

which it leaves out of view altogether. To labour is to exert oneself for the sake of procuring what is necessary for the purpose of life, and most of all for self-preservation. 'In the sweat of thy brow thou shalt eat bread.' Therefore a man's labour has two notes or characters. First of all, it is *personal*; for the exertion of individual power belongs to the individual who puts it forth, employing this power for that personal profit for which it was given. Secondly, man's labour is *necessary*; for without the results of labour a man cannot live; and self-conservation is a law of Nature, which it is wrong to disobey. Now, if we were to consider labour merely so far as it is *personal*, doubtless it would be within the workman's right to accept any rate of wages whatever; for in the same way as he is free to work or not, so he is free to accept a small remuneration or even none at all. But this a mere abstract supposition; the labour of the working-man is not only his personal attribute, but it is *necessary*; and this makes all the difference. The preservation of life is the bounden duty of each and all, and to fail therein is a crime. It follows that each one has a right to procure what is required in order to live; and the poor can procure it in no other way than by work and wages. Let it be granted, then, that, as a rule, workman and employer should make free agreements, and in particular should freely agree as to wages; nevertheless, there is a dictate of Nature more imperious and more ancient than any bargain, between man and man, that the remuneration must be enough to support the wage-earner in reasonable and frugal comfort. If through necessity or fear of a worse evil, the workman accepts harder conditions because an employer or a contractor will give him no better he is the victim of force and injustice. In these and similar questions, however—such as, for example, the hours of labour in different trades, the sanitary precautions to be observed in factories and workshops, etc.—in order to supersede undue interference on the part of the State, especially as circumstances, times, and localities differ so widely, it is advisable that recourse be had to Societies or Boards (Trades Unions) such as we shall mention presently, or to some other method of safe-guarding the interests of wage-earners; the State to be asked for approval and protection." The Holy Father has given a fresh proof of his affectionate interest in the working classes by the reception which he gave to the large body of French workmen who recently made a pilgrimage to Rome. This pilgrimage, which was promoted by M. Leon Harmel, was one of the most successful and enthusiastic of the whole series organised by that great leader of Christian democracy in France. M. Harmel, in an address to the Pope, intimated that the pilgrimage was to be renewed every year, and begged the Apostolic Benediction for the groups of the Christian democracy who were that day represented by the pilgrims to Rome. The Holy Father's reply showed how his heart warmed towards the toilers of the world. "It is with a lively tenderness," he said, "that we receive you, the representatives of the working classes, so worthy of our interest and of our fatherly solicitude;" and he proceeded to commend them for seeking the solution of the social problem on the lines laid down in the great encyclical, while at the same time he warned them against those dangerous men who seek the solution of that problem in the destruction of those inviolable laws by which society is held together. "Such men," he said, "will do nothing but foment unceasing strife, heap ruin on ruin, and make the state of the workers harder and less endurable than before." Finally, addressing the priests who participated in the pilgrimage, he said:—"It is sweet to us to express our satisfaction at beholding the splendid and numerous gathering of French priests, which we see around us, united with the workmen in this pilgrimage. Their presence is a source of pleasure to us, for we know that they are devoted in word and work to the promotion of the moral and material welfare of the workers, dispersing misconceptions, inculcating harmony, and spreading in all classes the rules of Christian life which are the most powerful means to solve the problem that engages their attention. We have the sweet confidence, that, under the wise direction of their bishops, they will continue that beautiful and noble mission, showing themselves more charitable and zealous for the poorest, the weakest, and the most suffering, who are the ones best loved by our Lord and by His Church, the heir of His Divine charity." These weighty words will infuse fresh courage and confidence into the party of Christian democracy—that party which is destined to play so important a part in the solution of the greatest problem of our time.

THE JEWS AND PALESTINE. At the Zionist Congress, or Jewish Conference, held recently at Basle, a proposal to purchase Palestine by the voluntary contributions of the Jews of the world for the purpose of reconstituting the Hebrew nation was carried by acclamation, and considerable public interest has been aroused both in England and on the Continent as to the probability or otherwise of the proposal being carried into effect. There appear to be two distinct parties among the Jews, one strongly in favour, the other as strongly opposed to the scheme. The attitude adopted by the

English Jews appears to be one of uncompromising hostility to the proposal. According to the London *Tablet* Dr. Adler, who is the Chief Rabbi of the United Orthodox Congregations of the British Empire, has denounced the Basle Congress as an egregious blunder, and regards the idea of establishing a Jewish State in Palestine as absolutely mischievous. "It is contrary to Jewish principles, the teaching of the prophets, and the traditions of Judaism. It is a movement that can be fraught with incalculable harm, which can be entirely perverted, and which might lead people to think that we Jews are not fired with ardent loyalty for the country in which it is our lot to be placed." Dr. Adler believes that in speaking thus he is only expressing the common opinion in the Anglo-Jewish community. Mr. Oswald Simon, who recently defended his co-religionists against the misrepresentations of the Lambeth Conference, takes the same view and declares that Dr. Herzl, the leader of the movement, is not an orthodox Jew at all, but an Agnostic. On the other hand there can be no doubt that there is a strong patriotic party among the Jews who long to return to the land of their fathers and to make it once again a "land flowing with milk and honey." Humanly speaking the scheme is quite possible. There are plenty of enormously wealthy Jews who could command almost unlimited capital and could easily make it worth the Sultan's while to part with that narrow strip of his dominions which comprises the Holy Land. The points which render the success of the scheme doubtful are:—(1) The doubt whether the wealthy Jews will be willing to risk their capital in such an enterprise; (2) The uncertainty whether a sufficient number of the Jews will be prepared to take advantage of the scheme; and (3) The entire absence of an agricultural class amongst the Jewish race. These difficulties, however, are not insuperable, and if any large section of the Jews are really bent on carrying out such an enterprise, there is, humanly speaking, very little to prevent them. Some imaginative anti-Catholic papers have managed to drag the Papacy into the question, and have taken advantage of the occasion to manufacture all sorts of rumours as to the proposed action of the Holy See. The following press telegram, for example, appears in a leading London daily paper of September 8:—"The Pope, being uneasy at the extent of the Zionist movement for the return of the Jews to Palestine, and the statement that promises have already been made in their favour by the Sultan, has called Mgr. Bonetti, Apostolic Delegate at Constantinople, to Rome, to devise means for opposing the Jewish plans, which are naturally regarded with horror by good Catholics. In fact, this project interferes with the Pope's own desire to collect the necessary money to redeem the Holy Land from the infidel. The Vatican has also made representations to France, which has the protection of Catholic interests in the East." The Catholic papers in Rome, and the Roman correspondents of English Catholic papers emphatically deny the truth of this telegram, and declare that the Pope has taken no action whatever in the matter. The Roman correspondent of the *Catholic Times*—a thoroughly well-informed and reliable authority—thus emphatically contradicts this rumour of a protest from the Pope:—"To this I am in a position to oppose a complete denial. The Vatican has not occupied itself in the least degree with this Jewish project, for it knows full well that in fulfilment of a prophecy of our Saviour there is not the least likelihood, for the present at least, of the Jewish nation reconstituting itself. Besides, the insinuation that the Catholic Church has a tendency to persecute the Israelite is absolutely false, as is patent to all who are acquainted with history."

THE Rev. W. J. Barry, D.D., one of the most brilliant and luminous of living Catholic writers, has an interesting article in a recent number of the *National Review* in which the great French pervert and the greatest convert of the century are compared and contrasted. At almost the very time when Newman was making his way to the Church Renan slipped his hold of the Catholic faith, and this circumstance has led Dr. Barry to draw out the points of similarity and difference between the two men. Both were perfect masters of literary style, and under this head Dr. Barry thus compares them:—"Newman has long been recognised as one of the crowned and sceptred kings of English prose literature, without a competitor save Ruskin; but as a spiritual teacher, a light in the world of spiritual development, he is by far the greatest that has risen up during our century. On the other hand, which among French writers has excelled Renan? I speak of the supreme French achievement, again of prose, not of poetry; and I call to mind Chateaubriand, George Sand, Victor Hugo—these are the highest modern names—but can we praise them beyond the choice, music-breathing and exquisite and endlessly cunning artist who, by a secret known to himself and none other, has combined the Celtic and the classic eloquence, stolen the hearts of friends and enemies, hidden the charm of his persuasiveness in words as simple as they are touching, and given to a phrase or an epithet power so strange that, once heard, it will never be forgotten? What a specious miracle is here, and how slight a value do we set on Hugo's chaotic

TIGER BLEND TEAS HAVE NO EQUAL.