or readers know, there are two large rival industrial organisations—the Industrial Workers of the World, or I.W.W., which stands for the general strike, sabotage, and revolutionary Socialism, and the Federation of Labor, which seeks to right industrial wrongs and improve the workers' conditions without recourse to violence. The other day—at the suggestion, it is said, of their priests—between 100 and 150 Catholic members of the I.W.W. in Baltimore who were employed in the High street factory of the firm of Schloss Bros. and Co. withdrew from the I.W.W. and joined the Federation of Labor. Thereupon the I.W.W. leaders—the industrial representatives of 'liberty, equality, and fraternity'—had the colossal impudence to go to the head of the firm (Mr. M. Schloss) and ask that all the employees who had seceded from the I.W.W. should be dismissed!

According to the statements made by the members who left and joined the Federation of Labor, the priests had told them that the teachings of the Industrial Workers of the World were inimical to the doctrines of the Catholic Church and the principles of morality; and that they were in duty bound to sever their connection with the organisation. It is stated that these priests were informed that the members of the Industrial Workers took an oath that placed obedience to the organisation above Almighty God and the Constitution of the United States. As we have said, the I.W.W. leaders went to Mr. Schloss and demanded that the Catholics who had left their ranks be dismissed. This Mr. Schloss peremptorily refused to do. It was then suggested that he remove some of these Catholics from the High street factory to others and give them lower positions. Mr. Schloss said he could not punish any one of his employees for following the dictates of his conscience; that religious beliefs and political creeds were not to be interfered with by him or any other man in a position of responsibility in the firm. The I.W.W. representatives then gave word that they wanted to hold a meeting to take action on the matter at 2 o'clock in the afternoon, saying they would return to the High street shop at three. The men were told that the firm could not permit business to be interfered with in this The recalcitrants then decided to walk out and hold the meeting in spite of the refusal of permission. When the one hundred men left the factory the doors were closed behind them, and they were told that they need not return.

The natural comment on the incident is supplied by the Baltimore Sun. 'No better illustration,' it says, 'of the dangerous character of the Industrial Workers of the World could be furnished than is found in their demand that certain members who had left the organisation on account of religious scruples should be discharged by their employers. Fortunately, their employers had the manhood and good sense to refuse compliance with this extraordinary demand. It will be a bad day for this country when men can be prevented from earning their bread because they are true to their religious convictions and because they place conscience above the orders of labor agitators.'

Archbishop Mannix on Home Rule

Many of our dailies are still a little nervous on the subject of 'Ulster,' their perturbation evidently arising from the fact that they take at their face value the exaggerated and highly-colored cables with which they are supplied. So far as the actual utterances of the 'Ulsterettes' are concerned, they are for the most part fair subject for laughter. Who, for instance, could take seriously such an utterance as the following, which was solemnly cabled out to us a day or two ago: 'Lord Londonderry, who presided, was greeted with ringing cheers when he remarked: 'We await the signal. We can to-day say to the Government, "We are ready; you can strike when you please."' It is urged by many of our dailies that in the interests of peace and good order every effort should be made to effect a compromise; and the abstract desirableness of a settlement

by consent cannot, of course, be gainsaid. But when one party to the dispute says that it will not abate its resistance to the Government of Ireland Bill though it were ratified by the verdict of twenty general elections what opening or inducement is there for conference or compromise? Speaking some little time ago in the House of Commons, Mr. John Redmond, on behalf of the Irish Party, announced not for the first time that they desired to come to terms with 'Ulster.' But the Irish Leader added: 'But, Sir, I must be quite honest. There is another side to this question. Twentyeight counties will not permit themselves to be intimidated by four, and, in the last resort, the cry of hon. gentlemen above the gangway, "We will not have Home Rule," will be met by the answering cry from the rest of Ireland, "We will, we must, and we shall have an Irish Parliament, and for an Ireland one and indivisible." That is the irreducible minimum; and in view of the past sufferings of Ireland, and of her long struggle for justice, it is not an unreasonable demand to make. Almost without exception the big city dailies have discussed the Home Rule question broadly, tolerantly, and sympathetically; and their utterances are entitled to the fullest measure of respect. The same cannot be said of some of the journalistic lesser lights—such, for example, as the Wairarapa Daily Times, which devotes more than a column of its editorial space to cock-and-bull stories about the Ancient Order of Hibernians, the Gaelic League, and the Commissioners of National Education, who are accused of altering the Ten Commandments 'to conciliate the Nationalists' because they are promulgating a version of the Decalogue which was officially adopted in Ireland-with the full consent of Archbishop Whately and the other Protestant members of the Commission—as far back as 1837! The whole article is marked by a scarcely disguised tone of bigotry and bias, happily rare amongst our New Zealand papers. In view of the fact that Home Rule is now on the eve of accomplishment no New Zealand Nationalist need allow his equanimity to be disturbed for a moment by such vaporings, which may be fittingly treated with silent contempt.

That Home Rule is now inevitable and well within sight is attested by men whose competency to judge is beyond all question. The latest witness is Dr. Mannix, the recently appointed Coadjutor-Archbishop of Melbourne, whose thoughtful, well-informed, and weighty utterances on public questions have already made a marked and highly favorable impression on the Victorian public. Speaking the other day at Ballarat, his Grace, who is quite a recent arrival from Ireland and entitled, therefore, to speak with special authority, remarked: 'He felt that he would disappoint many of them, if he made no reference to Ireland and her outlook. He believed that Ireland was on the eve of a triumph after her long struggle. He was glad to know that the people of Australia were sympathetic with Ireland in her claims and demands. He had promised Irish members of Parliament that whenever he had an opportunity he would thank the people of Australia for the sympathy that had always gone from this land back to Ireland—sympathy that was not barren, but which carried along with it the sinews of war. No doubt there were clouds in the political atmosphere at present, but unless all the sane prophets were wrong, Ireland was at last going to obtain trol of her own domestic affairs. People told them that Ireland could never get Home Rule because "Ulster" would never consent. "Ulster" never consented to anything which meant giving up monopoly and privilege. "Ulster" would never consent to Home Rule, but once the Bill was passed he thought he was safe in assuring them that the rifles and the drums would never be heard in Ulster, much less beyond its border. All the talk of which they heard so much in Australian papers about civil war in Ireland if Home Rule was granted was moonshine. The Provisional Government would go to pieces as soon as the Home Rule Bill became the law of the land.'