

press, the right to associate, the inviolability of home, the right of conscience itself, all these guarantees, about which they make so much noise, are declared absurd and illegal as soon as Catholics desire to employ them. The have gone so far as to profess and to apply against us all the principles that led Louis the Fourteenth to the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, and the English Parliament to its tyrannical legislation against Ireland—that is to say, their—I know not what to call it—disease, moral and intellectual, flowing into the marrow of the State, which will become a despotism of the most exalted kind, if God should ever permit their monstrous dream to be realised. Some say (and it is the principal defender of the present Ministry at the press that holds this language,) that there is something better worth preserving than the Charter—that is, the “philosophic spirit,” which means the spirit of the journal itself. Others dare to affirm, in the face of France and Europe, that the right of revolution is permanent, and that even liberty may become the sacrifice for its defence.

For ourselves, Messieurs, we accept the revolution as a fact, but liberty alone as a right, and the Charter alone as our safeguard. What we desire, what we demand is liberty; what our opponents wish is the contrary of liberty. This result we have acquired, and it remains with us. Whatsoever they may do, they can never prove that we wish to impose any restraint whatsoever on any individual whosoever. Whilst our adversaries absolutely hunt us down, telling us every moment—You shall not send your children there; you shall not wear that coat; you shall not follow that rule; you are not at liberty to employ your leisure hours in that way, nor your money so, nor your courage after that fashion!—we claim freedom of thought, liberty of association, freedom of education; freedom in all the powers and all the principles of social life; and we claim these rights for all, even for those who deny them to us.

Well, Messieurs, when I see this, I feel within me the invincible conviction that posterity will do us justice; and that, whatever may be the issue of this struggle, the position we have taken is in itself equivalent to the most splendid victory. Yes, the justice of posterity—the slight but glorious shadow of Divine justice—will not fail us. Posterity will acknowledge, with surprise perhaps, but certainly with admiration, that all doctrines favourable to liberty and human dignity, all that is generous, elevated, pure, and reasonable in the theories of 1789 and in the instincts of 1830—all this, at the middle of the nineteenth century, is to be found only in the camp of the Catholics; and that, with some trifling exceptions, the declaration of the Rights of Man no longer looks for consistent and sin-

cere defenders except among the Champions of the Rights of God. (Marks of assent.) Here the Chamber adjourned.

## EDUCATION IN IRELAND.

(Concluded.)

Sir, I denounce a theory so irrational, so unphilosophical, and, above all, so antichristian. The good sense of mankind denounces the crude and novel dogma, that education should be conversant with material ends only; it speaks to us in the voice of the soundest philosophies, and in the unwept departure of those who laboured to divorce religion from science, with the view to debase the arts from their legitimate calling, and to repress the expansion of Divine Truth. Ill-omened must be the separation between the spirit of charity and the frigid calculations of science; and powerless that knowledge when restricted to mere abstractions and definitions, to secondary laws and causes, without ever reminding the pupil of a “sursum corda” to Him who is the ultimate Law and Cause of all that exists! Even in nature all things love to ascend, and ascend in their strivings; but our modern philosophers have other aspirations and prefer looking downwards: not unlike the reflected images of trees planted by running waters, that grow downward, and seek a mock-Heaven in the unstable element beneath!

It would be an audacious calumny to hint the monstrous notion that increased knowledge served to diminish the sphere of revealed truth, or that the Church was opposed to the wide spread of scientific knowledge. The Church ever wished, not to retard, but to regulate the progress of the sciences: she would fain have all knowledge tend to Him who is its source and birth-throe. Hence that admirable precaution on the part of the Church, to absorb within the philosophic theories of her schools such principles as may have been introduced, with the view to disentangle truth from error, and to aid the Christian mind in drawing more legitimate inferences. Thus, Religion becomes the queen of man’s highest endowments, and all pure Knowledge and the unadorned Arts are her handmaids that rise up and call her blessed! That the life of the Church lies, in great part, in meeting the shifting forms of an infidel philosophy and facing its manifold changes with a suitable resistance, the learned productions of Molitor and Moehler, and of De Bonald and Le Maître, the very champions of Catholicity, abundantly testify. In all her universities and establishments of public education care has been taken to connect religious exercises with intellectual culture; and the students are supplied with healthy modes of philosophy, more enlarged views of history, and deeper criticisms in Philology, to meet the infidel sophists that seek to strike with dismay the Christian’s humble faith, and to sport with