

# The Catholic Record.

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

VOLUME XXXI.

LONDON, CANADA, SATURDAY, JULY 19, 1919

2127

## THE SACRED HEART

A Heart that hath a Mother, and a treasure of red blood,  
A Heart that man can pray to, and feed upon for food  
In the brightness of the Godhead is its marvelous abode,  
A change in the Unchanging, creation touching God!  
Ye spirits blest, in endless rest, who on that Vision gaze,  
Salute the Sacred Heart with all your worshipful amaze,  
And adore, while with ecstacy skill the Three in One you see,  
The Mercy that hath planted there that Blessed Heart of Man!

All tranquilly, all tranquilly, doth that Blessed Vision last,  
And its brightness o'er immortalized creation will it cast;  
Unfolding and unfolding, its pure essence doth it keep  
Thee in the depths of those depths where all are infinitely deep  
Unchanging and unchangeable as It hath ever been,  
As It was before that Human Heart was there by angels seen,  
So It is at this very hour, so will It ever be,  
With that Human Heart within It beating hot with love of me!

—FATHER FABER

## THE PRISON OF THE POPE

J. C. Reville, S. J., in America.

"Why should the Pope, who pretends to be the ruler of a kingdom not of this world, claim the territories, the political rights, privileges and jurisdiction of a temporal sovereign? Why does he want a temporal power? Why should he exercise its functions and prerogatives?" Such questions are often asked either by the avowed enemies of the Papacy and all that it represents or by well-meaning non-Catholics for whom the question of the Pope's temporal power seems to prove a stumbling block, or, at times, even by Catholics themselves who have heard of the so-called abuses of the Pope in their government of the Roman States. Some, moreover, are willing to admit that in the past there may have been some justifications for the possession by the Popes of temporal power. They hold, however, that now, since that power has been taken from them the Popes are better off without it, and that it should not or at least need not be restored.

The whole question of the temporal power of the Popes is one of the most interesting which the student of history can face, closely woven as it is into the very fabric of European history. It is also one of the most intricate and difficult. Here perhaps more than in any other historical problem, the student and the investigator must display not only the keenest powers of research, analysis and discrimination, but above all that one quality of the historian which is absolutely essential, impartiality. From the lack of that impartiality in their historians, the Popes have suffered more than other rulers. Misrepresentation has been the badge and the bane of too many of the annals of the long line of the Roman Pontiffs. Even to-day in an age that boasts of scholarship and science, old calumnies and slanders are renewed. The sibyllish of the enemies of the Papacy still re-echoes in our ears that the Popes greedily cling to their old honors and power, that they want them back merely to fasten more securely on their subjects and the world, the yoke of their spiritual tyranny.

That the Popes still claim their temporal power, a power of which they were hypocritically and unjustly deprived, is true. That Benedict XV. is taking extraordinary measures to restore that power to the present time is certainly not evident. While he would welcome such a restoration, as any sensible man would welcome back his stolen property, he knows full well that to urge it now when momentous problems are facing the world and puzzling those who are shaping its destinies, would be only to increase the embarrassment and add to the chaos. To assert that the Pope wants the temporal power restored merely for the love of that power itself, or because the prestige which it gives would enable him to fasten more securely his rule upon the necks of his subjects, to use the phraseology of his enemies, betrays a strange ignorance of the character of the Pope himself and of the mentality of his children. For the gentle Benedict, who long ago gave up all dreams of earthly power when he entered the ranks of the priesthood, the temporal power, its duties and prerogatives would only be an additional burden, which personally he would be anxious to avoid. For his subjects, the glamour with which that temporal sovereignty would mantle him could scarcely increase the love, veneration and loyalty with which they surround him. Shorn of all the pomp and splendor which flowered the Popes in the days of their glory, custom, and international right, were in the eyes of his children the successor of Peter and the Vicar of Christ.

And it is the unmistakable stamp of the loyal Catholic that he loves Peter suffering and in chains with a worse tender love than when, in the person of his successor, he is clothed with power and the insignia of royalty.

Yet the Pope must have back his temporal power. It is the desire and prayer of his children that it should be restored to him. The reason for such a restoration are manifold. It would be easy to show that the title by which the temporal power was vested in the Popes is from the legal point of view without flaw, that, compared with it, the titles to sovereignty of the emperors, kings and republics of the Old World were valueless, and the charters which conferred them, mere scraps of paper. It would be easy to prove, even from the pen of historians hostile to the Papacy and to the Church, that the temporal rule of the Popes has been on the whole beneficial to the Church, to Rome, to the Papal States, to Italy, and to the world; that the Roman Pontiffs were the only representatives of law and order in Europe when the continent was trampled by the iron heel of the invader, or terrorized by feudal lords. It would be no difficult task to show that when the political sovereignty of the Pope was threatened, ignored or violated, Europe and the world were ever in the turmoil, and peace was restored only when the Popes were again undisputed lords and masters in their rightful home, the Eternal City. For the moment these reasons and others equally cogent can be set aside.

The Popes themselves may be presumed to know their own mind and the mind of the Church on this important subject. Leaving aside their authority, the arguments they adduce in favor of the temporal power are of the strongest. On June 18, 1869, Pius IX. addressed an Encyclical Letter to the Bishops of the Catholic World. The letter was written at a time when the Pope heard the mutterings of the storm which was to shatter his throne and deprive him of his capital and kingdom. Even then, though his enemies thought he might compromise and sell his vineyard to the usurper, he was not afraid to say:

"We publicly proclaim that a civil principedom is necessary to the Holy See, that it may be able to exercise its sacred power without impediment; which civil principedom, indeed, the artful enemies of the Church of Christ are striving to take away."

A few months after, in his Apostolic Letter of March 16, 1890, the same Pontiff wrote:

"Since the Catholic Church founded and instituted by Christ the Lord to procure the salvation of men here, by virtue of its Divine institution, obtained the form of a perfect society, it ought consequently to possess such liberty that in the exercise of its sacred ministry, it should be subject to no civil power; and because in order to act freely, as was just, it needed defenses corresponding to the condition and necessity of the times, therefore, by a decidedly singular counsel Divine Providence it happened that when the Roman Empire fell and was divided into several kingdoms, the Roman Pontiff, whom Christ has constituted the head and center of His whole Church, acquired a civil principedom; whereby in truth it was most widely provided by God Himself that . . . the Sovereign Pontiff should enjoy that political liberty which is so necessary that he may exercise his spiritual power, authority and jurisdiction throughout the whole world without any impediment."

Here we have the whole question of the Pope's temporal sovereignty and political independence admirably summed up. In a day when Italy claims the Trentino, the Istrian Peninsula and Fiume in order to allow for her free and unimpeded political development, when a "corridor" is given to Poland in order that she may not be cut off from the sea and thus be absolutely landlocked and economically and commercially enlaved the argument of Pius IX. seems admirably timely and just. Poland and Italy insist on their rights. Why may not the successor of Pius insist on his? Why should he not demand the restoration of that territory, whose independent political life, whose rights and privileges were rooted in the law of nations, and recognized by Europe for centuries? Alas! Lorraine is restored by the Peace Treaty to France, and by the terms of the same pact, the great wrong done to Poland in the triple partition or robbery which took place at the end of the eighteenth century is atoned for, and the whole world rejoices in the restoration to national and independent life of the land of Casimir and Sobieski. But in its nature and gravity the crime which was done to Poland to Austria, Prussia and Russia cannot be compared to the odious and hypocritical spoliation by the House of Savoy of those States of the Church which by valid donation, by age-long possessions, by benefits conferred and services rendered not only to Rome and Italy but to the world by every title of prescription, law, custom, and international right, were still are the rightful domain of the Vicars of Christ.

When Pius IX. maintains that the Roman Pontiff has a right to temporal power and all that it implies, because that temporal power is a necessity for him, he does not of course mean that the Church of which he is the head, cannot exist without it. As a matter of fact for three centuries, from the days of Constantine Peter up to the days of Constantine the Great, the Church did not possess it. During those years, the years of the catacombs and the martyrs, the Church in the midst of suffering and persecution was as much the Bride of Christ, the Kingdom of the living God, the City set on a hill, the Pillar and the Groundwork of truth, as she was in the days of her subsequent splendor. She is the same now when the temporal power which began to be partially hers after the days of Constantine and fully and perfectly hers after the days of Stephen II. in the eighth century, has been wrested from her grasp.

Nevertheless, if the Church and the Papacy can exist without the temporal power, and if that is not strictly and absolutely necessary in order that they may fulfill their destinies, it is none the less true that the broader sense that it is needed for the well-being of the Church, for the freedom of her movement in the tasks allotted to her. Since she is a perfect society, she has a right to that prerogative of independence and autonomy which societies of that nature require.

Such was the doctrine of Pius IX. Such was the doctrine of the Bishops assembled in Rome in 1862, who on June 9 of that year assured the venerable Pius, around whom the more closely weaving its coils that they recognized the "civil principedom of the Holy See, as something necessary and manifestly instituted by the Providence of God." They did not hesitate, moreover, to "declare that in the present state of human affairs, this civil principedom is altogether required for the good and welfare of the Church and of souls." They added that it was assuredly necessary that the Sovereign Pontiff should not be the subject, and not even the guest of any prince, but that residing in a kingdom and of his own master, and in a noble, tranquil, and venerable liberty, should defend the Faith, and rule and govern the Christian Commonwealth."

"A noble, tranquil and venerable liberty." Such should be the position of the Vicar of Christ, in order that untrammelled by the bonds of a government which at any time may impede the freedom of his acts, he may dedicate himself to the duties of his sublime office. But as Pius IX. said on March 12, 1877, only a few months before the death of Victor Emmanuel II., the Roman Pontiff can never be master of his own freedom and of his power, so long as he remains subject to the rulers in his capital. "There is no other state possible for him in Rome," he adds, "but that of a sovereign or prisoner." Then admirably summing up his arguments for the necessity of the temporal power for the Church and her Pontiff, he solemnly declares that there can never be any security or peace for the entire Catholic Church as long as the exercise of the supreme ecclesiastical ministry is at the mercy of the passions of a party, the caprice of governments, the vicissitudes of political elections, and the projects and actions of designing men who will not hesitate to sacrifice justice to their own interests.

Now if heads of political governments rightly demand freedom of action in dealing with their own citizens and refuse to be subjected to undue pressure by the presence in their capitals of rival governments, the Pope with still greater reason demands a similar freedom in dealing with his faithful children who are not confined to one nation only, but who are scattered throughout the world. In order to deal with them, to send them his legates and ambassadors, to keep up with them the vast and varied correspondence, needed for the world-wide interests of the Church, to appoint with full liberty those whom he deems fit for the highest offices in his gift, and not have his action crippled and confined by the petty machinery of a jealous and hostile diplomacy, to administer the finances of the numerous departments necessary to carry on the government of his spiritual kingdom, the Pope must be independent of all external influence. While it is true that he can perform all these duties without the aid of the temporal power as he has done in the past, it is none the less true that without the assistance of that power, the tenure of his office is insecure and precarious, and his work is rendered doubly difficult. The Pontiff cannot but feel that now he is ruling the Church from a prison. Gilded and apparently honorable as his prison cell may be, it is not the place of honor, liberty and security from which reasonable men, guided by the ordinary standards of justice, decency and fair play expect the loved sovereign of 300,000,000 men to rule his subjects.

## CARDINAL MERCIER

### HIS WHITSUN PASTORAL DEALS WITH VISIT TO POPE IN 1916

In a Whitsun Pastoral, which was ordered to be read in all the churches of Belgium, Cardinal Mercier deals with the matter of his visit to the Pope in 1916. This Cardinal states that when it became known that the Pope had summoned him to Rome, the occupying Power circulated the rumor that it was in order to receive a reprimand from the Holy See. Regarding this rumor, the Cardinal says:

"Instead of a reprimand, which, according to the German version, awaited me, I met with the most affectionate reception from the Holy Father. He received me with open arms, granted me on several occasions, grantees lasting hours, allowed me to express my thoughts aloud, and accepted from my hand several dossiers relating to the invasion of our country, the crimes perpetrated by the invader, and the resistance made by us to the vexatious and perfidious proceedings of the Government."

"At the moment when, consoled and strengthened, I took leave of the venerable Pontiff, he was good enough, in a sentence written in his august hand under a portrait which he gave me as a souvenir, to tell me the share his noble heart was taking in our trials and struggles: 'To our Reverend Brother, Cardinal Mercier, we most cordially grant the Apostolic Benediction, assuring him that we are always with him and share his sorrows and anxieties, because his cause is also our cause.'"

His Eminence then goes on to speak about the action of the Pope in regard to Belgium, and his (alleged) abstention from any outspoken condemnation of the German arms. If the Pope, he says, had uttered to the masses of the German soldiery, convinced that they were accomplishing an heroic duty, the anathema, "You are injuring morality and offending God. Lay down your arms," these masses would probably have refused to obey; and innumerable acts which were formally innocent, being inspired by ignorance and good faith, would have been transformed into acts gravely culpable. Who could have dared, Cardinal Mercier asks, to assume responsibility for this immense upsetting of consciences?

But the mind of the Pope is clearly shown in his recent reply to an address from the Belgian bishops, in which he says:

"We have never ceased to occupy ourselves with the restitution to your dear nation of its full political, military, and economic independence, as also with the reparation of damages she has suffered. We are conscious of having done for Belgium and her people all that was possible for the Pontiff, the radiant charity of Christ and the tenderest paternal affection would suggest."

## BOLSHEVISM AND PHILOSOPHY

It has been said that "Bolshevism is the outcome of drawing-room philosophy." The wealth of truth contained in this statement is not at first sight clear. It seems to come as a shaft from the heavens, as sudden and unexpected as does the flash of lightning in a clear sky. The storm grows, without warning, amidst the rumble of thunder, reminding man once again that nature has its Lord, greater and mightier than the leaders of men. If we had inquired more carefully, probably the weather man could have told us the same is coming. Perhaps it had its harbingers in the legends of the realm of philosophy, who sang the swan-songs of dynasty, hazy with old age and respectability. Systems of philosophy have been and are now being propounded of which demagogues, unchecked even by the leash of conventionality, are the mouthpieces in the chambers of nations. Theories of morality, subversive of all authority, until recently confined for the most part to the class-room, are now being translated into practice. Morality and religion have been cast to the winds, and laws have received the sanction of self-styled liberators, which would bring the blush of shame even to the cheeks of a Don Juan or a Messalina.

Society without religion and morality is as a body without a soul. Add to this the destruction of the certitude in human belief, and of the external form of society must of necessity vanish. If put into practice such philosophy can only result in Bolshevism.

The past and the present, amidst the discord of growing social disharmony, contains one resounding dominant for the future, namely, caution. Stock should be taken of our philosophical currency. Countertefts will not give the true ring of authority when tested at the bar of reason. They may misguide the unsuspecting public by their false copy, but like all false coinage, their only authority is that of their maker, and their value is misleading. Authority alone defines the worth of our coinage, whether it be philosophical or not.—James I. King, in Catholic World.

## WOMEN CLERGY

### HEATED DEBATE IN CHURCH HOUSE, WESTMINSTER

London, June 20.—(Correspondence of the Associated Press.)—Excitement held the other day in Church House, Westminster, the headquarters of the Church of England, over the question whether women should be admitted to the priesthood. The principal debaters were Miss Maude Royden, a leader of the movement here for women clergy, and Rev. A. G. Magee, a staunch opponent of the scheme.

Clergymen joined with laymen and women in blessing, booing and cheering, according to the side they took. "To admit women to the priesthood," Rev. Mr. Magee declared, "would be a revolution, not an evolution. They cannot have a revolution that character until the whole church has set its seal upon it and God has approved of it."

Hissing and cries of "Shame!" greeted his discussion of the moral relationships likely to arise between men and women in the church if the latter were admitted.

"You cannot get away from the sex question," he said. "We are made as we are, and that fact remains."

Amid applause from his friends he said he believed the granting of the priesthood to women "would make her false to her sex."

"Women," argued Miss Royden, "desires women as priests, and their admission to the priesthood would make it much easier for women to get help from the church."

After quoting the New Testament to show that the commission of the priesthood was given to men and women alike in the "upper room" at Jerusalem she continued:

"The head of the Church of England has not always been a man. Queen Elizabeth, Queen Anne and Queen Victoria were all supreme heads of the church."

"No! No!" shouted many voices, "I am sorry if you don't like it, Miss Royden told the protesting element," but it is so.

She went on to affirm that the fundamental differences were not a bar to women's entry into the priesthood. "Women," she concluded, "desire to conform more nearly to the ideal laid down by Christ. He laid down nothing and suggested nothing that divided men and women in the vocation of priesthood."

## MASS BEQUESTS LEGAL, HOUSE OF LORDS RULES

C. P. A. Service  
London, June 5.—Cardinal Bourne, who was alluded to the other day by an Anglican Bishop as "one of our greatest citizens," has by his perseverance and courage secured a great and far-reaching victory for Catholics. It may be remembered that an Irishman, Egan by name, died in 1916 and left his fortune, exceed \$200 in bequests for Masses. The executors successfully contested the will in two courts on the ground that Mass bequests were for superstitious purposes and, therefore, were illegal. Cardinal Bourne took the case finally to the House of Lords, and the Court of Appeal had declared against him. It was tried by five Law Lords under the presidency of the Lord Chancellor, who after hearing exhaustively the arguments on both sides reserved their judgment. That judgment has now been given and four of the judges declare that Masses are perfectly legal by the law of England; therefore bequests for them are legal also. The only dissenter, Lord Wrenbury, maintained that, as for a century judges had declared against Mass bequests, the law was established by precedent, and that if any alteration was required, it should come by new legislation.

"The fanatics are foaming at the mouth over this important decision."

## A PHASE OF ANGLICAN CONTROVERSY

Along with this movement for self management on the part of the Church of England there is another which shows considerable activity, and aims at the reform in some degree, in the direction, at least, of liturgical precedent, of the Anglican Book of Common Prayer. That remarkable *melange* of Catholic prayers (some of them translated with extraordinary success) Protestant verbiage, and general liturgical wreckage, forms a schedule to an Act of Parliament, i. e., the Act of Uniformity of 1549, and as such cannot be modified, except by the same secular authority which originally imposed it. A few trifling alterations, aiming chiefly at greater brevity in the recitation of Morning and Evening Prayer, required in 1873 an "Act of Uniformity Amendment Act." There are few Anglicans, naturally, who would care to have the celebration

of their services discussed by an assembly like the House of Commons, composed of men of all religions and of none, and therefore what the Anglican authorities aim at is for all ecclesiastical legislation, disciplinary and liturgical, to be in the hands of the Church itself, as represented by the Houses of Convocation, and the canons or other directions thus set forth to be "laid on the table" of the House of Commons for a certain period—it being understood there shall be no discussion—and thus to pass into State as well as Church enactments. Here again it is to most people incredible that such a concordat will ever be achieved between the two powers concerned.

However, this may be, it is not uninteresting to consider briefly the chief liturgical proposal now under consideration, which has been accepted by three out of the four Houses of Convocation—the Upper House of the Northern Province alone rejecting the scheme. The suggestion is to restore as an alternative use the first Protestant Communion service, imposed by Act of Parliament in 1549. With the consent of the ordinary, either this or the form of 1662 may be used in any church—such is the wish of, apparently, a large majority of those clergy and laymen of the Church of England who care anything about such questions; and many of the rest, being indifferent, would place no obstacle in the way of such a restoration.

If then, as seems most probable, the Anglicans in the old country, who care at all one way or the other who succeeded in restoring the first Edwardine rite, such as use it will undoubtedly have rid themselves of a liturgical monstrosity, and secured greater solemnity and dignity in the supreme exercise of their worship. The extreme man on either side will be displaced, but will settle down to the accomplished fact.

But let us not seriously think that anything like a definite step back in the direction of the Ancient Faith will have been taken by the Church of England. There is this encouragement, however, for those who wish the best to our Anglican friends—that all such discussion as they are now involved in leads men to think, and when they think with a good will, and the determination to follow wherever the Light of Life may lead them, they at least have their faces set towards the Faith and the Church of their fathers.—J. R. Scholfield, in the July Catholic World.

## NUNS RETURN TO FRANCE

(Catholic Press Association)  
London, June 6.—Another interesting event, which seems but a fore-shadow better times for the Church, is in one hand, is the forthcoming departure from their beautiful home in the Isle of Wight, of the Benedictine Nuns of Solesmes, who were the first of the persecuted religious of France to settle here after the passing of the Law of Separation. As the Sisters are now returning to Normandy, we can only imagine that they must have some information that the law regarding religious associations is to be abrogated or at least forgotten.

This convent was one of the most aristocratic in the world, at least one ex-queen and more than one royal lady being amongst its inmates, while it was there the Empress Zita of Austria and the Grand Duchess of Luxembourg received their English education. The nuns also revived from Erin's sons, the chairman of their beautiful chapel, which was open to resident Catholics in the neighborhood, and their going is a calamity to the island.

## ARCHBISHOP HAYES HOPES FOR IRELAND

WRITES HIS FAITH IN FUTURE TO CHAPLAIN DUFFY  
"Many lands you have helped to liberate, though not as yet, alas! the one in which, after America, you, as I myself, are most deeply interested."

So wrote Archbishop Hayes to Chaplain Duffy of the "Fighting Sixty-ninth." Bestowing praise upon the New York regiment recruited from Erin's sons, the chairman called Sarsfield's noble lament as his life blood flowed, that it was not shed for Ireland.

"The Irish world, which has been drawn the world over for the cause of liberty," he wrote, "has once borne a noble part in the defence of the weak."

"The end, I hope and believe, is not yet. Our President has laid down the principle of self-determination for all peoples; both houses of Congress, following the fine American tradition of supporting the oppressed, have declared by overwhelming majorities their sympathy with the aspirations of the Irish people."—Catholic Transcript.

## CATHOLIC NOTES

Paris, July 6.—The Chinese delegation, which declined to sign the German treaty on account of the cession of Shantung to Japan, has decided to sign the Austrian treaty. The importance of this action is that it will bring China into the League of Nations. The delegation has heard nothing to indicate that its Government will raise objection to its decision.

Brussels, June 20.—King Albert and Queen Elizabeth this morning attended a service of national thanksgiving for the delivery of Belgium. Cardinal Mercier officiated and paid a tribute to the King and Queen, and the others who remained in Belgium during the period of occupation. King Albert and Queen Elizabeth received an ovation. The city was quiet yesterday and few Belgian or Allied flags were flown. There was no official demonstration or proclamation.

London, June 5.—Some wonderful Catholic treasures passed through the sales rooms this week when the Yates Thompson collection of Books of Hours, missals, etc., were disposed of. The Book of Hours of Jeanne Queen of Navarre fetched \$11,800, the Verdun Missal \$4,000, and wonderfully illuminated Mes. of the tenth, twelfth and thirteenth centuries made their owner a profit of 200%. Most of the lots fell to dealers but it is hoped that some of them may again find their way into Catholic hands.

The original copy of the peace treaty, which the Germans signed on June 28, cost nearly \$4,000. The printing of the document, on fine Japanese paper, has been completed and it is now being bound. The most famous bookbinder in France is charged with the task of binding the treaty in Morocco leather inlaid with a seal on the cover with a symbolic figure of peace. It is interesting to note that the color for the binding was made only with great difficulty and much wrangling, some of the plenipotentiaries declaring in favor of red leather, while others wanted green.—The Bulletin.

London, June 5.—The Holy Father has appointed the Very Rev. Canon O'Doherty, Dean of St. Patrick's College, Maynooth, as Bishop of Clonfert. The Bishop-elect, who is only forty-one, is a native of Roscommon, and was educated at Somerhill, Maynooth and Dunboyne. He has passed all his administrative life on the scholastic side of the Church. He is a brilliant journalist, being some time editor of the liturgical department of the "Irish Ecclesiastical Record." He is also an authority on the music of the Irish Church, and is no mean musician himself. He is a fine Gaelic scholar and an advocate of the restoration of the national tongue.

Nursing Sister, Helena Lunn, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. W. A. Lunn of Dundas, Ont., arrived home from overseas on Monday evening, says the Dundas Star, after an absence of over two years on active service in the bombing area in France and Belgium, having taken a commission with the Canadian Army Medical Corps. She is a graduate of St. Michael's Hospital, Toronto. Her brother, Ignatius, made the supreme sacrifice in May, 1917. The citizens of the town generally as well as her many friends are glad to see Miss Lunn return safely after her long service in the danger zone and are proud of the splendid service given by her in relieving the sick and wounded at the risk of her own life.

Rome, June 18th.—There is a suggestion that Msgr. Cerretti is endeavoring to do something to bring about a rapprochement between the Holy See and France. On that matter the word is not with the Holy See but with France. Rome has shown its good will unmistakably. It has gone to limits which only the extremest charity could approach. It is waiting for official France to meet it. But the action must be open and aboveboard. France—to use Cardinal Merry del Val's well known phrase recently quoted by Cardinal Gasparri—is too great a lady to come up the back stairs. If diplomatic relations are to be renewed it must be done openly; and advance to that effect will be met most cordially, but it must be frank and open; there must be no subterfuge in it.

Rome, June 30.—It has been universally noted here that the signing of the Peace Treaty at Versailles took place upon the fifth anniversary of the murder of the Austrian Crown Prince at Sarajevo. On that fatal and fateful day Pius X., descending from the Vatican to St. Peter's Basilica to pray before the Tomb of the Apostles on the eve of the feast of St. Peter and Paul, was overcome with a premonition that the crime in the little Serbian town had heralded in a disastrous world war. Recently Pope Benedict XV. could feel that the signing of the Peace Treaty heralds in not an immediate reign of peace on earth, at least the impossibility of the repetition of such a universal catastrophe as was precipitated upon the world by the Central Powers.