

Thomas Murphy	0	2	6
Caroline Page	0	2	6
John Perry	0	1	3
James Brennan	0	1	3
Andrew Mackie	0	10	5
Christopher McDermott	0	3	14
Widow O'Brien	0	0	74
Anonymous	1	0	0
Ditto	0	10	0
Daniel McGuire	0	1	3
William Doran, (4 mile house)	0	1	3
Ellen O'Mara	0	1	3
Mrs. Wilneror	0	0	74
Charles Medley (colored)	0	0	74
Widow Kelly	0	0	74
Mrs Michael Kenaley	0	0	74
P. Walsh	0	10	5
Loughlin Cummins, P E Island	0	2	6

£15 15 0

Paid to the Rev. T. L. Conolly, V. G., Nov. 24th, 1848.

W. BUCKLEY, Collector.

THE JESUITS.

The following quotation from the October number of Brownson's Quarterly Review, will be found particularly interesting at the present time, when the children of St. Ignatius are persecuted. When the devil, and the world, sometimes even urged on by the hastiness of imprudent friends, are up in arms against them, we love to read words like these.

"Everybody knows the popular meaning attached to *Jesuitical*. Taking the word in this meaning, there are no men so little *Jesuitical* as the Jesuits. Their whole history proves them to be remarkable for their simplicity of heart, singleness of purpose, and straight-forwardness of conduct. No man can take up a work in defence of the Order, written by a member, without being fully convinced that the Jesuit is the antithesis of the character commonly ascribed to him. We have heard many charges, and grave charges, against him; but we have not heard one that we have not seen refuted. Jesuits are men, and, of course, suffer more or less the infirmities common to all men; but we should like to be shown a body of men, of equal numbers, placed in the trying circumstances in which they have been, who have shown less of human infirmity, or have been more true to the motto, *Ad maiorem Dei Gloriam*. There is no field of science or art which they have not cultivated with success; no department of literature which they have not enriched with their contributions; scarcely a nation to which they have not preached the cross; and hardly a land which they have not sanctified with the blood of their martyrs.

"Even the present persecution of the Society is to its glory. If the Jesuits had been political demagogues, if they had been violent radicals, ready to sacrifice liberty to licence, order to anarchy, religion to politics, heaven to earth,—our ears would not have been stunned with mad-dened outcries against them; the world would have owned them as her children, and the age would have delighted to honour them. We know it is pretended that they are the enemies of liberty and the friends of despotism, but it needs only a slight knowledge of facts to know that this is more pretence. Liberty has more than once found her noblest champion in the Jesuits, and the hostility a year or two since manifested to them in France was because they demanded the freedom of education a right guaranteed by the charter itself. They may not be, in these days, foremost among those who stir up rebellions and revolutions; they may not regard the fearful events which have just transpired in Europe, or are now transpiring, as sure to bring back the golden age of the poets; they may hold their mission to be spiritual, rather than political, and believe it more important to convert individuals and nations to God than to one political creed or another; but if so, it does not follow that they are wrong, or that for this very reason they are not all the more worthy of our respect and confidence.

The Society of Jesus was instituted, not for political, but for religious purposes, and its members, by their profession, are devoted to preaching the Gospel, hearing confessions, and educating youth, and that not for one country only, but for all countries. These ends are the same and of equal importance everywhere and under all forms of government. If the Jesuits were to adopt a political creed, and become its propagandists, how could they avoid themselves alike to ends of their institution, and the morality of

Europe and the democracy of America? What course would or could be proper for them, but to abstain from declaring themselves in favour of any particular form of government, and to content themselves with simply inculcating upon all citizens to obey the legitimate government of their country, whatever its form or constitution?

The charge against the Jesuits of being in favor of this or that form of government arises from their refusal to declare themselves in favor of one or another, from the fact that they have no political creed, and make it a point of duty to stand aloof from politics, and to confine themselves to the discharge of their spiritual functions. They obey the powers that be, and comport themselves as loyal subjects to the authority of the country, whether it be autocracy, as in Russia, constitutionalism, as in France and Great Britain, or republicanism, as in America. What more could we ask of them? If tyrants denounce them because they will not turn defenders of tyranny, if revolutionists denounce them because they will not join in the war against legitimate authority, whose fault is it? Are we to condemn the Jesuits because tyrants and revolutionists have wronged them?

Wherever the Jesuits are permitted to establish themselves, they are a blessing. It is not easy to estimate the value to this country of their services as instructors of our youth. It would be difficult to find a substitute for them as educators. In every part of the country, they are, for the pure love of God, founding colleges, and training up our children in the way they should go. Is this nothing? These colleges are but of yesterday, yet they have already done great service,—as we ourselves can testify, who have had four sons for a long time in one of them, and who have peculiar reason to thank Almighty God for raising up and moving the good fathers to devote themselves to the important work of education. But as yet they have really done nothing, in comparison with what they will do. They now rank among the best in the country, and in a few years they must place education with us at least on a level with what it is in the most favored countries of the Old World. And can we count this small service.

Worldlings may despise the Jesuits: infidels and heretics may calumniate them; misguided Catholics, whose faith is but a dead faith, may distrust them; but the world needs them, our own country needs them, and though the Church is dependent on no religious order, they are not the least efficient of her servants. Protestants, in their estimation of the Jesuit, betray only their ignorance or their malice, or both. The character they ascribe to the Jesuit they will find in its perfection in their own ministers, and the best definition of *Jesuitical*, in the proper acceptation of the term, is a *Presbyterian minister*, the antithesis of a Jesuit. Mr. Thorowell illustrates and accepts, in the book before us, every element of what he calls Jesuitism. No man can have been brought up among Presbyterians without knowing that the principle, that the end justifies the means, is the one on which they generally act, whether they avow it or not. No one can read one of their books against the Church without perceiving that the principle of mental reservation, or, in plain terms, the right to lie for the purpose of advancing Protestantism, is a principle which they practically adopt, and hold in constant requisition, and whoever will read a Presbyterian dogmatical work will see that to higher certainty than probability its author does not aspire, and that to substitute authority for evidence, and to make the opinions of men the arbiters of faith, is his boast. Nothing is more ridiculous than for a Presbyterian minister to accuse the Jesuits of a want of principle, of candour, of honesty, or to charge them with fraud and cruelty. Who ever heard of a Presbyterian minister that was not, officially, the very impersonation of pride, cant, hypocrisy, bigotry, and cruelty? If such a one there ever was, we may be sure that he did not live and die a Presbyterian. We know something, of Presbyterianism; it was our misfortune to have been brought up a Presbyterian. We know what are its secret covenants, the pledges it exacts of its adherents, and the measures it takes to prevent the least ray of light from penetrating their darkness. Take a Protestant's account of Catholicity or Jesuitism, change the name, and it is a faithful picture, as far as it goes, of proud, arrogant, bigoted, cruel, and persecuting Presbyterianism. There is not a charge brought against us by Presbyterians that we cannot retort.

THE CATHOLIC CLERGY AND THE LATE REVOLT IN IRELAND.

We have lately met with statements, from time to time, severely blaming the Catholic Clergy in Ireland for not taking an active part in the late struggle. Many attribute this to the failure of the attempt at revolution. To those who make these charges it might be enough to remark that whatever influence of this kind is enjoyed by the clergy it can be retained only by being used with prudence; that the fact of its having been retained so long should create a presumption in favor of the opinion under which they acted—that an attempt at revolt was hopeless.

Were no more granted them than is conceded to every one else—a right to be guided by their own convictions, they should not be blamed for pursuing the course which they thought the best. Thinking revolution hopeless, if for no other reason, they were bound to use every effort to stop it as soon as possible.

Much might be said to defend their position on its own intrinsic merits, but if their co-operation were necessary for success, whether they were right or not in withholding it, whether it was desirable or not that they should occupy such a position, their enjoying it was a fact which the Confederates had to deal with. If this co-operation was necessary it was obviously the duty of any one that meditated revolution, to have secured it before he moved. To have been ignorant of the fact, or to have overlooked it, argues utter incompetency in any one who would put himself at the head of such a movement. Their refusal to co-operate might in such circumstances be a very good excuse for not commencing such a revolution,—it is no apology for failing. The present statements and complaints are the best proof that without securing this co-operation they never should have commenced a revolution.

These remarks appear to us obvious, and therefore we were no little incensed on reading in the *Morning Chronicle*, of this city, a long letter of Thos. D'Arcy M'Gee, copied from the *Spirit of the Times*, in which he explains the causes of the failure of the Irish revolt. More fortunate than some of his brethren, he succeeded in making his escape to this country. Scarcely has he landed, than he turns round to throw on the Irish clergy the whole blame of what a moment's reflection will show lays at the door of himself and his associates of the Young Ireland party.

Gladly would we overlook their faults, for we are convinced that most of their leaders were animated by the purest patriotism. But credit for purity of intention can be awarded them solely at the expense of credit for practical good sense. Merit is not generally to be measured by success, but a certain degree of success, in some cases at least, is necessary even for ordinary merit. Men who will involve a nation in the responsibility of a revolution must make a better attempt than that on Boulagh Common, or be pronounced wanting in the ordinary requisites of character for their position.

Nothing has happened in Ireland, that any one might not have foreseen. The British government could not have been expected to wait until it suited the revolutionists to give the signal for the fight. No government, just or unjust, without superfluous itself, could have allowed preparations for war to be made within their border, in open day, without making counter-preparations, and seizing the rebels. If the Young Irelanders, then, were not able to do more than they did, it is a clear proof that they never should have commenced. The event has proved them entirely incompetent for the work they laid out for themselves.

The result was what all were inclined to expect from the surface of things. Yet, many could not believe that the Young Irelanders, whatever opinion was entertained of their qualities, could be so mad as to force a contest without some better reasons for hoping for success than appeared. Now, however, we find that they really had none, and the only excuse they can offer to cover their rashness is to blame the Catholic clergy for not co-operating with them in rushing into the rebellion.

The utter incapacity of the men stands now revealed to the world; it is creditable to the Catholic Clergy that they kept aloof from them, and saved all they could from the ruin which must necessarily have attended such men's undertaking under any circumstances.

We should like to forget their mistakes in the sympathy which we feel for their misfortunes, brought on though they be by their own intemperate zeal. We entertain, and always did entertain, respect for Smith O'Brien, even when we deplored his mistakes. We would say the same thing of more than one of the prominent men of the Young Ireland party now in prison. We know they loved their country, but we think it now too evident to be called in question, that they made sad—nay woful mistakes. Those amongst them who were more fortunate than their brethren and are now free, would do well to make use of their liberty in answering the demand of the well-wishers of their country, and show on what grounds they dared to drag it into its present dreadful condition. This would be more proper than blaming the men who had the penetration to see their incompetency, and the good sense to avoid them.

Mr. M'Gee not only says that the Catholic Clergy was to blame for not having aided the revolution, but he dares to insinuate that their course was influenced by the British government. With much more apparent reason might it be said, that the conduct of the Young Irelanders was the result of such influence. They have played effectually into the hands of the Government, as effectually as if they had been hired for the purpose; they pursued the very course which we know men were hired to pursue—to push on a premature outbreak of the people. This was the very thing which O'Connell always warned against, in guarding against which his great skill consisted. These men have given evidence, if evidence had been wanting, how correct were his views on this subject.

They found their country wanting in many things, because she was held in bondage by a powerful nation. Yet in the physical weakness to which she had been reduced, O'Connell taught her to fling defiance at her oppressor.—He taught her how to fasten upon that oppressor the scorn of the civilized world, and to extort from her shame, one by one, many of her most precious rights. This was done without any favorable circumstances from without, but he proclaimed, and every one felt, that nothing was wanting to wring from her the full measure of justice, but that the day of England's difficulty should approach. The speck on the horizon which O'Connell waited for so long, and which he would have recognized as the morning star of Ireland's triumph, had already risen: the dawn of the day which he had looked for during nearly forty years, was already making its appearance, the distant rumbling that proclaimed Europe in a chaos and England in her difficulties, but which would have been the signal of Ireland's deliverance, was already heard; and when every well-wisher of Ireland was beginning to entertain hopes—sanguine hopes of happier days, these thoughtless friends cast away the whole in a moment, and seemed only in a hurry to prevent the opportunity being turned to account. They enabled the enemy to strike with effect the blow he was long meditating, and the country that was advancing to liberty now lies prostrate at his feet.

The men who brought about this result are themselves likely to be amongst its first victims. From our hearts we condole with them. But it requires all the indulgence that can be awarded them, to reconcile their conduct with common honesty, and that cannot be affected but at the expense of credit for practical common sense.

We forbear for the present making further comment on Mr. M'Gee's letter. He went far already towards seriously committing the Catholics of this country, while he edited the *Boston Pilot*, before his departure from the United States. It is a bad omen of his career amongst us again, that, scarcely landed, he turns to vilifying the Catholic clergy of Ireland, who have shown themselves, even on this occasion, her best friends. Had they no other claim to our esteem than that they saw in time and kept aloof from the mad career on which Young Ireland was forcing them, it would be sufficient to show them the most discerning friends of the Irish nation.—*Pittsburgh Catholic*

Cheap postage is becoming the order of the day.—Russia has adopted a uniform penny rate; France a four sous rate or about two pence; and the United States propose a reduction from five to two cents. An ocean penny postage will ultimately complete the facilities for intercourse between all nations.