

The Catholic Record

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum. United States and Europe—\$2.50. Publishers & Proprietors, Thomas Coffey, L.L.D. Editors—Rev. James T. Foley, R. A., D. D. Thomas Coffey, L.L.D. Associate Editor—H. F. Mackintosh. Manager—Robert Burns.

From the tributes universally paid to the dead patriot we select a few.

Just nine days before the tragic death that good Irish American, Joseph I. C. Clarke, thus answered some of his puny and spiteful detractors unfortunately still to be found amongst a negligible section of Irish Americans:

"For Michael Collins I will only say he is bravest of the brave and truest of the true today as in the past; that the fight for a free Ireland which, with Arthur Griffith, he carried through in London against the massed talent of the English Government's ablest negotiators, stands out as one of the most startling victories in the field of diplomacy, old or new.

"To bring Lloyd George, Winston Churchill, Hamar Greenwood and the rest from the murderous attitude of the year before to a full, free trust in the Irish people to handle their own Government is a colossal work. Collins did it as Arthur Griffith did it. That should be enough. As for the ability Michael Collins has shown, the firmness, the dash, the unceasing push, the moderation even in his place of power, it is delightful and inspiring. Words would not add to the brilliance of his deeds—a statesman's soldier, a soldier's statesman—deeds speak and will speak to the end for themselves."

Morgan J. O'Brien, former Supreme Court Justice, a splendid type of Irish American who enjoys to an exceptional degree the esteem and friendship of all classes of his fellow-Americans and who voices the sentiment of the vast majority of Irish Americans, said on hearing the tragic news of Collins' death:

"I have been absolutely overwhelmed by this dreadful tragedy. "Because, you know, after Griffith's death he was the one man who stood out after 700 years of struggle. And he was bringing his people to the point where all their troubles, elemental and political, would be solved.

"It is a great shock to those who believed in the absolute certainty that Ireland could govern herself. Now we have this dreadful crime presented to us by a handful of men—that is all there, are—standing against the Government, standing after 700 years prepared to lose all through their madness—madness of a few young and impetuous men misled by older people. They have set their cause back many years.

"Collins was one of the greatest figures, if not the greatest, in Irish history. He lived for Ireland. He had intelligence, courage, a spirit of self-sacrifice and love of country. At his young age he died recognized as the leader of the Irish race. Is it not wonderful that so young a man could direct the destinies of a people? More than 80 per cent. of the Irish people in Ireland and throughout the world, and the whole of the United States, had confidence in this young man's sagacity and ability to solve the Irish problem.

"He may favorably be compared to Lincoln, who, of course, was a great statesman, while Collins was a great soldier, a soldier on the verge of accomplishing the liberation of his people and the restoration of law and order, just as Lincoln was.

"The men who killed Collins must either be regarded as children or as savages. The Irish cause will go on, perhaps, but things look very dark. Collins established the only lines on which the Irish people can go forward to complete independence."

Generally, prominent New Yorkers of Irish sympathies mourned Collins as "the strongest man in Irish history" who was rapidly bringing order out of chaos and had taken his country to the threshold of peace and prosperity.

Interesting and instructive are the tributes of the chief personages of that Government which, little more than a year ago, offered a reward of £10,000 for the capture of the "chief of the murder gang."

Prime Minister Lloyd George sent the following message to William T. Cosgrave, Acting Chairman of the Irish Provisional Government:

"I deeply regret to hear of the death of the Commander in Chief of the Free State Army. In his death the Free State has lost a fearless soldier, a leader of great energy and devotion and a man of remarkable personal charm. Please convey my profound sympathy with them in their loss of one of Ireland's brilliant sons at a moment when Ireland most needed his special qualities of courage and resolution."

The Prime Minister issued the following statement for publication in The Evening Standard:

"I am inexpressibly sad at the news of the death of this gallant young Irishman. He fell victim to a treacherous blow delivered when he was engaged in endeavoring to restore ordered liberty to his country, which stands sadly in need of it. His engaging personality won friendships even among those who met him as foes, and to all who met him the news of his death comes as a personal sorrow.

"I sincerely hope his death will be the last episode in this dark chapter of Irish history and that a new and brighter story will henceforth be written in the life of that unfortunate land."

Winston Spencer Churchill, Secretary for the Colonies, has sent the following message to Mr. Cosgrave:

"I hasten to express to you, as acting head of the Provisional Government, the sorrow I feel at the cruel and wanton act which has deprived Ireland, in her hour of trial, of the leader she had chosen and in whom she trusted.

"Michael Collins was a man of dauntless courage, inspired by intense devotion to his country's cause, and his hopes for its future never quenched. His energy and vision marked him as a leader of his fellow-countrymen. He has fallen trying to do his duty in accordance with the will of the Irish nation.

"The double loss within a few days of Arthur Griffith and Michael Collins is a heavy blow to the Irish National Government, struggling for Ireland's life, freedom and unity amid so many difficulties, but in offering you and your colleagues my sincere sympathy at this tragic hour I venture also to express my sure confidence that Ireland will find men to fill the gap and that the Irish people will not rest until they are masters in their own house."

The Chancellor, Lord Birkenhead, interviewed by The Evening Standard, said:

"I am profoundly shocked at the death of Michael Collins. He was a complex and very remarkable personality, daring, resourceful, volatile and merry, and differed in almost every conceivable way from the more dour and placid Arthur Griffith. I myself formed the view quite early in the history of the negotiations that these two men were equally courageous and honest. I never doubted that if they once gave their word they would sacrifice life itself in order to carry out their promise and this both have done—Griffith perished of sheer exhaustion and overwork; Michael Collins predicted his own end, but the knowledge that his life was certainly forfeit neither abated his spirit nor influenced his actions."

It is not in any spirit of resentment or with the desire to recall bad old times and methods that we note the contrast between this appreciation of Collins the Irish statesman, and the vilification of Collins the intrepid Irish soldier waging unequal warfare for the freedom of his native land.

Rather is it that we desire to note the magnitude of the work for the reconciliation of two peoples in which Michael Collins bore so conspicuous a share as soldier, diplomat and statesman.

Through the grief at his passing and the manner of it there arises the vivid realization of a great work greatly accomplished. The achievement of Michael Collins is marvellous; the progress made under his leadership is definite and irreversible.

AN IMPORTANT CORRECTION

That there was no unnecessary or unwarranted interference with the Catholic Missions of Marianhill, (Natal, South Africa), during or after the War is put beyond all question by the following letter from His Lordship Bishop Delalle, O. M. I., Vicar-Apostolic of Natal.

In the interest of truth and justice we are glad to give editorial prominence to this authentic correction of a misleading report of our N. C. W. C. correspondent.

Editor CATHOLIC RECORD: Dear Sir,—In your issue of May 20th, under the heading "German Missions in Africa," your Cologne correspondent says:

"During the War the work of the Missions (of Marianhill) was practically abandoned, because most of the priests, brothers and sisters were interned and denied any sort of communication with their former associates or their native charges. For a time after the War the difficulties were hardly less."

Allow me to tell you you have been imposed upon, and this statement is simply a tissue of untruths. The Marianhill Fathers, Brothers and Sisters, owing to my efforts, were never interned. Five only, because they gave cause for suspicions, were interned for a few weeks.

The work on the Missions went on without any interference on the part of the authorities, except a few regulations, which at times were a little annoying, but never interfered with the work.

The best proof is the fact that during the whole period of hostilities, the number of Baptisms of Natives on their Missions has not decreased, as I can show from the statistics which, as their Bishop, I received every year.

After the War, there was no difficulty whatever. Of course, they suffered like the other bodies of Missionaries from want of men, but this was a difficulty common to all.

I am sure the Fathers of Marianhill would be the first to protest against the statement of your Cologne correspondent, as it would imply a black ingratitude towards the Government of the Union of South Africa, which treated them with so much consideration.

Hoping you will kindly insert this letter, I remain, Dear Sir, Yours faithfully,

H. DELALLE, O. M. I. Vic. Ap. of Natal. Durban, Natal, 22/7/22.

THE DONATION OF IRELAND BY ADRIAN IV.

The following letter calls attention to a mistake which, though easily enough explained, deserves to be corrected.

Editor, CATHOLIC RECORD: A couple of months ago, you published the following item in your weekly column of "Catholic Notes":

"Cardinal Gasquet, in his new book published in London, declares that the so-called papal bull 'Laudabiliter' of Pope Adrian IV, urging the English king, Henry II, to invade Ireland, is a colossal forgery. Cardinal Gasquet is the archivist of the Library of the Holy Roman Church, and speaks with great authority."

I presume that the new book referred to is "Monastic Life in the Middle Ages," which is a reprint of essays written at various times during a long literary life. In the July number of "The Month," there is a review of this book, which is on the whole very favourable, but is also at times somewhat critical. The following extract is a sample of the latter:

"What seems even more surprising is the venerable author's want of regard for the opinions, whether of Catholics or of Protestants, which differ from his own. Take, for instance, the Donation of Adrian IV. A popular conspectus of recent opinions, Protestant and Catholic, is now easily accessible in The Catholic Encyclopedia, and they differ widely from those here propounded. But this essay runs just as it did forty years ago, oblivious of the work of all subsequent scholars, and without even further search for the important Roman documents, the absence of which is passed over, at p. 165, just as before, with what sounds like a mere evasion, made by Theimer in 1855."

M. J. GORMAN. Ottawa, Aug. 24th.

The "great authority" attributed by the compiler of the note to Cardinal Gasquet was due to the recent publication of the book. The fact, to which our esteemed correspondent and the learned reviewer in The Month draws attention, that the book is "a reprint of essays written at various times during a long literary life," and that the question of the Donation of Ireland is an unrevised reprint of an essay written forty years ago, removes altogether the ground for believing that what is therein written would be the reasoned judgment of the eminent author were he now to address himself to a critical study of the question.

The Irish scholar Arthur O'Clery, who writes the article in the Catholic Encyclopedia, points out that "neither Gasquet nor any of the others who are against the genuineness of the Bull, refers to the text of *Laudabiliter* in the *Book of Leinster*, which is by far the most important piece of evidence bearing on the question." And he concludes his article, strongly in favor of the affirmative side, with these words: "In conclusion there is not in my judgment any controverted matter in history about which the evidence preponderates in favour of one view so decisively as about the Donation of Adrian."

The reprint of Cardinal Gasquet's forty-year old Essay of course carries with it none of the authority that would attach to a pronouncement of this eminent scholar were he to study critically the evidence in the premises available today.

The question is one of purely historic interest, as, it need scarcely be added, the genuineness or otherwise of the famous Donation would have no present practical bearing on the political attitude of any Irishman or Catholic.

CO-OPERATION ON THE FARM

By THE OBSERVER

There is a great deal of encouragement for the future of the great farming industry in the formation in recent years of farmers' co-operatives in many parts of the Dominion. No human solution of any problem is, or ever can be, perfect; but it is beyond question that the position of the farming industry has been greatly improved, and its future to some extent assured by the adoption of the co-operative principle. More than that, it is a gain for the whole consuming public; for, though it is, and always will be, possible for men, however organized, to take unfair advantage of others, that is much less likely to happen in the case of a co-operative system than in that of the present system of the marketing of goods.

Mr. Papineau, of the central Farmers' Co-operative Society of the Province of Quebec, says: "In seven of the leading agricultural counties of that Province between 70,000 and 100,000 lambs will be raised this season, and a large proportion of them will be for sale. Now, according to the practice of many years the farmer will await the arrival of itinerant buyers. These men will go through the country and buy up sheep at all sorts of prices. They are in touch with the quotations of the principal markets and are familiar with the demands. Naturally they buy as low as possible and sell at the highest figure obtainable. In many cases the farmer is at their mercy."

Mr. Papineau goes on to point out the disadvantages under which the farmer labors, in not knowing the demands of the markets, nor the ways of stock-yard traders. When a few farmers get together and try to act in common, they too often make a mess of it. Considerations such as these have had much weight in bringing about the gradual revolution in the system of marketing which is involved in the formation of large co-operative farmers' associations. The apple growers of Nova Scotia have made a great success in the marketing of that difficult and uncertain crop. We need not mention the high degree of success attained in Ontario by the farmers' co-operatives.

In some parts of Canada, the farmers have gone farther than the marketing of their farm products; and have gone into the purchasing of the supplies they require on the farm; and it is at this point in the business that the interesting question arises, what are to be the future relations between the farmer, on the one hand, and the producer of other goods, and the general consuming public; to which of course, the farmer belongs, as do all the other people in the country. These problems remain for the future; and the steps that have been already taken are unquestionably steps in the right direction; but it may be remarked that co-operative enterprise can be a permanent success only by avoiding the spirit of greed which has brought the present system into such deep disrepute. So long as the co-operative enterprise is confined to societies of people of one occupation, who have a common interest and no conflicting interests, the matter is not difficult; but different considerations arise when we consider a possible situation where, say, a farmers' co-operative and a manufacturers' co-operative find themselves with conflicting or divergent interests. But we may point out that there is no reason why the occupations of a country must be separated, so that all the farmers will be in one co-operative, having only to do with agriculture or in a number of co-operatives of that sole occupation; whilst each other occupation is set apart in a similar manner, having to do with nothing but its own particular business; and though that may be a very natural way to start co-operative enterprises, it is not at all inevitable that they should be continued along that line.

The Co-operative system is not confined to single occupations. It is perfectly applicable to unions of, say, farmers and manufacturers; or to societies which may run farms and shops; or farms and factories. And if one can imagine a farmers' co-operative at loggerheads with a co-operative of, let us say, grocers, it is just as easy to imagine a co-operative in which several such conflicting interests would be harmon-

ized, by simply forming them from the members of the several occupations or groups; and indeed that is the way it is done in Europe, and notably in Great Britain and Ireland, where it is quite common to see co-operative societies engaged in the work of several different occupations; farming, manufacturing, banking, and transportation and other things.

The strong point about the co-operative system is, that it tends so strongly to harmonize the divergence of interests which, under the present system, makes of business a great game of grab, in which the principal aim of the parties concerned is to get the better of the party which is opposite in interest. That that war in business is carried on at a great cost to the consumer is only too plain. What I have said in former articles about the cost of advertising bears out the charge that the present system is economically wasteful, and that it is so to a scandalous extent.

That people do not get up advertisements to entice themselves is plain enough; for though men fool themselves easily enough in many ways, they do not write advertisements to humbug themselves; they let other people fool them when they want to be foolish in that particular way. The vast sums now spent in advertising goods may be cut out, to the extent of two thirds, at least, in computing the probable savings of the co-operative system.

So may the sums now spent in the travelling expenses of commercial travellers. This may not seem to be good news for those who are now making their living in that way; but they need not fear the change; for no change which makes the whole country so much more prosperous—and that is what is indicated in every country where co-operation has been introduced—is likely to leave long out of employment a class of men so capable and useful as the commercial travellers.

The expense of the vast amount of banking now necessary to look after a multitude of customers' accounts, would also be largely cut out. Besides these important savings there is another, which is a very important matter. As everybody knows, under the present system, the good payers pay for the poor ones. Thousands of shops are started all over the country. Many of them go to the wall. The wholesalers who supply them with goods reckon their chances; and price their goods with an eye to their probable average losses on unpaid accounts. This extra price is passed on to the retail customer by the retail shopkeeper; and it is paid in part every time we buy goods.

Co-operative Societies, as managed in the European countries, seldom fail; for they are organized on a large scale; employ experts as managers; and deal mainly on a cash basis.

These are some of the advantages of the Co-operative system over the system at present in use. In future articles I shall take up the actual results attained in co-operative enterprises.

Father Huslein, the eminent economist, regards the Co-operative system as applicable to the business of manufacturing as well as to that of buying and selling the manufactured goods; and if so, there is little doubt that another generation will see practically all the business of the world done co-operatively.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

THE TORONTO Evening Telegram, always conspicuous in any anti-Catholic or anti-Irish tirade, says of Lord Northcliffe that "he was hated and despised by the Ulster men and women who followed Edward Carson." It would be hard to conceive a higher tribute to the deceased peer.

THE DEATH of Genevieve Ward in England last week leaves Mme. Navarro (Mary Anderson) and Ellen Terry almost the sole survivors of the classic stage of the last quarter of the nineteenth century. And the fact that they have no successors is a decided misfortune to the present generation. For the leading actors of the period referred to were first of all artists, whose highest ambition was to make their profession an elevating force, and by the interpretation of the works of the great dramatists to instil into life an interest above the sordid things of the market place, to lessen, if they might, the rough places in life's journey, and to

increase thereby the sum of its joys.

OF GENEVIEVE Ward, as of many of her contemporaries, men and women, it can be said that she never prostituted her art to an unworthy purpose, but by her consistent devotion to its best traditions increased perceptibly the sum of intellectual pleasure to a whole generation. Those whose privilege it was to witness her rendition of some of the most noted parts in the legitimate drama—in Lady MacBeth, for example, or Queen Catherine, in Shakespeare's "Henry VIII."—will not need to be reminded of her power over an audience. It may be doubted, however, if she ever reached a higher level in her art than as the adventuress, Stephanie, in "Forget-Me-Not"—that unforgettable performance for which she had unique qualifications and which seemed beyond the range of any other artist of her generation. She has now passed from the shifting scene of life, but her memory remains as a cherished possession to multitudes on both sides of the Atlantic.

SLAVES OF the tobacco habit (for men may pass out of the category of moderate devotees of Dame Nicotine, and become veritable slaves) may take comfort from the experience of the "Old Tiger" of France, M. Clemenceau. Until 1896 he smoked to excess. Sickness having in that year overtaken him, he sought medical advice and was told that tobacco was the main cause of his illness, and that if he hoped to regain health he must limit himself strictly to six cigars a day. He declared, however, that he would rather give up smoking altogether, and forthwith resolved to do so. For a fortnight he sat and worked every day with a box of his best cigars open on the desk in front of him. It was a terrible ordeal, as he afterwards confessed, which only a man of immense will-power could have survived. That M. Clemenceau possessed such power of will was proved by the result of this ordeal, no less than by his war achievements. He carried it through successfully, and now declares that he has never since experienced the craving. What merit he might have gained had he infused a religious spirit into the experience!

THE CENTENNIAL of the poet Shelley's death recalls his description of Rome, regarded by many as one of the finest pieces of writing in our language, especially that portion of it devoted to the English Cemetery, in which he was destined to find his last earthly resting place. There, close beside the grave of his brother poet, Keats, and the latter's artist-companion, Severn, Shelley's ashes were deposited after the cremation of his body on the seashore at Lagurno, whence it had been cast up by the waves following the storm in which he lost his life. The cremation, it should be added, was compulsory under the law, cholera being epidemic at the time.

"Rome," he had written, "is a city, as it were, of the dead, or rather of those who cannot die, and who survive the puny generations which inhabit and pass over the spot which they have made sacred to eternity. In Rome, at least in the first enthusiasm of your recognition of an ancient time, you see nothing of the Italians. The nature of the city assists the delusion, for its vast and antique walls describe a circumference of sixteen miles. Wide wild fields are enclosed within it, and there are glassy lanes and copses wending among the ruins, and a great green hill, lonely and bare, which overhangs the Tiber. The gardens of the modern palaces are like wild woods of cedar, and cypress, and pine, and the neglected walks are overgrown with weeds. The English burying-place is a green slope near the walls, under the pyramidal tomb of Cestius, and is, I think, the most beautiful and solemn cemetery I ever beheld. To see the sun shining on its bright grass, fresh, when we first visited it, with the autumnal dews, and hear the whispering of the wind among the leaves of the trees, which have overgrown the tomb of Cestius, and the soil which is stirring in the sun-warm earth, and to mark the tombs, mostly of women and young people who were buried there, one might, if one were to die, desire the sleep they seem to sleep. Such is