

The Irish Delegates

A FAREWELL LETTER

To the Editor 'New Zealand Tablet.'

Dear Sir,—Departing from New Zealand, we desire to record an expression of our profound gratitude to the people of all creeds and classes in this progressive Colony who contributed to the flattering success of our mission. Nothing could exceed the wonderful enthusiasm and generosity of the friends and sympathisers of Ireland in New Zealand, who rallied to the practical support of our cause. We succeeded here far beyond our keenest anticipations. Apart from the financial tribute of well over £5000 given towards the Exchequer of Ireland's fighting army in the cause of freedom, the permanent moral effect of our efforts in illuminating the issues involved in the Home Rule problem is to us the most encouraging feature of our tour through these beautiful islands. We not only succeeded in effectually demolishing the bogey arguments brought forward against the inalienable right of the Irish People to a full measure of national autonomy, but we have rallied all that is honest and fair-minded in the public life of New Zealand. The people of this Colony now realise that Ireland's right means no man's wrong, and no aggression on the prerogatives of other States or nations. We believe, with the potent social influences in all parts of the British-speaking world now operating in our favor, the dawn of Ireland's national regeneration cannot be much further delayed.

We desire to thank especially the Archbishop, Bishops, and priests of New Zealand, not only for all their generosity and support to our cause, but for their great personal kindness. To the public-spirited press in all the centres we visited for their powerful assistance our thanks go forth. To you, Mr. Editor, for your able and consistent championship of Ireland's rights, we are under a deep debt of gratitude.

We carry away with us many pleasant recollections of our visit to New Zealand; its people, its scenery, its institutions, and generally, the character of the Colony have impressed us deeply. May every success and prosperity attend the people of New Zealand, and may the future of the Colony continue great and progressive.—Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH DEVLIN.

JOHN T. DONOVAN.

CHURCH AND STATE IN FRANCE

VITAL POINTS IN LATER HISTORY

(Concluded from last week.)

The Bishop, however, did not come to Rome. On the contrary, he forwarded a letter (1), in which, without any reference to the summons of the Holy Office, or his communication of its contents to the Government, he announced his intention of paying his ordinary visit ad limina in October. He fixed upon this time because he wished to bring with him the Peter's-Pence offering, and its collection would not be completed before October. The Secretary of State replied (2), that according to a decree of the Holy Office, approved by the Pope himself, he (Cardinal Merry del Val) was instructed to inform the Bishop, that unless he appeared in person to answer the charges against him within fifteen days, he should incur ipso facto suspension from Orders and Jurisdiction. The Bishop communicated this letter to the Government, and wrote (3), to inform the Secretary that although he asked permission to set out for Rome, the permission was refused, and requested the Cardinal Secretary to communicate with the French Government, expressing himself, at the same time, willing to carry out whatever agreement might be arrived at by the two Powers. The Secretary wrote (4) immediately requesting the Bishop to appear in Rome before the 20th June under pain of censure.

(1) 24th June, 1904. (2) 2nd July, 1904. (3) 6th July, 1904.
(4) 10th July.

The case of Monsignor Nordez was somewhat similar. Charges of a serious nature, in no way connected with politics, were made against him. His diocese was in a state of rebellion, and the crisis came, when in February, 1904, the students of his Seminary refused to receive Holy Orders at his hands. The ordinations were adjourned, and the Cardinal Secretary requested (5) the Nuncio to inform the Bishop of Dijon not to proceed with the conferring of Orders for the present. The Nuncio carried (6) out these instructions; and the Bishop replied (7) that he entirely agreed with the suggestion that had been made. Meanwhile the letter of the Papal Nuncio to the Bishop of Dijon had been communicated to the Government, and the Charge d'Affaires at Rome was instructed to inform the Secretary of State (8) that such a letter was contrary to the regulations of the Concordat, as the Nuncio at Paris had no right to communicate directly with the Bishops of France. Such a contention had never been admitted by the Holy See, and had never been sustained in practice even by the French Government. But it was necessary to do something with regard to the extraordinary state of affairs existing in the diocese of Dijon. Monsignor Nordez was requested by the Secretary of State (9) to present himself in Rome to answer the serious charges that were made against him. He replied (10) that he would be at the disposition of the Holy Father by the middle of June. The month of June came and went, the Bishop remained beyond the Alps; and nothing remained for the Cardinal Secretary except to inform (11) the Bishop that if he did not appear within fifteen days he should consider himself suspended from Orders and Jurisdiction. The Bishop wrote (12) to say that he had communicated the letter to the French Government, and protested that nowhere in the world had the Pope a more obedient or more devoted subject than himself. The Secretary in response to this document made a strong personal appeal (13) to the Bishop to spare the Holy Father the agony his conduct was causing him, and to come to Rome.

The French Government instructed its Charge d'Affaires to protest (14) against the unwarrantable liberty which the Nuncio had taken in communicating directly with French Bishops; and at the same time to demand that the Secretary of State should recall the letters to the Bishops of Laval and Dijon in which they had been threatened with suspension unless they came to Rome. Such letters, it was contended, were a violation of the Concordat. Why this should be so, it is not easy to see. No doubt, following the analogy of the method of appointment—for there is nothing in the Concordat expressly dealing with the deposition—the consent of the two signatory Powers should be required before a French Bishop could be deposed; but, here, there was no question of deposition. There was only a summons to come to Rome, to the non-compliance with which a censure was attached, just as it is attached to many other regulations binding even French Bishops; and if in case of these general laws the threat of censure does not violate the Concordat, it is not easy to see why it should do so in any particular case. If the trial went against the two bishops in Rome, it was well understood that the Pope would have put himself into communication with the Government to bring about their deposition, if they still persisted in refusing to resign.

The Secretary of State replied in a courteous but firmly worded note (15). He pointed out, that the Concordat in no way prevented the Pope from advising a Bishop to resign, or from calling him to Rome to answer for his conduct; that the Bishops of France are not independent of the Holy See, but bound by their sacred oaths of office 'to humbly receive and to diligently execute the apostolic commands'; and that they, too, like the rest of the hierarchy, are obliged under pain of censure to visit Rome at fixed times to give an account of their stewardship. He added, however, that to show his wish for conciliation, the Holy Father was willing to give the Bishops yet another month for their appearance in Rome, provided they promised to come in that time, and provided also that the French Government, in case they refused, or were unable to justify themselves, agreed to enter into communications with the Holy See to provide for the due administration of their dioceses. Four days later, the Charge d'Affaires presented a note (16) from his Government announce-

(5) 10th March, 1904. (6) 11th March, 1904. (7) 13th March, 1904.
(8) 15th July, 1904; Doc XXXVIII. (9) 24th April, 1904. (10) 3rd May, 1904. (11) 6th July, 1904. (12) 19th July, 1904. (13) 22nd July, 1904.
(14) 23rd July; Doc XLIV, XLV and X.
(15) 26th July, 1904; Doc XLVI.
(16) 30th July; Doc XLVII.

WHENEVER you see a Smiling Woman, think of Hondai Lanka Tea. It always gives pleasure.

"HONDEE Lanka" is so much used tea of sea family. Madam, she praise it—so eat is "tres bon"!