecting from it the renovation of the world," allowed herself to be hypnotised by a friend of the family. During the trance he made her write a letter denouncing one of his personal enemies. The denunciation was one which is often disastrous, even for absolutely innocent men. The panic-stricken object of it committed suicide to escape the scandal of a public prosecution. It was only at the death-bed of the hypnotiser that the Archbishop's correspondent learned the hideous truth. Mad with remorse, she desires to know whether she is morally responsible for the suicide. The Archbishop answers negatively. As this particular woman believed that hypnotism was harmless, as she really ignored its dangers at the time, and had absolutely no doubts regarding the operator or the practice, no guilt is attributable to her. The slightest doubt on her part would have rendered her responsible. Nevertheless, this instance proves how necessary it is to abstain from hypnotism. The second letter emanates from a woman who, tied to an unworthy life-companion, allowed herself to be hypnotised, and committed at his suggestion a series of robberies in Paris shops. On discovering this, through a friend, she made restitution, and was assured that "she had nothing to reproach herself with." The Archbishop is unable to confirm this consolation. The woman knew the character of her companion; she was seen to rob with evident reluctance and hesitation, and was morally a wrongdoer. In the present state of science it is not established that the intellect and conscience continue to "slumber" after the hypnotic seance, and therefore freedom of the will is not completely suppressed. The subject being awake, is therefore in the situation of a man in prey to passion or temptation. Now, the passions diminish freedom in proportion to their violence, but they do not suppress it; similarly a physical or psychical impulsion to accomplish an evil act attenuates its heinousness, perhaps, but cannot excuse it.

The Duty of Catholics.

A person who deliberately places his will at the mercy of another, and thus abandons all control over his soul and his salvation, takes full responsibility for every one of his subsequent acts, even if he executes them in a semi-somnolent state. This really is the central principle of the whole discussion, and is so patent to every thinking man that no subject can logically invoke the order of his hypnotiser to excuse his own share of the guilt and responsibility for any evil results of his trance. As no man can satisfactorily convince himself of the purity of another's motives, however blameless and disinterested this other may appear to be, the absolute avoidance of hypnotic suggestion is the only course that a Catholic can safely follow. This conclusion renders it impossible for any Catholic to countenance in others or pursue himself the practice of hypnotism.

Ireland's Handicap.

It has always been the fixed policy of England to discourage Irish manufactures. Various means were employed from time to time to stifle Irish industry. At one period in recent history Ireland was turned into a gigantic cattle ranch, the object being to prevent the Irish manufacturer from competing in his own country with the British manufacturer, and at the same time to provide England with a regular supply of food at her own price. The fact that British companies owned and controlled the Irish transport system was responsible for a Gilbertian situation. If a person in Dublin wished to purchase an article of Irish manufacture from Limerick he found it cheaper to have it first sent to England and then returned to Ireland than to have it sent direct from Limerick to Dublin. The excessive inland freight charges were responsible for this. The result was that Irish manufactures could not live. That this handicap still exists was shown recently by the president of the Drogheda Chamber of Commerce. The meeting was held to consider the recent advance in cross-Channel freights. The President said that Ireland was suffering from the want of competition in shipping. They were often reminded of the close proximity of Ireland to the greatest market in Western Europe for foodstuffs, but when the freight charges on goods which Ireland exports were compared with the freights which obtain in other countries they find that Ireland might just as well be in mid-Atlantic. Canada is now a large exporter of livestock, and the freight per head on cattle from Canada to Liverpool is 20dol per head, which works out at 3s 3d per 100 miles; while the freight from Drogheda to Liverpool is 19s per head for 120 miles, or 15s 10d per 100 miles. Proceeding, Mr McArdle gave the following figures showing the freights on bacon to Liverpool:—

	Per ton.	Per 100 m.
America ...	47s	1s 6½d
Drogheda	24s 6d	20s 5d

It costs the Limerick curers 14s per ton more to send their bacon to London than it costs America to send their produce to Liverpool; and it costs more to bring Limerick bacon to Drogheda than it costs to bring American

bacon to Liverpool. The freight on butter from Australia and New Zealand to London is 4s 6d per 56lb or less than 1d per lb for a journey of 11,000 miles; while from Drogheda to Liverpool it is 40s 9d per ton. In other words, the Australian farmer has to pay only 1s 7½d per ton for 100 miles as compared with 11s 11½d per ton per 100 miles on the cross-Channel steamer. Denmark is Ireland's greatest competitor in the English market, and the freight on bacon from Copenhagen to Liverpool is only 31s per ton for 1102 miles, and on butter 47s per ton, or about half the amount which the Limerick curers have to pay on their produce from Limerick to London. The steamship companies had not given any reason for increasing the rates, concluded the President. It is clear there is something wrong. New countries like Canada and New Zealand are increasing their production of foodstuffs at an alarming rate, and these countries will be Ireland's keenest competitors in the future. The question of transport by sea and land demands the immediate attention of those who govern Ireland at the moment. The battle of the future will be a keen one, and Irish farmers and merchants must be put on a fair basis with due regard to other lands.

Coffee and Pistols

Mr. Lloyd George's reputation is very frail in these days of grace. Mr. Wickham Steed, late editor of the *Times*, in his book, *Through Thirty Years*, describes a scene at the Peace Conference between Mr. Lloyd George and M. Clemenceau. He writes:—"Clemenceau accused Lloyd George so flatly of repeated inaccuracy of statement that Lloyd George rose, seized him by the collar, and demanded an apology. After President Wilson had separated them Clemenceau offered Lloyd George reparation with pistols or swords—as soon as he should have acquired a domicile in Paris, and in the meantime refused to apologise. Despite these amenities the work proceeded somehow." Mr. Lloyd George informed the Press Association that the extract was a stupid invention, containing not the slightest basis of truth, whereupon Mr. Steed replied through the same medium that he would not have published a story of that kind without having verified it in advance from persons who were present. In a matter of this kind Mr. George is heavily handicapped. It was in 1918 that Mr. Chesterton wrote in the *New Witness* that people should believe certain things to be true, not because Mr. George said they were true, but in spite of the fact that he said they were true—that a thing could still be true even though he said it. Since those words were written Mr. George has piled up a veritable mountain of prevarication to his credit, so that those who know him best can scarcely be blamed if they treat his disclaimer with cold contempt.

When I say that the Son is distinct from the Father, I do not speak of two Gods, but as it were, light from light, and the stream from the fountain, and the ray from the sun.—St. Hippolytus.