

The Catholic Record.

"Christianus mihi nomen est Catholicus vero Cognomen."—(Christian is my Name, but Catholic my Surname)—St. Pacien, 4th Century

VOLUME XXXXI.

LONDON, CANADA, SATURDAY, MAY 17, 1919

2118

The Catholic Record

LONDON, SATURDAY, MAY 17, 1919

IMPARTIAL JUDGES

Many notable writers and publicists have dilated upon modes of government, but few of them could be reckoned impartial judges. The whole school of materialists, before and after Hobbes, takes for granted the inability of mankind generally to look after their own affairs; consequently rulers by exclusive right were necessary to the very existence of a State. Thus Caesar and his imitators founded their rule upon force and craft. Successful rebellions usually started among their military chiefs, Napoleon being the great modern instance of triumphant army leadership. Yet he could truly avow that as an alternative a military despotism was a failure. "I am not so fortunate as Genghis Khan," he said, "each of whose sons rivalled the other in zeal for his service: no sooner do I create a king than he thinks himself such by the grace of God." Machiavelli's detestable doctrine has widely prevailed. "When the safety of his country is the question, a good citizen will not be stayed or diverted by any consideration of justice or injustice, benevolence or cruelty, glory or dishonor. The one essential, paramount object, in comparison with which all else is as nothing, is to make sure of his country's liberty and independence." President Wilson's declaration affirms the sanctity of treaties founded upon the fundamental moral law. No selfish claim to power could compare with the safety and welfare of self-respecting peoples, desiring to live and let live. Patriotism is only a virtue when it aims at the common happiness; when it becomes a covetous passion it is like a vice of cumulative destructiveness to the guiltless and guilty alike.

After all, Democracy rests on a foundation of integrity as between governors and governed. The words of Alexander Pope only hit off one practical aspect of lawful rule—that "form of government which is best administered is best," when it possesses the confidence of the nation at large. Efficiency is of the greatest value when it does not need to be backed by physical force.

Government, to be stable and just, must spring from and lean upon the sense of right which is the deepest element in the national consciousness. This surely is what was meant by the ancient saying, Vox populi vox Dei.

We are aware that these lofty abstract levels are not easily reached by the average man. Let us, then, recall some of the traditions by means of which the mass of simple folk have been induced to leave their affairs to be looked after by those in authority. Charlemagne and his paladins, Siegfried and the Niebelungs, Arthur and his Knights of the Round Table represent the strong and capable leaders, men of heroic mould, whose vigor saved their countries from anarchy. Their brave deeds and sacrifices established order, made law respected, and laid the foundation of social and political civilization. The ballads and romances of early ages exalt such pioneers, crediting them with heaven born virtues which sealed them as chosen to rule by divine right. These mailed heroes were by no means particular as to the methods they adopted to establish their power. Court and camp exhibited strange contrasts of behaviour. Blithe and debonair among the ladies, they could be ruthless when their will was crossed. Chaucer's gentlemen were followed by those Elizabethans who wielded both sword and pen; famous in love and in war, they became the titular leaders of society—indeed had they been equal to so great a calling they might not have suffered eclipse as they have done in these complex and exacting days.

Do these few facts imply that a complete reversal of the existing order, with its semi-feudal survivals, offers a sound basis for government? Is social salvation to be found among the revolutionary parties who swear by Karl Marx or any of the prophets of an era which shall see the downfall of organized authority—the substitution of rule by popular clamour? Out of leaden instincts can golden virtues be magically evoked? Such an Earthly Paradise is not to be extemporised. The New Jerusalem must be reflected in human hearts before it can be materialised in society at large. Not after such a fashion are truth and happiness to be "in widest commonality spread." But of that long-desired consummation of humanity's struggles we have no direct commission to prophesy. This we may venture to predict—only as the wisest and best yield themselves up to the service of their fellows with singleness of purpose, obeying an imperative call and renouncing all selfish designs in the interests of the whole, can power be safeguarded, haunting terrors banished, and life raised to its full and supreme dignity. In that day men will understand how this War has been instrumental in making "the world safe for Democracy." Its awful cost, its limitless sacrifice of life and temporal good, its spiritual agonies borne with a dumb patience or a quickened faith, will be justified in the blazing light of a redemption such as the storied past has never known through the fading symbols of a vanishing world.

stitution of rule by popular clamour? Out of leaden instincts can golden virtues be magically evoked? Such an Earthly Paradise is not to be extemporised. The New Jerusalem must be reflected in human hearts before it can be materialised in society at large. Not after such a fashion are truth and happiness to be "in widest commonality spread." But of that long-desired consummation of humanity's struggles we have no direct commission to prophesy. This we may venture to predict—only as the wisest and best yield themselves up to the service of their fellows with singleness of purpose, obeying an imperative call and renouncing all selfish designs in the interests of the whole, can power be safeguarded, haunting terrors banished, and life raised to its full and supreme dignity. In that day men will understand how this War has been instrumental in making "the world safe for Democracy." Its awful cost, its limitless sacrifice of life and temporal good, its spiritual agonies borne with a dumb patience or a quickened faith, will be justified in the blazing light of a redemption such as the storied past has never known through the fading symbols of a vanishing world.

IRELAND'S ULTIMATE OPPORTUNITY

DOMINION HOME RULE

SIR HORACE PLUNKETT TELLS ENGLAND SOME VITAL TRUTHS

London (Eng.) Times, April 15

To the Editor of The Times:

Sir—You are still opening your columns to all who are seriously trying to disentangle the Irish situation, notwithstanding the prevailing belief that nothing can be done now. If proof of urgency be needed, it will surely be supplied when, on Tuesday of this week, the Lord Chancellor introduces a measure in the House of Lords to compensate military and civil officers and their dependents if they are injured or killed in the task of upholding the existing régime. Considerations, however, of a much deeper and more far-reaching character move me to send you some thoughts upon the subject from a point of view at once deeply interested and yet comparatively detached.

I have differed widely from the majority of my fellow countrymen upon three political issues. (1) I felt and said that, no matter what our grievances against Britain might have been, we should go into the War to our last man, though I knew well the formidable case which could be made for demanding first a political settlement in accordance with the principles for which we were fighting. At the beginning of the War a large number of Irish Nationalists, mostly dead, acted as I felt. (2) While I hold that an Irish settlement is an essential foundation of a lasting peace, I do not think the Peace Conference can be relied upon to settle it. Such a body might, for example, favor partition in an unthinkably form. (3) I believe in a much wider measure of self-government than might formerly have sufficed, but not in an Irish Republic.

Do not, therefore, presume to speak for my countrymen; but life-long relations with them at home and abroad justify me in speaking frankly to them, or to others about them, in moments of national crisis.

I have exercised this privilege lately in America without, so far as I know, having done harm even to myself. In London, before I sailed, I have been assured by those whose duty it was to know outside opinion that the Irish failure to follow the United States enthusiastically into the War had completely changed the American attitude to our national demand. I knew it had done so to some extent, but I expected to find—and did find—that, on a review of all the circumstances, the major part of the blame was placed upon the shoulders of the British Government. If upon the main issue American opinion has changed, it is only that it has been driven by the closely-watched course of British government in Ireland during the War into sympathy with extreme Irish opinion and its new demand. This latest swing of American opinion is, I am convinced, quite open to reconsideration; and not until something definite and irrevocable is done, in proof of good faith, towards an Irish settlement. And I assert emphatically that not only is the Irish question more active in the domestic politics of the United States than at any time since the early 'eighties," but that it is also a dominant factor in their foreign policy. It is felt that in the Peace settlement, President Wilson's principles must be applied to the Irish case.

On my way home I spent last week in London. I found the common atti-

tude towards Ireland one of cultivated indifference. The problem being obviously incapable of solution, the less thought or said about it the better! But, while I was there, there was an Irish debate on the motion of Mr. T. P. O'Connor, who tried to make the House realize the urgent importance of removing American doubts of British sincerity—the inevitable consequence of the present Irish situation. A new Chief Secretary had to put before a new Parliament and an expectant world the latest British policy for my country. In his speech I have no doubt he quite accurately reflected the official mood. He did not speak until near the end of the sitting, nor approach the vital question of the Government's intentions until near the end of his speech. "I know, he then said, I am expected to say a few words about general Irish policy." The words were few, as he had only two things to say. "The first was that:—'No outside authority can interfere with us by intervention or otherwise in the solution of our own Irish problem.' In other words, 'Hands off, America!' Then he heralded 'the solution of our own Irish problem.' 'No steps,' said Mr. Macpherson, 'can safely be taken by the Government to alter the present system of government,' on account of the lawless condition of the country, which he proposed to deal firmly. Of all the declarations of Irish policy in my life it was both the most familiar and yet, in the circumstances of the time, the most amazing. The rest of the speech was a catalogue of outrages—presumably to demonstrate the safety of leaving things as they are—with the final avowal that a 'generous settlement' of the problem was 'never more pressing than today!'

Let me take the Chief Secretary's two points in order. When I said above that it is felt in America that, in the peace settlement, President Wilson's principles must be applied to the Irish case, I did not mean to suggest that the American delegates would themselves raise the matter in Paris—it would be very helpful if they could do so, but I can quite understand they cannot. What I had in mind was the paramount importance of friendly cooperation between the democracies of the United States and of the British Empire. I have personal knowledge of the extreme injury which is done to these relations by keeping open the Irish sore. Moreover, if President Wilson's world policy means anything, it is that the public opinion of the world is in future to support the rule of right rather than the rule of force, and that it may be focused even upon internal questions where this principle seems to be contravened.

I pass now to Mr. Macpherson's second point. I returned to Ireland, where, since I left its shores, a Republic has been set up alongside of the Castle. So far the two have not come into more than verbal conflict. Throughout the country grave symptoms of unrest are almost universal, and there are sporadic outrages which Sinn Féin cannot desire and the Government cannot control. Meanwhile, there is the inevitable demand for more coercion, and more troops to back it. I still meet old Unionists who confidently assert that nothing is required but firm and consistent government to end the present political agitation. They cite the agrarian agitation of a generation ago, which died down, albeit after a longer drawn out agony than would be tolerated now by the British people. These optimists forget one half of their precedent. British statesmen, beginning with Gladstone and ending with Wyndham conceded the whole of the agrarian demand. In the present case none of the political demand has been conceded unless the creation of an Irish Parliament and its instrument in the Statute-book can be called a concession. At best, we have been asked what we would like not to get. In the result those of us who are striving to concentrate the best thought of Ireland upon the problems of reconstruction, against the time when representative and responsible government can be set up, are paralysed. Unless an immediate settlement is reached the country will shortly become ungovernable either by England or by Ireland itself.

I realize that I must not raise my voice in protest against leaving things as they are without saying very definitely what I think ought to be done, and why it should be done now. I know that every postponement of the inevitable reform makes its enactment and operation more difficult; and the successive postponements during the War were exasperating. Often, half in jest, in the last quarter of a century I have said that nothing but a world war would settle the Irish question, and when that calamity befell I did think that some reality was going to be given to the phrase, "the one bright spot." The opportunity came in April of last year, when the Coalition Government and the Ulster Unionist leaders together threw it away. Let there be drift, said Sir Edward Carson, and there was drift.

It was a bitter disappointment to all who worked for an Irish settlement during the War. It could then

have been based not upon necessity but upon good will. I decline to abandon the hope that such a settlement may yet be within the resources of British statesmanship. A year ago the penultimate opportunity was lost; in my view the ultimate opportunity is now ripe. It may be heard those who persevere in this great endeavour if I point out that the peace value of an Irish settlement may be vastly greater than any possible war effect it might have had. So let me, in conclusion, state what I believe to be the most hopeful path for those who have the statesmanship to follow it.

A year ago an Irish Parliament might have been set up with all the powers granted by the Act, and with any reasonable safeguards demanded by Ulster. The further powers demanded by the majority in Ireland could have been postponed, without prejudice, for consideration after the War, when the mere fact of North and South having come together in the War might have made a settlement by consent immeasurably easier. As things are now, it is useless to offer a restricted form of self-government. Ireland must be given the status of a self-governing Dominion. Upon the strategic questions raised by the proximity of the two islands the Peace Conference in being, and the League of Nations to come, will make it easy to avoid conflict between British and Irish opinion. The Convention was clear and unanimous upon the necessities of Imperial defence as long as there is any Empire. As to fear of a hostile fiscal policy in Ireland, my own belief is that a contented self-governing Ireland would at once enter into commercial arrangements with Great Britain which would be tantamount in practice to the present system of Free Trade.

I will not say that the course to be followed in the ultimate settlement, which every sane man must desire to bring about at the earliest possible moment, is a choice of evils; but I admit it is a choice of difficulties. The direction of the greatest difficulty, and certainly of the greatest resistance, is leaving things as they are. The most hopeful course is to give to the Irish people as nearly as they are asking for, in the interests of that people (which I personally believe are almost identical with the interests of the other peoples in the British Isles) permit Partition, in the only thinkable form of county option, I believe to be neither desirable, nor anywhere in Ireland desired. I admit fully the claim of part of Ulster to special consideration based on the difference of its economic life from that of the rest of Ireland. Within the scope of a Dominion there is ample room for provincial rights; but, if one thing has been made clear by all that has happened in the recent attempts to deal with the Irish problem, it is that, while there may be many solutions, there is but one Ireland.

Your obedient servant,
HORACE PLUNKETT,
Kiltaragh, Foxrock, Co. Dublin, Apr. 15.

THE LITTLE FLOWER

REMARKABLE INSTANCE OF HER INTERVENTION IN BELGIUM

Catholic Press Association

London, April 4.—A remarkable instance of the intervention of the Little Flower is related in pursuance of a promise, by the Abbot of the Premonstratensians at Leffe, Belgium. It will be remembered that one of the most terrible episodes of the fighting on the Meuse was the sack of the charming little town of Dinant, near which the abbey stands. German soldiers entered the abbey, and drove within it some two thousand men and women, of whom they chose promiscuously sixty men, and shot them in the courtyard. The other refugees they left in the abbey, of which they made an exhaustive search, threatening the Fathers with death if they did not disclose their treasure, and finally dragging them away for six weeks in captivity.

Now the Fathers had disposed all the vestments, altar linen, and what valuables they had in a box, in the cellar of the abbey. During the search this box, which had no lock, was struck by the guns of the soldiers more than once. It was also left to the discretion of the nondescript crowd during the absence of the Fathers. Within it they had placed a relic of Soeur Thérèse, and commended its contents to her protection. When some of the Fathers returned six weeks later they found the box and its contents intact.

BOLSHEVISM THE NEW NAME FOR SOCIALISM

MARXIAN PRINCIPLES APPLIED WITH RIGID LOGIC

DR. RYAN EXPOSES SOCIALISTIC AUTOCRACY

(By John A. Ryan, D. D., of the Catholic University in The Catholic Charities Review.)

The Nation has rendered an important service to the American public by publishing (December 29) the Declaration of Rights by the Bolshevist Government of Russia, and a week later the new Russian Constitution. Inasmuch as Bolshevism is merely Marxian Socialism in its most logical and extreme form, we should expect a body of organic law made by it to be the last word of reckless radicalism. Our expectations are fully realized in these two documents, which have been formally adopted as the fundamental law of the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic.

In chapter two of the constitution, "all private property in land is abolished, and the entire land is declared to be national property and is to be apportioned among husbandmen without any compensation to former owners, in the measure of each one's ability to till it."

Taken as a whole, this is sheer robbery. Let us make all due allowance for the injustice that vitiated a large proportion of the titles to Russian, as to English and Irish land in the past; let us admit that possibly the majority of the present owners have inherited it from men or purchased it from the heirs of men, who took it by force and conquest; still we must remember that their land as we have a good right to owners of any kind of property. In the long period that has elapsed since the original acts of spoliation, the titles of the Russian landowners have become morally valid through prescription and other circumstances. Why have these factors made the claims of the present owners legitimate? Simply because this is on the whole a reasonable arrangement for human welfare, individual and social. From the viewpoint of human welfare, prescription is as reasonable a title as purchase, or gift or inheritance. If the new Government with the long name wishes to transfer the ownership of the land of Russia to itself, it can honestly do so only through compensation to the present owners. In those cases in which the title of the present proprietors is vitiated by fraud or any other form of injustice, compensation would properly be assessed accordingly; but the device of universal confiscation means that all property titles will be put in jeopardy. Indeed, that is exactly what these ultra-socialists of Russia desire to accomplish.

The same chapter of the constitution annuls and repudiates all loans obtained by the government of the Czar, and also those made by landowners and business men. The millions of persons, both within and without the borders of the Russian empire, as well as all persons who lost money to a landowner or a director of industry, are at a stroke of the pen deprived of any hope of getting back their money during the life of the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic. The immediate effect of this measure is of course, to relieve the taxpayers and the private borrowers of the burden imposed by these debts, but its effect upon the persons who have provided the money is quite different. Apparently their welfare is not of equal importance with the welfare of the debtors. It is a very simple theory and it is not new in human practice, but it has never before been deliberately adopted by a political government.

The Declaration of Rights includes this decree: "Inheritance, whether by law or by will, is abolished. After the death of an owner, the property which belonged to him, whether movable or immovable, becomes the property of the government of the Russian Socialist Federated Soviet Republic." When a man dies, therefore, the Government takes possession not only of his house, his factory, or his store, but of his household furniture, his watch and his trousers. The two documents under consideration contain many other curiosities of systematic plunder in the name of law, but their general trend and spirit are sufficiently indicated by the foregoing examples.

Turning from the economic to the political sphere, we find the constitution declaring that there shall be "universal military training"; that "all soldiers be armed, . . . and that the compelled class be disarmed"; that "a dictatorship of the urban and rural proletariat be established in the present transition period"; that only "the toiling masses can hold a position in any branch of the Soviet Government"; and that right to vote or be voted for shall not be exercised by "persons who employ hired labor in order to obtain from it an increase in profits; persons who have an income without doing any work, such as interest from capital, receipts from property, etc.; private merchants, trade and commercial brokers;

monks and clergy of all denominations" (chapter two, four, five and thirteen). This is all orthodox and logical Socialism. The owners of private capital or business of any kind must, by all effective means, be dislodged from this position and converted into government wage earners. When that process has been completed, they may have all the political rights of the great body of the proletariat. When the last of the private capitalists and exploiters has been thus regenerated, it may be safe to dispense with universal military training and to decide political issues by a majority vote. Until that condition is securely established the Government must be that of a "dictatorship," and the democratic theory of government by the majority cannot be suffered to operate. We all know that the Bolshevists were only a minority of the Russian Constitutional Assembly, and that they overthrew the Kerensky government merely because they had the requisite physical power. One of their English apologists, Mr. Arthur Ransome, admitted this a few months ago in the New Republic, and defended it on the ground that the Bolshevists were the more active and vital element of the assembly. Lenin himself is quite frank and explicit on this point: "Just as 150,000 lordly landowners under Czarism dominated the 10,000,000 of Russian peasants, so 200,000 members of the Bolshevist party are imposing their proletarian will on the mass, but this time in the interest of the latter."

Obviously this is the principle of pure autocracy. The man who denies the democratic principle of majority rule always assumes that a select few, or an individual, possess certain superior qualifications, or harbors certain benevolent intentions, which give the minority a moral right to override the majority. The late German Kaiser, and every other monarchical autocrat in history, defended his position and his despotism on precisely this principle. Whatever else the present Russian Government may be, it is certainly not democratic. It is aristocratic and autocratic.

The scientific formula concerning the equality of action and reaction is curiously illustrated in the section on qualifications for the franchise. For centuries the nobility and the propertied classes denied the right of political suffrage to the workers. Today the proletarian rulers of Russia retaliate by imposing a like disability upon the dislodged dominant classes. In so doing they have not "bettered the instruction" received from their late masters; they have kept strictly within its limits. If the makers of the new Russian Constitution had a sense of humor, which we know they have not, they should derive considerable amusement from this franchise restriction.

The frequent assertion of Socialists that their doctrine and system are not hostile to religion or the family, receives a rather damaging interpretation in the Bolshevist Declaration of Rights. While freedom of religious profession and worship is promised, the Church is separated from the State, and the school from the Church. While "citizens may teach and study religion privately" they may not impart religious instruction "in either public or private educational institutions in which general subjects are taught." No church may compel its members by any sort of penalty to contribute to its support, nor own property, nor have the rights of a juridical person. Only civil marriages are recognized by law, and "marriage is annulled by the petition of both parties, or even one of them." Comment would be superfluous.

Fantastic and unjust as are the economic and political provisions considered above, they are the inevitable reaction from the oppressive rule of Russian autocracy during many centuries. This, however, is an explanation, not a justification. The principles of the Bolshevist Government show that it is quite as anti-democratic, quite as autocratic, as ever was the Government of the Hohenzollerns. Did it seriously threaten to attack, whether by arms or by propaganda, the social and political systems of other countries, the democratic nations of the world would have exactly the same right and duty forcibly to abolish it that they had to put an end to the autocracy of Prussia. The only previous question to be decided would be that of expediency. As things are, the use of force by the other nations does not seem to be expedient. Leaving aside the dangerous probability that the soldiers of the Allied armies would refuse to enter upon such an enterprise, we can take refuge in the practical certainty that the resources of a sane and democratic diplomacy, combined with the latent common sense of the masses of Russia and the inherent folly and stupidity of their present masters, will within a few months bring about the downfall of the monstrous political edifice of Bolshevism.

What good is there in friendship and love if they bring not to friends and lovers increase of faith and hope, and of wisdom and joy?

CATHOLIC NOTES

The past year, says the Buffalo Union and Times, marked the death or consolidation of 1954 papers and the launching of 776 new enterprises.

Right Rev. Dr. Browne, Bishop of Cloyne, Ireland, announces that the building of the Cathedral at Queenstown has been completed, and that the consecration and dedication ceremony will be held in August.

A beautiful old Brussels tapestry of the Renaissance period, enriched with gold, "The Resurrection of Our Lord," which is said to have been designed by Giulio Romano, Raphael's most distinguished pupil, was sold in New York recently for \$14,000.

Verner Z. Reed, a multi-millionaire philanthropist, who as a non-Catholic proved one of the most generous friends of the Catholic Church has ever known in America, was received into the Church at Coronado Beach, Cal., before his death Sunday evening, April 20.

The Process of Beatification of the Venerable John Nepomucene Neumann, C. S. S. R., says the Catholic Transcript, was taken up recently by the congregation of Sacred Rites. The Venerable Neumann, a native of Bohemia, was at one time Bishop of Philadelphia. He died in 1860.

Pope Benedict on April 14 received in special audience Senor Olyntho de Magalhães, who presented his credentials as Brazilian ambassador to the Holy See, the legation there having been raised recently to the rank of embassy. Ambassador de Magalhães has been Brazilian minister to France.

There is a movement on foot in Venice to restore the Chapel of the Rosary, built in memory of the Battle of Lepanto and partially destroyed in the aerial attacks on the city during the War. It is proposed that this work should be undertaken as a thanks offering for the present victory of the Italian arms.

The Rev. Michael O'Dwyer, Albany Diocese, who has been a student in the Academi of Noble Ecclesiastics, Rome, for the past three years, has left that city for London en route for the United States. Father O'Dwyer was at one time editor of "Donahoe's Magazine" and afterwards a successful lawyer of Boston. He was fifty-nine years old when ordained.

Rome, May 1.—On Monday, there took place, at the Dominican Church of Minerva, the consecration, as Bishop of Myriophytos, of Rev. Father Couturier, of the English Dominican province, who was the first Apostolic visitor to Egypt and, for three years Principal Chaplain in Egypt. The consecrating prelate was Cardinal Van Rossum and the co-consecrators were Archbishop Cerruti; Papal Under Secretary of State, and Archbishop Sardi, Assessor of the Sacred Congregation of the Consistory.

Rome, May 1.—No official utterance has been made by the Holy See regarding the present critical situation, existing by reason of the departure of the Italian delegates from the Paris Peace conference, on account of the Adriatic dispute; the only recent document issued by the Vatican being a letter written by the Holy Father to the Franciscans across the Adriatic, urging them to practice and inculcate moderation, in both language and action, when feeling is apt to run high.

In payment of a debt of gratitude to the asylum in which he found a haven and where he was reared and educated Peter Dominici, who was killed in France in the Battle of the Argonne, September 28th, gave one-third of his estate to the St. Paul's R. C. Orphan Asylum at Pittsburgh. That he made a success of life after he left the institution is evidenced by the amount of his estate, which is estimated to be worth more than \$12,000. This is disclosed in his will, filed for probate in Pittsburgh.

Five bells, taken from the churches of Colmar during the War by the Germans, have been found in Frankfurt and will be returned to their old places. Four of the bells were from the Church of St. Martin, while the fifth was the great bell from the Church of St. Joseph. Valuable treasures stolen from the museum have been found in Munich, where they were taken by Bavarian soldiers. The treasures include the painting of the "Madonna in an arbor of Roses," by Sebongauer, and the painted wings of the famous altar at Isenheim.

During the year 1918 there were four losses to the Sacred College; Cardinal Serafini, Martinielli, Farley and Tonti. There are at present sixty cardinals and two reserved in pectore. Thirty-one are Italians; twenty-nine non-Italians. Thirteen are of the Pontificate of Leo XIII.; thirty-two of Pius X.; fifteen of Benedict XV. Cardinal Gibbons is the second on the list in point of entry into the Sacred College and of age, Cardinal Netto being first in the former category, Cardinal de Cabrières in the latter.