

# The Catholic Record.

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

VOLUME 9.

LONDON, ONTARIO, SATURDAY, AUGUST 25, 1888.

NO. 514

## ENCYCLICAL LETTER

OF  
OUR HOLY FATHER

BY DIVINE PROVIDENCE

POPE LEO XIII.,

ON  
HUMAN LIBERTY.

TO OUR VENERABLE BROTHERS THE PATRIARCHS, PRIMATE, ARCHBISHOPS, AND BISHOPS OF THE CATHOLIC WORLD, IN FAVOR AND COMMISSION WITH THE APOSTOLIC SEE.

POPE LEO XIII.,

Venerable Brethren, Health and Apostolic Benediction:

What Rationalists aim at in philosophy, that the supporters of liberalism are attempting in the domain of morality and politics. The chief doctrine of rationalism is the supremacy of the human reason, which, refusing due submission to the Divine and eternal reason, proclaims its own independence, and constitutes itself its own supreme principle, and source, and judge of truth. So these followers of liberalism deny the existence of any Divine authority to which obedience is due, and proclaim that every man makes his own law; whence arises that ethical system which they style independent morality, and which, under the guise of liberty, exonerates man from any obedience to the commands of God, and substitutes a boundless license. The end of all this is not difficult to foresee. For, once granted that man is fully persuaded of his own supremacy, it follows that the efficient cause of the unity of civil society is to be sought, not in any principle exterior or superior to man, but simply in the free will of individuals; that the power of the State is from the people only; and that, just as every man's individual reason is his only rule of life, so the collective reason of the community is the supreme guide in the management of all public affairs. Hence the doctrine of the supremacy of the majority, and that the majority is the source of all law and authority. But, from what has been said, it is clear that all this is in contradiction to reason. To dissolve the bond of union between man and civil society, on the one hand, and God the Creator, and consequently the Supreme Legislator, on the other, is plainly repugnant to the nature, not only of man, but of all created things; for, of necessity, all effects must in some way be connected with their cause; and it belongs to the perfection of every nature to contain itself within that sphere which the rational order has assigned to it; namely, that the inferior should be subject and obedient to the superior. But, besides this, a doctrine of this character is most hurtful both to individuals and to the State. For one ascribe to human reason the only authority to decide what is true and what is good, and the real distinction between good and evil is destroyed; honor and dishonor become a matter of private opinion; pleasure is the measure of what is lawful; and, given a code of morality which can have little or no power to restrain the unruly propensities of man, a way is then opened to universal corruption. To turn to public affairs: authority is severed from the true and natural principle whence it derives all its efficacy for the common good; and the law determining right and wrong is at the mercy of a majority—which is simply a downward path to tyranny. The empire of God over man and civil society once repudiated, it follows that religion, as a public institution, ceases to exist, and with it everything that belongs to religion. Likewise, with ambitious designs on sovereignty, tumult and sedition will be common among the people; and when duty and conscience cease to appeal to them, there will be nothing to hold them back but force, which is an inefficient restraint upon their covetousness. Of this we have almost daily evidence in the riotous and seditious societies, whose one object is revolution. It is for those, then, who are capable of forming a just estimate of things, to decide whether such doctrines promote that true liberty which alone is worthy of man, or rather pervert and destroy it.

There are, indeed, some adherents of liberalism who do not subscribe to these opinions, which we have seen to be so fearful in their enormity, and tending to produce the most terrible evils. Indeed, many, compelled by the force of truth, do not hesitate to admit that such a liberty is vicious and simple license, when it is in temperate in its claims, and the neglect of truth and justice; and therefore they would have liberty ruled and directed by right reason, and consequently subjected to the natural law and to the Divine eternal law. And here they think they may stop, and hold that no man is bound by any law of God, except such as can be known by natural reason.

In this they are plainly inconsistent; for, if, as they must admit, as no one can rightly deny, the will of the Divine Legislator is to be obeyed, because every man is under the power of God and tends towards Him as his end, it follows that no one can assign limits to His legislative authority without falling in the obedience which is due. Indeed, if the human mind be so presumptuous as to define what are God's rights and its own duties, its reverence for Divine law will be apparent rather than real, and its own judgment will prevail over the authority and providence of God.

Man must therefore take his rule of life from the eternal law; and from every one of those laws which God, in His infinite wisdom and power, has been pleased to enact, and to make known to us in a manner so sure as to leave no room for doubt. And the more so, because laws of this kind have the same origin and author as the eternal law, and are absolutely in accordance with right reason, and perfect the natural law; and they constitute the government of God, Who

gradually guides and directs both the intellect and the will of man lest they fall into error. Let then a holy and inviolable union prevail where disunion is neither seemly nor possible; and in all things, according to the dictates of right reason, let God be dutifully and obediently served.

There are others, somewhat more moderate though not more consistent, who affirm that the morality of individuals is to be guided by the Divine law, but not the morality of the State, so that in public affairs the commands of God may be passed over, and may be disregarded in the framing of laws. Hence follows that fatal theory of the separation of Church and State. But the absurdity of such a position is manifest. Nature herself proclaims the necessity of providing in the State the means and opportunities whereby the community may be enabled to live, as it should, according to the laws of God; for He is the source of all goodness and justice, and it is absolutely repugnant to maintain that such laws can be totally disregarded, or rendered abortive by contrary enactments. Besides, those who are in authority owe it to commonwealth not only to provide for the external well-being and administration of the State, but also to consult for the welfare of men's souls by the wisdom of their legislation. But, for the increase of such benefits, nothing more suitable can be conceived than the laws which have God for their author; and, therefore, they who in their government take no account of these laws abuse political power by causing it to deviate from its proper end and from what nature prescribes. And, what is more important, and what we have more than once pointed out, although the civil authority has not the same approximate end as the spiritual, nor proceeds on the same lines, nevertheless in the exercise of their separate powers they must occasionally meet. For their subjects are the same; and not infrequently they deal with the same objects, though in different ways. Whenever this occurs, since a state of conflict is bound and manifestly repugnant to the most wise ordinance of God, there must necessarily exist some order or mode of procedure to remove the occasions of difference and contention, and to secure harmony in all things. This harmony has been not inaptly compared to that which exists between the body and the soul for the well-being of both; the separation of which brings harm chiefly to the body, since it extinguishes its very life.

To make this more evident, the growth of liberty ascribed to our age must be considered in its various details. And, first, let us examine that liberty in individuals which is so opposed to the virtue of religion, namely, the liberty of worship, as it is called, which rests on this principle, that every man is free to profess as he chooses any religion or none. But, assuredly, of all the duties which man has to fulfil, that without doubt is the chief and the holiest whereby he is bid to worship God with devotion and piety; which follows of necessity from the truth, that we are ever in the power of God, and are ever guided by His will and providence, and having come forth from Him, must return to Him. Add to this, that no true virtue can exist without religion; for moral virtue is concerned with those things which lead to God, as man's supreme and ultimate good; and therefore religion, which (as St. Thomas says) "performs those actions which are directly and immediately ordered to the Divine honor," rules and governs all virtues. And, if it be asked, which of the many conflicting religions it is necessary to embrace, reason and the natural law unhesitatingly answer, that one which God commands and man can without difficulty recognize for himself by certain exterior signs whereby Divine Providence has ordered that it should be distinguished, because, in a matter of such moment, the most terrible loss would be the consequence of any error. Wherefore, with a freedom such as we have described, to man is given the power to pervert or abandon with impunity the most sacred of duties, and to exchange the unchangeable good for evil, which, as we have said, is not liberty, but the degradation of liberty, and the subject subjection of the soul to sin.

This same liberty, if it be considered in relation to the State, clearly implies that there is no reason why the State should offer any homage to God, or should desire any public recognition of Him; that no form of worship is to be preferred to another, but that all stand on an equal footing; no account being taken of the religion of the people, even if they profess the Catholic faith. But to justify this, it must needs be true that the State has no duties towards God, or that such duties, if they exist, may be abandoned with impunity; both of which assertions are manifestly false. For not men are doubted in civil society; whether its elements be considered; or its form, which is authority; or the object of its existence; or the abundance of the services which it renders to man. God it is Who has made man for society, and has placed him in the company of others like himself, so that what was wanting to his nature, and beyond his attainment if left to his own resources, he might obtain by association with others. Wherefore civil society must be professed which alone is true, and which can be recognized without difficulty, especially in Catholic States, because the marks of truth are, as it were engraven upon it. This religion, therefore, the rulers of the State must preserve and pro-

tect. If they would provide, as they should do, with prudence and usefulness for the good of the community. For the public power exists for the welfare of those whom it governs; and although its proximate end is to lead men to the prosperity which is found in this life, yet in so doing, it ought not to diminish, but rather to increase, man's capability of attaining to the supreme good in which his everlasting happiness consists, which never can be attained except through religion.

But this we have explained more fully elsewhere. We now only wish to observe that liberty of such a kind is greatly hurtful to the true liberty both of rulers and of their subjects. Religion, moreover, is of wonderful advantage. For, deriving the first origin of power directly from God Himself, with grave authority it commands rulers to be mindful of their duty, to govern without injustice or severity, and to rule their people kindly, with almost paternal charity; it admonishes subjects to be obedient to lawful authority, as to the ministers of God; and it binds them to their rulers, not merely by obedience, but by reverence and affection, forbidding all seditious and attempts that would disturb public order and tranquility, and cause greater restrictions to be put upon the liberty of the people. We need not mention how greatly religion conduces to pure morals, and pure morals to liberty; for reason shows, and history confirms the fact, that the better the morality of the State, the greater the liberty, and wealth, and power do they enjoy.

We must now consider a little the liberty of speech and the liberty of the press. It is hardly necessary to say that there can be no such right as this, if it is not used in moderation, and if it passes beyond the bounds and end of all true liberty. For right is a moral power which, as we have said, must again repeat, it is absurd to suppose that nature has given indifference to truth and falsehood, to justice and injustice. Men have a right freely and prudently to propagate throughout the State whatsoever things are true and honorable, so that as many as possible may possess them; but also, by means of which no mental plague is greater, and vices which corrupt the heart, should be diligently repressed by public authority lest they inordinately work the ruin of the State. The excesses of an unbridled intellect, which really end in the oppression of the ignorant multitude, are not less rightly restrained by the authority of the law than are the injuries inflicted by force upon the weak; and even more so, because by far the greater part of the community either absolutely cannot, or can only with great difficulty, avoid their illusions and subtleties, especially such as flatter their own passions. If unbridled license of speech and of writing be granted to all, nothing will remain sacred and inviolate; even the highest and truest judgments of nature, the common and noblest heritage of the human race, will not be spared. Thus, truth being obscured, herarkness which no mental manifold error, as often happens, will easily prevail; and license will gain what liberty loses; for liberty will be more free and secure, in proportion as license is more restrained. In regard, however, to such matters of opinion as God leaves to man's free discussion, full liberty of thought and of speech is naturally within the right of every one; for this liberty is not given to man to oppress the truth but to lead often to its discovery and manifestation.

A like judgment must be passed upon what is called liberty of teaching. There can be no doubt that truth alone should imbue the minds of men; for in truth are found the well-being, and end, and perfection of intelligent nature; and therefore truth alone should be taught both to the ignorant and to the educated, so as to bring knowledge to the former, and to preserve it in the latter. For this reason, it is plainly the duty of those who teach to banish error from the mind, and by sure safeguards to exclude all false opinions. From this it follows, that greatly opposed to reason, and tending absolutely to pervert men's minds, is that liberty of which we speak, in so far as it claims for itself the right of teaching what it pleases—a liberty without failing in its duty, and the more so, because the authority of the teacher has great weight with his hearers, who can rarely defend themselves as to the truth or falsehood of the instruction given to them.

Wherefore, this liberty also, that it may be just, must be kept within certain limits, lest the art of teaching be turned into impunity into an instrument of corruption. No teacher, who should be the sole object of those who learn, should be free to teach what he pleases, of two kinds, natural and supernatural. Of natural truths, such as the principles of nature and what is deduced from them immediately by reason, there is a kind of common patrimony in the human race. On this as on a firm basis, morality and justice and religion, and the very bonds of human society rest; and to allow it to be with impunity violated or destroyed, would be impious and foolish, and inhuman. But with no less religious care must we preserve that great and sacred treasure of the truths which God has taught us. By many convincing arguments which the defenders of Christianity have often used, certain leading truths have been laid down, namely, that some things have been revealed by God; that Flesh, to bear witness to the truth; that a perfect society was founded by Him, that is, the Church of which He is the head, and with which He has promised to abide till the end of the world. To this society He intrusted all the truths which He had taught, that it might keep and guard them; and at the same time He commanded all nations to hear the voice of the Church, as if it were His own threatening those who would not with everlasting perdition. Thus it is manifest that man's best and surest teacher is God, the source and principle of all truth; and the

Only-Begotten Son, Who is in the bosom of the Father, the way, the truth, and the life, the true light which enlightens every man, to whose teaching all must submit. "And they shall all be taught of God." (St. John vi. 45). In faith and in the teaching of morality, God made the Church a partaker of His Divine authority, and through His Divine help she cannot be deceived. She is therefore the greatest and most safe teacher of mankind, with inviolable right to teach them. Sustained by the truth received from her Divine Founder, the Church has ever sought, above all things, to fulfil the mission intrusted to her by God; undeterred by the difficulties surrounding her, she has never ceased to assert her liberty of teaching; and in this way, the superstition of paganism being dispelled, the world was renewed unto Christian wisdom.

Now, reason itself teaches that the truth of religion and those of nature cannot really be opposed to one another, and that whatever is in variance with them must necessarily be false. Therefore, the Divine teaching of the Church, so far from being an obstacle to the pursuit of learning and the progress of science, or from retarding in any way the advance of civilization, in reality brings to them the guidance of a shining light. And for the same reason it is of great advantage for the perfection of human liberty, since Our Saviour Jesus Christ has said that by truth is man made free: "You shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." (St. John viii. 32). Therefore, there is no reason why genuine liberty should be displeased, or true science to feel aggrieved, in having to bear that just and necessary restraint by which, in the judgment of the Church and of reason itself, man's Church, as facts have everywhere proved, while she chiefly and above all looks to the defence of the Christian faith, is at the same time careful to foster and promote every kind of human learning.

Learning is in itself good, and praiseworthy, and desirable; and all erudition which is the fruit of sound reason, and in conformity with the truth of things, serves not a little to illustrate what God has taught us in His Holy Scriptures, and to our great benefit, has carefully preserved the monuments of ancient wisdom; has opened everywhere homes of science; and has urged on intellectual progress, by fostering most diligently the arts by which the civilization of our age is so much adorned. Lastly, we must not forget that a vast field lies freely open to man's industry and genius, containing all those things which have no necessary connection with Christian faith and morals, or as to which the Church, using no authority, leaves the judgement of the learned free and unrestrained. From all this may be understood the nature and character of that liberty which the followers of liberalism so eagerly demand and proclaim. On the one hand, they demand for themselves and for the State a license which opens the way to every perversion of opinion; and on the other, they hamper the Church in many ways, carefully preserving within the narrowest limits, although from her teaching there is nothing to be feared, but very much to be gained.

Another liberty is greatly proclaimed, namely, liberty of conscience. If by this is meant that every one may, as he chooses, worship God or not, it is sufficiently refuted by what has been already said. But it may also be taken to mean that every man in the State may, from a consciousness of duty, and with no other view than the will of God and obey His commands. This indeed is true liberty, worthy of the sons of God, which nobly sustains the dignity of man, and is stronger than all violence or wrong—a liberty which the Church has always desired and held most dear. This is a liberty which the Apostles claimed for themselves with Christian constancy, which the defenders in Christianity contended by their writings, which the Martyrs in vast numbers consecrated by their blood. And rightly so; for this Christian liberty bears witness to the absolute and most just dominion of God over man, and to the great and supreme duty of man towards God. It has nothing in common with a seditious and rebellious mind; and it is no way derogates from obedience to public authority; for the right to command and to require obedience exists only so far as it is in accordance with the authority of God, and is within the measure that He has laid down. When anything is commanded which is plainly in variance with the will of God, there is a departure from this divinely constituted order, and a conflict with the Divine authority, and then it is right not to obey.

By the patrons of liberalism who make the State absolute and omnipotent, and proclaim that man should live altogether independently of God, this liberty of which we speak, which is joined to virtue and religion, is now acknowledged; and whatever is done for its preservation, is held to be an injury and an offence against the State. Indeed, if they spoke truly there would be no tyranny, no matter how cruel, which we should not be bound to endure and to obey.

The Church would most earnestly desire that this Christian teaching, of which we have given the heads, should in reality and in practice penetrate every rank of society. This teaching would be of the greatest efficacy to heal the evils of our day, which are neither few nor light, and are the offspring in great part of the false liberty which is so much extolled, in which the germ of salvation and glory was supposed to be contained. The hope has been disappointed by the result; the fruit, instead of being sweet and wholesome, is tainted and bitter. If a remedy is desired, let it be sought for in a restoration of sound doctrine, from which alone the preservation of order and the defence of true liberty can be expected. Yet, with the discernment of a true mother, the Church weighs the great burden of human weakness; and she knows what is the course in which the minds and the affairs of men are now borne along. For this

reason, while not conceding any rights to anything that is not true and honest, it does not forbid public authority to tolerate what is in variance with truth and justice, for the sake of avoiding a greater evil, or of obtaining or preserving some greater good. God Himself, in His providence, though He is of infinite goodness and power, allows evil to exist in the world, partly that greater good may not be impeded, and partly that greater evil may not follow. In the government of States it is well to imitate the Ruler of the world; and, as the authority of man is powerless to prevent every evil, it has (as St. Augustine says) "to overlook, and to leave unpunished, many things which are punished, and rightly, by Divine Providence." But in such circumstances, if, for the sake of the common good (which is the only just reason), the law of man may and ought to tolerate evil, it may not and ought not to approve or desire evil for its own sake; for evil of itself, whether a privation of good, is opposed to the common welfare, which a legislator must desire and defend to the best of his power. In this, human law must endeavor to imitate God, Who, as St. Thomas says, in allowing evil to exist in the world, "neither wishes evil to be done, nor wishes it not to be done, but wishes only to permit it to be done; and this is good." This sentence of the Angelic Doctor contains briefly the whole doctrine as to the permission of evil. But, to judge rightly, we must acknowledge that the more a State has to tolerate evil, the further it is from perfection; and that the tolerance of evil, which is suggested by political prudence, must be circumscribed by the limits which its cause, the public welfare, requires. Wherefore, if such tolerance would be injurious to the public welfare, and bring greater evils on the State, it would not be lawful; for in such a case the motive of the law is wanting. And although in the extraordinary condition of these times the Church usually acquiesces in certain modern liberties, not because she prefers them in themselves, but because she judges it expedient to permit them, in better times she would use her own liberty; and, by persuasion, exhortation, and entreaty, she would endeavor, as she ought, to fulfill the duty assigned to her by God of providing for the eternal salvation of mankind. For this, however, remains always true, that the liberty which is claimed for all, to do all things, is not, as we have often said, of itself desirable, inasmuch as it is contrary to reason that error and truth should have equal rights. And as to tolerance, it is surprising how far removed from the justice and prudence of the Church, are they who profess what is called liberalism. For, in allowing that the licentiousness of which we have spoken, they exceed all limits, and at least by making no apparent distinction between truth and error, honesty and dishonesty. And because the Church, the pillar and ground of truth, and the unerring teacher of morals, is forced utterly to reprobate and condemn tolerance of such an abandoned and criminal character, they calumniate her as wanting in patience and gentleness, and thus fall to see that, in so doing, they impute to her a fault which is in reality a matter for commendation. But, in spite of all this show of tolerance, it very often happens that, while they profess themselves ready to show liberty on all in the greatest profusion, they are utterly intolerant towards the Catholic Church, by refusing to grant it the liberty which is its right.

To reduce briefly, for clearness sake, to its original basis all that has been here written and that follows from it, the summary is this: that, by a necessity of his nature, man is wholly subject to the true and everlasting power of God; and that man has no liberty except that which must be in submission to God and in subjection to His will. To deny the existence of this authority in God, or to refuse to submit to it, is to act, not of a free man, but as one who reasonably knows his liberty, and in such a disposition of mind the chief vice of liberalism consists. The form, however, of this vice is manifold; for in more ways and degrees than one can the will depart from the obedience which is due to God or to those who share the Divine power.

To reject the supreme authority of God, and to cast off all obedience to Him in public matters, and even in those which are private and domestic, is the greatest perversion of liberty, and the worst kind of liberalism; and against this, what we have said applies in its fullest sense.

Next comes the system of those who admit indeed the duty of submitting to God, the Creator and Ruler of the world, inasmuch as all nature is dependent on His will; but who boldly reject the laws of faith and morals, which are above the natural order, and are revealed by the authority of God; who at least assert that there is no reason why regard should be paid to these laws, at least in public by the State. How wrong such men also are, and how inconsistent, we have seen above. From this doctrine, as its source and principle, flows that fatal maxim of the separation of Church and State; whereas, on the contrary, it is clear that the two powers, though dissimilar in functions and unequal in degree, ought nevertheless to live in concord, by the harmony of their actions and the fulfillment of their respective duties.

But this maxim is understood in two ways. Many wish the State to be separated from the Church wholly and entirely, so that in every right of human society, in institutions, customs, and laws, in the offices of State, and in the education of youth, they would pay no more regard to the Church than if it did not exist; and, at most, would allow the citizens individually to attend to their religion in private if they pleased. Against these, all the arguments by which we disproved the doctrine of the separation of Church and State are conclusive; and with this additional argument, that it is absurd that the citizen should respect the Church but the State despise it.

Others do not oppose the existence of the Church nor indeed could they; yet they rob her of the nature and rights of a perfect society; and maintain that it does not belong to her to legislate, to judge, or to punish, but only to exhort, to advise, and to rule her subjects according to their own consent and will. By their opinion they would pervert the nature of this Divine society, and attenuate and narrow its authority, its efficacy of teaching, and its whole efficiency; and at the same time they would aggrandize the power of the civil government to such an extent as to subject the Church of God to the same and away of the State, like any voluntary association of citizens. To completely refute such teaching, the arguments often used by the defenders of Christianity, and set forth by Us, especially in the encyclical letter *Inimicitiae Dei*, are of great avail; for by those arguments it is proved that, by a Divine provision, all the rights which essentially belong to a society that is legitimate, supreme, and perfect in all its parts, exist in the Church. There remain those who, while they do not approve the separation of Church and State, this they nevertheless do, the Church ought to adapt herself to the times, and conform to what is desired by the modern system of government. Such an opinion is sound, if it is to be understood of an adaptation that is consistent with truth and justice; in so far, namely, that the Church, in the hope of some great good, may show herself indulgent, and may conform to the times in whatever her sacred office permits. But it is not so in regard to practices and doctrines which a perversion of morals and a false judgment have unlawfully introduced. Religion, truth and justice must ever be maintained, as God has entrusted these great and sacred things to the care of the Church, she can never be so unfaithful to her office as to dissemble in what is false or unjust, or to connive at what is hurtful to religion.

From what has been said, it follows that it is in no way lawful to demand, to defend, or to grant unconditional freedom of thought, of speech, of writing, or of religion, as if they were so many rights which nature had given to man. For, if nature had really given them, it would be lawful to refuse obedience to God, and there would be no restraint to human liberty. It likewise follows, that freedom in these things may be tolerated when there is just cause; but only with such moderation as will prevent its degenerating into license and excess. And while these liberties are in use, men should use them in doing good, and should regard them as the Church does; for liberty is to be regarded as legitimate in so far as it gives greater facility for doing good, and no further.

Whenever there exists, or there is reason to fear, either an unjust oppression of the people, or a deprivation of the Church's liberty, it is lawful to seek for such a change of government as will give due liberty of action. In such a case it is not an excessive and vicious liberty that is sought for; but only some relief, for the common welfare, in order that amidst the license for evil the power of doing good may not be hindered.

Again, it is not of itself wrong to prefer a democratic form of government, if only the Catholic doctrine be maintained as to the origin and use of power. Of the various forms of government, the Church does not reject any that are fitted for the welfare of the subject; she wishes only—and this nature itself requires—that they should be constituted without wrong to anyone, and especially without violating the rights of the Church.

Unless through some exceptional condition of things it be otherwise determined, it is well to take part in the administration of public affairs. And the Church approves of every one giving his services for the common good, and doing all that he can for the defence, and preservation, and prosperity of his country.

Neither does the Church condemn those who, if it can be done without violation of justice, wish to make their country independent of any foreign or despotic power. Nor does she blame those who wish to give to the State the power of self-government, and to its citizens the greatest possible measure of prosperity. So long as it is without license, the Church has always fostered civil liberty; and this has been especially in Italy, in the municipal property, and health and glory, which were obtained at a time when the salutary power of the Church had, without opposition, spread to all parts of the State.

These things, Venerable Brethren, which under the guidance of faith and reason, we have, in the discharge of Our Apostolic office, now delivered to you, will, we hope, especially by your cooperation with Us, be useful unto many. In loneliness of heart we raise Our eyes in supplication to God, and earnestly beseech Him to shed mercifully the light of His wisdom and of His counsel upon men, so that, strengthened by these heavenly gifts, they may in things of such moment discern what is true, and may then in public and in private, at all times, and with unshaken constancy, live in accordance with the truth that they have known. As a pledge of these heavenly gifts, and in witness of Our good will, to you, Venerable Brethren, and to the clergy and people committed to each of you, We most lovingly grant in the Lord the Apostolic benediction.

Given in Rome, at St. Peter's, on the 20th day of June, in the year MDCCCLXXXVIII., the eleventh year of Our Pontificate.

POPE LEO XIII.

Mr. Parnell denies the report which has been circulated that he intends to vacate his seat in Parliament until the charges against him be enquired into either by the Scotch Court or the Parliamentary Commission.