

THE CATHOLIC RECORD
 Published Weekly at 481 and 483 Richmond Street, London, Ontario.
 Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.
 EDITOR—REV. GEO. R. NOTHGRAVES, Editor of "The Catholic Record."
 MESSRS. DONAT CROWE, LUCK KING and JOHN NIGHE are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transmit all other business for the CATHOLIC RECORD.
 Agents for Ottawa—P. J. C. Gray, Esq. Agents for Alexandria, Grandview and Leaside—Mr. Donald A. McDonald.
 Rates of Advertising—Ten cents per line each insertion.
 Approved by the Bishop of London, and recommended by the Archbishop of St. Boniface, the Bishops of Ottawa, Hamilton, Kingston, and Peterborough, and leading Catholic Clergy men throughout the Dominion.
 All correspondence on business should be addressed to the Proprietor.
 Arrests must be paid in full before the paper can be stopped.
 Persons writing for a change of address should invariably send us the name of their former post office.

Catholic Record.
 London, Ont., August 18th, 1898.
 A CARICATURE OF JUSTICE.

As illustrative of the manner in which justice is administered by Mr. Balfour's Removable Magistrates, the case of several persons sentenced to one month's imprisonment on the charge of criminal conspiracy is instructive. Mr. Gladstone said, repeating and endorsing the words of Mr. Reid, M. P., "justice, as administered in Ireland, is a caricature and disgrace." The Killigrew case is but a sample of what has occurred over and over again. Four persons were sentenced to imprisonment on a charge of conspiracy for refusing to sell goods to the police. It had been before decided that on a charge of this kind, it was necessary to establish the fact of conspiracy, but without any evidence of collusion the accused were in this case adjudged guilty, without the opportunity being afforded of bringing their case before a higher court. Three of the accused, however, obtained by other means a hearing before the Exchequer Division, Messrs. Healy, David Barry, and Daniel Lynch. On examining the evidence the Chief Baron held that there was absolutely no evidence to justify the magistrates in conviction, and the three men were discharged from confinement by order of the court. The magistrates having refused to state a case for the consideration of the Court, Baron Dowse declared they were guilty of grossly violating the most sacred rights of the accused. Judge Andrews also stated that the magistrates had no justification for the conviction. Even under the Coercion Act, the refusal of individuals to sell goods is no violation of law. Mr. Gladstone referred to this case in the following manner:

"The resident magistrates, in spite of this being pointed out to them, sentenced the men and refused to state a case for appeal. It was illegal—illegal, I say, and passed off with the people as law and order. The Irish perceive this as well as we. But it is said that this is only one case. Mr. Reid, M. P., had, however, stated in the House that he and some friends had entered largely into the cases under the Act. They had looked at seven hundred cases and declared that justice as administered in Ireland was a caricature and a disgrace to the country."
 This is to say that the administration of the law in Ireland is not justice, but an abominable caricature of justice.
 Another case with a similar moral occurred at Swinford, Co. Mayo. The Guardian of Swinford Union sued for arrears of poor rates which had remained long unpaid on the Tasse estates. Judge Boyd was appealed to by Tasse's agent, and the Judge immediately issued a conditional order for the attachment of the Board of Guardians for proceeding against Tasse, stating at the same time that this "is an instance of what might be expected from such boards if their privileges and powers were extended."
 One of the Dublin organs of the Government joined the Judge in indignation that a landlord should be sued, saying "the Guardians had given a specimen of Home Rule in advance by their action."
 Quite a surprise awaited the Judge, however. It was discovered that the Board of Guardians was not, as is usually the case, a Board elected by the people, but a Board selected by Government to supersede the people's Board, and that they were the officials of the same master as himself. As soon as this became known the Judge apologized to the Board, withdrew the attachments, and promised to aid them in the proceedings against the landlord, completely reversing his former position.

THE INQUEST ON IRELAND'S MARTYR.

The testimony of the physicians who gave evidence at the coroner's jury on Mr. Mandeville, throws additional light upon the shocking story of barbarity which was related by Mrs. Mandeville in regard to the treatment inflicted on her husband while confined in Tullamore jail. Dr. Moorhead, J. P., visited the prison several times and found Mr. Mandeville suffering from sore throat and falling breath, whereupon he recommended several times that he should be placed in the hospital, but to his suggestions no atten-

tion was given. On the 23rd he found Mr. Mandeville walking about in his cell barefooted, and wrapped in a quilt and sheet. This was, he remembered, in midwinter, the day after his clothes had been forcibly taken from his back. For twenty-four hours he had been left completely naked, until at last he put on the prison garb. The cell was offensively smelling, owing to non-removal of filth. Mr. Mandeville had been ordered to clean his cell, but he refused to do menial offices or to associate with criminals. For this refusal Mr. Mandeville was put on punishment on bread and water, notwithstanding his illness. The doctor had never known punishment to have been inflicted before for such a cause. On Nov. 29th Mr. Mandeville was weak from the bread-and-water diet to which he had been subjected. He had tremor in both hands, and complained that he had had no exercise for three days. The doctor recommended relaxation of the punishment, but his suggestions were disregarded. From November 9 to December 21 Mr. Mandeville frequently suffered from diarrhoea, and while in this condition he was in the punishment cell on bread and water for forty-eight hours. During this time he suffered from an increasing rheumatism, but the prison doctor did not examine him nor prescribe for him.
 Dr. McCraith was asked: "What was the cause—not the immediate cause—of Mr. Mandeville's death?" He answered: "I should say the cause of his death was the lowering of his nervous and physical system by the treatment which, it is stated, he received in prison; but of course I don't know anything of that treatment. . . . I am of opinion he would be alive now if it were not for the treatment he received in Tullamore jail."
 Dr. Chas. Ronayne and William O'Neill testified similarly. The latter stated positively that in his opinion the death was caused by his treatment in prison. Dr. Cremen gave similar evidence.

Ex-warder Daniel Goulding stated that he first saw Mr. Mandeville three days after his arrival at the prison. His physical appearance was very remarkable. He was a big, strong, able man, and healthy in every respect. He was then punished for two days on bread and water for refusing to wear the prison clothes.
 Mr. Mandeville told the Governor "I am not a convicted criminal, but a political prisoner, and I will not wear the prison garb." The punishment was then inflicted. The witness was brought to Mr. Mandeville on the 23rd of November to assist in stripping him. He did not assist, however, but he was locking on. His coat was pulled off by force, after a struggle, then his waistcoat, and a twisted knitted "gansy" which was over his shirt. When they pulled off his shirt, Mr. Mandeville said "for decency's sake leave me my shirt. I won't give up my shirt without a struggle." Prison clothes were left in his cell. He was nine times punished on bread and water. Before he left the prison his face had become thin, there were dark circles around his eyes, his lips were blue, and his face also was of a bluish color. His own clothes seemed too big for him, and he was quite a different man from the man I saw at exercise with Mr. William O'Brien. Mr. Mandeville was punished sometimes without his name being entered on the warder's book.
 Major Roberts, Governor of Cork Prison, testified that Mr. Mandeville appeared to be a healthy, strong man while in his custody. On his removal to Tullamore the rule of the Prison's Board, which required a doctor's certificate of fitness for removal, was not observed. Witness stated that he had received orders from Mr. Balfour as to the treatment of the prisoner, but he would not disclose them, though ordered by the coroner to do so.
 Captain Featherstone-Hugh acknowledged, on cross-examination, that Mr. Mandeville was a fine-looking man, gentlemanly in his manner and demeanor, truthful and inoffensive. He claimed that the denial of two hours' exercise was a consequence of the sentence of punishment on bread and water. The MacDermott pointed out that the prisoners are allowed exercise by statute, so that the right could not be withdrawn as a mere privilege, as it was in Mr. Mandeville's case. The Governor could not give any rationale authorizing him to use force to compel a prisoner to wear prison clothes, but stated that he was informed he could do so.
 Dr. MacCabe, a member of the Prison's Board, testified that Mr. Mandeville seemed to him to be very well on the 19th November, though he complained then of sore throat, and said that he was just recovered from a diarrhoea. He declared him fit for punishment. However, he stated "I don't consider that a patient suffering from diarrhoea should be on bread and water, or in a punishment cell. Comfortable clothing and comfortable quarters are very essential in cases of diarrhoea." Dr. MacCabe had been informed by Mr. Bourke that it was Mr. Balfour's wish he should visit Tullamore.

Considering the inhuman treatment inflicted upon Mr. Mandeville, it is so wonderful that he expressed his wish that he should die rather than be should go mad. Mr. Balfour has declared that the verdict of the jury casting blame on the prison officials of the jail was unwarranted by the evidence. The only thing in which we can find that the jury failed is that they did not fix the guilt of the murder on the moving spirit in the nefarious transaction—that is on Mr. Balfour himself.
 As Mr. O'Brien stated before 30,000 people in Edinburgh, it was to Mrs. Mandeville alone that Mr. Mandeville told the whole story of the cruelties he endured—how on one occasion "so famished was he with brown bread and water diet that he was obliged to tie a rope around his waist and to tighten it to repress the pangs of hunger." She told that when a poor, compassionate prison warder once flung him a morsel of meat, as he said, as I would fling it to my own dog Rover, he ravenously lapped it up as if he were a dog, and the warder who gave him that morsel of meat has since been dismissed from the prison service—dismissed by the Chief Secretary, who in a few days is going to preach to the Church Congress on the virtues of practical Christianity.

DIVORCES IN FRANCE.

Under the present French Deistic regime, divorces have been procurable in France since 1884, the law of divorce having been in force since the 27th July of that year. During the three years which elapsed since that date 1773 divorces were granted in the first year, 4,640 in the second, and 4,581 in the third. The number of marriages in 1886 was 283,183, so that there are about 16 divorces to 1,000 marriages, but by far the greater part of these take place in the districts where infidelity is most rampant. In Paris there are 47, in Marseilles 27, in Bordeaux 24 divorces to 1,000 marriages, while in Catholic Brittany there was but 1 divorce to 1,000 marriages, and in Laudes only 1 to 2,000 marriages. This shows that the bulk of the French people are faithful in regarding the sanctity of the marriage tie, while it is among the sceptics of the country that this foundation of the social system is disregarded.
 A suit was brought recently against Rev. S. Rogers, of St. Mark's Church, Liverpool, for making alterations in the church without legal authority. It appeared that the alterations were made for the convenience of an Orange lodge which meets in the church and keeps its paraphernalia there. Rev. Mr. Rogers being its chaplain. Some ornaments described as "a sort of colored stoles," were pronounced by the Chancellor to be contrary to the rubrics, also some three candlesticks, which Mr. Rogers said were "very little ones." The Vicar promised that the objectionable articles would be removed at once. The Chancellor said it would be wise that this step should be taken.

EVICTON SCENES.

The brutality of Colonel O'Callaghan towards his tenants at Bodjke in 1886 has become a matter of history, and the graphic descriptions which Mr. Henry Norman sent from the spot to the *Pall Mall Gazette* and other newspapers did more than perhaps any other event to call the attention of the English public to the barbarities inflicted day after day upon the people of Ireland. It is true Mr. Balfour stated from his place in Parliament that most of Mr. Norman's statements were "pure fabrications," but Mr. Norman's character for truthfulness, and his ability as a close observer, stamp Mr. Balfour's assertion with the brand of mendacity, and he has so often proved himself to be unscrupulous that no one would think for a moment of accepting his word in preference to that of Mr. Norman. However, Mr. Norman supports his statements with such evidence that they are not to be regarded as his unsupported testimony, though even under this aspect, as an honest witness of events at which he was present, his testimony is most valuable. To Mr. Balfour's endeavor to throw discredit upon it, Mr. Norman says in the preface to his book "Bodjke," which is chiefly a republication of his letters to the *Pall Mall Gazette*, "if he (Mr. Balfour) would do me a favor to repeat this assertion (as above quoted), in some place where Parliamentary privilege does not render him irresponsible, I should be able to submit to a court of law the question which of us is speaking the truth."
 These Bodjke evictions were similar in every respect except some minor details, with those which are going on at this moment in many localities of poor Ireland. We may quote from Mr. Norman's description of these enormities the following, which shows how they are appreciated by a disinterested spectator whose sole object was to place the truth of the matter before the British public. Mr. Norman says:

"Eviction was rapidly reduced to a fine art in this unhappy valley, and each morning saw some task begun in the campaign of extermination, and each evening saw its close, with the relentless regularity of a machine. When we drove into Bodjke each day there were some half a dozen families beneath the roof they had built, in possession of the crops which had been sown, poor, perhaps, but still sheltered from the wind and rain, and with that primal eldest privilege of civilized mankind, a hearthstone which is sacred to them from the whole world. Each night as we drove back these families were in the ditch or the road, their cottages ruined by the crowbar, their furniture smashed to bits by the sledge-hammer, their goats and chickens and pigs driven off the land, the mothers and daughters and sisters noted down in the constable's book for summons, and the fathers and brothers in handcuffs on their way to prison—and all for what? Simply from inability to perform the miracle of squeezing from the land a yearly sum of money, which is, admittedly, in the majority of cases beyond its physical power to produce. That is, in other words, the tenants are evicted, robbed, maltreated, and imprisoned, that the landlords may be protected from losses due to the irresistible operation of natural laws. And from the first 'quick march' ordered at daylight to the last 'come back, come back,' blown by the bugle in the afternoon, the whole machinery moves as easily and as regularly as if it were actuated by somebody turning a handle in hell."
 Such, then, is the noble work in which the brave British soldiers who garrison Ireland are employed.
 It would be amusing, were it not so atrocious, to read how "a couple of hundred Royal Irish constables" assisted by a whole company of Her Britannic Majesty's troops, with fixed bayonets," are obliged, in order to make the work of eviction complete, and legal, to chase an obstinate sow, or a few alarmed but lively roosters and hens over the holding so as to eject them. In some cases the pig succeeds in evading the evicting process, and thus, after all their labors, the soldiers' efforts are unavailing.
 The descriptions given by Mr. Norman tally perfectly with what is still going on. The other day at Glenbigh, a poor woman aged 100 was one of the evicted. Being homeless, after the departure of the soldiers and emergency-men, she re-entered her ruined cabin for shelter. For this she was fined, but being unable to pay was sent to Tralee Jail. She obtained permission to take her shroud with her to the prison. She will probably need it before long.
 On the estate of Lord Carysfort, on the 16th ult., Bernard Rafferty was evicted though he promised to pay an exorbitant rent when his crops would be reaped in August and September. Five children, from twelve months to seven years of age, were sleeping in a bed, and were deposited in the yard, exposed to the cold, with only a miserable blanket covering them.
 The tenant, Rafferty, is an industrious man, whose family had been in possession of the homestead for seventy years. The improvements on the property were his own, and his rental was raised as his labor rendered the property more valuable, until the high rent, and the poor crops made it impossible for him to keep up the payments. Nevertheless, he would make a supreme effort to meet the demands which tyrannical laws imposed upon him, if only the opportunity were afforded him to gather his crops. The opportunity was refused him, and his family and himself are thrown on the roadside, destitute.
 The horrors attendant upon the eviction process in Ireland occasionally make an impression even upon supporters of the Government, and cause them to give sympathy to the sufferers. The *Dublin Express*, one of the most Tory organs of Ireland recently stated that the methods practiced in carrying out evictions are a scandal which the Government can ill afford to face. But the sympathy of the *Express* ends there. It still supports the Government which perpetrates these scandals.
 If such scenes were enacted in Russia, the indignation of the whole world would be directed against the Czar, and free born Englishmen would be especially moved under which such scenes were possible. But when they take place at their own doors, and under laws made by themselves, the Government are sustained in their perpetration by a most decisive majority. It is, indeed, little to be wondered at that Irish patience is sometimes exhausted, and that the Irish people have little love for a Government which can do such things.
 The evictions on Colonel Vandeleur's estates are proceeding on a large scale, but the tenants are, for the most part, resisting to such an extent as to render the progress slow and costly. There will be, undoubtedly, many such scenes as have depicted here perpetrated in this case before the diabolical work of Colonel Vandeleur will be completed.
 The annual picnic under the auspices of the Catholic congregation of La Sallette will take place on the 29th inst. There is always a grand gathering on this occasion, and the Rev. Father Dillon is exerting himself to make the picnic this year surpass all that have preceded it. We hope his efforts may be crowned with the success they deserve.

A COMMUNISTIC DEMONSTRATION.

The funeral of the Communist General Eudes was made the occasion for a Communist demonstration in Paris on the 8th inst. There was great excitement in the city, and 15,000 persons marched in front of the bears. Mr. Basley, a Deputy, and Henri Rochefort were greeted with shouts of "Vive la Revolution," and "Vive la Commune." The pallbearers were members of the Commune of 1871. Fifty thousand people lined the streets, and cries of "Vive la Commune" were frequent.
 At the Boulevard Voltaire three red flags were unfurled, one of which a commissary of police attempted to seize, and he was fired at, but the bullet went wide of the mark. A bomb was thrown near the police station, but it did not explode. Some shots were also fired, and the police charged the crowd with drawn swords, wounding and arresting a number of the most violent. In the cemetery the police did not oppose the display of red flags, which were brought furled in the procession, but were unfurled on its arrival at the grave. Official reports show that the total number of arrests made was twenty-four, but all were released except eight who were detained. The Parisian papers agree that the demonstration was much less formidable than was anticipated.

THE POPE ON LIBERTY.

The Ecyclical of Our Holy Father on Human Liberty is, at this period especially, a most important document. It appears at a time when the most erroneous doctrines regarding the nature of man's liberty are in vogue, yet, clothed in elegant language, sometimes, and appealing to man's natural inclination to give loose rein to pleasure, and to be under no restraint of law, they are so apt to be adopted without thought as if they were the unchangeable truth. The first part of this Ecyclical will be found in another column.
 The Ecyclical is directed against the false notions on Liberty, which, under the name of Liberalism, are so freely taught at the present day, and it must be accepted as defining the sense in which Liberty is to be taken, that it may be that Liberty of which Reason and Revelation approve, not License, or Immunity from the control of God or man.
 Our Holy Father explains that "Man is free to obey his reason, to seek moral good, and to shive after his last end." By the gift of God's grace, especially conferred by our Redeemer, the will of man has been ennobled, and what is good in human liberty, the Catholic Church has always approved and practiced, but whatever is the consequence of the disorders of the age, is of a vicious kind, and this the Church has always condemned, as she will continue to do.
 It is strange that among those who most loudly proclaim the doctrine of universal liberty should be found the teaching that man has no liberty whatsoever; yet such is really the case, and it is by the Catholic Church that this teaching has been always vigorously and consistently condemned. Protestantism, in its origin, declared with remarkable unanimity the absence of the first germ of liberty in men. Lutherans and Calvinists alike denied free will, the very basis of all liberty, and to this day the followers of John Calvin on the continent of Europe, equally with the Presbyterian of the English-speaking world, are for the immutable decree of fate which men cannot avert, though they conceal the pagan doctrine of fatalism under the more plausible name of the operations of grace. It is equally, who maintain that man is but the result of one of the never-ending forms which the atoms of matter assume in their necessary or chance contact with each other, maintain as a necessary consequence that everything which occurs, is the result of inevitable fate. Man's will has no real existence. What is called his will is but one of the modes in which this fate manifests itself, and is the necessary consequence of his organism! No one more openly maintains this absurdity than Col. Ligtensoll, who, nevertheless, is one of the most determined advocates of a "Liberty" which in his theory does not and cannot exist.
 The Holy Father shows that the Church has maintained Liberty of will against modern and ancient heresies, as a sacred dogma of religion, and has never made truce with fatalism. But this Liberty needs light and strength to direct its acts to good and to restrain them from evil. Hence it requires to be subject to law. Liberty must be directed by reason, and this subordination to reason is law. This supreme directing reason is the eternal law, the reason of God. If not so subjected, use of Liberty becomes dangerous both to the individual and to society. If all were allowed to do as they please, turmoil and confusion would be the inevitable result. The State is as much bound to be subject to the Law of God as the individual, and it may not sanction what is contrary to God's law. Enactments of the State which run counter to the Law of God are therefore of no authority. True liberty must, therefore, in all cases, whether in the individual or

THE PARNELL INQUIRY.

The bill providing for a commission to examine into the *Times* charges against Mr. Parnell and others passed its third reading on the 8th inst., by 180 to 164. Amendments offering for object to render it really efficient, and to bring the charges against Mr. Parnell and other members of Parliament to be the real subject of investigation were all voted down, so that the Government will have it to their liking, a roving commission enquiring into all the acts of the Liberator in Great Britain and America.
 Mr. Matthews moved to insert the following—Any person who, having been served with a summons under this Act, shall fail to appear, the commission shall have power to issue a warrant for the arrest of such person.
 The motion was adopted.
 Mr. Matthews moved that anybody who is summoned to appear before the commission and refuses or fails to attend shall be liable to punishment for contempt of court.
 Mr. Parnell moved to amend, that any person refusing to make a full disclosure in all matters in respect of which he might be examined shall be liable to punishment by the High Court of Justice.
 The amendment was received with cheers.
 Mr. Parnell explained that his object was to compel the *Times* to produce the person who supplied the letters that had been ascribed to him.
 Mr. Parnell's amendment was rejected.
 Mr. Clancy (Nationalist) introduced a amendment empowering the commission to report from time to time, which was accepted by the Government and adopted.
 A long discussion ensued on a proposal by Mr. W. A. Hunter, to compel the *Times* to formulate its charges before the opening of the enquiry by the commission.
 The proposal was rejected—184 to 118.
 Mr. Healey moved that no accused member of Parliament should be detained in prison under the Crimes Act during the sitting of the commission.
 Mr. L. H. Courtney suggested that Mr. Healey's object might be attained by means of a short process securing the attendance of accused persons.
 The Government leader accepted the suggestion, and Mr. Healey withdrew his motion.
 Other new clauses were then debated, and the House adjourned at 2.40 a. m.
 The Parnell Chamberlain duel is becoming interesting, the more so as it now seems likely to be fought out in the *Times*. Mr. Parnell's draft of the National Council Monday and saw a long letter in big type signed "Your obedient servant, Charles Stewart Parnell," thought the paper had been boxed, but this letter at all events, is genuine. One object of it is to challenge Mr. Chamberlain to produce the documents referred to in the O'Shea letter. The most important of these are Mr. Parnell's draft of the National Council scheme and the Coercion bill, altered in Mr. Parnell's own hand in the form in which according to Mr. O'Shea, he proposed it should be passed, with just enough show of opposition for him to satisfy these concerns. "I think," says Mr. Parnell, "if Mr. Chamberlain possesses these alleged proofs he is bound to publish them, and I call upon him to do so."
 Yesterday appeared in the *Times* the following four line letter from Mr. Chamberlain:—"I accept Mr. Parnell's challenges and will forward to you in the course of a few days a full statement of the communications initiated by him, which passed between us in 1884 and 1885." This is, in fact, accepting Mr. Parnell's challenge, and something more. In fact, Mr. Chamberlain assumes the offensive, which, like other warlike postures, he almost always regards as the best defensive tactics.
 Mr. Parnell's other point, which he argues at length, is of great historical interest, but less exciting for the moment. "True," he says, "I meet I have favored the National Council scheme, but it was only for administrative and not legislative purposes. Only a step towards Home Rule, not a substitute for it. When I found you meant it to be adopted as finally, instead of the Irish Parliament, we parted company. You accuse us of double dealing because we first proposed, then opposed, this scheme. There is the explanation. We accept it as a means; we rejected it as an end." Mr. Chamberlain's promised publication is awaited with extreme interest.
 On the 9th, the Bill passed its first reading in the House of Lords.
Catholic Ireland says the Parnell Commis- sion bill is the greatest fraud ever fashioned. The Parnellites did not reject it, because their action would have been misinterpreted, and did not accept it because it is a fraud, and the tribunal will be packed. The Parnellites, however, will pass the ordeal earnestly, and in good faith. Though the dice are loaded, they feel that the game is theirs.

A SECOND BURCHARD.

The election campaign in the neighboring Republic has produced a second Burchard, whose bigotry may not, however, prove so disastrous to the Republic as that of his prototype, because the Republican candidate is not this time made responsible for his utterance, as he has in no way seemed to approve of it as Mr. Blaine did by his silence when the original Burchard addressed him on the importance of repressing "Rum, Romanism and Rebellion." This time it is Dr. John H. Vincent, lately elected Bishop of the Methodist Church, who has made an asinine exhibition of bigotry, which might have proved as fatal to the Republic as Burchard's in 1884.
 Bishop Vincent is of the opinion that the Republican party is dominated by anti-Catholic prejudice, and he is not backward in stating that it is this conviction that makes him a partisan of that party. His courage is certainly to be admired, but his political prudence does not seem to be quite so worthy of commendation. In view of the fact that it has been demonstrated that Dr. Burchard's courage and indirection together were the direct cause of the loss of the last Presidential election.
 Dr. Vincent being questioned as to his political faith wrote a letter which was published, in which he states "I am not a third party man. Being a true Protestant and an anti-Romanist, I am a Republican." Unless the Republicans keep their Burchards locked up in some Asylum they are in danger of dire defeat. The original Burchard, however, is said to be now in favor of Cleveland.
 It is worthy of remark that respectable Republican journals repudiate both Bishop Vincent's expressions and himself, as may be seen by the following from the *Philadelphia American*, which also apologizes for Mr. Blaine as to the folly of Burchard the first:
 "Dr. Vincent, the founder of Chautauque, is a very able and useful man. But he is capable of saying very foolish and mischievous things. To a lady who wrote to remonstrate with him for not voting with the Prohibition party, Dr. Vincent wrote in reply: 'I am an anti-Romanist, and therefore a Republican.' If Dr. Vincent's sectarian antipathies control his politics in this way, he has mistaken his party. He rightfully belongs to the little faction which calls itself the American party, and has organized on the Know-nothing platform. The Republican party wages no warfare on any religious body which obeys the laws of the country. It does not, and it never did. It has attacked the Church of the 'Latter Day Saints,' only on account of its breaches of the law. If Mormonism abandons Polygamy, it will disappear out of politics. Some of the Democratic newspapers are exulting in the hope that Dr. Vincent is to be Mr. Harrison's Burchard. They forget that what hurt Mr. Blaine in this matter was that those words—'Rum, Romanism and Rebellion'—were uttered in his presence, and without eliciting any protest from him. The truth was that he did not hear them. Sir Richard Temple, the eminent Anglo Indian, was present at the interview in which Dr. Burchard figured, and said he saw that Mr. Blaine was paying no attention whatever to him. But the words were printed in a leaflet and distributed at the door of every Roman Catholic Church in New York and New Jersey, two days later, and cost Mr. Blaine a great number of votes, because he was supposed to have heard them without protesting. Mr. Harrison, while loyal to his own church, is no anti-Catholic fanatic, and no intelligent Roman Catholic will believe him so. Only a few months ago, he was on the platform of a meeting in Indianapolis, called to promote the good work done by the Sisters of Charity, and we believe he spoke on that occasion."

THE FORGED LETTERS.

The Honorable Reginald Brett, who stated that the *Times* forgeries were hawked about for sale previously to their publication by the *Times*, declares his readiness to give evidence before the Judges' Commission. Speaking at Lestwithel a few days ago he said that letters similar to those which appeared in the *Times* were offered to him for £1000. He declares that the letters are undoubtedly forgeries. Lestwithel is within the division for which he is a candidate, namely Liskeard Domain. The person who offered upon him with this offer was an ex-M. P., who wished at the same time to bind him to secrecy as to the source from which the letters came. He was asked who to submit the same offer to Lord Hartington, but he indignantly refused to have anything to do with the transaction. He said "to

THE PARNELL INQUIRY.

The bill providing for a commission to examine into the *Times* charges against Mr. Parnell and others passed its third reading on the 8th inst., by 180 to 164. Amendments offering for object to render it really efficient, and to bring the charges against Mr. Parnell and other members of Parliament to be the real subject of investigation were all voted down, so that the Government will have it to their liking, a roving commission enquiring into all the acts of the Liberator in Great Britain and America.
 Mr. Matthews moved to insert the following—Any person who, having been served with a summons under this Act, shall fail to appear, the commission shall have power to issue a warrant for the arrest of such person.
 The motion was adopted.
 Mr. Matthews moved that anybody who is summoned to appear before the commission and refuses or fails to attend shall be liable to punishment for contempt of court.
 Mr. Parnell moved to amend, that any person refusing to make a full disclosure in all matters in respect of which he might be examined shall be liable to punishment by the High Court of Justice.
 The amendment was received with cheers.
 Mr. Parnell explained that his object was to compel the *Times* to produce the person who supplied the letters that had been ascribed to him.
 Mr. Parnell's amendment was rejected.
 Mr. Clancy (Nationalist) introduced a amendment empowering the commission to report from time to time, which was accepted by the Government and adopted.
 A long discussion ensued on a proposal by Mr. W. A. Hunter, to compel the *Times* to formulate its charges before the opening of the enquiry by the commission.
 The proposal was rejected—184 to 118.
 Mr. Healey moved that no accused member of Parliament should be detained in prison under the Crimes Act during the sitting of the commission.
 Mr. L. H. Courtney suggested that Mr. Healey's object might be attained by means of a short process securing the attendance of accused persons.
 The Government leader accepted the suggestion, and Mr. Healey withdrew his motion.
 Other new clauses were then debated, and the House adjourned at 2.40 a. m.
 The Parnell Chamberlain duel is becoming interesting, the more so as it now seems likely to be fought out in the *Times*. Mr. Parnell's draft of the National Council Monday and saw a long letter in big type signed "Your obedient servant, Charles Stewart Parnell," thought the paper had been boxed, but this letter at all events, is genuine. One object of it is to challenge Mr. Chamberlain to produce the documents referred to in the O'Shea letter. The most important of these are Mr. Parnell's draft of the National Council scheme and the Coercion bill, altered in Mr. Parnell's own hand in the form in which according to Mr. O'Shea, he proposed it should be passed, with just enough show of opposition for him to satisfy these concerns. "I think," says Mr. Parnell, "if Mr. Chamberlain possesses these alleged proofs he is bound to publish them, and I call upon him to do so."
 Yesterday appeared in the *Times* the following four line letter from Mr. Chamberlain:—"I accept Mr. Parnell's challenges and will forward to you in the course of a few days a full statement of the communications initiated by him, which passed between us in 1884 and 1885." This is, in fact, accepting Mr. Parnell's challenge, and something more. In fact, Mr. Chamberlain assumes the offensive, which, like other warlike postures, he almost always regards as the best defensive tactics.
 Mr. Parnell's other point, which he argues at length, is of great historical interest, but less exciting for the moment. "True," he says, "I meet I have favored the National Council scheme, but it was only for administrative and not legislative purposes. Only a step towards Home Rule, not a substitute for it. When I found you meant it to be adopted as finally, instead of the Irish Parliament, we parted company. You accuse us of double dealing because we first proposed, then opposed, this scheme. There is the explanation. We accept it as a means; we rejected it as an end." Mr. Chamberlain's promised publication is awaited with extreme interest.
 On the 9th, the Bill passed its first reading in the House of Lords.
Catholic Ireland says the Parnell Commis- sion bill is the greatest fraud ever fashioned. The Parnellites did not reject it, because their action would have been misinterpreted, and did not accept it because it is a fraud, and the tribunal will be packed. The Parnellites, however, will pass the ordeal earnestly, and in good faith. Though the dice are loaded, they feel that the game is theirs.

A SECOND BURCHARD.

The election campaign in the neighboring Republic has produced a second Burchard, whose bigotry may not, however, prove so disastrous to the Republic as that of his prototype, because the Republican candidate is not this time made responsible for his utterance, as he has in no way seemed to approve of it as Mr. Blaine did by his silence when the original Burchard addressed him on the importance of repressing "Rum, Romanism and Rebellion." This time it is Dr. John H. Vincent, lately elected Bishop of the Methodist Church, who has made an asinine exhibition of bigotry, which might have proved as fatal to the Republic as Burchard's in 1884.
 Bishop Vincent is of the opinion that the Republican party is dominated by anti-Catholic prejudice, and he is not backward in stating that it is this conviction that makes him a partisan of that party. His courage is certainly to be admired, but his political prudence does not seem to be quite so worthy of commendation. In view of the fact that it has been demonstrated that Dr. Burchard's courage and indirection together were the direct cause of the loss of the last Presidential election.
 Dr. Vincent being questioned as to his political faith wrote a letter which was published, in which he states "I am not a third party man. Being a true Protestant and an anti-Romanist, I am a Republican." Unless the Republicans keep their Burchards locked up in some Asylum they are in danger of dire defeat. The original Burchard, however, is said to be now in favor of Cleveland.
 It is worthy of remark that respectable Republican journals repudiate both Bishop Vincent's expressions and himself, as may be seen by the following from the *Philadelphia American*, which also apologizes for Mr. Blaine as to the folly of Burchard the first:
 "Dr. Vincent, the founder of Chautauque, is a very able and useful man. But he is capable of saying very foolish and mischievous things. To a lady who wrote to remonstrate with him for not voting with the Prohibition party, Dr. Vincent wrote in reply: 'I am an anti-Romanist, and therefore a Republican.' If Dr. Vincent's sectarian antipathies control his politics in this way, he has mistaken his party. He rightfully belongs to the little faction which calls itself the American party, and has organized on the Know-nothing platform. The Republican party wages no warfare on any religious body which obeys the laws of the country. It does not, and it never did. It has attacked the Church of the 'Latter Day Saints,' only on account of its breaches of the law. If Mormonism abandons Polygamy, it will disappear out of politics. Some of the Democratic newspapers are exulting in the hope that Dr. Vincent is to be Mr. Harrison's Burchard. They forget that what hurt Mr. Blaine in this matter was that those words—'Rum, Romanism and Rebellion'—were uttered in his presence, and without eliciting any protest from him. The truth was that he did not hear them. Sir Richard Temple, the eminent Anglo Indian, was present at the interview in which Dr. Burchard figured, and said he saw that Mr. Blaine was paying no attention whatever to him. But the words were printed in a leaflet and distributed at the door of every Roman Catholic Church in New York and New Jersey, two days later, and cost Mr. Blaine a great number of votes, because he was supposed to have heard them without protesting. Mr. Harrison, while loyal to his own church, is no anti-Catholic fanatic, and no intelligent Roman Catholic will believe him so. Only a few months ago, he was on the platform of a meeting in Indianapolis, called to promote the good work done by the Sisters of Charity, and we believe he spoke on that occasion."

THE FORGED LETTERS.

The Honorable Reginald Brett, who stated that the *Times* forgeries were hawked about for sale previously to their publication by the *Times*, declares his readiness to give evidence before the Judges' Commission. Speaking at Lestwithel a few days ago he said that letters similar to those which appeared in the *Times* were offered to him for £1000. He declares that the letters are undoubtedly forgeries. Lestwithel is within the division for which he is a candidate, namely Liskeard Domain. The person who offered upon him with this offer was an ex-M. P., who wished at the same time to bind him to secrecy as to the source from which the letters came. He was asked who to submit the same offer to Lord Hartington, but he indignantly refused to have anything to do with the transaction. He said "to