

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AND HER ENEMIES.

PROFESSOR GOLDWIN SMITH THE LATEST CALUMNIATOR.

THE DISTINGUISHED VISIONARY TAKEN TO TASK

ARCHBISHOP LYNCH HANDLES HIM WITHOUT GLOVES, AND TOTALLY DESTROYS THE PATCH-WORK OF HIS HEATED IMAGINATION.

(From the Irish Canadian, Aug. 26th)

We mentioned last week that it was announced Archbishop Lynch would reply to certain calumnies lately uttered against the Catholic Church in her relations with education, at an early day. His Grace has been prompt, as on Sunday evening he delivered one of those brilliant discourses which have ranked him not only prompt and decisive, but irrefutable and convincing in defence of the Ancient Faith and its bearing on society. The vast Cathedral was filled, the subject being of absorbing interest to Catholic and Protestant alike; and the impression made by him must have been fatal to the flimsy pretences and gilded oratory of Professor Goldwin Smith. We give below an accurate account of the Archbishop's lecture, especially reported for this journal, and invite its careful perusal. The text will stand good in time to come as a reference that cannot be denied. His Grace began:

So is the condition of our fallen nature, that if a bad habit of mind or body be contracted in youth, that habit will return constantly, and in old age will assume even youthful force. If one be educated in false principles and in false history and in false ethics, the whole man is distorted. Others see this deformity better than he does himself. If a child be educated a Protestant, it will probably remain so; if an Atheist, it will retain their tenets. As many diversities of education, so many diversities of views and opinions. This pervades in politics, in medicine, and especially in religion and education. Alas for any man educated and formed in a false mould!

The Catholic Church, founded by Our Lord Jesus Christ, containing the deposit of truth, proclaims the truth, fights for this truth, endeavors to propagate this truth by means of that spirit of truth which Christ promised should always abide with her. Whilst contending for truth and right, she has to struggle with adversaries who are always warring against this truth. Who malign her doctrines and institutions, falsify her history and misrepresent her actions. The ministers of this church are engaged in writing, explaining, refuting calumnies but the same calumnies and errors are constantly repeated. The Catholic Church is therefore, especially for the last few centuries, put upon the defensive, and yet from time to time she exposes the false doctrines and the false positions of her adversaries. Her adversaries are multitudinous. All who are enemies to the spread of the real doctrines of Christ are her adversaries. All who are setting up their own private judgment and views, not in accordance with the doctrines of Christ, are her adversaries. She has an ominous phalanx of adversaries called Protestants, the offshoot of personal inspiration, so-called, and of personal infallibility in the interpretation of the Divine word and of the Divine mind of God in the Sacred Scriptures. Of consequence, the Protestant sects must be innumerable as the diversities of human genius. Man make a human religion founded on reason alone, but none can make a divine religion with its mysteries and Sacraments, except God.

We often hear of the Protestant doctrines of the Reformation, that they must be upheld and propagated. Would it not be better to hear of the doctrines of Jesus Christ held and promulgated by His Church from the beginning? Misrepresentation of Catholic doctrine has always been the great mode of warfare against the Catholic Church. Do Catholic clergymen misrepresent Protestant doctrines? No. The best thing to do would be to explain them. The Catholic Priest has a lamp to his feet to guide him—the teaching of the whole Catholic Church. The Protestant has only individual inspiration and very vague formulas of doctrine. Hence the constant splitting into sects.

A certain Professor, learned in that range of science that came within his grasp, delivered a lecture to a very respectable body of men in one of our public educational halls. He said many good things which would make one wish that his reading were not so much one sided. He gave utterance too to many things that, considering his position and the publicity they got through the newspapers, we would deem it almost criminal to allow to pass unchallenged. We won't pretend to review the whole lecture, but only portions of it. This learned gentleman allows himself from time to time, to emit some flashes of truth, as, for instance, when he concedes that education was to a limited extent given to the poor, and this from early times. Who gave this education, even to a limited extent, to the poor? The Catholic Church, principally. The Catholic Church got a universal command to go and teach all nations, and she has fulfilled this task, teaching first all truths of Christianity, and, as helps to the understanding of these divine truths, all natural sciences. On this point we need not enter as we have amply proved it on a former occasion.

In another part of his lecture the learned Professor appears to contradict himself when he says that the Catholic clergy, and especially the Jesuits, were almost inimical to popular education. Those who don't tell the whole truth, they say need long memories; but the learned Professor forgets this when he says "High honor is due to the monasteries, and especially to those of the Benedictine Order, for the services thus rendered by them to education as well as to learning in the darkest hour. But their pupils, all told, must have been few in number; and of these, while a few were scions of the lay nobility, the bulk, and probably all those taken from the poorer classes, were destined for the ecclesiastical order. That order indeed was far more comprehensive than it is in modern times; it included not only the priest proper, but all the intellectual professions, the lawyer, the physician, the literary man, the architect, the artist, the mechanic, every one, in short, but the soldier, the trader, and the tiller of the soil. Still it was limited compared with the mass of the population which remained in a state of total ignorance," &c.

The learned Professor says the mass of the population were in a state of total ignorance; and yet he says that all the intellectual professions were well provided for—the lawyers, the physicians, the literary men, the architects, the artists, the mechanics—no inconsiderable proportion of the inhabitants—and those must have shed some light of learning around them, and all this the Church did without school tax. "But," he insists, "the soldier, the trader and the tiller of the soil remained in a state of total ignorance. Total ignorance of what, I would ask? The soldier did not know the use of arms, and the trader did not know how to make a trade, and the tiller of the soil did not know one season from another—than they were worse than our present Hotentots! The soldier, the trader and the tiller of the soil were not in total ignorance, they were instructed in the commandments and in the sacraments; every Sunday they heard in the Gospel the truth of religion explained to them. A learned author has said "the humble husbandman in the fields, who loves God and keeps His command-

ments, is wiser than the proud philosopher who counts the stars." We must remember that the Professor is speaking of a period before the age of printing, when books cost a fortune.

Had the Protestant church existed at that time would it have done better, with its married clergy, and no monasteries or convents? I presume not. What is the Protestant Church doing for education at the present hour unaided by state taxation? Take printing from the world and state aid and old Catholic foundations for the Protestant church of to-day, would it do what the Catholic Church did 400 years ago. The Catholic Church still pursues her policy of educating her children. In the United States at the present hour she is forced to pay taxes to support common schools that her children cannot use, and she erects school-houses and pays her teachers large salaries to give a Christian education to her own children. Our American Protestant friends are astonished at the small salaries our priests get, a few hundreds a year, whilst their own ministers get so many thousands. Our churches have as much revenue as the Protestant churches in the great cities of the United States, but it is devoted to the support of schools and schoolmasters, who receive a salary equal to that of a priest. A church of such sacrifices must progress, and hence the terrible fear of Popish domination and supremacy in America. Here in Canada, on account of the Separate School Law, Catholics are in a better condition though not treated so fairly as the Protestant minority in Lower Canada, who have their Normal School and other advantages that we have not. In our anxiety to have our Catholic children educated we permit them to frequent the Common Schools where the paucity of their number prevents them having a Separate School. We know it is a risk, they are surrounded by a Protestant atmosphere; the teacher, whose opinions silently influence his surroundings, is a Protestant; the majority of the pupils are Protestants; the absence of Catholic teachings and Catholic prayer, week after week and month after month, act banefully but surely on the youthful mind; and yet, for the sake of education we tolerate all that, hoping at the same time that Catholic priest and parent will counteract the effects of this want of daily religious school education. We have besides in Upper Canada a vast number of our children also frequenting Common Schools with our full consent, because the township is Catholic, the trustees are Catholics, the teacher is a Catholic; because we look on it as our own Separate School, but yet this fact is commented on as a proof of how Catholics love the Common School System. They do love it in such circumstances, when it suits them. The Catholic Church must love education, when we find in its bosom so many joint stock companies of men and women devoted to the education of the poor, gratis, and that by vow, content with their food and raiment only. I mean our Religious Orders. I don't know their number myself, but I know it would be easy to count the number of men and women in the school and Church of our learned Professor, who teach the poor gratis. The Christian Brothers alone teach in the United States 45,000 pupils, and in Canada 15,000.

The Professor says "a church which can herself teach all truth needs not the aid of the human intellect, perhaps naturally mistrusts it and therefore has comparatively little interest in education;" this is simply a sentence full of blunders. How teach all truth without the aid of the human intellect in the Church aided by divine light that instructs the masses; and this is done by education both in the pulpit and in the schools. Education is the great aid of the Church, and so far from mistrusting education the Church courts it. Our Professor remarks that a "church which appeals to reason and to private judgment must of necessity educate." Here the Professor truthfully explains the standpoints of all Protestant churches, reason and private judgment, both of which are faulty, and a poor foundation for true education. I don't now speak of sciences which depend on reason and observation alone. I speak of education in its comprehensive meaning. The Catholic Church has always proved herself accurate in all science, even human.

Spain, the Professor says, is woefully deficient in the education of the masses. It is not surprising, since Spain has been in a state of civil war and conspiracy for the last half century. Ireland, he says, is being educated by the interposition of a Protestant power. The majority of the inhabitants of Ireland, it is true, are Catholics, but the Government is Protestant, the aristocracy is Protestant, the recognized and well-paid church of the country until lately was Protestant, and only lately were Catholics allowed to be educated. No country on the face of the earth has done more at all times for education than Ireland; and in no country in the world was education of the people, till lately, prohibited with more diabolical cruelty; and yet Ireland battled for and preserved her education. Listen to a few of the enactments against a people professedly Catholic. In 1692 and following years it was enacted as follows that:

"If a Catholic kept school or taught any person, Protestant or Catholic, any species of literature or science, such teacher was, for the crime of teaching, punishable by law by banishment—and if he returned from banishment he was hanged as a felon. If a Catholic, whether a child or adult, attended, in Ireland, a school kept by a Catholic, or was privately instructed by a Catholic, such Catholic, although a child in its early infancy, incurred a forfeiture of all its property, present or future.

"If a Catholic child, however young, was sent to any foreign country for education, such infant child incurred a similar penalty, that is a forfeiture of all right to property, present or prospective.

"If any person in Ireland made any remittance of money or goods for the maintenance of any Irish child educated in a foreign country, such person incurred a similar forfeiture."

In addition to all this a fine of £10 a month, a great deal for those days, was imposed on the person who employed a Catholic schoolmaster in a private family, and £2 a day on the schoolmaster so employed. So he was robbed of all his personal property before he was banished; and £100 fine was imposed on the father who sent his child to foreign parts, besides his child being disinherited. These laws were applicable to England. Where do we find any Catholic country making against the education of Protestants such barbarous enactments. These laws continued until the reign of George III., when the American revolution brought on a pressure. But the Irish loved learning, and schools were kept under the hedges and ditches, in the bogs and mountains. A boy was kept in a tree to watch the soldiery. Gentlemen sent their children to foreign parts to be educated, and colleges for their education sprang up all over the continent of Europe. In Rome, all through Italy, France, Spain, and Portugal, Catholic powers and noblemen vied with one another in founding colleges for the persecuted Irish. I may mention a fact of recent date utterly disgraceful to all concerned. After the French revolution Napoleon I., in making restitution for the deeds of rapine perpetrated on foreign residences in France, paid over an immense sum of money to the English Government for the losses sustained by the Irish college at Paris. What did the English Government do? Instituted a Commission for the disposal of the money, and passed an Act of Parliament freeing the Commissioners from any blame or punishment personal or pecuniary for whatever judgment they would pronounce on how the money was to be disposed of. They found that there was no such institution recognized in England as an Irish college abroad, voted a large sum of money as salary for their judgment, and the remainder for the use of

the King. This amount was expended on the repairs and extension of Windsor Castle. So much for English justice where Catholic Ireland and Catholic interests are concerned. However, the President and Faculty of the Irish College at present have taken preliminary steps to sue for the money. Now if this were done by a Catholic state against a Protestant institution, what an outcry!

And how did the great Reformation treat the schools and colleges of education? No country in Europe was so well endowed for education as England; 1040 colleges, monasteries and hospitals, more or less, all engaged in education; in Wales 43 and in Ireland 95. These were suppressed, books destroyed, and funds given to the Court harpies. Now what have the Protestant ministers individually or collectively done for education or what sacrifices have they made? True, celibacy stood in the way. Had the church been entrusted to a married Protestant clergy would they have performed all the laborious services rendered to education by monks surrounded as our Professor admits by many difficulties? Imagine the labor of transcribing the whole Bible by hand and multiplying those copies a thousand times. Would they have endured the cold of such a scriptorium as our Professor sketches, for the sake of transmitting the Word of God to our times, for the preservation of the classics and of the records of their country? No indeed! they would have quite enough to do to educate their own children. The state educates, taxing Protestant and Catholic alike, and in most cases the taxes of the poor have to be spent in educating the rich; and to exclude the Irish from the benefits of education, though the University (Trinity College) was supported from Irish revenues, the Sacramental Test was applied to the students. Before they could get an education or honors they had to receive the Protestant Sacrament, swear that it was not Our Lord's Body, and abjure the Catholic religion. Then their cry was raised, "Oh, the Catholics are inimical to education." A drink is not wholesome from filthy vessels, or when mixed with poison!

Our Professor says "no Jesuit was ever a hearty friend to popular education. We need not press the case too far." As this sentence reads, and will be generally understood, the assertion is false; a thousand facts and imperial decrees against Jesuit colleges prove the assertion to be utterly without foundation. However, the Professor may mean by popular education, education without religion. Then indeed the Jesuits and all good Catholics are opposed to such education. Strangely enough he asserts in another place that the Jesuits are good educators, yet they are not the friends of popular education!

The Professor again says that in Spain it was considered immoral for a woman to be able to read! Here the rhetorician evidently hallucinates.

The Professor again, by a strange flight, tells some truth when he has said in another part of his lecture "Christianity was a religion of light, and in the early Anglo Saxon times, while the conversion of the nation was still going on, we find in the mission centres the centres also of learning and education. The Church, in fact, in those days was the school." Precisely so; as the Catholic Church was in Anglo-Saxon times she is now. She fears not the light of education; she rather encourages it. The Church believes that the child has an immortal soul placed upon this earth principally and especially to know and serve God and to be happy for ever. Our first grand duty therefore is to educate that child for eternal life. The immortal soul of the child craves divine instruction, and that instruction which tends to make it happy for all eternity. Secular instruction is principally to make a man useful for this life; it is very good as far as it goes, but does not go far enough.

From the tenor of the reasoning of the learned Professor, he appears to worship an educational system free from religion and "a religion that appeals to an open Bible and to reason as the interpreter of its page." Our Professor then would want reason to extract a religion from an open Bible.—But reason cannot find or appreciate the mysteries of the Trinity or the Divine Incarnation, which are above reason. Therefore our Professor wants a natural religion only; a supernatural religion cannot be the work of reason.

He still proceeds, "the state clergy of the Church of the Restoration were almost as indifferent to public instruction as the state clergy of Spain." Putting this sentence into plain English, it means that the clergy of the established Church of England were as indifferent about the education of the poor as the Catholic clergy of Spain. Well as far the English clergy were concerned, as I have said, their own little families appear to be quite enough for them to educate. The clergy of Spain, however, educated in their monasteries, colleges, and universities, without any support from the state, a vast number of rich and poor.

Let us now turn to England with the learned Professor. The fearful picture of a modern voting booth in Protestant England shows that the poor are very badly educated. We quote the learned Professor: "These miserable possessors of a misstowed power, flocked to the poll, drugged with beer, and inflamed with fury, ignorant of everything, devoid not only of the rudiments of political knowledge and duty, but of the knowledge which is imparted in an infant school. Swarms of them were unable to make a cross opposite a candidate's name and had to vote by the form appointed for illiterates. In the trial of a controverted election a witness was put upon the stand who never heard the names of the leaders of the two great parties, and only knew that in his own town one party was blue and the other yellow. In another trial the judge said that the sum spent in bribery altogether was very small; but that, nevertheless, there had been a great deal of corruption, for the voters were so ignorant of what they were doing, and their duty as citizens, that they could be bought for a pot of beer. Yet these were arbiters, not only of the destiny of England, but of the colonies of India." Alas, Protestant England, with all her schools and expenditure, stands in need of the proper schooling. The ignorance and degradation of the English poor in general, as proved by a learned Professor of Cambridge University, is much more degraded than Englishmen would like to hear. The great question to dispute between two classes of men is this. Whether religious instruction should form part of public education or not. The clergy of the Church of England, and many other denominations of Christians, say with the Catholic clergy that education is not only incomplete without religious instruction, but hurtful. Education will render a man more powerful for evil, without religion. The Secularists, many of whom profess no religion, and others not overcharged with any religion, say let the state supply an education in all the branches of secular knowledge, and eliminate from the schools all religious teaching; let religion, they say, be taught by parents at home or by ministers of various denominations on Sundays. In other words, let religion be a home and Sunday affair. The difficulty of the Sunday and home religion is, the parents themselves are very often ignorant and too much occupied to teach their children. The poor mother has to administer to the wants of the little ones and the father is working all day and comes home wearied at night, and cares not to teach his children their catechism, even were he to know. The Sunday teaching occurring only once a week will be ineffective; children, as in the United States, will find Sunday school too irksome, and will end by no religion at all as is the case with a great majority there. Or they may become like the basetted voters as described above. The world is undergoing a terrible revolution; the state wants to gain complete control over both body and soul, intellect and reason, and hence it is the old story over again. When Christ proclaimed His doctrines to the world, He did not

ask permission of Caesar, but Caesar waged war against Christ and His Church. Caesar was defeated; ships could float in the blood of the martyrs; if they were gathered together, Caesar was converted, but no sooner settled on his throne than he began to "dogmatize" and interfere with the Church. Constantine, his son, strove to prescribe the doctrines of the Church and arrange its discipline according to his own fancy; and so with other emperors and kings, for they appear to embody the spirit of the world that fights against Christ. From King Rufus to Henry the VIII., true to the instincts of the world, kings opposed the Church and its doctrines. The present Emperor of Germany enters upon the same war of usurpation, to prescribe what the clergy are to do and to teach, and what education they are to receive. But the Catholic Church will resist, as it did before, this usurpation, and will say to the king, "You have the Government of the affairs of this world; we, the Government of Christ's Church in spiritual things."

Our Professor speaks of Catholic resistance to public education as having been minimized in this country. Do Catholics anywhere resist and prevent Protestants from educating their children as they please? But Catholics resist and will continue to resist a system of education imposed upon them by Protestants—that is, an education divorced from religion; and Catholics do protest against being taxed for the education of Protestant children, and to build palaces in which the Protestant children of the well-to-do people are educated. The learned Professor again says, "In this respect, if the foreign Jesuits will only refrain from troubling us with their alien intrigues, I believe we shall all do well." (Well, what a pettish sentence. Nursery terrors again! Children will hide their heads and cry out "Oh! the awful Jesuits!" The meaning of these intrigues may be that, if the foreign Jesuits will refrain from plotting to bring the Pope here with a large army, assisted by Don Carlos of Spain and the Mexicans, who will drive all the Protestant Canadians across the borders, and establish a Popish Dominion, we will be all right. Or the sentence may mean, if the Jesuits stop intriguing to carry off the Queen of England to Quebec, force her to become a Catholic, and upset Protestant ascendancy, we'll all do pretty well, and our Indian possessions will be safe.

In the nineteenth century, in this our present age, when every man, except the Catholic of course, claims the right to make up a religion of his own, to suit his own views of eccentricities; and when there is so large a number of pretty well defined denominations of Christians, it is very difficult, I concede, for Governments to devise a system of education to answer the views of so many classes of individuals.—We hold that it is the parent's duty and his right to educate his children in that form of belief which he considers before God to be the best. It is the duty of the state to help the parent to fulfil this duty, but it steps beyond the limits of its power to assume the obligations of parents and to instruct the children in any state religion. It is true that the state has a right to see that its citizens are properly trained for the duties of citizens, but it can do so without interfering with the consciences of its subjects. Would it not be enough for the state to require certain qualifications in teachers and certain conditions of school requisites which it can do by means of inspectors; then subsidize these schools, as is done in England, according to the number of schools attending them. Then the best School Teachers and the most attentive will have the most pupils, parents can select that school to which they wish to send and all will be satisfied, except perhaps the teacher who is unfit to teach. All Protestants have a kindred spirit; they can easily agree to have their children associate for their differences are after all very inconsiderable. The Catholics may have schools apart as at present in this country; but let them enjoy the same privileges that Protestants enjoy both for a higher and minor education.

I am glad to find that the school teachers of this country begin to look upon their profession as one of the most honorable, and as useful to the community at large, and perhaps to themselves, as any other calling in the country. We exhort them to continue their noble efforts for God and the people. As a great deal is said about the open Bible, I will on a future occasion tell what the Catholic Church did for the preservation of the blessed work, and for its spread amongst the people even before the "Reformation."

WAS ST. PETER EVER IN ROME?

His Lordship the Bishop of Salford preached last Sunday night to a crowded congregation in the Church of the Holy Name, Oxford-street, Manchester on the question, "Was St. Peter ever in Rome?" He said he had been asked by some whom he wished to oblige to speak on this subject. He could not consider it necessary to prove by direct argument that St. Peter ever went to Rome, for it had been proved abundantly, and superabundantly, by arguments which were indirect, and which had the greatest force. The doctrine of the supremacy of the Holy See was argument sufficient that St. Peter was the predecessor of the pontiffs of Rome, that he was the Bishop of Rome, and that, therefore, he was in Rome. Those who asserted that St. Peter never was in Rome, and those who said that it was doubtful whether he was there or not, performed one and the same office. They cast dust into the air in order to blind and to deceive the unwary. They who had reduced themselves to deny the presence of Peter in Rome, had reduced themselves to what he would call the back stunts of religious controversy, and the weapons which they too frequently used in this warfare were weapons which corresponded to the position which they had chosen to enter into. They ignored the most salient and undoubted passages which occurred in the writings of the Fathers bearing upon the question, and they offered the most forced and absurd explanations of many of those passages which stared them in the face, and which they could not otherwise get over. As a specimen of the weapons to which this class of controversialists resorted, he referred to a pamphlet which had been distributed broadcast over England, purporting to be a speech made by Bishop Strossmayer in the Vatican Council, denying that Peter ever was in Rome, and full of abuse of the Holy See. It happened that last year he was in Rome, and he took with him a copy of this pamphlet, and Bishop Strossmayer being then also in Rome inquiry was made, and the Bishop indignantly denied that he had ever made such a speech anywhere, and it was known before that he had not spoken it in the Vatican. His first argument was that the doctrine that Peter was Bishop of Rome was never called in question for fourteen centuries; and in these fourteen centuries there lived men as acute as any of the present day, and many who had been excommunicated and anathematized by the Popes on account of heresies, but none of them ever called this doctrine in question. It was first challenged in the 16th century by Marsilius of Padua, a heretic and schismatic, who was the abettor of one of the princes of Germany in his war against the Holy See. In the time of the Reformation this, no doubt, became a useful weapon, and some of the Reformers made use of it, but not all. For instance, Calvin, who was so acute, and who prided himself too much on his learning, never committed himself to such an assertion. His second argument should be from the testimony of the Fathers. St. Irenaeus, the disciple of Polycarp, the friend of St. John, who wrote in 178, said, in his treatise against heretics, "We confound them by pointing out the tradition which the greatest and most ancient and universally-known Church of Rome, founded and constituted by the two most glorious apostles, Peter and Paul, derives from the apostles," &c. He knew that some Protes-

tants tried to overthrow the force of these expressions by referring to the expression "on account of its more powerful principality," which occurred in the passage, which they said confined St. Irenaeus's meaning to a statement that, because Rome was the seat of the Empire therefore it had a greater authority, a greater principality." When, however, it was borne in mind that the Christian Church in Rome was persecuted for the first three hundred years of its existence, and its pontiffs, one after another, were martyrs, his hearers could judge how little authority the early Fathers would attach to Rome on account of its political importance. In another passage St. Irenaeus said, "Matthew also issued a written Gospel among the Hebrews, in their own dialect, while Peter and Paul were preaching at Rome, and laying the foundations of the Church." These were passages which no man in his senses had ever called in question. Tertullian, who wrote in 195, referred to Rome as the place "where Peter had a like passion with the Lord, and where Paul was honoured with an end like unto the Baptist." St. Cyprian, writing about 246, referred constantly to Rome as the "chair of Peter," and St. Optatus, writing in the next century, spoke in the same way. Speaking of the chair of Peter at Rome as one of the marks of the Church, his lordship proceeded to quote passages in which it was taken for granted that Rome had been the see of Peter from St. Epiphanius who wrote in 385. St. John Chrysostom, writing in 387, speaking of the resurrection of the dead, said: "From Rome the body of Paul will be borne in rapture; from Rome the body of Peter will likewise ascend." He also mentioned St. Jerome (whose testimony was most distinct both that Peter went to Rome and that he was buried there), and other later writers down to the time of St. Leo. He next quoted Protestant authors, in which the same doctrine was granted, as Cane, who affirmed without hesitation with the whole body of the ancients that St. Peter was at Rome, and Leibnitz (the correspondent of Bossuet); Home in his introduction to the "Study of Holy Scripture;" Whiston Geisler (the German Protestant Church historian); Bertold in his introduction to the Old and New Testament; Wilberforce, Maitland, and others. The only argument against the doctrine which had any colour or pretence was that Peter said in his first Epistle, "The Church that is at Babylon saluteth you." It was argued by some that in this epistle Peter referred to Babylon in Chaldea, but that had not been held in the Catholic Church, and it was not believed by the most learned commentators amongst the Protestants; the obvious explanation being that St. Peter in this passage referred to Rome as the modern Babylon, by which name it was also designated by St. John in the Apocalypse.

In conclusion, the preacher appealed to those in the Church of England who were only separated from the Catholic Church by the doctrine of the supremacy of Peter, and who through no fault of their own, had been defrauded of their inheritance at the Reformation, to examine the question carefully, with prayer for the Divine guidance.—Catholic Times, Aug. 7.

THE O'CONNELL CENTENARY.

We have entered upon the hundredth year which has elapsed since the occurrence of an event for ever memorable in the annals of the Irish race. On the 6th August, 1775, Catherine, wife of Morgan O'Connell, of Carhen, near Caherciveen, presented her husband with a son, who was, in due time, christened Daniel. Seventy-one years afterwards the body of that son was borne to its last resting-place, amidst the tears and lamentations of a bereaved nation. In the three score and ten years which elapsed between the hour when the birth of a son gladdened the house of Morgan O'Connell and the hour when a stricken nation mourned its lost and glorious chief, Daniel O'Connell had won for himself the most brilliant and the most enduring reputation which has been the meed of any man springing from the old Celtic race. To the last—up to the moment when Disease laid its giant hand on that majestic figure, the moment when "the scene darkened ere the curtain fell"—O'Connell was not alone the loved, the honored, the adored Chief and Tribune and Liberator of his own people, but the most conspicuous and remarkable figure on the great stage of Christendom. What he did for Ireland needs no recapitulation here. He was at once the hero and the epitome of the Celts. In that breast every virtue, every characteristic of the Irish race was mirrored and intensified. A Celt of the Celts, it was given to him to lead his people out of a bondage which has been as bitter and more enduring than that in which the Egyptians held the people of God. Before the major genius of O'Connell blazed across the western sky, the Irish Celts had for seven troubled centuries been the Helots of Christendom. Their faith was banned, their race was despised, their country was but a name. Even the good men who had pleaded their cause before the Parliaments of Ireland and of England pleaded for concessions to be accorded to bondsmen, not for rights to be yielded to the free. In the darkest hour of the nation's history, when Treason was consuming the west which Despotism had commenced—when the best and bravest of the land had perished in the field or on the scaffold—when a recreant Senate was haggard for the price at which it was to sell its own existence and its country's freedom—a young barrister, just admitted to the profession, attended a meeting of the Catholics of Dublin, held to protest against the Union, and there delivered a maiden speech which was a fiery denunciation of that infamous measure. That young barrister was O'Connell—that speech was the keynote of his life.

We repeat that we have no intention of following the stirring incidents of that career. The people of Ireland do not need to be told the story of Ireland's mightiest son. They do not need to be told how he breathed into the soul of his country the divine fire of Liberty—how he led her from victory to victory—how he struck off the chains which bound her fair limbs—how he confounded her foes—how he conducted her to a place among the peoples of the world, and all but replaced the diadem of Nationhood upon her brow.

We have said that the Irish patriots who preceded O'Connell were wont to adopt a suppliant attitude, to teach—

Millions to kneel down
And ask of thousands for their own.
O'Connell's voice was a *sursum corda* to the Irish heart. He found his country bound; he left her free—free in the freedom of the spirit, which is above all freedom. Faultless he was not; who is? but never yet did tribune leave behind a tale of services so splendid, of devotion so unwavering. The undertone which harmonised and modulated his whole career was an intense, passionate, absorbing love of Ireland—her hills and valleys, her generous people, her history, her archeology, her crumbling ruins, her traditions, and her customs.—The lines which he penned when Miss Mitford asked him for an autograph summed up the whole history of the man—
Still shalt thou be my waking theme,
Thy glories still my midnight dream,
And every thought and wish of mine,
Unconquered Erin, shall be thine.
Love, even in the world of politics, is mightier than hate, and it was love that strengthened the high heart and mind, the giant arm, of O'Connell. Let us prefer to speak of him, here, not so much as an Irish patriot achieving the emancipation of his country's independence—we prefer to speak of him as the greatest European tribune and statesman of the 19th century.—We have said that the manning of O'Connell's career was love of Ireland; let us add, that by its side grew a love of Liberty, all over