was responsible for the offensive and ill-bred thing. All papers gave us a fablegram about Dr. Mannix in Paris that was self-contradictory and absurd on the face of it. The story was said to have been cabled from Paris on April 15. Then, from London, April 19, came another cable, telling us that Dr. Mannix (who is usually "Mannix" to the gentlemen who at present conduct the Star) denied that he ever said that the Pope described the British policy in Ireland as shocking. On April 20, followed another London cable giving further denials of the original fablegrammer's report. In order that they may serve as a guide, and attest whereby we may estimate the value and the truth of reports concerning Ireland or Catholic dignitaries, we give here the ridiculous little string of cables as they were published in Dunedin:

ATTITUDE OF THE POPE. STATEMENT BY ARCHBISHOP MANNIX "BRITAIN'S POLICY SHOCKING." PARIS, April 15.

(Received April 17, at 5.5 p.m.) Irish residents entertained Archbishop Mannix at dinner. Interviewed, Archbishop Mannix said that the Pope asked him to be his intermediary in condemning the acts of his compatriots in Ireland. "I refused," he said, "and showed the Holy Father that there was something fine and heroic in Sinn Fein's war against Britain. The Pope finally agreed that the British policy in Ireland was shocking."

Archbishop Mannix declared that the persistent rumors that the Vatican intended to issue a condemnation of the Irishmen's efforts to obtain the freedom of their country were merely English propaganda.-A.

and N.Z. Cable.

STATEMENT BY DR. MANNIX. MISINTERPRETED IN PARIS

LONDON, April 19.

Archbishop Mannix, referring to his recent Paris interview, denies that he said that the Pope described the British policy in Ireland as shocking.—A. and N.Z. Cable.

DR. MANNIX INTERVIEWED. STATEMENTS DENIED.

LONDON, April 20. (Received April 21, at 10.50 p.m.)
Dr. Mannix, in a further interview, denied that he stated the Pope had asked him to condemn the alleged Sinn Fein outrages in Ireland, that he refused the Pope's request, and that when he informed the Pope of the real situation in Ireland the Pope had said that the British policy in Ireland was shocking.—Reuter.

The absurdity of the entire business has dawned even on the editor of the Otago Daily Times. poor man has written for his paper, we learned some time ago, hundreds and hundreds of editorials. It looks as if the following which we take from Saturday morning's paper is very much one of them. It is a gem of

purest ray serene and no mistake:

Those people who hang upon the words of Archbishop Mannix will have been perplexed this week to know what really was the nature of the interview in Paris, of which we have heard something by cable. The Archbishop was represented as having said that he refused a request by the Pope that he should act as the intermediary of the Vatican in condemning the Sinn Fein practices in Ireland. This was a bold statement to attribute even to a prelate who has never been remarkable for the discretion he has shown in the choice of his language. But only a day or two later Archbishop Mannix, having arrived in London, denied having said in Paris either that the Pope had asked him to denounce the Sinn Fein practices or that he had refused to do so. With this denial, one-half of the interview in Paris, as communicated by cable, went by the board. There remained the statement that Archbishop Mannix "showed the Holy Father that there was something fine and heroic in Sinn Fein's war against Britain"—a notable achievement, if it were true—and that "the Pope finally agreed that the British policy in Ireland was shocking." The suggestion that the Pope had been persuaded, against his previously-formed conviction, that it was the British policy in Ireland that was to be condemned—though it bereft Archbishop Mannix of some of the glory accorded to him in the original message-still left some tangible evidence of the compelling power which the Archbishop carried even into the Vatican. But, alas, Archbishop Mannix has since denied that he ascribed to the Pope the statement that the British policy in Ireland was shocking. It is, indeed, shocking to be assured—and assured piecemeal, as though the denials were dragged from reluctant lips—that the interviewer in Paris, who drew such a striking picture of Archbishop Mannix as a courageous and successful pleader of the "wrongs" of the Irish rebels, must have relied on his imagination for his story. All that is left to us of the narrative is the bald assertion that Archbishop Mannix was interviewed in Paris. That has not been denied so far. Perhaps, however, it also is "clumsy English propa-

Just think of the simplicity of assuming that there are any persons silly enough not to see that the first self-contradictory cable was a fake! Think too on the editorial gem which describes Dr. Mannix as "a prelate who has never been remarkable for the discretion he has shown in the choice of his language." What a knowledge of men and things that sapient sentence reveals! If there is one thing for which Dr. Mannix is famous it is precisely his discretion in the use of words, and nothing has been more galling to Australian anti-Irish journalists and parsons and politicians than that very fact. But, the entire passage from the Otago Daily ought to be preserved as a good sample of what a poor hard-pressed editor working on such a bad cause will say and do when he loses his temper and proceeds to prove that he has lost it. One would think that he had a personal grievance against Dr. Mannix for not saying what he did not say. The last phrase, however, hits the bull's eye. It is clumsy English propaganda—though the Daily Times man thinks he is scathingly sarcastic in saying so. But he is right, although he does not know he is right: it is all as clumsy as his own pitiful balderdash on the situation. Before we leave the topic it is worth while recalling that we were told on Thursday that Lloyd George denied that there were organised official reprisals. A brilliant cable next day assured us that official reprisals had taken place in Ireland again! What a lot of fun others would lose if only somebody in our day-lie offices had a sense of humor!

NOTES

Poets' Graves in Rome

It is worth while adding a few additional notes to what we have already said concerning the place where Keats was buried, under the walls of Rome. Shelley's heart was, as we have said, brought thither after Byron and Trelawney had burned the poet's body on the beach at Spezzia. During his lifetime he loved this spot, and in the preface to Adonais we read:

"The cemetery is an open place among the ruins,

covered in the winter with violets and daisies. It might make one in love with death to think that one should

be buried in so sweet a place."

The wealthy banker, Samuel Rogers, wrote of it: "When I am inclined to be serious, I love to wander up and down before the tomb of Caius Cestius, The Protestant burial ground is there, and most of the little monuments are erected to the young—young men of promise cut off when on their travels, full of enyoung men thusiasm, full of enjoyment; brides in the bloom of their beauty, on their first journey; or children borne from home in search of health. It is a quiet, from home in search of health. . . It is a quiet, sheltered place, covered in winter with violets; and the pyramid that overshadows it gives it a classical and singularly solemn air."