

The Catholic Record

Price of Subscription—\$1.50 per annum. In the United States—\$1.00

THOS. COFFEY, L.L.D., Editor and Publisher.

Advertisement for teachers, situations wanted, etc., 25 cents each insertion. Remittance to accompany the order.

Approved and recommended by the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa and St. Boniface, the Bishops of London, Hamilton, Peterborough, and Oshawa, N. Y., and the clergy throughout the Dominion.

Me on, Luke King, P.J. Seven, E. J. Tiedrick, M. J. Hagarty and Miss Susie Hanley are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for the Catholic Record.

When subscribers ask for their paper at the post office it would be well were they to tell the clerk to give them their CATHOLIC RECORD.

LETTERS OF RECOMMENDATION. Apostolic Delegation, Ottawa, June 15th, 1905.

Mr. Thomas Coffey. My Dear Sir:—Some time past I have read your estimable paper, THE CATHOLIC RECORD, and congratulate you upon the manner in which it is published.

UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA. Ottawa, Canada, March 7th, 1906.

Mr. Thomas Coffey. Dear Sir:—For some time past I have read your estimable paper, THE CATHOLIC RECORD, and congratulate you upon the manner in which it is published.

LONDON, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 12, 1910

THE SUBJECT OF INFALLIBILITY

A non-Catholic friend has written us a couple of letters which, however well intended, are quite critical both of ourselves and of the Church. Never mind the former, as we do not pretend to profound learning or exalted diction. At present we limit our reflections to the following paragraph: "I have read Catholic history and teaching. I have just finished Birkenhauser's History of the Church and am not prepared thereby to say 'The Pope said so and therefore it was right.' I admit an 'infallibility' in the Church as a whole, i.e., an infallibility to 'teach the way of salvation' to the world to the end. To say that it is in the individual is to contradict the history of the Church, un-disputed facts, reason, common sense.

Jesus Christ Himself, etc., etc., as in this so-called marriage of King Leopold for instance." We may in the first place simply remark that our friend misunderstands entirely papal infallibility. King Leopold's morganatic marriage had no more to do with infallibility than it had with the apostolicity of the Church. This marriage concerned the administration of a sacrament—not the teaching of the whole Church upon the subjects of faith and morals. An individual member of the Church might as reasonably demand an explanation of every marriage celebrated. We are confident that in this case and in every other case the Holy Father is fully aware of his own responsibility and as anxious to protect the sanctity of marriage or avoid scandal as the humblest priest in the world. Papal infallibility is not an attribute bestowed upon an individual but a property belonging to an office. Our friend professes to believe in the infallibility of the Church as a whole, teaching the way of salvation. We assume that this infallibility is in the teaching Church as a whole, not in individual bishops, still less in individual priests; not in particular councils; but that the apostolic magistracy by divine institution was entrusted to the whole episcopate whether scattered through the whole world or assembled together in oecumenical council. If ever the Church teaches the way of salvation it is in her most solemn universal councils. This conciliar infallibility is not in any way affected by the subsequent acceptance or refusal of the decrees (nearly contended) by any or all the faithful. Nothing is clearer than that the power of infallibility was entrusted by divine institution to the Church teaching, as that he who hears that Church hears Christ. And as there is a teacher fully equipped and authorized so there must be those called to receive the lesson with docile obedience. It was upon the apostles and their successors, independently of any lay assembly or acceptance, that Christ bestowed infallibility. There is only one step from the infallibility of an oecumenical council to that resting by divine institution also in the primate of the apostle, St. Peter, and his successors, the Popes and Bishops of Rome. This papal infallibility is no mere outcome of ecclesiastical experience, much less any assumption of power by reason of Rome's civil position. This primacy is not a mere representative of the unity of the whole Church. It is a power and jurisdiction over the whole Church conferred by our Lord upon St. Peter who was to feed both lambs and sheep. Where Peter is there is the Church. So far as human foresight can go no other plan would secure unity for any

length of time or would give councils their power to assemble and legislate or would be a practical continuous bond of unity. Infallibility is the crown and sceptre of this Petrine primacy. The unity of the Church requires unity of faith, so that the head teaching the whole body, the monarch ruling the whole Kingdom of truth is infallible. How can our friend claim infallibility for the whole body without admitting it in the head and centre and source of all jurisdiction? In the ever memorable words of Christ: "Thou art Peter and upon this rock I will build My Church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it," there was a sweeping, confiding promise of primacy and infallibility. It is the consolation and security of the faithful that they know where to turn for unerring guidance in matters of faith and sound Christian morality. The mists of doubt clear away by the light of Rome's unerring lamp. No matter how the figures of history are made to appear, the keys of heaven, with power to open and close, to bind and loose, are the divine gift ever in the hands of St. Peter and the Popes of the Catholic Church.

IS THE BIBLE ITS OWN WITNESS?

The Presbyterian of the 13th ult. claims that the Bible is its own witness. Not even does the attack upon the Toronto colleges discourage our friend. It finds in these Biblical discussions the satisfactory, though misty, reflection that at the root of them all "there has been the belief, on both sides, that the Bible is of supreme importance." Here is the crux. Admitting its importance we must insist likewise upon the reverence due to the Bible and also the necessity for legitimate interpretation. Indifference, contempts the Presbyterian even though it be respectable and courteous indifference, is the worst of all. We can hardly think that indifference is quite so bad as higher criticism. What will be the result in a few generations when the professors of this generation are cutting away the tree? What portion of the Bible will be left after it has passed through the laboratory of pseudo science? If the Bible is so important, and we claim that it is, it is equally important that its integrity should be preserved and its interpretation guaranteed. Easy going in the extreme must any one be to prefer such discussions as touch the most serious points of revelation to more indifference. The parties are all standing on slippery ground, both sides disputants as well as the indifferent lookers on. By what force of argument can either of those discussing convince the other? The whole dispute is too rationalistic either for the subjects upon which the Bible treats or the certitude which these subjects demand. The trend of Biblical criticism shows the evil of leaving the Bible unprotected by a living guardian. In the hands of the learned it supersedes scepticism and as it should increase faith. In the hands of the illiterate and unstable it sows nothing but division and reaps error instead of truth. It may have been absurd to punish people in the Middle Ages for being heretic, but it is much more absurd to find no harm in discussions which aim at the centre of revelation and which concern the being or non-being of God's written word. But is the Bible its own witness? If any evidence has ever appeared, conclusively proving that it is not its own witness, that it requires a living teacher and guardian, those disputes of higher critics and others are the testimony. A volume is presented to a pagan with the warning advice that it is God's word. The Book itself never said so. It was the Tract Society agent. Along comes a professor or one of our universities. Our poor bewildered pagan listens to him for a short time talking about the first chapter of Genesis and the story of Jonas and various other parts of the Old Testament as myths and fables. Then he opens upon the synoptic gospels, and assures the new convert that the gospel of St. John was never written by the beloved Disciple. Which way is the man to turn? If he appeals to the Bible itself as its own witness the chances are that he will join the higher critic. Tradition is the living teacher as necessary for the certitude of the Bible reader as the importance of the subject demands. To what does the Bible by itself witness? It witnesses to the Church whose essential character is that she has the word of God and is its legal keeper and expounder. Nowhere does the Bible witness that each individual reading it is the authorized keeper and expounder. Nowhere does the Bible witness that our Blessed Lord proposed to teach mankind by writings and not by a body of men. There can be no doubt about the spiritual charm, the undiminished freshness of the Bible's sacred hymns and holy prophecies. Deeper, too, lies the heavenly character of its authorship and the sweep of its action over the conduct and history of man. But its intrinsic value is that it is the written Word of God. In order that it may speak to the heart as such it needs something more than itself, in order that it may carry conviction of this tran-

scendental claim, it must have an authoritative guardian and teacher, or else higher criticism will tear it into shreds.

CATHOLIC DEVOTIONS

Our friend who takes up another column of our space to-day is so disturbed that we devote attention to some more of his complaints. He seems afraid lest Catholics, notwithstanding their protests, go too far "in their addresses and titles of the Virgin." Furthermore, he finds in a prayer book which he possesses a number of Litanies to our Blessed Lady, as many in fact as to our Lord, and not one to the Father or the Holy Spirit. Let us see whether the gentleman's suspicions are at all founded. He is under the unfortunate idea that perhaps Catholics do worship the Blessed Virgin, that they may not intend Mariolatry, but their language does not justify them. Then, as for the length of time they spend at prayer far too much is devoted to the mother and the saints, and very little to either the first or the third Person of the Blessed Trinity. There is no confusion in the city of the saints or in our Father's house. The children know exactly, although they do not always revert to it, the difference between the handmaid and the Lord, the servants and the Master, between mere creatures and the Creator. Beautiful and touching are the titles bestowed upon our Blessed Lady in prayer-books generally. Modest addresses will not compare in fervor and honor with those used by many of the Fathers towards her. Let us take four invocations from the Gospel in Italy, that Christians Endeavor work:

- (1) I will praise thee, O Lady, with my whole heart. I will tell forth to the people thy praise and thy glory.
- (2) How long, O Lady, will thou forget me!
- (3) Preserve me, O Lady, because I hoped in thee.
- (4) The heavens declare the glory of the Virgin Mary, and the fragrance of thyointments is dispersed among the people.

What is wrong about those titles and invocations? When scriptural language, which in its full and absolute sense is applied to God, is applied to the Blessed Virgin it is always used in a relative sense. The praise of the whole heart which is given to the Mother is not in the least derogatory to the Son. Surely when we contemplate the message of the Angel to Mary and listen to the salutation: "Hail, full of grace, we admit that the heavens tell her glory. If all nations shall call her blessed and rejoice in doing so is it not because the fragrance of her exalted dignity and more than angelic virtues are dispersed among the people? She has the purity of the virgin, the sinlessness of the angels, the zeal of the apostles, the fortitude of the martyrs. If our friend would let the Motherstand by the Cross or on the right hand of her Son—the queen clothed in varied robe—his piety would give simple and confident and he would give double honor to the Saints by honoring the Mother. Non-Catholics in their devotion have drawn too much from the Old Testament, as a consequence one special loss is the absence of the Blessed Virgin and her particular relation to the Incarnation and the Redemption. One other point and we are done. The Litanies, our correspondent complains, are quite numerous addressed to our Lady. It may be. We do not know the name of his prayer book. We call his attention to the fact that every litany begins with invocations to the three Persons of the Blessed Trinity and closes with those beautiful petitions to the Lamb of God. The particular book which the gentleman has may not contain Litanies to the Father and the Holy Ghost. We beg to assure him that there are such Litanies, treasures of piety, mines of theological learning and scriptural quotations. There is one of the Blessed Trinity—another of Our Lady whose petitions are also flowers gathered from both Testaments. The Litany of the Holy Ghost and others are in use among the devout of both clergy and laity. These Litanies are collections of ejaculatory prayers which like springs in the hills, are scattered all over. No matter how varied they may be they begin in the great doctrine of the Blessed Trinity whose mercy is implored, and they close in humble petition to Him who as Lamb of God taketh away the sins of the world. Catholic devotion is safe in the clefts of the great rock of the Incarnation within whose truth it always seeks shelter and where as the turtle-dove it rejoices to build its nest.

LATIN AMERICA

The spiritual obligations of Protestants are distressingly onerous towards Catholics and pagans, heavier we should judge by their talk towards the former than towards the latter. The Christian Guardian in its issue of Jan. 12 has an article by a Mr. Robert E. Speer upon the obligation of the United States and Canada are under to Latin America. In plain English the gentleman thinks that the duty consists in placing before Central and South America unadulterated Christianity as preached by Methodists. Whether milk-and-water heresy is a good substitute for Catholic truth we have our most serious doubts. This is not, however, our point just now. It is much to be questioned whether in the next two hundred years Mr. Speer and his fellows would fulfil this pretended obligation. We build for the future upon the experience of the past. Catholicity in Latin America is always a favorite scandal with some zealots. They have their obligation upon the illiteracy of these countries, the deep need of moral purification and the frequent appeals from the inhabitants. If we can form any comparison between the two forces of Catholic and Protestant missions it ought to be fairly estimated by their relative work amongst the aboriginal Indians in Central and South America. We have an excellent non-Catholic witness in Seaman's Progress of Nations. We quote one sentence: "It should be remembered, to the credit of the Spanish and Portuguese colonists, and the Catholic missionaries and Catholic policy, that they have been the means of changing the habits of life, and of civilizing more than twenty millions of American Indians and half-breeds; while the Anglo-Saxon and German colonists and peoples have scarcely exerted any favorable influence upon the mind, the character, or the habits of life of more than one hundred and twenty thousand of the descendants of the aborigines of our country." In North America with their boasted free institutions and Protestant civilization they have succeeded in half-civilizing about one hundred thousand during a period of two hundred and fifty years. How long it will take these zealots to

THE ENGLISH PARTIES

With the Liberals and the Unionists about even the balance of power rests really with the Irish Nationalists. The Labor members added to the Liberals will not afford a working majority to Premier Asquith. This leaves the honor and responsibility of the situation to Mr. John Redmond and his party. It may be thought that this being the case

nothing remains except for Mr. Redmond to dictate terms and carry Home Rule to a successful issue. If the elections took place, or Home Rule plus the reform of the House of Lords then the battle might be considered as won. No hesitation could be admitted. There are not only other questions besides Home Rule, such as tariff reform, budget and education; but there is the relation between the Liberals and the Irish Party. Except for old friendship and tradition sake we can see no pledge that this important question is going to take the front place and be made law whether the Lords or the Unionists like it or not. When the Premier before the elections stated the issues before the country he declined going into detail about Home Rule upon the ground that there was no use talking about it until the power of the House of Lords had been effectively curbed. The House of Lords must therefore be dealt with first. They will not surrender their power of veto at the bid of an Irish party. They might, as in the case of the budget, send the Commons back to the country upon the direct question of Home Rule. But if the Premier shrewdly abstained in his Albert Hall speech, from committing himself upon the details the Liberal whip showed by a brief statement what might be expected. "There was no pledge," he said, "given at the Albert Hall that Home Rule will be given to Ireland. What was said was that the ban that was placed by the Liberal party on itself was removed, so that the Liberals are free, if they so desire, to extend self-government to Ireland. But, of course every one in the Government is pledged not to give to the Irish an independent Parliament but to give self-government consistent with the union of the United Kingdom and Ireland." Upon being asked if he was in favor of granting Mr. Redmond's demands he professed not to know what they were. A question followed: "Are you in favor of granting a Parliament to Ireland with an independent executive?" "I am not," was the brief, ominous reply. Taking all things into account this treasure-trove of the balance of power will not prove a blessing. Ireland is rather to be pitied than congratulated. Home is continually deferred. It requires more tact for the details of a prospective measure than for the criticism of a proposed bill. Prudence and true statesmanship are more necessary than ever before—for Mr. Redmond stands to-day the real Premier of England in the most critical period of its history. He holds the balance not only for Ireland but for all the other grave questions which will be before the new House of Commons. He cannot be heedless of the demands for Catholic education, nor can he contradict the many defence of the subject which he made a few years ago on the very floor where he is now the central figure.

THE GALICIAN VOTE

No institution is so lauded as the suffrage. It is the guarantee of liberty, the pledge of reform. There is no abuse which it is not supposed to correct, no blessing it is not expected to bestow. Countries which have it not walk in darkness—their citizens slaves, their rulers tyrants. One thing, however, the suffrage does not correct, its own abuse. Ideals do not always realize themselves. In the Northwest, judging by the comments of the Presbyterian upon the subject, the immigrants from Eastern Europe, of whom the Galicians are the most numerous, form "a dangerous element in Western politics." The poor Galicians are too simple. They will have to learn Scotch methods before they can be trusted with a ballot. One difficulty and the primary is that they vote solid. Another insuperable and tiresome mark of their incapacity to exercise the franchise is that they are Catholic. The Presbyterian relates an incident showing that if the Galicians are illiterate they are shrewd enough to estimate political situations at their proper value. It seems that in a certain town they had erected a Church upon which considerable debt remained. A municipal election was about to be held. They availed themselves of the opportunity by calling every candidate before they themselves would go to the polls. The result was a surprise, as many appeared on the list of subscribers who had never been known to give to a church before, still less to anything in the form of a Rotherham Church. There is no use pretending to be shocked at that slight matter. Not in the West only, nor by people from Eastern Europe is the generosity of candidates put to the test and church debts decreased in proportion around election times. These Galicians should change their philosophy, join the Scottish school and adopt western European methods. Had they been collecting for a Presbyterian church the left hand would never have known what had been dropped into the right, nor would the world have heard of the dreadful sin. There is a good deal of pharisaism in the world.

THE FERRER POEM

The author of what claimed to be a few verses on the nun-murderer and church-looter Ferrer has written us thanking us for our criticism. He is welcome to all the comfort he can take out of it. We had not the remotest idea of criticizing it as poetry; for poetry it was not. It was not a work of art. Nor could it be considered a work of nature. The lack of ideas prevented the latter, whilst the awkward limping of the language excluded the former. It was coarse without being strong, and blasphemous with no reason for its irreverence. When anarchy is regarded as a subject for poetry and an anarchist is held up as a martyr even ordinary ideals will have fallen into the mire of aesthetic and moral degradation. As an elegy it committed the unpardonable sin of displaying the writer's ignorance of his subject and of falsifying the man whom he had proposed to magnify. It was neither epic nor lyric. Perhaps we did give it too much prominence by noticing it at all. What attracted our attention was just what might occur with a man passing down street. We were indignant at the blasphemy and entered a protest against such language in a Christian country.

VOLUMES COULD BE WRITTEN ABOUT THE

apathy of the Catholic laity in regard to Church work. It is the habit to leave everything for the priest. The priestly office and the priestly duties are well defined, and no good Catholic would dream of interference where interference would be not only wrong but impertinent, but, apart from this, how many Catholics have we who are as but dead wood in the Church? Archbishop Ireland lately said, in addressing the Knights of Columbus at Pittsburg, Ohio, "I know the Catholic laity, I put my confidence in them, their power for good is boundless, their will to use it is sincere, but perhaps they wait too patiently the word of command to enter action." This places the whole situation in a small compass. The average Catholic will go to Mass on Sundays, will go to Holy Communion at stated times, will pay for his pew and put a mite on the collection plate on Sunday, and will then console himself with the reflection that he has done his whole duty. Not at all. He is but a laggard. What has he done to promote better condition among his fellow Catholics? What has he done for the St. Vincent de

Paul Society? What has he done to bring comfort to the needy? What has he done to spread Catholic literature? What has he done for temperance? In a thousand and one little ways he could aid the priest in his blessed work of preparing souls for heaven. But he does not do it. He thinks the priest should do everything. We will quote the great Archbishop, who defines the duties of the Catholic layman:

"My Catholic layman—the whom the Church recognizes as the full heir of its promises—is a man unimpeachable in personal demeanor, loyal to the inspirations of loftiest probity and honor, scrupulously honest in business, high-minded in principle, in deed as loyal to principle as he is in profession. He is the kindly neighbor seeking ever to please, never to offend, gentle to the poorest and the lowliest as to the wealthiest and the brightest. He is the faithful and loving husband, the staunch upholder of the sacredness of the marriage tie, the vigilant and devoted father; the guardian angel of his home, remembering ever the saying of St. Paul, that he who has not care of those of his house has denied the faith and is worse than an infidel. All of this he is, whatever his station in life, whatever his daily avocation, whatever the trials and temptations his surroundings may bring to him; and, while all of this, he is the loyal son of the Church, the obedient disciple of its precepts—showing by his practical Catholicity whence germinate the noble virtues his life so beautifully typifies."

FEW PUBLIC MEN IN THE UNITED KINGDOM

can give as clear a forecast of events in English politics as Mr. T. P. O'Connor, the eminent member of Parliament and journalist. He predicts that, with the majority of one hundred and twenty-two or over, which the Asquith government will have in the next house, they will be enabled to retain power, and Home Rule will be one of the measures of the ministerial programme. Mr. O'Connor pays his compliments in caustic fashion to Mr. Wm. O'Brien and his party of eight. "The Tories," he says, "place great hopes on William O'Brien. He certainly means to do as much mischief as possible, and Tim Healy will help him. Their first attempt will be to bulldoze the Irish party into voting against the budget, as to which they have told an amazing and gigantic falsehood of the Irish party having adopted O'Brien's advice on the budget." Mr. O'Brien and his little party have no kindly feelings for the budget because it presses heavily on the whiskey industry. For ourselves we may say that the whiskey industry in Ireland is not taxed out of existence entirely. Mr. O'Connor truly says that the O'Brien policy means losing the Liberals and not gaining the Tories. The affected party claims that the Irish members should not be allied with either Tories or Liberals. How in the name of common sense can Ireland ever get a local house unless with the aid of one or other of the English parties? Altogether it seems as if Mr. O'Brien and Mr. Healy were going Dublin Castle way, as many have done before them. The "wreckers" have ever proved traitors to Ireland. There must be union if there will be victory. Those who are not with the Nationalists are Ireland's enemies.

THE METROPOLIS OF CANADA WAS,

Tuesday of last week, engaged in the election of its civic officials. It was the bitterest contest in the city's history. The "citizens slate" swept everything before it by immense majorities. Dr. Guerin, the mayor, getting over 10,000. It may be that some of the men who went down to defeat, and who were not on the citizen's ticket, had no black marks against them, for these a degree of sympathy will be felt. A number of the candidates, however, were grafters who gloried in their shame. The royal commission had given them a certificate of character which was not to be envied. The curious feature of the case is the fact that they are not behind prison bars, instead of being given full liberty to continue their operations as graft artists. Most people will be surprised to know that the best governed city in the world is St. Petersburg, Russia. Its taxes are the lowest and its streets the cleanest. Some years ago the grafter was abroad, and affairs were in a horrible condition. The Emperor sent a number of grafters to Siberia, and the graft microbe was killed. We may yet have to take somewhat similar action in Canada.

THE FLOODS, WHICH DURING THE PAST

few weeks enveloped Paris, caused a loss of life and property which cannot yet be estimated. The property loss has been roughly placed at \$200,000,000, and the loss of life will be numbered, we fear, by the thousands. One calamity after another seems to be the lot of poor France. In 1870 she lost two of her fairest provinces, official France has lost the faith, and now industrial France has been visited with a calamity which takes rank with the greatest horrors in history. The papers recount many deeds of heroism of priests at Alfortville, who continued the work of rescue between midnight and daylight, when the soldiers, jackies and firemen, after several days without rest, had become exhausted. Sisters of Charity rowed to houses, giving assistance to several cases of starvation. The food has subsided, but it will be some time before the full extent of the damage will be known.

THE BATTLE OF THE BALLOTS IN THE

United Kingdom has been fought, and the result has been a surprise to both parties. The Liberals will have a clear

majority of about 122, counting the Nationalists and the Laborites. They expected a larger following, while the Conservatives went to the polls with the firm belief that the strenuous work of the Lord and the Lady and the automobile, while the band played "Rule Britannia," would stampede the masses as well as the classes into their wigwam. They were sorely disappointed. The average voter saw it was a case where the fly was invited into the parlor of the spider. Clipping the wings of the Lords will be the next great battle, and when that is fought and won, Ireland's parliament, of which she was robbed over a century ago, will be restored, the London lawyers, the London money-lending Jews, the Ulster Orangemen, and the senseless "Jingos" to the contrary notwithstanding. An effort is being made to magnify the insignificant division in the Irish party by the independent action of O'Brien and Healy, who have a very small following. This is hardly worthy of notice, and what may be expected is noisy warfare in every country in the world. The two gentlemen named, want Irish members to hold aloof from all English parties. As it is only by connection with one or the other that Irish aspirations may be realized it will be a puzzle to every one how Home Rule can in any other way be won.

"BY THE IRISH LANGUAGE"

how many of the Irish language speakers are in the ranks of the Unionist party? It is a question which should be faced. If Ireland is given the boon of self-government, Scotland will no doubt feel justified in demanding Home Rule too. And if Scotland, why not Wales? The Scots and Welsh have just as much right as the Irish. And if these three portions of the British Isles secure their legislative independence, the Channel Islands will probably set up a similar claim. And what is to hinder the North of England from demanding separation from the South? All this is a logical development, once the precedent is established.—Toronto Saturday Night.

"WHEN RESPONSIBLE GOVERNMENT WAS

given Canada, what then? It had the effect of transforming a disloyal into a loyal people. We desire to go farther than Saturday Night in extending Home Rule. We would like to see local Parliaments not only in Ireland, Scotland and Wales, but in England as well. The cry of the Unionists, that local self-government would lead to the dismemberment of the Empire is what our American friends would call a "roarback," manufactured especially for the purpose of covering up the greed of the privileged peers and landlords. The opposition to Home Rule in Ulster is beneath contempt. It is the outcome of the brutal fanaticism of the Orange order.

"THE 'WRECKERS' HAVE EVER PROVED

traitors to Ireland. There must be union if there will be victory. Those who are not with the Nationalists are Ireland's enemies.

THE POETRY OF THE LATE FATHER TABB

is receiving most kindly recognition from America's greatest critics. His personality, too, is touched upon with loving remembrance by those who knew him best. Cardinal Gibbons says of him: "He was a man of marked personality, and his ability was recognized among clergy and laity. His works show intellectual and a devout application to the task he set out to accomplish. I was grieved to hear of his death, but I have lost another of the dear friends who were a comfort to me. It was I who received him into the Church. I met him in Richmond, and soon became deeply attached to him because of his simplicity of nature. Instructed him in the belief of the Catholic religion, administered successively to him the sacraments of baptism, confirmation, Holy Eucharist and holy orders. His life as a priest has been a model one and an example for all good Christians."

THE LITERARY EDITOR OF THE ROSARY

Magazine pays the following graceful tribute to the beautiful soul who left us all too soon: "Of Tabb, the dainty poet, the jeweller of fine thought, the carver of verbal canes, his friend, Professor Henry E. Shepherd, of John Hopkins University, says discriminatingly: 'In his epigrammatic skill Father Tabb was equalled by few contemporary poets. There is in his verse at times a seeming renaissance of the Anglican Herrick and the Catholic Crashaw. Exuberant humor, relentless wit, love of rare fantasies reveal themselves along with the fervor of ardent devotion, as they manifest their power in more than one master of the seventeenth century. I had hoped to see Father Tabb reproduce in varied form the incident of the Lord's first miracle at Cana of Galilee, which inspired the fadless hexameter of Crashaw, written during his college days at Cambridge. Father Tabb's literary discernment was clear and touched by the pure fragrance of the muses. To Shelley, Coleridge and Keats he was devoted. Poe he regarded as without a peer in our poetry and was his uncompromising, inflexible champion.'"

THE BATTLE OF THE BALLOTS IN THE

United Kingdom has been fought, and the result has been a surprise to both parties. The Liberals will have a clear