

day by Cardinal Laurentino. The sight of this young man, after what she had just said, had such an effect upon Blanche, that she tottered, and fell fainting to the ground. When she recovered, she was with her mother. "It is Germain; I have seen him!" was her first exclamation; but when her father and mother had convinced her of the impossibility of such an apparition in the Pope's apartment, she began to think as they did, that she must have been mistaken, and she became somewhat more composed. Eight days after, Claude, his wife and daughter, took leave of the Pope, who promised to send to Laverdun the husband and the portion destined for his niece.

It was a sad day for Master Claude when he found himself obliged to return to Laverdun. At first, he had only thought of the pecuniary loss he had sustained; but now that he was to go back amongst his neighbors, he was suddenly assailed by other fears, which never occurred to him before. He thought of the jeers and mockery which awaited him, and his heart sank within him; nevertheless, feeling that there was no possible way of escaping the danger, he resolved to meet it boldly, and in this mood he entered the town. But how great was his surprise when, as he passed along, he saw every one salute him with respect, and heard Master Guerdard thank him because the monks of St. Bernard discharged him from his rent of ten leaves. The poor man thought at first that they were mocking him, but his surprise and joy had no bounds when, turning into the street where his house was situated, he saw the shop open, and customers going in and out as usual. In a moment, he fancied that some other baker had profited by his absence to establish a bakery in place of his, but he was quickly undeceived. There was still over the door the figure of St. Nicholas, and underneath, the name which almost made him weep with joy—the name of *Master Claude Fournier*. Alighting quickly from his mule, he entered the shop, the keys of which were at once handed to him by the person who had conducted it in his absence. A moment after, the same monk who had announced the promotion of James to the Holy See, came in and asked him how much his journey had cost him. "Fifty good crowns," replied Claude, with a sigh.

"There they are," said the monk, taking them from a large purse which he kept concealed under his robe; "your brother restores them to you, and hopes you will profit by the lesson he has given you."

Master Claude was so overjoyed that the tears sprang to his eyes. He could scarcely believe it possible that he who had thought himself utterly ruined only a few hours before, was now just in the same position as when he started for Avignon. Blanche was now his sole trouble, and, indeed, the poor girl began to look so pale and care-worn, that he had sufficient cause to fear for her health and happiness.

"Confound my folly!" said he to himself, sometimes, when he looked at his daughter, "nothing would serve me but I must be a lord, I who am only just good for keeping a bakery; we were so happy before that unlucky day when the marriage was interrupted!"

But these regrets were of but little use to Blanche. Ever since that apparition in the papal palace, she had never known a moment's peace. Vainly did she try to persuade herself that it was not Germain she had seen; his reproachful glance was ever before her mind, and she began seriously to repent of her unaccountable folly. She no longer dreamed of nobility, pages or valets, hunting and hawking; she only sighed to recall the fatal word spoken in the presence of her uncle, which precluded the possibility of rejecting the husband whom the Pope was to send. These reflections became at length so painful that her health was grievously impaired. One morning, Blanche was unable to leave her bed, and the physicians who were called in declared that there was imminent danger of madness, if her grief could not be dispelled. One night, Blanche, who was then at the worst, awoke with a start.

"The Holy Virgin has heard my prayer," cried she, in a strange manner, and half raising herself in the bed; "I shall never see the bridegroom whom the Pope has to send."

"What do you mean, child?" asked Guillemette, in an agony of fear.

"No, no," repeated Blanche, looking earnestly at her mother, "I shall be dead before he comes."

Then drawing herself up—"Germain has nothing to do here—I am not the bride of a rich and noble knight—hold—there he is—look! only look—there—in that corner!"

Guillemette looked in the direction pointed out by Blanche, but there was no one there.

"Do you hear?"—He tells me to follow him," added the poor girl, whose breathing became every moment more oppressed. "I go! I go!" She made a motion as though she would have sprang from the bed, but her strength failed, and she fell back in a faint.

Meantime, what was going on in Avignon?—Germain had been introduced a second time to the presence of the Pope; for it was indeed he whom we saw there before, and Blanche was not mistaken. The young man arrived from Laverdun, whither he had gone by order of Benedict.

"What news from Laverdun?" demanded His Holiness, anxiously.

"Nothing good!" cried Germain, "nothing good, Holy Father! Blanche is ill, and the physicians have pronounced her life in danger—I beseech your Holiness to put an end to this torment!"

"Yes, you are right; it is time that all this should end. Laurentino," said he, turning to his favorite cardinal, "give me that parchment and that purse!"

Laurentino obeyed. The Pope traced some words on the parchment, rolled it up, tied some silk around it, and gave it with the purse to Germain.

"Here," said he, "take this; thou shalt be the husband of my niece. This purse contains her dowry; but remember it is not to be opened

until after the marriage. This parchment thou wilt give to a Benedictine monk who will meet thee on thy return to Laverdun. Go, now, and may God preserve thee!"

The worthy Germain left the Papal Palace, his heart full of hope and joy; and, an hour after he was journeying gaily on, assured that happiness could not now escape him. Just as he entered Laverdun, he was stopped by a monk.

"Have you nothing for me, brother?" inquired the monk.

Germain, wholly engrossed with his happiness, had forgotten the parchment, which he now quickly handed to the monk.

"It is well," said the latter, after reading the words traced on the parchment; "the will of the Holy Father be done! Come!" and he pointed towards the baker's house. They had still some distance to go, and Germain walked on silently for some time; but yielding at last to his impatience, he ventured to question his companion: "What has been going on here, father, since I left? What news of Blanche? Is she cured yet?" To all these questions the monk remained cold and silent, and Germain's anxiety became every moment greater. On reaching the street where Master Claude lived, he perceived that the baker's house was closed, and he trembled from head to foot. When they came to the door, the monk pushed it open, and they entered together. "Go up to your bride's apartment," said the monk, with a strange smile. A convulsive trembling ran through Germain's whole frame. He ascended, nevertheless, and from the staircase he could see the tapers burning in Blanche's room. By the time he reached the top, his heart had ceased to beat. A death-like stillness reigned in the chamber! He went in, followed by the monk, and saw—

Blanche kneeling before the image of Our Lady, around which tapers were burning; Claude and Guillemette were kneeling beside her. The poor girl was thanking Heaven for her care, and that she was soon to be the happy wife of Germain. The monk had brought the good news. Next day the wedding took place, and all the nobility of the neighborhood, as well as the townspeople, wished to assist at the marriage of the Pope's niece. In the evening, when they all returned from the Church, and partaken of a family repast, during which more than one glass was emptied to the glory of Benedict XII, the monk, who never left the young couple all day, said to Germain—

"And that purse which I see at your girdle; have you forgotten that it contains your wife's portion?"

"Why, sure enough, father, I forgot all about it," cried Germain. He quickly opened the purse, and found in it an hundred gold crowns, with tablets, which Germain handed to the monk. The latter read these words aloud—"This is a little present from your uncle, James Fournier. As for the Pope, he has no relations but the poor and the afflicted." Every one admired the wisdom of these words, and when the first emotions of joyful surprise had subsided, the monk arose. "Now, daughter," said he to Blanche, "my mission is accomplished, and I return to Avignon, to your saintly uncle. God keep you, Master Claude!"

"But will you not explain to me?" said Claude, embarrassed.

"Know then, that I have never left this town," answered the monk, "since the day that you first saw me, and that I watched over the interests of your family by the express orders of the Holy Father." So saying, he disappeared. Next day, Master Claude said, with a sigh—

"All this is very good, but, by my beard! if I were Pope, my bother should have a fine castle, and my niece more than a hundred crowns of a portion!"

"Oh, father, do not complain," said Blanche; "my uncle has done well for us," and she looked fondly at her husband; "he has made me happy and taught me the useful lesson that—VANITY IS EVER A BAD COUNSELLOR."

REV. DR. CAHILL,

ON THE DANGERS OF A MIXED CATHOLIC AND PROTESTANT EDUCATION.

To the Editor of the Catholic (Dublin) Telegraph.

My Dear Sir—In the year 1845 I addressed a public letter to the Bishops of Ireland on the then projected scheme of the Queen's Colleges with their staff of Protestant Professors. My observations were founded on the working of mixed education in France; and on the reclamation put forth by the Catholics of that country against the infidelity taught and acquired in these government schools. Count Montalembert, who was at that time the O'Connell of France, delivered in the House of Peers a telling and brilliant speech against this infidel system; and I made this speech the text on which I based my protest against the new Irish Colleges. In the present episcopal remonstrance against the educational similar anti-Catholic conduct of the Irish National Board, I fancy I cannot send to you a more useful communication on this work than to furnish you with a copy of that letter. It proves that Protestant administration is ever the same, and that while Senates and Governments, and statesmen may be guided by liberal views, and exalted generous sentiments, the subalterns who execute the laws are almost invariably poisoned by an anti-Catholic malice; and wherever they are officially employed and are unchecked, will damage and ultimately uproot every institution under their control by a rancorous bigotry, an intractable arrogance, and an unconquerable superiority. The following is the letter of 1845:—

TO THE ROMAN CATHOLIC BISHOPS OF IRELAND.

MY LORDS—In modern times the separation of England from the Catholic Church, and the first French revolution may be clearly set down as the two great sources of the trials of religion (I might say, all over the world during the last three centuries). State power struck down Catholic principles, not only in England, but in the various countries of Europe that followed her example; and French infidelity withered and almost entirely consumed Gallican faith, throughout all the French-conquered, during the national delirium of Napoleon's sway; and the bad example, and the corrupting consequences felt so intensely from these two large and melancholy events, spread such resistless infec-

tion through the orthodox portion of Christian society, that the result became alarming, and it was only by calling out the chosen bands of learning and zeal in every country, that the Catholic Church has been able to counteract its influence and arrest its career.

State power being thus opposed to religion throughout several of the great countries of Europe, two principles became antagonized which should have been united: power that should have been based upon religion, oppressed it; resulting in an enormous anomaly, and producing rancour, and strife, and persecution, in the room of charity, and peace, and brotherly love. Religion proscribed, too, it became (strange fact!) a crime to be faithful to conscience; and, as a matter of course by the abandonment of the State could only be obtained by the abandonment of faith, and perjury to God. This sad principle it was that has laid the deep foundation of the national dissensions and unchristian hatred, that from that hour to this day have shaken the stability of empires, embittering human existence, drying up the fountains of public prosperity, and converting the family-brotherhood of mankind into all the sectarian varieties of implacable and sanguinary enmities.

The principle that has thus oppressed conscience for so many centuries cannot now bear to see it about to recover its long-lost liberty. While men lay prostrate and weak, their powerless struggles were disregarded; but since time and circumstances have made the weak strong, Europe has become alarmed, and a universal combination appears to have been formed amongst all the powerful states to prevent this accomplishment of Catholic liberty. In several countries the old system of force is resorted to to defeat this advance to freedom; but amongst other people, where oppression cannot be adopted in these days of moral power, a more wily, but not less efficient plan is arranged of effecting by an alluring diplomacy what cannot be achieved by threat, and thus perpetuating by golden stratagem the slavery that was first imposed by force. But in whatever shape slavery presents itself, whether in golden or iron chains, it is the same bitter yoke. The Church that Christ established in free worship can never be restricted by men, and the creed that He has won from the slavery of Satan and this world, can never be subjected to the evil counsels of human will.

Count Montalembert, the first peer in France (and who is personally known to your lordships), in his two speeches on the "Liberty of the Church," and the "Liberty of public instruction," in April, 1844, clearly shows that Catholicism is at the present time exposed to the combined persecution of the powers of Europe; and that while the unjust laws of France deprive the clergy of all legitimate influence and power, the educational monopoly of the government (in the hands of infidels) has banished the knowledge of Christianity, and substituted infidelity in the hearts of all the youth who attend the halls of public instruction. I proceed, my lords, to prove eleven distinct and most evil principles and consequences of the plan of public instruction imposed by government on the Catholics of France.

First point. The French government forcibly imposes the penal law of government instruction on the Catholics against their will.

The Count says:—

"It is attempted to be proved that the ancient regime of France always claimed the power of public instruction. Yes, the state sanctioned certain establishments, granted certain privileges, conferred certain degrees; but it never disputed the power of the Church to teach on its own account and as it pleased. The Church then, as to-day, was and is the representative of moral liberty, and by her liberty has always escaped the control of the state. . . . But if you wish to argue the ancient power of France, push the argument to its full extent, namely, the state once had power over the press—will you grant this power now, and if not, what becomes of the argument drawn from the ancient regime of France, as applied to public instruction? This is a reply to the perpetual sophism put forward by young France."

"But there is a vast difference between the ancient universities and yours. They had the most scrupulous respect for the smallest religious truths, a steady practice in the least laws of a Christian life, and the serious belief in the infallible authority of the Church. How different from these are the apostles of the modern revelation, men who preach a fusion of all religions, and the destruction of all church symbols."

"Hear, on this subject, the most celebrated Rector of the ancient universities—the good Rollin—hear his opinion of education: 'The object of our labors, the end of all our institutions ought to be religion, and the final view of education is to form Christian men (confusion and murmurs).'"

He continues:—"The state can have a right of offering a national education, but it can have no right to impose it. To say the truth, the principle of a national education is inseparable from a national religion; and the founder of the university well understood this, when he ordered, in article 33, that public instruction should have for its base, not only the doctrine but the precepts of religion, and of religion not only Christian but Catholic. But this article is excluded, because it would not only hurt the conscience of Protestants, but also the crowd of indifferent Catholics who are hostile to the dogmas of the Church, and who fill all French society in general, and the university in particular."

Second point. The French Government encourages attacks on religion through the profession of the mixed colleges (page 25).

Hear the Count:

"A respectable priest, whose life has been spent in apostolic labors, was publicly sued and punished because he said public truths of the university, at the very gates of the palace—the very university of France, with which every one is acquainted, namely, 'that the same professors published, in a series of public lectures, everything that was indecent and slanderous on the dogmas which we hold sacred in religion; and yet these professors have never received the slightest reprimand, the least censure. I don't intend to stop here to cite the series of public lectures of these professors; but when public scandal has been thus given in the halls of public instruction, and in the name of the state, there is a total want of generosity and justice to pass over this fault, and yet punish the first priest who should dare to speak of the scandal. It is the president of the college that remains silent towards them in the midst of the publicity and popularity of these lectures; and he, the same minister, is the person who has denounced the priest!'"

"The Minister of Public Instruction—it is his right and his duty."

"Count Montalembert—You have no right to interrupt me."

"The Minister—I have a right to reply to you."

"Count Montalembert—Yes; after I shall have spoken, but at present you have only the right of listening to me."

The Count then proceeds:—"In addition to their attack on the priest, they attack the newspaper that publishes the public sympathy towards the condemned priest; while on the other hand they pass over another journal, although it publishes shameful accusations against the seminaries of France, accusing them of defiling the imagination and the heart of the young French priesthood."

Third point.—The French government encourages and fosters the plan of separating the clergy from the people in order to destroy clerical influence.

Hear the Count in continuation:—"You say the bishops have no right of public interference, because, being functionaries, they are bound by certain duties of their position, and that functionaries acting in a body is prohibited. And then you ask what are their duties?—and you reply, 'preach submission to the public officers of the state. Gentlemen, I must protest against this idea—it is

completely erroneous (loud murmurs). I repeat it, and say, a thousand times—no, no. A bishop is not a functionary; it is false. You wish to make him a prefect in soutane—a commissary of moral police. You wish to convert his functions into a public office of worship—to celebrate feasts with civic pomp—to attend at the funerals of princes. Is this what you understand to be the office of a bishop? You mistake; a bishop is the ambassador of God—he holds his authority from God. Every bishop who would hold his authority from any other source would be an impostor—he would be a preparator; and one word more—princes, in becoming the children of the Church, are not therefore made its masters; in submitting their conscience to it, they therefore acquire no right to enslave it. If they vow in baptism to serve it, they have no right to become the governors of it; they are bound to kiss the dust of its feet, and not to impose the yoke of slavery on it."

Fourth point.—The French government employs every means in their power to wipe out every vestige of episcopal authority thus.

The Count in continuation:—"In the last charge brought against the bishop of Chalons, he was charged with having painfully disturbed the public conscience (troubler les consciences). Now, I ask any man of common sense, is there anything more laughable than the exhortation of a bishop, and yet so contented as to be calmed by an order of Viscount D'Haubersart and a rule of M. Martin? (long and continued laughter.) Is there a man in France who would say, 'because yesterday my bishop spoke things that wounded my conscience, but to-day I am tranquil, because M. Haubersart and M. Martin have given me consolation?' Renewed merriment and laughter."

He continues:—"What a strange thing that, in a country like this where daily complaint and opposition, as it were, is the daily food of the press—where (if I may speak) the national existence is a kind of continual murmur—where, when a citizen makes a complaint, he receives the sympathy and the compassion of all—what a strange thing, I say, is it that if a bishop, a priest, or a Catholic only raise his voice in defence of his opinion and his conscience, instantly are let loose at him like a hungry pack of hounds, a set of journalists, lawyers, attorneys, state councillors, as if eighty bishops, fifty thousand priests, and several millions of Catholics—a corps which has existed in this country these 1,500 years—are to be excluded from that liberty of complaint which is the common right of man, and the privilege of all Frenchmen."

Fifth point.—The French government have placed infidels at the head of government colleges.

He proceeds:—"What you want is a conclave of men who acknowledge no supernatural faith—no unchangeable doctrine; who make a philosophy to reconcile the most extravagant and contradictory things. This is the conclave so composed which you wish to come and usurp a moral authority, the most sacred and delicate; pretending to a lofty cast of soul and mind, and putting their hands on everything which formerly belonged to the exclusive domain of faith and religious obedience. (Murmurs and cries of opposition.)"

Sixth point.—The French Catholics exclaim in public indignation against this power, as a political engine in the hands of the government.

In continuation, page 95—"I go farther. This power of the state in public instruction would have the most frightful consequences. The government being the absolute master of instruction, could sooner or later direct it according to the views of their ambition. This lever, the most powerful of all, would be, perhaps, in their hands (le premier mobile de la servitude) the very mainspring of slavery. Emulation would be extinguished—free thought a crime."

Seventh point.—The French Catholics exclaim against the combined effects of infidelity and slavery, as the results of the plan of public instruction.

"Gentlemen—I believe I have a right to cite other authorities, and M. Ledru Rollin has said very justly that there does not exist any grievances so great as this oppression of conscience—this kidnapping of children in schools which he regards as places of perdition—this conscription of infancy trained in violation of every duty in the enemy's camp, and to serve the enemy."

In continuation—"No one can present himself for a situation at any of the public offices without having a degree from this university, and no one can take this degree without running ten chances to one (un sur dix) of losing his faith. See the alternative put on Catholic parents—an alternative odious before God, hateful before men, in a country where each citizen professes his faith with an equal liberty."

Eighth point.—The infidelity of the professors is a fact of public and undisguised notoriety.

He continues:—"I shall prove (page 114), I think, without the least fear of a reply, that the great majority of your professors who are appointed to give instruction in the colleges, attack without disguise the dogmas and history of the Catholic Church—some of them in their lectures, others in their academical writings, for instance, on history, on literature, on political economy, on everything." Hear this, my lords.

Ninth point.—The infidelity of the students on leaving the university is universally acknowledged.

In continuation, page 103:—"But there are in the results of the university education facts which are startling, and which are clearer than the sun. It is, that the children who quit their families with a germ of faith entering the universities, leave them infidels (en sortant incredules)."

"The Minister of Instruction—I wish to explain. Count Montalembert—The fact is incontestable. It is an axiom as certain as that which M. Rossi published some time ago—I say that no one knew the faith of any one living; I say the faith of young France is well known—it is scepticism."

"Several Voices—No, no."

"The Duke de Broglie—You assert it; it can be contradicted."

"Count Montalembert—Every one has the right to contradict me; but I have a right to affirm what every one can verify, and what the Minister of Foreign Affairs said in irony 'was an excellent preparation for a religious education.' I call to witness all the fathers and all the mothers, and let any one select by chance ten children come from the university at the end of their studies, and if he can find one boy who is a Christian—that is, one in ten (un sur dix)—it will be a phenomenon. (Loud exclamations.) The Chancellor—You exceed the bounds of truth. It is an insult to the French generation to say that no one comes out of the colleges a Christian."

"Count Montalembert—I did not say precisely that. I said one in ten, and that scepticism was the ruling character of the great majority of the French youth who leave the universities of France."

"The Chancellor—Still it is an assertion. Count Montalembert—True, it is an assertion. I am exposed to contradictions, and I expect them; but I have spoken what I intimately know (ce que je sais) and what I can prove."

"Hear an unsuspected authority, a young French Protestant—hear him amidst the crowd of authorities—Monsieur de Gasperin, the young and eloquent son of our colleague, M. Agenor de Gasperin. Page 107—"I recollect with terror what I was on completing this national education—I recollect what were all my companions, with whom I had any intercourse. Were we excellent citizens? I cannot say; but assuredly we were not Christians—we had not even the most faint perception of Christian faith."

"Nous n'avions pas meme, les plus faibles commencements de la foi evangelique" (new and increased clamour.)

Tenth point.—The decline of learning under the educational monopoly is clearly proved.

Speaking of the consequences of the government of

France, having the monopoly of instruction, the count contrasts France with Belgium, whose education is free, as being guided by the Catholic Church. He also contrasts Belgium with Belgium during the reigns of William and Leopold.

"In 1829, the last year of the monopoly of Holland, there were 1,450 students in the universities.—On this day there are 1,700—an increase of nearly one-third. In 1829 there were 45 colleges of secondary instruction, and 5,490 students.—On this day there are 74 colleges, and 10,280 students. That is, the number almost doubled under the free principle."

He continues:—"In Belgium the students of primary instruction have increased ninety-two per cent in ten years; of free instruction, and the proportion of scholars in the population is as one to nine; and in France, under the monopoly system, the students are reduced to seventy-five per cent and the proportion of scholars to the population is only as one to eleven."

"These (he continues) are figures and facts, and not empty words."

Eleventh point.—The virtuous portion of the French profess a deep-rooted hatred to this wretched system.

"You alienate the affections, and you force into hostile opposition men who ask no other reward in the public cause than to give you the advantage of their support and the weight of their political integrity. The heads of the clergy, a large amount of zealous and sincere Catholics, are situated with regard to the present government in precisely the same position as Count Mole, the Duke de Broglie, and M. Guizot, were with regard to the Restoration; it is in this sense that the bishops of the province of Paris have been able to say to the king with so much truth that 'M. Villemain has been the means of losing in three years all that had been gained during ten years of emulation, and prudence, and skill.'"

"The Minister of Public Instruction—I beg to explain."

"Count Montalembert—You shall not interrupt me. You can reply."

"The Minister—The language is so personal that I cannot avoid begging a hearing."

"Count Montalembert—I shall soon conclude, and then the minister will be able to reply."

Twelfth point.—The present persecution of Catholics, Catholic priests, Catholic Church, is only a part of the combined efforts of all Europe at the present time (more than even for the last three hundred years) to coerce the liberties and arrest the triumphant advances which Catholicity has been making during the last twenty years throughout the whole world.

He continues:—"Cast your eyes for an instant on the facts which, during the last fifteen years, are occurring throughout the entire world—in Sweden, in Switzerland, in Russia, in Prussia, in England—in a word—in the whole world."

Is it Catholicism which in Sweden has condemned a citizen, and found him guilty, because he wished to return to the faith which his country has professed for seven centuries—is it Catholicism that has condemned him to banishment, and confiscated his property?"

Speaking of Switzerland—"Is it Catholicism which in Switzerland have violated the federal laws of the Cantons in the destruction of the monasteries, declaring in language worthy of the College of France, that the friars should be yoked to the cannon?"

Speaking of Russia—"Is it Catholicism which in Russia has spilled a nation's blood, and by gradual iniquity wrenched from them, with their ebullient life, the faith of their fathers? No; it is a schismatical power, which long before, and far more cruelly than you, has practised the monopoly of public instruction by the state. It is Russia that has murdered Catholic Poland."

Speaking of Prussia—"Is it Catholicism which in Prussia has forced conscience, which condemned to cell an old man, and raised the flame of persecution along the banks of the Rhine? No; it is a Protestant King, in the country of rationalism, who has imprisoned a Catholic prelate for no other crime than having refused to bless a marriage which his conscience could not approve."

"And in Ireland, is it Catholicism that has enchained, robbed, and insulted an oppressed people, who are resolved to burst their chains? No; it is a parliamentary church—a state religion—a church in the state; it is this church that has trampled under foot Catholic Ireland, and which has prepared for the English nation the most fearful retribution."

Ce peuple opprime, qui veut briser ses fers; sont ces Catholiques qui l'ont enchainé, depouille, insulte? Non, c'est une eglise parlementaire, une religion d'etat, une eglise dans l'etat; c'est elle qui foule aux pieds les Catholiques Irlandais, et qui a prepare a la nation Anglaise, le plus terrible danger."

"In every part of the world the Catholics are oppressed, and nowhere do we retaliate."

Conclusion.—The Count finishes this statistical and religious speech with a piece of brilliant and impassioned invective against the French—the withering, the barbarizing, and infidel course pursued by the French government against the liberty of education, and the freedom of Catholic principles.

"What a lesson and example have we from Belgium! The king found the liberties of the Belgian church in a condition superior to anything known before his time; but, being surrounded by diplomacy and liberalism, he began to pursue the system of public instruction which you now recommend; the hierarchy resisted him; he in turn persecuted the episcopacy, and he summoned the Bishop of Gand who now hears me, before a court of assize, and caused him to be condemned and placed in effigy, with an iron collar round his neck, between two thieves.—This fact happened about twenty years ago, and how has it ended? You know it; the son-in-law of the present King of the French is on the throne of Belgium!"

"But in the midst of the scoffs of liberalism and philosophy, we shall cling to the Sovereign Pontiff, who rules at Rome, who directs our conscience, and supplies our wants, and who combats our enemies with a weapon which never can rust or be broken in his hands—the sword of prayer—a weapon employed in the service of Heaven, from the Danube to the Ganges, over all the world. . . . I conclude in the language of Tertullian and the amiable Fenelon—'We are not to be feared by you, neither do we fear you'; and I add in the name of Catholic hymn—the men of the nineteenth century—that we live in the midst of a free people, and we do not wish to be treated with scorn; we are the successors of the martyrs, and we shall never tremble before the descendants of Julian the Apostate; we are the children of the Crusaders, and we shall never yield to the sons of Voltaire."

"France has not violated its oath in the revolution of 1830. France has been released the day when the royal authority violated the charter; and if on this day royal power violated the constitution, just like the year 1830, we should be released from our oath to the king."

From the extracts of the two speeches of Count Montalembert, we have a clear view, my lords, of the entire machine of public instruction in France, together with a very minute inspection of all its minor mechanism. Most certainly it is a very dangerous and blasphemous article on the other side of the British Channel, and unless it were very considerably changed in the engraving to Ireland, I cannot conceive how it could turn out to produce useful and religious results here; it is unquestionably the very same construction as the Irish Colleges bill, at present before parliament. It is your sole province, my lords, to see whether you can have it in Ireland with safety; or whether the modifications which may be conceded are such as to alter substantially its evil and infidel working, time will tell.