



THE NOTRE DAME SCHOLASTIC

Sermon Delivered by the Rev. T. J. Ganney, of Worcester, Mass., at the Solemn Opening of the Sixteenth Annual Convention of the C. S. A. of America, at Notre Dame, Ind., August 4, 1886.

"Take thou courage and show thyself a man."—III Kings, 4, 2.

May it please your Grace, Brother Delegates, Dearly Beloved Brethren:—I congratulate you upon this auspicious opening of your 16th Annual Convention in this University city of the West. I congratulate you upon the splendid organization which you represent, which sends you here to look into one another's faces, to meet the friendly smiles and kind words of brethren, to consult as to the means and methods best adapted to promote the ends of your Union. You come to raise again your voice in no uncertain tones against a giant evil, warning men of its closeness to their doors, and showing them the means by which to protect themselves from its ravages. Brother Delegates, all men agree that intemperance is a great evil. All men agree that this evil is in every community, but not all seem to realize that no one can claim that for him it has no dangers, or from them there is no need of interest. Intemperance erects in our midst a monument, in the presence of which all the monuments of men pale into insignificance. It is not granite, nor marble, nor bronze, but it is crime committed by it; poverty and destitution wrought by it; jails, lunatic asylums, orphan homes filled by it; faith ruined, religion robbed, souls lost, homes shattered, communities paralyzed, men degraded. Look at it, this monument of intemperance, as Babel-like, it fills the earth and raises itself against Heaven, threatening the destruction of God Himself. Yes, Brother Delegates, intemperance is a scourge, a plague, a foulness in society, destroying more men than Asiatic pestilence or the horrors of war. It wages an unceasing, an unrelenting war upon man, and a ceaseless, unrelenting force must meet it and attempt its destruction. Intemperance is a monster fiend, threatening man, the home, society, and the Church. The home and society must unite for protection, while the Church blesses and aids the union, which is but a co-operator in her work. What greater enemy has man a being created by God for God, endowed by God with all the faculties necessary to know the good and the true, to love the beautiful, to enjoy life in its best gifts, and, by fidelity to truth, to purchase the inheritance of God? Intemperance clutches the mind and renders it unfit to know the truth. It weakens the will and renders it unable to follow the good. It makes the man, ordinarily intelligent, a babbling fool; it makes the man, ordinarily pure of speech, and reverent of manner, obscene and blasphemous; it makes the man ordinarily obedient to law and reason, a violator of all law and the most unreasonable of men. It wastes man's energy by which his daily bread is earned; it paralyzes industry and makes providence and beggary. In a word, it takes man, whom God made little less than the angels, and degrades him beneath the brute. Intemperance is truly the enemy of man. But man lives not for himself alone; he is a social being. At his advent into the world, he finds himself in the home. He is child and parent. Home! home! how sweet the memories evoked, how tender the affections formed! How like the ivy the traditions that are lasting cling around it! Home, which is but heaven in miniature, a little kingdom wherein are learned the first lessons of manhood, where is found man's first happiness. As the home, so the State. Home is the nursery of true citizens and brave soldiers. To enjoy and possess home, good laws are demanded; to protect and defend home, true courage and bravery are needed. Yes, indeed, the strength of nationality, the vigor of citizenship, the bulwark of country are all in the homes of the land whence go forth men with intelligence and morality to shape the laws that govern them, and to avert the dangers that threaten them. Intemperance is the great enemy, the great curse of the home. The traveller who has visited scenes of devastation wrought by temper and torrent has seen the wrecks of homes laid waste even in the midst of bounteous, beautiful nature and busy, prosperous industry. He has seen the roof torn from many a cottage by cruel war; villages depopulated by giant famines; peasantry scattered by the iron rule of despotic land laws. But torrent and temper, war and famine—aye, even the iniquities of tyrants, all combined, have not strewn along the highways of life such wrecks of homes as those caused by intemperance. Intemperance uses the family itself as the instrument by which to destroy the home. How many parents sworn to defend the home have been led by intemperance to destroy it! How many children sent by God as angels of the hearth have been changed to demons? Never until the great reckoning day will man know what a curse intemperance is to the home. If this nursery of the State, this source of true manhood, this mould of character, produce bad men or weak men, the State is endangered thereby. For man finds himself in society face to face with duties as well as rights. On him devolves the duty of giving to the State his best intelligence to shape its laws, his greatest activity to develop the resources of nature, his entire being to contribute to his own happiness and the welfare of his fellowmen. How can the intemperate man fulfil these duties with an intellect dulled, an activity wasted, an evil, an unhappy life? Is he not rather a burden where he should be a protection, a destroyer where he should be a preserver? Intemperance forces the State to increased expenditures for poor-houses, asylums and

jails, where the wretches reined by drink and the childhood unscarred for, as a result of drink, may be housed and nourished. Society then has an interest in any organization against the demon of intemperance, and no man can say it does not affect him, for what injures the body politic injures every member.

What shall we say of the Church? Placed on earth to save men; planted near the home to assist it in the formation of the good man and the true citizen, where does it meet with difficulties? where does it find the greatest—yes, the insurmountable obstacle? In intemperance, which neutralizes its efforts, paralyzes its energy, disgraces its garments. It alone defies God, renders the Blood of Jesus Christ valueless, places a barrier between sin and grace which not even the Almighty power of God can remove, for it destroys the will; and God who made us without our will does not save us except in our co-operation. The strong words of the Plenary Council of Baltimore tell us the cry of agony from the heart of the Church against this plague. This is an age of organization. On every side men and God together for mutual relief, for political ambition and for good or evil designs. Did ever men have greater reason for organization than that given by the danger of intemperance? Shall we not band together to battle the giant, to defend our homes and our manhood against their arch enemy? Our Union, based upon the great cardinal principle of Temperance, urges men of the Gospel to counsel Total Abstinence and bids them enter the ranks of the Temperance crusaders and save the Holy Land from a tyranny worse than that of the Moslem. This Union is Catholic, and warfare against evil; it teaches not to re-ye upon man, but upon God. It gathers you to the altar; it encircles you with the network of the divine esonemy; it opens to you the treasures of Heaven; it strengthens you with the Blood of the Saviour. It warns you against the heretical teachings of sect; aries who make a religion of temperance. It tells you that temperance is not the moral code, but only one of the many virtues you should practise; that the pledge is not a charm, but an aid; that it is not outward, but true courage. Men may sneer at you, call you hypocrites and fanatics. These names are not new—this scorn is as old as virtue. All men who labor against an evil; all men who denounce a great wrong; all men who struggle for the liberation of society must expect the hatreds of men whose lives are not in sympathy with them.

Brother Delegates, we are on hallowed ground, beneath these shades of learning, within the walls of the great University whence go forth men armed for the battle of life, educators, teachers, reformers. May we not catch inspiration from these surroundings? Are you not educators, teachers, apostles, commissioned to educate and evangelize, spreading the gospel of total abstinence everywhere. Reform is the want of the hour—reform in politics, reform in State, reform in public life—you are reformers not self-constituted but under the guidance of the only true Reformers to whom alone the Savior said: "Go, teach all nations." To you, society may look for relief in her contest with political dishonesty and impurity. To you, labor in its great battle should extend a friendly hand, for temperance is labor's best friend. May your deliberations here be blessed by God and men. May the Church find in them assistance in her great work. Be men, have courage. Be true to your principle and you will be men. Character, which is the badge of manhood, will be built upon the basis of manhood. Be undimmed in your fight against the saloon which threatens your home. Have no compact with evil. Intemperance is a curse, woe to him who yields to it. The saloon that breeds it is the nursery of evil; raise your hand against it. Cling closely to the Church, frequent the Sacrament and have recourse to prayer. An your life in Temperance will pass in God's love, and when you pass away to God men will say, He had courage, he was a true man.

FIFTY THOUSAND PEOPLE HOMELESS.

TERRIBLE LOSS OF LIFE AND PROPERTY BY THE BURSTING OF A RIVER EMBANKMENT.—FAMINE STARVING THE AFFLICTED PEOPLE IN THE FACE.

MANDALAY, Aug. 24.—One of the embankments of the Irrawaddy river burst in this city yesterday. The breach was sixty yards in length. So rapid was the flow of water that in a few moments the whole district was flooded from four to twenty feet deep. Engineers at once cut a dam south of the city to allow the waters to subside, but the result of this manoeuvre is as yet unknown. Fifty thousand persons are to-day homeless in the city; their houses and possessions having been either submerged or destroyed. A number of persons were drowned by the sudden in-rush of the water, but how many has not yet been ascertained. The flooded district had within its territory many of the flood and supply stores, and all of these were swept away. The result will be an approach to famine among the homeless population. The river will not fall sufficiently to permit any attempts at a reconstruction of the broken embankment until November.

British military operations are seriously interfered with by the overflow.

FRANCE, THE VATICAN, AND CHINA.

PARIS, Aug. 30.—It is stated that the Pope has accepted the proposal of France to send Mgr. Agabardi temporarily to Peking to study conjointly with the representatives of France and China the conditions for a permanent nunciature to China.

AN EVICTION ABANDONED.

DUBLIN, Aug. 27.—At Donoughmore, County Cork, to-day, a party of military and police set to evict a number of tenants were savagely attacked with stones by a mob of natives, and the task had to be abandoned after one tenant had been evicted.

MR. GLADSTONE'S BROCHURE

HE TELLS HOW THE HOME RULE IDEA GREW WITH HIM.

Lessons of the Late Elections.—Ireland's Position Much Stronger than Ever Before.—He Scorns the Idea of Separation.

LONDON, Aug. 27.—Mr. Gladstone's brochure on the Irish question was published to-day. It contains fifty-eight pages, and is similar in the excellence of its style to Mr. Gladstone's pamphlet on the Bulgarian atrocities. The brochure is under two heads. The first is the "History of an Idea," in which Mr. Gladstone summarizes the following conditions under which alone, in his view, home rule became possible:—First, the abandonment of the hope that Parliament could serve as a possible legislative instrument for Ireland; second, the unequivocal and constitutional demand of the Irish members; third, the possibility of dealing with Scotland in a similar way in circumstances of equal and equally clear desire. Mr. Gladstone then passes on to defend himself from the charge of having sprung the home rule measure upon his friends. Referring to the charges of Lord Hartington and Mr. Chamberlain that he had conceived the idea, precipitately and to the charge of Mr. Bright that he had concealed it, he denies that it is the duty of a minister to make known even to his colleagues every idea forming in his mind, which would tend to confuse and retard instead of aid business. He continues: "What is true is that I had not publicly said in principle condensed it, and also that I had mentally considered it; but I had neither adopted nor rejected it, and for the very simple reason that it was not ripe either for adoption or for rejection." Mr. Gladstone then goes on to point out that during all the earlier years of his public life the alternatives were repeal on the one hand and on the other the relief of Ireland from grievances. It was not possible, he says, at that time to prognosticate how in a short time

Parliament would stumble and write under its constantly accumulating burdens, or to pronounce that it would eventually prove incapable of meeting the wants of Ireland. Evidently there was a period when Irish patriotism, as represented by O'Connell, looked favorably upon this alternate policy and had no fixed conclusion as to the absolute necessity for measures formed in justice to allow that measure to be formed in justice to Ireland might possibly suffice to meet the necessities of the case. It was as early as 1871, Mr. Gladstone says, that he took the first step towards placing the controversy on its true basis. He opposed Mr. Butt's scheme because the alternative described in the last paragraph had not been exhausted, but even at that time he did not close the door against a recognition of the question in a different state of things, for instead of denouncing the idea of home rule as one in its essence destructive of the unity of the Empire, in the following words he accepted the assurance given to the contrary: "Let me do the promoters of this movement the fullest justice, always speaking under the conviction as they most emphatically declare, and as I fully believe them, that the union of these kingdoms under Her Majesty is to be maintained, but that Parliament is to be broken up."

Similarly in 1874 Mr. Gladstone accepted without qualification the principle that home rule had no necessary connection with separation. Coming to the electoral campaign of 1885 Mr. Gladstone says his great object was to do nothing to hinder the prosecution of the question by the Tories, but to use his best efforts to impress the public mind with the importance and urgency of the question.

LESSONS FROM THE ELECTIONS.

In the second portion of the pamphlet Mr. Gladstone begins drawing certain lessons from the elections as they affect the Liberal party. He estimates the loss to the Liberal party from the Unionists' schism at two-sevenths of the whole, but this fraction is distributed, he points out, very unequally among the classes. It has commanded five-sixths, he says, of the Liberal peers, but not more than one-twentieth of the Liberal workingmen. Mr. Gladstone points out that even now the Tories have failed to secure an absolute majority, and draws the final conclusion that at the first moment Liberalism is again united it must become predominant in Parliament. Mr. Gladstone

SEES FURTHER GROUND FOR HOME

In the statement that has already taken place in the Tory opposition. "We have no more potent language," he says, "no more of the Hottentots, and no more of the famous twenty years during which Parliament was to grant special powers for firm government in Ireland, and at the end of which time in a larger or less degree the coercive laws might be repealed and measures of local self-government be entertained." Mr. Gladstone then goes on to point out that the Unionists are already pledged to an immediate and large concession, many of them on such a scale that they give to their death the name of home rule, declaring themselves favorable to its principle and only opposed to the awkward and perverse manner in which it was handled by the late administration. "Look at the question," Mr. Gladstone continues, "which way we will. The course of Irish self-government lies and moves, and can hardly fail to receive more life, more propulsion, from the hands of those who have been its successful opponents in one of its particular forms. It will arise as a wounded warrior sometimes arises on the field of battle, and stab to the heart some soldier of the victorious army who had been exulting over him." Mr. Gladstone then looks at

THE ELECTIONS FROM A GEOGRAPHICAL POINT OF VIEW. He points out that even in the case of England what we have is not really a refusal,

but is only a slower acknowledgment. The effect of all this on Ireland he describes as follows: "All the currents of the political atmosphere as between the two islands have been cleansed and sweetened. For Ireland now knows what she never has known before, that even under her defeat a deep rift of division runs all through the English nation in her favor; that there is not throughout the land a parish or village where there are not hearts beating in unison with her heart, where there are not minds earnestly bent on the acknowledgment and permanent establishment of her claims to national existence."

UNDER THESE HAPPY CIRCUMSTANCES

what is there, Mr. Gladstone goes on to ask, in separation that would tend to make it advantageous to Ireland? As an island with many hundreds of miles of coast, with a weak marine and a people far more military than nautical in its habits, of small population, and limited in her present resources, why should she expose herself to the risks of invasion and to the certainty of an enormous cost in the creation and maintenance of a navy for defence rather than remain under the shield of the greatest maritime power in the world, bound by every consideration of honor and interest to guard her. Why should she be supposed desirous to forego the advantage of absolute community of trade with the greatest of all commercial countries, to become an alien to the market which consumes (say) nine-tenths of her produce, and instead of using the broad and universal paths of enterprise now open to her, to carve out for herself new and narrow ways as a third-rate state? Mr. Gladstone next deals with

THE PURCHASE AND SALE OF LAND

in Ireland, and at the outset acknowledges that the most powerful agent in bringing about the defeat of the Government was the aversion to the Land Bill, put to scorn by those for whose benefit it was in a great part designed, having been deadly to both, he thinks it his duty explicitly to acknowledge that the sentence which has gone forth for the severance of the two measures is irrevocable and the twinning which has been for the time disastrous to the hopes of Ireland exists no longer. At the same time he hopes the partnership between the enemies of home rule and the enemies of the Land bill which brought about the result may now be dissolved. Mr. Gladstone believes a measure of self-government not less extensive than the proposal of 1886 will be ultimately carried. "Nor is it for me," he says, "to conjecture whether in this, as in so many other cases, the enemies of the measure are the persons designed finally to guide its triumphant procession to the capital."

IN CONCLUSION MR. GLADSTONE SAYS:

"If I am not egregiously wrong in all that has been said, Ireland has now lying before her a broad and even way in which to walk to the consummation of her wishes. Before her eyes is opened that same path of constitutional and peaceful action of steady, free and full discussion which has led England and Scotland to the achievement of all their pacific triumphs."

GLADSTONE'S PAMPHLET.

A POSTSCRIPT CRITICIZING THE CONSERVATIVE IRISH POLICY, WHICH IS DECLARED PERILOUS AND INADQUATE.

LONDON, Aug. 28.—Mr. Gladstone's pamphlet on the Irish question ends with a postscript, dated August 22. It is as follows: "Since these pages were written the principal intentions of the ministers in respect to Ireland have been announced. The statesmen who in January deemed coercive measures an absolute necessity, do not now propose them, although agrarian crime has rather increased and Ireland has been perturbed (so they said) by the proposal of home rule. This is a heavy blow to coercion and a marked sign of progress. I am concerned to say that on no other head do the announcements supply any cause for congratulation;

- 1. Large Irish subjects, ripe for treatment, are to be referred to commissions of enquiry. This is a policy (while social order is in question) of almost indefinite delay.
- 2. Moreover, while a commission is to enquire whether the rates of judicial rents are, or are not, such as can be paid, the aid of the law for levying the present rents in November has been specially and emphatically promised. This is a marked discouragement to remissions of rent and a powerful stimulus to evictions.
- 3. A state has been sketched of imposing upon the State the payment of a million required to meet the difference between the actual rents and what the land can fairly bear. This project is in principle radically bad, and it would be an act of rapine on the treasury of the country.
- 4. Whereas, the greatest evil of Ireland is that its managerial and administrative systems are felt to be other than Irish, no proposal is made for the reconstruction of what is known as the Dublin Castle government.
- 5. It is proposed to spend large sums of public money on public works of all kinds for the material development of Ireland under English authority and Dublin Castle administration. This plan is in the highest degree wasteful. It is unjust to the British taxpayer, and it is an obvious attempt to divert the Irish nation by pecuniary inducement from its honorable aim of national self-government, and will, as such, be resented.
- 6. The institution of local government in Ireland to what may at this moment be desired for Great Britain, is just to none of our nationalities, rests upon no recognized principle, and is especially an unjust limitation of the Irish national desire. In my opinion such a policy for dealing with the Irish question ought not to be and cannot be adopted.

FRANCE'S FUTURE.

PARIS, Aug. 30.—Jules Simon has published a letter in which he predicts that France will eventually become a conservative republic which he declares to be the only stable government for Frenchmen.

JUSTIN M'CARTHY'S LETTER.

Irish Landlords Not to be Bought at the Parliamt. Me Cost—The Debate on Mr. Parnell's Amendment—Confusion in the Benches.

HOUSE OF COMMONS LIBRARY, WESTMINSTER, August 29, 1886.

The debate on Mr. Parnell's Amendment, which came to a close at about one this morning, was one of the most powerful and best sustained we have had in the House of Commons for many years. Parnell's speech was singularly impressive, and was acknowledged such by all who listened to it. Mr. Gladstone was at his best—I mean his best of recent years. Chamberlain's bitter, spiteful and malignant speech was, as a mere piece of Parliamentary polemic and rhetoric, the finest display he has ever made. Labouchere was delightfully sarcastic and droll. I cannot say anything higher in praise of Sexton than to declare that while everybody was awaiting his speech with the most intense anxiety no one was disappointed with it when it came.

A FOREGONE CONCLUSION.

Of course, the amendment was defeated by a large majority. That was expected, and was, indeed, inevitable. Mr. Gladstone and many other Liberals, who avowed themselves favorable to the principle of the amendment, abstained from voting on the ground that it would not be reasonable to ask too much from the government at the very moment of their coming into office. Two of our Irish members are away in America. One other, who was abstained from voting and even from taking his seat in the formal sense of the word, because he was advised on the best legal authority that by taking his seat for the county which lately elected him he might prejudice his claim to be declared elected on petition of the sitting member for an Ulster city, which he contested at the general election. The actual members, therefore, who voted for Parnell's amendment do not by means represent the number of men in the Commons who favor its object.

A LOST CAUSE.

One great result of the debate is that the Irish landlords' chances of being bought out at the cost of the ratepayers of the three kingdoms are gone forever. Gladstone's pamphlet on the Irish question, which has just been published, makes it clear that he will never again try an attempt to buy out the Irish landlords. "Their sands are fast running out," he said in his speech in the Commons last session. His pamphlet now declares in substance that their sands have run out.

In the Commons this session one sees a curious sight. As most of our readers know, what is called the front Opposition bench, the bench which faces the Treasury bench, on which Ministers sit—is usually occupied by members of the Government which has latest gone out of office.

CONUSION IN THE BENCHES.

Men who come into office occupy the Treasury bench, while the men turned out occupy the front opposition bench. This time, however, Hartington and Chamberlain, who helped to turn out Gladstone's Government, insisted on the right to sit on the front Opposition bench, on the ground that they are still Liberals, still members of Gladstone's party in their general principles, and were members of Gladstone's government. The result of this resolve has been that men ranged side by side on the same bench got up and denounced each other with all the fervor of political rivalry, fury and personal hate. Chamberlain stands up just beside John Morley and rattles at Morley as if the two had been lifelong opponents. Harcourt gets up and declaims away vigorously and vehemently at Chamberlain, who is sitting on the same bench and just under his eyes.

A CONVENIENT BARRIER.

I remember Disraeli once humorously complaining to the House of Gladstone's energy of invective, and observing, amid the lighted laughter of the House, that he was often glad to remember that a very solid piece of furniture stood between the right honorable gentleman and himself. That solid piece of furniture was a table placed between the Treasury and the Opposition benches, covered with reference books, standing orders and big despatch boxes. But now, in the new divisions of parties, the protection of a solid piece of furniture is not always of any avail. If in some future debate Chamberlain should sting Harcourt into unquenchable fury, there is no barrier between the two men—nothing to prevent Harcourt simply falling with all his vast bulk and weight upon the slender form of the hapless Chamberlain and crushing him out of existence.

POSSIBLE POLEMICS.

Once in the course of his speech, on Thursday, Chamberlain was interrupted by some remark from a former colleague in office, Henry Fowler. Chamberlain got angry, and, looking sharply at Fowler, who was sitting on the same bench quite near, said the remark was nonsense. Suppose, now, that Fowler had lost his temper, what barrier was there to prevent him from addressing his remonstrance to Chamberlain's left eye? Something will have to be done, I think. In days long past it used to be the way with the men of the different parties to sit side by side. Many a time did Sir Robert Walpole and Pulteney pitch into each other from the selfsame bench; but our generation has never before seen anything of the kind. It adds immensely to the oddity of the whole condition of things.

PERSONAL ELEMENTS.

Perhaps when Chamberlain is backing up the Tories and denouncing the Irish Nationalists, when Harcourt is thundering for Home Rule, and speaking as if he rather preferred Parnell to his own brother, it is but natural

that there should be some curious novelty in the outward aspects of the debate. Harcourt is a strange man. He made a very powerful speech last night. I do not know what he ever spoke so powerfully before. Probably he is spritied on now by a fresh hope of the succession of the Liberal leadership, which at one time seemed lost to him forever. Now that Hartington, Chamberlain and Dilke are out of the way, his chance shines again. This probably animated him with added power. I wish any one could think that Harcourt is sincere, but if any one does think anything of the kind I certainly never heard any one say it.

JUSTIN M'CARTEY.

THE IRISH DELEGATES.

Their Departure from New York and Opinions on Ireland's Prospects.

Previous to the departure from New York of Messrs. William O'Brien, John Redmond and John Deasy, the Irish delegate to the Chicago Convention, they were interviewed by a Telegram reporter, and spoke without reserve on the outlook for Home Rule. "If we brought back no other tidings," said Mr. O'Brien, "than the triumph of harmony in the National Convention, we will have a mighty weapon against the Salisbury Government. The English people had been so educated by the calamities of the Irish press concerning the Irish Nationalists in America that they looked for nothing but a grand upset at Chicago.

"Will the English people now take a lesson from these calamities, in your opinion?" "I am glad you put the question in that shape. It is only within the past few years that sensible, cool-headed Englishmen, who are not controlled altogether by prejudice, began to realize how badly they were fooled—I believe I am now using an Americanism to which I was beginning to get accustomed—by the persistent lying of the British press in matters concerning Ireland, and whether here or on the other side of the Atlantic. Now, what was the result? The magnificent uprising of 1,400,000 voters in England, Wales, and Scotland, who declared that Ireland had been so grievously wronged that she should have the opportunity now to legislate for herself. It is in behalf of that large class of voters, to a great extent, that we are pleading for our countryman's harmony in the Chicago attitude.

"Did John F. Finerty's attitude take you by surprise?"

"I regard Mr. Finerty as a noble Roman to use the old expression. He yielded for the sake of harmony. I feel bound to say that the accounts of imminent disruption in the Convention and all that was said by our countryman's fact was greatly exaggerated. Finerty was one of the last men to bid adieu with a firm grasp of the hand. So much for the information of the British press. The entire controversy was a question that has been described in the American press as one of methods. The issue has now been happily settled, much to the chagrin of the Salisbury Ministry and the advocates of reneged coercion.

"And the outlook?" "Ireland's cause was never so hopeful. We will not recede an inch, but put us forward. The news of the evictions in Ireland was distressing to all of us, but we hope for a best during the coming winter, when the lay doctors will exact the last penny and best, backed up by a relentless Tory policy. How long it will last I dare not venture to predict."

LETTER OF ACKNOWLEDGMENT FROM MR. T. HARRINGTON, M. P.

We have been requested to publish the accompanying letter from Mr. T. Harrington (for Mr. Parnell), acknowledging receipt of the two remittances made last month to the Irish National League, by Mr. Edward Murphy, treasurer, amounting to £20 9s 0d (over \$85,000), contributions of the Irish people of Montreal and vicinity, to the Irish Parliamentary Fund. The letter is as follows:

THE IRISH NATIONAL LEAGUE, 43 GPO Street Upper, Dublin, 7th Aug., 1886.

DEAR MR. MURPHY, Mr. Parnell has requested me to acknowledge the receipt of your favors of the 18th July, enclosing original draft for £200 (six hundred pounds), and of the 21st July, enclosing duplicate for same, with original draft for the sum of £20 9s 0d. Owing to the pressure cast upon Mr. Parnell by the general election, he was not able to get through a great portion of the correspondence I had had come upon him during that period; and he has asked me to explain to you that this pressure rendered it impossible for him to reply earlier to your kind and encouraging communications.

I beg to request that you will convey to our friends in Montreal the assurance of our warm thanks for their generous offerings, and for the management that they gave us at this most critical period of our struggle. Believe me,

Dear Mr. Murphy, Yours faithfully, T. HARRINGTON. Mr. W. MURPHY, Esq., General Treasurer Irish Parliamentary Fund, Montreal.

THE POPE AND SOCIALISM.

VIENNA, Aug. 27.—The Pope, in an encyclical letter to the bishops of Hungary on the occasion of the recent *Reses* at Buda, deplores the spread of naturalism, rationalism, divisions and sects, and says the Church alone can effectually cope with Socialism. It is essential, therefore, that the Church should enjoy full liberty. The Pope exhorts the episcopate to guard the sanctity of the marriage ties, and to enlighten the faithful on the evils of civil marriages and the illegitimate character of marriages between Catholics and those who are not Christians. The Pope approves of the rejection by the Hungarian Diet of the bill to legalize marriages between Jews and Christians, and condemns neutral and mixed schools.