

# The Catholic Record

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

VOLUME XXXIII.

LONDON, CANADA, SATURDAY, MARCH 12, 1921

2213

## THE SIGN OF THE CROSS

Whene'er across this sinful flesh of mine  
I draw the Holy Sign,  
All good thoughts stir within me,  
And renew  
Their slumbering strength divine;  
Till there springs up a courage high and true  
To suffer and to do.  
And who shall say, but hateful spirits round,  
For their brief hour unbound,  
Shudder to see, and wall their over-throw?  
While on far heathen ground  
Some lonely Saint haunts the fresh odour though  
Its source he cannot know?  
—JOHN HENRY NEWMAN.

## WEEKLY IRISH REVIEW

IRELAND SEEN THROUGH IRISH EYES

Copyright 1921 by Seumas MacManus  
MOUNTJOY AND CARSON LIVE AGAIN IN IRELAND

We on this side of the water can have no idea of the horrors that Ireland is presently suffering. There is a writer living in the West, one of the best-known women writers in Ireland, a non-Catholic of an old Conservative family, whom I had employed to do some historical research for me. She was to do the Elizabethan period in Ireland, when Elizabeth's savages, Mountjoy and Carew, carried fire and torch wide and broad over the land—and also the Cromwellian period. A letter I have just received from this Conservative woman accompanying her manuscript of the Elizabethan Wars makes painful reading. She says: "Now I have to tell you what you may think, and I am afraid is, a breach of contract on my part. I can not go any further with this work—because we are today living the same horrors which I am expected cold-bloodedly to describe in that faraway time. I have suffered more than I can tell you in doing the time of Mountjoy and Carew—and I simply can not nerve myself to do the Cromwellian horrors. Six years ago I could have gone through that time of bloodshed, fire and horror—because I could rise from the nightmare and find life right and normal round me—but now. Can you comprehend it? Can you picture it? No, I do not think you can fully—though I am sure your blood is stirred with anger when you read the accounts that come from Ireland. But I am living in it. It is the days of Mountjoy and Carew—the same horrors. On one six years ago could then conceive that Ireland was to be placed under the heel of an army with its awful auxiliary forces—and that life, liberty—were to be in daily jeopardy—and ordinary civil law to be suspended. The fall fury of the English Government called 'Reprisals' has been flung upon Ireland. She will emerge of course, as she has emerged before—that we know for God reigns—the God of justice, love and pity—and her martyrdom will pass. But the blood red cloud shadows life, shadows one's days—and the young men—the young men who are suffering so gloriously. Never has Ireland had such splendid sons.

"May I ask you to forgive me—I am ashamed and sorry. But to rise from writing about horrors—and to find similar horrors happening now so affects me that I find the power of continuing the work beyond me. I am very, very sorry. I struggled on—then I felt it was too terrible."

## DEGRADATION OF THE FLAG

In the town of Ballina lately the Black and Tan to "amuse" themselves by provoking the public, organized a Union Jack parade compelling the leading merchants of the town to march the street carrying Union Jacks, and one of them to trail the Republican flag in the dust behind him. They had an itinerant musician play a banjo in front of the procession; and at a certain point all had to kneel down and kiss the Union Jack, and then burn the Republican flag. The Black and Tan marched alongside with loaded guns. When an explanation was demanded by a Labor member in Parliament, it was explained that these merchants did not march in this parade and carry Union Jacks under compulsion. The commander of the Black and Tan had just "invited" them to join in a loyal parade—and of their own free will they had knelt on the ground and kissed the Union Jack and burnt the Republican flag. This explanation given in Parliament of the terribly provoking humiliation put upon the respectable merchants of the town, under the muzzles of the guns of the Black and Tan savages, is fair sample of Sir Hamar Greenwood's method of publicly lying in Parliament about the happenings in Ireland, and a good example of what the English people readily stand for. When, a few days or a few weeks after the perpetration of such outrageous blackguardism, two or three of the blackguards are shot dead, Sir Hamar Greenwood and all England will hold up their

hands in horror, at the work of the Irish assassins. It must be of lively interest to Sir Thomas Lipton to know that it was his first employer, old Mr. Pat Beirne, the chief merchant in Ballina, who, with a Black and Tan bayonet, uncomfortably close to his spine, led the Ballina procession, carrying the Union Jack above his head. When Sir Thomas, as a lad, began his career, his first employment was under Pat Beirne in the branch establishment which he had opened in Glasgow.

## WHY POLICEMEN ARE SHOT

The genesis of the slaying of two policemen will throw interesting light upon many such incidents in Ireland. From my little home village in the mountains of Donegal I get regular accounts of happenings. Three months ago a lorry load of soldiers passing through the village at night, shot it up as a matter of amusement to themselves, shot through every window in which they saw a light, narrowly missing two girls and one child, and putting the peaceful villagers in a terrible panic. A month later, passing through again they gave it another shooting up—again for amusement. Then an ex-soldier in the village, a republican, is taken under the patronage of the Crown forces, supplies them with news regarding movements of any boy who is supposed to be working for Ireland, and is given a free hand, and all encouragement to annoy, harm, and provoke the villagers, and extract from them all the money and drink he requires, the villagers being given to understand that if the fellow is interfered with, the soldiers and police from neighboring prisons will wreak terrible vengeance upon the village. The fellow goes from bad to worse in his harrying the suffering people and treating them with insolent truculence and tyranny—till at length he takes a can of petrol and proceeds openly to set fire to the houses of people whom he especially dislikes. Next the policemen from the neighboring garrison visit the fair in the village, mug and provoke a fine young man of my acquaintance, a known worker for Ireland, till he turns on and strikes one of them whereupon they set on him and beat him unmercifully, afterwards following him as he leaves the town, hold him up, and under pretence of searching for arms, strip him on the public road, to humiliate him before the crowds passing out from the fair. Just three days after the receipt of my letter with this annoying intelligence I lift the New York morning papers and read the called announcement that a band of police from Donegal were ambushed outside this village and two of them shot dead.

## BELFAST MERCHANTS DISLIKE SPLENDID ISOLATION

Accounts still pour in of the stranglehold which the boycott has got upon Belfast's business and industry. The Dublin Daily Independent reports that things have got so serious with some firms, bringing them to the verge of bankruptcy, that they are resorting to the most ingenious schemes to evade the boycott. In order to get their goods surreptitiously into the south and west of Ireland some of them are shipping them first to England and Scotland, and from thence direct to Irish customers. An informant of The Independent at Belfast says that the most famous Belfast Unionist businessman are objecting to the separate Ulster Parliament—to the partition scheme—because they believe it will spell final ruin for their trade. The same informant says that many of these men have their travellers to the south and west of Ireland actually bringing large stocks of goods along with them and offering them to shop keepers on the spot at bargain prices.

## ULSTER IS ULSTER

There is an Ulster Farmers' Union for looking after the interests of farmers, prices, etc.,—which Union is composed almost entirely of Unionist farmers. When the Separation Bill went into effect Carson's lieutenants called upon this Farmers' Union to combine themselves to the six counties that were included in the Partition Bill. But it is encouraging to know that the Unionist farmers at once refused to respond to the crack of the whip. They maintained that Ulster was Ulster, in spite of the division; that there were nine counties and not six in Ulster, and that the Union would still cover all nine counties. It was an unpleasant bit of news to the Carson political machine, the first sign of independence not to say rebellion, and presaged for them loads of trouble that is ahead.

Altogether there are very grave apprehensions in the Carson camp that the new Parliament of Carsonia is not going to be a pleasant party. There is an independent Ulster Labor Party (of Unionists) who are against the machine-men. There is quite a body of farmers who are against them for trade reasons. There is a growing spirit of scorn and opposition among the Belfast merchants, whose trade is going to be ruined by the division. And on top of all this will come the opposition of thousands of Orange-

men who are clamoring for office and will not get it, because the places have to be filled with favorites. Before the new Belfast Parliament is six months old there will be some lively times in it—and a significant portion of Orangemen will be sorely crying that a handful of demagogues and office-seekers made tools and fools of them.

SEUMAS MACMANUS,  
OF DONEGAL.

## THE DISEASE OF DIVORCE

REV. JOHN J. O'GORMAN ANSWERS THE OTTAWA EVENING JOURNAL

"He that marrieth one that is put away from a husband committeth adultery." (St. Luke xvi, 18.)

An attempt will be made this session (the third attempt in three years) by a private member to have a bill passed establishing divorce courts in Ontario. The Ottawa Journal is, I regret, one of the press champions of the divorce court. Last week it published two pro-divorce editorials. The first I will charitably ignore, as I believe if the editor will re-read it, especially its last line, he will regret having written it. In the second editorial, dated Friday, the editor opens up his argument with a statement that the Catholic Church must not interfere with what he calls the liberty of the individual and then gives several arguments why the Senate should hand over the divorce business to a divorce court.

The Journal concedes that it is all right for a Catholic to believe that he is bound by the doctrine of the indissolubility of marriage. It objects, however, to the Catholic Church interfering with the liberty of any individual who claims a divorce. Who is interfering with anybody's liberty? Liberty presupposes rights. Now what right has anybody to divorce? Unless somebody has a right to divorce, privation of divorce is not privation of liberty. Has anyone a right to divorce? It is no answer to refer to 'recent experience' or 'current conditions' or to say that divorce is a 'fact' not a theory. So is venereal disease a fact, a fact resulting from the same cause as divorce, namely adultery. Because venereal disease is a fact, must we pass legislation to facilitate its spread?

One does not have to be a Catholic, or even a Christian to see the evils of divorce. Divorce is the disruption of the family, the putting asunder of the marriage bond. If marriage is a good institution, divorce is an evil institution. Since the family is the cell of the social organism upon which the welfare of society principally depends, a disruption of the family is an undermining of society. If the family is a good institution, divorce is an evil institution. Divorce is invariably based on mere selfish passion, and logically results in free love. Will anyone say that interference with what is miscalled free love, but which is merely depraved sexual promiscuity, is an interference with the liberty of the individual? Yes; the extreme protagonists of divorce on the continent actually maintain this hellish doctrine. They at least are logical in carrying out their principles to this ultimate conclusion.

It is high time to tear aside the veil of quasi respectability and expose the rotteness of divorce. Divorce is a premium put on adultery. A legal divorce means that an adulterer or adulteress, as a reward of crime, may seek a new partner in life. Who will support that perversion of morality? No specious talk about interference with the rights of the liberty of the individual will avail. A man and a woman vow before God and men to take each other as husband and wife till death do them part. Divorce makes that vow a mockery. Yet that vow is the foundation stone of our civilization and morality. Marriage is a contract and like all contracts implies obligations. Husband and wife begin their married life by the voluntary and permanent surrender of their individual lives in the interest of that deeper and wider life which they are to have in common. Henceforth they belong entirely to each other, and to him for whom marriage and the family principally exist—the child. For a married person to run away from such solemn obligations to a divorce court, is as if a soldier ran away from the field of battle because bullets and shells interfere with the liberty of the individual. The home may not be always what it should be; and the trenches may be but a poor shelter, but he who runs away is a traitor.

Don't tell me that Christ sanctioned divorce. Christ did no such thing; He abolished Mosaic divorce. Those who, in face of the clear and consistent testimony of three books of the New Testament, try to justify divorce for adultery, by an obscure clause, which the best manuscripts do not possess, and which even if genuine, is shown by the context to preclude remarriage, should remember that even if we concede that whole unorthodox contention Christ did not, even if in that supposition, sanction divorce; He merely toler-

ated it owing to the hardness of hearts, just as Christianity tolerated slavery owing to the hardness of hearts. Shall we pass a law legalizing human slavery because Moses sanctioned it, and Christ did not abolish it? In the one case as in the other, Christ laid down principles concerning the indissolubility of marriage, and the universality of brotherly love which inevitably resulted, where they prevailed, in the elimination of divorce and slavery. Modern legislators, however, care little for the legislation of Christ. For if there be one law which is found throughout the whole of the New Testament it is that an adulterer may not remain. Every divorce law and every divorce court in the world permits her to remain. But if religious arguments against divorce are disregarded by men who put asunder what God has joined, the practical results in our own life time of this disease of divorce are sufficiently gruesome to make our legislators pause.

A divorce bill or a bill of divorce is a cowardly and selfish betrayal of a helpless third party—the child. Society is vitally interested in this third party: upon him rests the whole future of humanity. Society should protect the rights of the child to the support and guidance of both his parents. A race that will not assume and fulfil the obligations of the most solemn obligations, have given themselves up to selfish vice. It is no argument to answer: You Catholics need not worry; practical Catholics will not seek divorce no matter how easy they become. I answer: If my neighbor's house be on fire, shall I sit on my doorstep with folded hands and say that mine is fire-proof? As far as this world is concerned, we sink or swim together, irrespective of the individual merits or demerits which determine our sterility. It is a duty of citizenship to oppose the divorce evil by constitutional means.

Having thus disposed of the Journal's fundamental objection relating to the so-called interference with the liberty of the individual, I shall now answer its arguments in favor of divorce courts for Ontario. I hold no brief for divorce by Act of Parliament. I believe such Acts are immoral, un-Christian, unnatural and unjust. The present system in Ontario, which is established by Parliament passing a law abolishing divorce in Canada. But the present system is less wrong than the establishment of divorce courts, since the latter would increase the number of divorces and hence the extent of this evil, which from a privilege that Parliament may grant becomes a right that the court must decree. I will now deal with the Journal's six arguments for abandoning the present system in favor of the establishment of a divorce court in Ontario.

The Journal writes:  
(1) "The Parliament of Canada ought not to waste time discussing the marital squabbles of a few of the people."

Ans. There are only 9 Senators in the Divorce Committee which does practically all the work; 8 form a quorum. The rest of our legislators spend only a very small fraction of their time passing into law the reports of the Senate Committee.

The Journal writes:  
(2) "We have asserted that many Senators and Members of Parliament were continually voting on these bills on other than their judicial merits; is that true? We did question the propriety of a Catholic or anybody else voting in Parliament to decide a divorce question upon any grounds except the merits of the case."

Ans. It is not true. There is no Catholic on the Divorce Committee, and every report of that committee last session was passed without a division being taken. For several years there have been only two cases on which a division was taken, and in neither case was the decision based on the religious beliefs of the legislators. Only two alleged errors out of over 300 cases is as good a record as that of any court of the land.

The Journal States:  
(3) "We asserted that Canada alone of all countries in the world persisted in withholding court trial of divorce from a part of her people; is that true?"

Ans. No, it is not true. There is no divorce in Italy, Spain, South Carolina, or for Catholics in Austria; in the case of a divorce application from Ireland the parties have to go before the House of Lords, and the same applies to Britishees in India.

The Journal States:  
(4) "We asserted that Parliamentary procedure is more expensive than the average court procedure would be."

Ans. The Senate charges \$210 but remits them in the case of the poor. There are, however, other heavy expenses. Admitting that Parliamentary divorce is expensive, I would answer with Daniel O'Connell: 'I wish that the poor shall be placed on the same footing with the rich, but I would accomplish that not by giving it to the poor, but by refusing it to the rich.'

The Journal states:  
(5) "We asserted it to be notorious that considerations of some of these bills were affected by the good looks of a woman or the lobbying of parties to the case or their friends; is that true?"

Ans. Is it? Let us turn from the editor of the Journal to Senator Ross, who being the Chairman of the Divorce Committee is a competent witness. Senator Ross, in the very speech in which he moved the second reading of his bill "to provide in Ontario and Prince Edward Island for the dissolution of marriage," stated in the Senate, April 14, 1920: "I doubt very much whether the case will be any more carefully tried by a court than they have been by the Divorce Committee of this House. There has been considerable criticism . . . about the way in which we have tried the case, but I may say for myself that there has never been a report from the Divorce Committee in favor of granting a divorce regarding which I was not thoroughly satisfied that the case had been clearly proven. Such criticisms of course come from people who are not used to examining evidence. The fact of the matter is the opinion of the man of the street with regard to trial of a case before the Divorce Committee is not worth anything at all; it is not worth any more than my opinion should be in a case of typhoid fever. I have reason to know that the leading lawyers who have been before the Divorce Committee are satisfied that the cases have been as well tried as if tried before a court of the regular courts of Canada." That disposes of the Journal's argument. It may be asked why did Senator Ross want a divorce court established in Ontario. His principal reason was because he considered that the prevailing sentiment was in favor of it. Of this no proof has ever been forthcoming.

The Journal's last argument in favor of a divorce court is thus worded:  
(6) "We asserted that in the provinces in Canada in which divorce courts exist no proof is observable that divorce courts have a particularly evil effect; is that true?"

Ans. No, it is not true. The official Canada Year Book, 1919, shows that during the years 1905-1918 in British Columbia where divorces were granted by the courts, they numbered 277, while in Ontario, where they were granted by Parliament, they numbered 163. Proportionately to the population there were 11 times more divorces in British Columbia where they have a divorce court, than in Ontario where they have not. During the same period, Saskatchewan and Alberta could procure divorces only by Acts of Parliament. They numbered 11 in Saskatchewan and 23 in Alberta. In British Columbia, as noted, they were 277. This huge disproportion is due to British Columbia having had a divorce court. During the same years Nova Scotia and New Brunswick had, excluding judicial separations, 193 divorces, over five times more than had Alberta and Saskatchewan, which are slightly more populous.

Turn next to Manitoba. From 1870-1917, divorces were obtainable only by Act of Parliament, and only 26 were granted in all that period, a ratio of 7/10 of a divorce per year. In the one year 1920, according to recent information, Manitoba courts granted 94 divorces, 42 of these being absolute divorces, and 52 nisi. As late as four or five years ago, the average yearly number of divorces granted to Manitoba citizens by Act of Parliament was only one and a half per year. Thus in 1915 one divorce was granted, in 1916 two divorces. Then Manitoba courts were declared competent to grant divorces, and they are doing it at the rate of 94 per year.

This appalling increase is due to the fact that the facility of divorce courts was placed at the disposal of the people of Manitoba just when they needed rather every restrictive force to cope with the rising tide of post-war divorce cases. A comparison with Ontario's ratio proves this contention.

Averaging the figures it is safe to say that the establishment of a divorce court increases divorces sevenfold. The nearer you bring the mill to the grist, the more grist goes into the mill.

We are at present passing through a plague of divorce applications due to the abnormal conditions occasioned by the War. This divorce wave is as much the result of the War as was the influenza. Like the influenza it will be but transient unless we take measures to make it permanent by passing legislation for the facilitation of divorce. Instead of legislating divorce into the constitution of this Province, let us rather ask that Parliament begin a series of

restrictive legislation, aiming as soon as public opinion is sufficiently educated, at total prohibition of the disease of divorce. This can be accomplished if all Canadians, whether Catholics or non-Catholics, who honestly believe that divorce is a social evil which should be eradicated from our national life, will organize their opposition to this disease.

## CATHOLIC NEWS

FROM MANY PARTS OF THE WORLD

ROME CABLE—Y. M. C. A.

The Vatican is receiving depressing reports regarding the propaganda which the Y. M. C. A. is conducting against the Church in the territories where it was introduced during the War, as in Austria, Czechoslovakia and Serbia. The Holy Father is deeply grieved, and wishes America to know how the Y. M. C. A. employs its activity in a ruthless fight against Catholicism.

## PALESTINE REPORT

Rev. Doctor Paschal Robinson, O. F. M., of the Catholic University of America, who was last autumn appointed Apostolic Visitor to the Holy Land, has returned from Palestine, and has submitted to Pope Benedict a report respecting his work and much information regarding conditions there.

## NUNCIO AT BERLIN

Monsignor Pacelli, papal nuncio at Berlin, has completed his labors in connection with the negotiation of a concordat between Bavaria and the Holy See. His stay in Munich, whither he went on his mission, probably will be terminated at Easter. He will then go to his residence in Berlin; and the Holy See will appoint a new nuncio at Munich.

## THIRD ORDER CONGRESS

Preparations for the celebration of the centenary of the Third Order of St. Francis at a great congress at Assisi next September are now in progress. The congress will be international in character, and will be marked by great solemnity. A representative of the Pope will attend. It is intended that Italian tertiary associations will hold a national gathering preliminary to great international meeting.

## GOLDEN JUBILEE

It is planned to observe appropriately the fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the Society of Italian Catholic Youth.

On this occasion it is hoped there will be held in Rome a great assembly to translate in solemn procession the remains of Pope Leo XIII. from their temporary sepulchre in St. Peter's Basilica to the tomb already constructed in the Church of St. John Lateran, in compliance with the deceased Pontiff's wishes. This project has not yet received approval, but it is being considered with great favor by the Vatican.

## HOLY HOUSE OF LORETTO

The Holy House of Loretto, it is learned, was only slightly damaged by the fire which last Tuesday destroyed the famous altar and the statue of the Blessed Virgin in the basilica, and ruined many precious relics. Some of the priceless stones in the gold and silver vessels and ornaments on the altar have been found in the ashes, uninjured. The origin of the fire has not yet been determined, but an official investigation is under way. All Italy is profoundly shocked. The town of Loretto is filled with grief, and the Holy Father has expressed his sympathy to the Bishop. Pope Benedict will present a new statue to take the place of the one which has been destroyed.—Pucci.

## PARIS CABLE

(By N. C. W. C. Special Cable)

## ST. VINCENT DE PAUL IN PARIS

Paris, Feb. 28.—Marshal Foch, who is an active member of the St. Vincent de Paul Society, and a zealous visitor of the poor and needy, was the principal speaker at the General Assembly of the society held here last week, Cardinal Dubois presiding. The society, last year, recruited four hundred new voluntary visitors, the majority of whom were students, and founded six hundred gardens for workers. It also opened sixty-four information offices for families.—Massiani.

## DUBLIN CABLE

(By N. C. W. C. Special Cable)

Dublin, Feb. 28.—Shane Leslie has answered Lord Hugh Cecil's accusation that the responsibility for the Irish situation rests with the Irish bishops, by pointing out that the bishops do not govern the country. Leslie declares that a change in the British Government policy is the only remedy possible.

## ANGLICAN BISHOPS SILENT

The Irish press refers to the almost complete silence of the English Anglican bishops on the subject of the morality of reprisals. The Anglican convocation at York on Friday decided by vote, seventeen to fifteen, not to condemn reprisals but recommended prayers for Ireland.

## CATHOLIC NOTES

Philadelphia.—A purse of \$500,000 will be the gift of the Catholics of the archdiocese of Philadelphia to Cardinal Dougherty after his elevation by Pope Benedict. The presentation will not be made until his return from Rome.

Rome, Feb. 16.—Charles M. Schwab was received by Pope Benedict at a most cordial audience here today. Schwab is a Catholic and Knight of Columbus. Pope Benedict highly praised the nobility and generosity shown by the American nation as well as by individual Americans, and was greatly interested in the steel maker's views of the situation in the United States.

Very Rev. Canon Dillon, D. D., who has just passed away at the age of eighty, maintained an active interest in his parish, Tullanstown, County Meath, Ireland, till the end. He was a man of surprising vitality. Up to two years ago he made his parish rounds on a bicycle. He was educated at the Irish College, Salamanca, and was appointed parish priest in 1903. Canon Dillon was buried in a spot in the parish church marked out by himself.

Lucerne, so well known as Switzerland's most popular tourist resort, is to become the seat of a Catholic university. Two of its largest and finest hotels, built shortly before the War, are to be converted into university buildings at an estimated cost of 16,000,000 francs. The hotels adjoin each other, and one will serve as residential quarters for students and professors. The German Rhine provinces are subscribing large sums to this project.

During the recent struggle which took place at Middleton, County Cork, says the Catholic Sun, a member of the Black and Tans was mortally wounded, and lay dying on the roadside. In his agony he called out for a priest, saying he wanted to die a member of the Catholic Church. Father Donnelly hurried to the scene, and before dying the wounded man had received the Last Rites of the Church. His remains were conveyed to London for interment.

On January 15 the first issue of the Review of Reviews, London, appeared under new management. Founded by the late Mr. Stend, the Review now appears under the editorship of Sir Philip Gibbs. Mr. Hilaire Belloc heads the list of contributors. It is planned to give an impartial survey of the world's history and thought. Under the direction of Catholic men as capable as Sir Philip Gibbs there seems no doubt but that the monthly will regain the prestige which it held for a time. The writers engaged are quite as talented and eminently more dependable.

Six new Cardinals will be created at the coming Consistory, according to Osservatore Romano, the semi-official organ of the Vatican, which also states that the Secret Consistory will be held on March 7, and the Public Consistory on March 10. The following is the list of the Cardinals as announced by the Osservatore Romano: Monsignor Dennis J. Dougherty, Archbishop of Philadelphia; Monsignor Francesco Vidal Barraguer, Archbishop of Tarragona; Monsignor Juan Benlloch y Vivo, Archbishop of Burgos, Spain; Monsignor Karl Josef Schulte, Archbishop of Cologne; Monsignor Michael von Faulhaber, Archbishop of Munich, and Monsignor Francesco Ragonesi, papal nuncio at Madrid.

The doctors are still disputing among themselves whether or not there will be a recurrence of the influenza in 1921, says The Echo. Surgeon-General Cummings thinks that "those who had the disease in 1918-19-20 need not expect to have it again, and that the waves of those years used up the great bulk of susceptible material." The Chicago Health Department expects another epidemic in April, 1921, but says: "If we can get through the winter until the last week in April without much influenza, we probably shall escape any considerable wave." Meanwhile a new and aggravated form of the influenza, known as "sleeping sickness," is working havoc in different parts of the country, especially in New Mexico, southern Illinois, southern Michigan, and Northern Indiana.

Fifty successful Philadelphia businessmen, prominent in finance and commerce, says the Standard and Times, laid aside their business affairs and formed the Philadelphia branch of the American Committee for Relief in Ireland at a spirited meeting in the Bellevue Stratford Hotel. Judges of the Courts, Monsignor and priests of the Church, presidents of banks, leaders in other lines of endeavor—all met under the roof-tree of "Humanity" to chart the course they should follow to aid the stricken land. A Philadelphian who has watched various Irish movements come and go in the last thirty-five years was astonished when he observed these men of affairs fling into the meeting room to give public expression to their love of Ireland. "I've never seen anything like it in this city," he remarked, his eyes swelling. "When the best men of our city take off their coats, Ireland's cause will win."