

bly the future life of that man will be a bad harvest of the seed which it received in the spring. No man can expect an abundant harvest of grace, morality, or godness unless he be provided in the beginning with a good education; and if there be any fault in the seed, which is found to be an inferior character,—when it has been found to be largely mixed with bad seeds,—it is too late to make this discovery when the child has passed into youth,—when the youth has matured into manhood,—for then principles are well established, and opinions are deeply and indelibly fixed. Again, the state of life is chosen by him; he has found the road—which he will go; for wisdom,—again more than human—tells us, it is too late to try to bend the tree when it has grown into goodly proportions. That work of bending must take place while it is yet a tender twig (applause). This being the case, it follows that there is the necessity for education for all.

Coming to this first aspect of this great question, I find the Redeemer of the world,—the highest authority, because He is God,—declaring that the first want of man is education, and that all the evils that fill the world may be traced, as to their source, to the want of education. Christ, our Lord, my friends, was not only the Redeemer of the world, but He was also a Prophet. The Scriptures speak of Him as a teacher. "Grace poured abroad from His lips; therefore, Lord, let us bless Thee for ever." The Scriptures speak of Him as a prophet of this world. Moses says: "I will send unto thee a Prophet of thine own nation, like unto me. Him shalt thou hear." Now, upon a solemn occasion, He was approaching the City of Jerusalem. The people went forth to meet Him, with acclamation and with joy, waving palm branches before Him; a sign of their gratitude; for He who came to them was blessed, coming in the name of the Lord, Israhel's King. And they cried, "Hosannah to the Son of David!" In the midst of their joy, in the midst of their tumultuous gratitude, we read in the Gospel, that the Son of God,—who saw the city,—wept over it bitter tears. He said: "Oh Jerusalem, the time will come to thee when thine enemies shall encompass thee round, and straighten thee on every side. They shall cast a trench about thee, and beat thee flat with the ground; and they shall not leave thee a stone upon a stone." What was the cause, the sign, of this terrific prophecy? He immediately added the reason: "Because thou hast not known these things that are good for thee; because of thy ignorance, Oh Jerusalem; therefore shall all thine enemies come in upon thee." Is not this what he said? And to the Jewish priests: "Hear me; ye are not of my priests." He says: "because you have rejected knowledge, I will reject you, and you will no longer fulfil the duty of the priesthood unto me; because my people were silent; because they have no knowledge." Elsewhere, the Prophet says: "There is no truth, there is no knowledge of God in the land." He immediately added that, "Cursing, lying, infidelity, adultery, abound, because there is no knowledge of the Lord in the land." To cap the climax of all that the Omnipotent says on this point, we have the Apostle and the inspired writer saying of the Jewish people, "If they had known, if they had knowledge, they never would have crucified the Lord of Glory." And, passing from the evidence of the grand words of Scripture,—looking at this great fact simply with eyes of reason,—do we not know, my friends, that there are two lives in man; that man is a wonderful being in whom two distinct natures meet. Almighty God has created in this world the mere animal and material nature,—the animal that reasons not; that only feels and lives. The trees of the forest grow, and the flowers of the field; they reason not, neither do they feel; but they live. The animal object that is in man has not feeling, but only existence. On the other hand, God has created in heaven a higher order of purely spiritual beings, in the angels,—like to Himself, in that they are pure spirits, in that they are utterly dissociated from everything gross, corporeal and material; in that they are pure intelligence, pure love, gifted with power and virtue over the will. Observe the difference of these two great ranks of creation,—things that do not reason at all, that only feel; and things that do not feel at all, but reason;—the animal and the angelic. Then comes man,—the golden link in the creation of God; in whom the inferior creation and the superior meet; in whom the angelic soul, the prime spiritual essence, and the mere animal, the mere material thing embrace. Therefore, man is a being, made up of two natures: the angelic,—spiritual, Godlike,—which is his soul; and the material,—animal and brutal,—which is his body. As these are elements, or subdivisions, united in man's life, so, in the Divine destiny, he lives, in his two-fold figure of life, the life of the body and the life of the soul; the life of the body, with its appetites, with its passions, with its strong, almost ungovernable desires, and with its animal propensities;—the life of the soul, with its lofty aspirations to heaven, and, as regards its ultimate destiny, of everlasting glory. The body must be born; so must the soul. The body must be fed; so must the soul. The body must be exercised; so must the soul. Now, the life of the soul, the exercise of the soul, the food of the soul, I assert, is knowledge; and, therefore, it is as necessary for the soul as food for the body. The soul we are obliged to exercise as well as our inferior corporeal nature. If you neglect either one or the other, its power fails. A little infant is born into this world; if you neglect that child, or stint that child in its food, it grows poor and puny and weak. And why? Because it is mortal. The soul, on the other hand, when deprived of food, grows not at all; it cannot die, because it is immortal; but it can remain in the same state of helplessness, of infancy, of imbecility, in which it was in the first day of its birth, unless it receives aliment, strengthening, the food of instruction, education and morality (applause).

Man differs from all other creatures in this world, in that he has been created by Almighty God to live in society. Every other animal on the face of this earth leads an isolated, solitary, and independent life, each one living for itself. Man alone is created for society,—to live for his fellow-man, to enter into their cares, to commune with them, to take a portion of the public burden of society, to move through life, not only for himself, but for those around him. Now, that state of society is rude that has no inter-communication of intellectual feeling; and the man who is utterly uneducated is incapable of fulfilling his obligations to society. Take a man utterly without instruction,—and what have you so far as regards society? He is incapable of communicating with his fellow-man; for all such communion of intellect or of power he is incapable, because he is utterly uneducated. He is the greatest enemy of society. Why? because every power of his soul is left untouched. The angelic nature lies dormant within him. No gentle thought, no softening remembrance, of heavenly things ever comes to move the unenlightened wretch. No generous impulse, no lofty purpose, no spirit of heroic sacrifice is found in him. He is the enemy of society; for he turns in upon his solitary self, in whom he finds no actual quality of good; the very idea of moral good is a stranger to him, because of his benighted condition. Take him in his relations to God. What says He of him who has not knowledge? What says Almighty God of such a one? "Man," says the Psalmist, "when he was without knowledge, understood not; he had no knowledge in him, he is compared to the senseless beasts, made like to them." "The body grows apace, the uneducated soul remains in its infancy. The body becomes a giant of

passions, of evil propensities, and of all the baser desires. The infant soul is unable to oppose these passions by a single principle. It is unable to coerce them or purify them by a single element of intellectual, moral power or grace. The consequence is that the will of man,—the source of all his moral power,—is removed from the jurisdiction of intelligence to which God made it subject. The allegiance of the will thus follows the submission of the mind to passion; to pride, and to all the disorders of the brutal nature. Therefore it is, that the thoroughly uneducated man is unavailable for any purpose, whether for God or for human society. The statesman finds the ignorant man his difficulty; because it is impossible to legislate for an uneducated people, who are unable to comprehend even the idea of law. The Church finds the uneducated man her greatest enemy; because faith, in its highest form, is an appeal to the intellect, for which that intellect must be prepared by education, because that very act of its exercise, that the Church imposes upon a man, requires intelligence of a kind, of which the thoroughly uneducated man is incapable; he is unable to act for himself. The world finds in the uneducated man, in the utterly uneducated man, its greatest enemy; for, though ignorant, he knows how to do one thing, and that one thing is, to follow the brutal instincts, to follow the base inclinations of his passions; and in the pursuit of them he will set at hostile defiance every law, human and divine; and we see that he makes himself the pest, the canker worm, the great enemy of society,—an object of dread.

Hence it is, my friends, that the whole world, the whole civilized world to-day, cries out for education. The Churchman, the statesman, the priest, the philosopher,—Catholic and Protestant,—all alike, cry out, we must educate; we cannot live in society; society cannot exist without education.—And they are right; for, if we could imagine a time when men were thoroughly and completely uneducated, then we imagine that there was a time when human society was an impossibility, because the essence of that society is intercommunication. The statesman and the churchman alike declare that we must educate. And they approach this question,—let us see how.

The statesman has his own views of education.—The Christian man,—outside the pale of the Catholic Church,—he, too, has his view of education;—and the Church has her view of education. I want to put these three before you in order that I may vindicate the action of our holy Mother, the Church, to show you that she alone understands the meaning of that much abused word, education. All acknowledge the evil of ignorance; all acknowledge it is the root and source of all evil in society. First comes the statesman; and he says, "I will educate." And he builds up his common schools and his colleges. He says to the Catholic Bishop: "Stand aside. You have no right to educate the children." And he says to every man: "I will have no fixed form of religious belief! Stand aside; you are only sectarianism! I am prepared to administer an unsectarian education." Unsectarian education? What does this mean, my friends? It means, in plain English, teaching without God. I wish you, above every thing else, to remember these three words, when you read political speeches, when you hear men talking about this glorious land of America; the splendor of the country of England, the enlightenment and wonderful intelligence of the age. All that "unsectarian education" means, is teaching without God (applause). And now, reflect a little, my friends, upon what this means. We read in the Scriptures that St. Paul said: "The world has committed crimes such as I am ashamed to mention"—and turning to the Christians, he said: "let them not be as much as named amongst you." They must learn, because God gave them will and intelligence. The state refuses to put God in their knowledge. Formerly, they taught without God.—The world was not uneducated when Christ came. Oh, dear, no! The schools at Athens, and the schools in Rome were as flourishing as any that we have to-day,—poo-pooing the idea of religion.—When Christ and His religion came upon earth, He told them that they must change,—that they must teach their children something about God. And they said: "This man, indeed, raises a few from the dead; He opens the eyes of the blind; He heals the sick and the paralyzed; and He works many strange miracles that we cannot understand, for this is the language of that Christ who tells us we must teach our sons about God." And they answered the Son of God, eighteen hundred years ago, pretty much in the same way as the "unsectarian" man does to-day. What is teaching or instructing without God? What is the meaning of the word educate? It is derived from two Latin words, namely, *ex* and *duco*, to lead forth,—to educate,—or, as the true derivation has it, to bring out all that is in that child.—That child is there before you, a child of seven; that child has to become a man; that child is the father of the man that is to be in twenty years time. Now, to educate means to bring out in that young mind all that is necessary to make the man. I ask you, Christian men, can that man be thus brought out in the child without God? Education,—if it is to make the man; if it is to bring out all the powers that are in him,—must train him up in the two great sources, the education of the head and the education of the heart,—the two great powers of the man that reasons. Now, the "unsectarian education" of the State means to educate the mind; it gives the mind every form of human knowledge; it teaches the mind Geometry, History, Electricity, Mathematics, Geology, and everything else; but not a word about God at all. Not a word of God must be mentioned. The science of God,—the knowledge of God,—is the principal point of knowledge which that child must not hear; he must have no God. Therefore, whilst the mind of that child is receiving every form of human knowledge, his heart is hardening every day, more and more, into the hardness of unbelief, into the preparation of every form of helplessness, hypocrisy, and sin. Not a single scintilla of Divine knowledge is let into that child's mind; nothing but the knowledge of this world,—human knowledge. Itself human, it is vain, I say. And, if you were not Catholics, I would still ask these men who pretend to teach without God,—tell me, as you wish only to teach human knowledge, thus excluding God; then you wish to teach history? And to teach history you must come to the fountain head of history; and there you find the creating God.—Will you exclude this? If you teach the progress of history, the true philosophy of history is the over-ruling providence of God, guiding and shaping all things. Will you exclude it, and pretend to teach that child history? What will you tell that child of the history of his race, its acts and its power, if you exclude Almighty God from his knowledge? Will you teach that child philosophy,—the philosophy that seeks and searches after truth,—that loves the truth in interior things,—the philosophy that means the analysis of the human mind,—the philosophy that traces every effect to its cause,—touching that cause with the true genius of its acquaintance with theology,—and that follows the great first cause of all things? No; the philosophy that excludes God is simply absurd. Fancy a man going to teach mathematics,—to teach figures,—excluding the figure one and starting with the figure two. Why the simplest child would say "but, my dear sir, isn't the multiple of one?" "It is not," this teacher says; "there is no one" (laughter). If he says there is no one, how can he tell us there is two or three? How can a man teach philosophy ignoring the first principle, beginning without the One, which is the precise cause of all? In a word, the system is too absurd; it is not worthy the consideration of any man of thought. "Teaching without God is an impossibility; even for the men who pretend to do it; and in its results, it is fatal to society.

Well, let us suppose they had their way; that they brought up our children without God. Let us suppose that the favorite theories of the statesmen were carried into effect.—The Protestant, the Catholic, the Quaker, the Shaker,—all want us to teach their form of religion; and, as we cannot teach their religion, the best plan is to exclude religion altogether. We know nothing at all about religion; but we know how to teach them to read and write. We will teach philosophy, and everything; but without God. Now, the favorite theory of the statesman is put in practice; and what do they send home to you? Oh think of the monsters living in the house with you—think of the young man or the young woman, fourteen or fifteen years of age, coming home to you! They know everything; and they are ready for any profession; they have studied Law; they have studied Chemistry, Philosophy, History; they know all the sciences; they are well fitted for the service of this world; and you ask a child: "Do you know your duty to me,—your father or mother?" "No; I never heard of it." Do you know that you are bound to love and respect me?" "Who said that?" "God said it." "I never heard of God before." "I'm a student who had spent a great part of his life in an European College. He was studying amongst other things, Geology,—the nature of the earth, the history of the earth's foundation; and that young man assured me that for eighteen months that he was attending the school or college, every day during the eighteen months the Professor there was lecturing; and he never once made use of the name of God. There will follow from that education an infidel mind and an infidel heart; a ripened intellect and a will debased, corrupted, enslaved to the dictates of every passion. Now, my dear friends, a child so educated will come home in a few months filled with impurity and iniquity. For that teacher that does not teach God, by that very act teaches the devil (applause).

Well, the next great system of education is that which is proposed and directed by so many who are not Catholics. They say: "Oh dear, it is highly improper to exclude Almighty God." They said, when they were agitating the question of education they never heard of such a thing; it isn't in the American Constitution—God bless the mark (laughter and applause). Well they build schools; they get a large grant of government money for these schools; they open these schools; and they ask Catholic parents to send their children to them; and they say, "Don't be afraid; we will not teach your children infidelity. We have God in our education. We have the Bible laid on the table,—open (laughter). We will teach your children to read it (renewed laughter). We won't teach a word that the Catholic children are opposed to,—not a word against their religion; but we will go in to educate on the basis of our common Christianity." There is "common Christianity"—the favorite theory of those who are outside the Church. Let us analyze it. We have disposed of the theory of "Unsectarian Education," or teaching without God; "the basis of our common Christianity" is the next big word we have to deal with. "The basis of our common Christianity" teaching only as much as the Catholic believes in common with the Protestant; reducing the religious education of the Catholic child to a few elementary truths that the Protestant and Catholic believe together. Now, if you will remark, how much is there in that "common Christianity" can I go one step further? I will ask you that question,—shall I go one step further? I defy you, my Protestant friends, to tell me one single point upon which the Protestant and the Catholic are combined, except this one point,—the existence of God. You say you believe in Jesus Christ? I say you do not. I don't mean to insult you, my friends; but I want to prove it to you. There are some of the very first and most intelligent of Protestants, to-day, who deny the divinity of Jesus Christ. There were some books written some time ago,—essays and reviews,—they were written entirely by Anglican clergymen, learned men, and honest men. God forbid that I should hurt their feelings; for some of the dearest friends that I have in the world, the best and most intimate friends, are Protestants and Englishmen; but I still say that Protestants, as such, are not bound to believe in the divinity of Christ. If the Protestant says he does not see his way clearly in the baptismal regeneration and every such question, he discovers they are only "opinions." For Christ has said in the Scriptures: "The Father is greater than I," and some one will say: "Now if He was God, He would not say that. My opinion" is changed on that subject. My children must be brought up in the widest form of that belief in Christ. This is the belief of a great many others. But I ask you, would he be a bad Protestant for saying that? Would the Protestant Church communicate him for saying he did not believe in baptism, or in the divinity of Christ? By no means. There are clergymen now in England, preaching the Gospel, who do not believe one bit in the divinity of Christ. If a Protestant to-morrow, wrote a letter to the *Herald* newspaper, stating that he "did not believe in this question of the divinity of Christ: it is not so clear at all," would that Protestant lady or gentleman be expelled from the Church? Would they be denounced as heretics, and declared to be no longer members of the Protestant Church? Not at all. Now, my Protestant friends, you must keep to the existence of God, because if you deny that you are atheists; but the moment you step from the mere truth of the existence of God,—the very first step in your ecclesiastical doctrine,—at that very moment your faith and ours differ. Your reason is upon a different foundation from ours. With you it is perfectly immaterial; but if I deny the existence of Jesus Christ, if I deny his divinity, here on this platform, I would go down speedily. The Bishop this night before to-morrow, would tell me I was no longer to preach in his diocese. There is not an altar from which I would not be denounced; the Catholics would be warned, in this way: "Don't listen to Father Tom Burke; he has lost the faith" (laughter and applause).

But, even admitting a few elementary truths, such as the divinity of Christ, the atonement of our Lord upon the Cross,—the all-sufficiency of that sacrifice;—admitting what, for the most part, the great body of the Protestants admit and believe as well as we do,—every man here has the liveliest belief in these doctrines,—a loving and devoted belief in all these doctrines, which our Protestant friends are in so much trouble about,—after all you think in vain to unite us on the basis of our "common Christianity." Take the highest form of our Protestantism, as far as it goes with Catholic principle, even in the mind of the little child; before you can let him into the Protestant school, on a religious footing, upon a footing of religious equality with his Protestant companion, on the basis of our "common Christianity"—that Catholic child will have to forget Confession, Communion, Examination of Conscience, Devotion to the Blessed Virgin and to the Saints, the Sacrament of Confirmation. He will have to forget that his father and mother were united in the Sacrament of Matrimony. He will have to forget Prayers for the Dead. If his old grandmother, when she was dying, laid her hand upon his head and said, "Son I want you to pray for me when I am gone," he will have to forget that before he can go in with the Protestant child, "which means that the Protestant child takes his own ground and says: 'Here is my ground; I have every privilege, every enjoyment of my Protestantism.'" Then he says to the little Catholic child: "Come in, with me; stand on this platform; but you will have to come down ever so many flights of stairs before you can do it" (laughter). Now, my dear friends, I need not tell you that, whether in religious matters or not, very few people like to be coming down stairs to meet their friends; you would much rather stand on your own landing,

and, if your friends wants you, let him come upstairs to you (laughter). If he does not choose to come up to you, why would you say, "You can stand in the hall; but I will stay where I am" (renewed laughter).

New, we approach the great question of the Catholic Church, her ideas, and her system of education. The Catholic Church lays down a few principles which no reasonable man, I think, can deny. First of all, the Catholic Church says, education must take in every element of intellectual and spiritual well-being. Education must apply itself to the whole soul of man, to every capacity of that soul. Education must bring out and develop everything and every power that is in that soul; not giving undue prominence to one, to the neglect of the other. And every reasonable man must say that this is the proper idea of education, which means to bring out. What would you say of the man who would bring up his child in this way, accustoming that child to work with his hands, to lift weights, to perform every exercise with his hands,—if he never allowed that child to walk? why not would say, he will make a strong armed cripple of him. As, in like manner, if that child's hands had been banded and he was obliged to exercise himself with his feet until he was twenty years of age, he would be unable to lift the lightest weight. So it is with the soul; the child, in order to be educated, must be altogether educated,—not one faculty or one power developed at the expense of the others. This was the first principle of Catholic education. The second principle of Catholic education is that of the education of the heart, of the affections, and of the will; it is as important, as the education of the soul, and more important than the education of the intellect. And why? Because, my friends, it is by the education of the heart and of the will that man's moral life is determined. No amount of knowledge that you can give to man's intellect will make him good or honest, will make him pure, will make him obedient. You have no guarantee because a man can read and write well, because he is ingenious, that, therefore, he will make a good husband, a faithful, loving father, or an honest man. Why, as I can see, if you have great talents, if you have great ability for business, that makes people rather shun you, and be on their guard of you; for, seeing so much intellect, they say you are wanting in the moral qualities. They mind this in dealing with such a man; for they say he is a "mighty smart man" (laughter); a "mighty smart man" in intellect; an educated man; a man that, because he is your superior in education, in intellect, knows how to get at the blind side, or the green side of you (laughter). What does this prove? Only as an illustration, it proves a great principle, namely, that the education that is to make a man pure, high-minded, amiable, faithful and loving,—that is education of the heart rather than that of the mind. The Catholic Church, therefore, says, I must apply myself, as in education, first to the will, first to the affections. I must teach the mind. I must bring out these powers. I must stamp this will and soul with the one divine resemblance that has been fixed into them; and, at the same time, that I educate and give with the one hand, education to the heart and to the will, with the other I will pour into the intellect every form of knowledge, so as to make an intellectual as well as a holy man (applause). How does she do this,—this Church of God? My dear friends, she takes the child before that child has come to the use of reason; she brings the child, or the infant to school; the Sisters of Mercy, or the Sisters of Charity, are ready to receive that child. Reason has not yet dawned upon that little mind; the child has not yet begun to understand the mystery of unlawful desires. The Church of God takes that child before the mystery of sin—before the passions are developed or made known to it. The Sisters begin by teaching that young child, before it begins to reason, the things of Heaven. The very Sisters that ministers that education to the infant in her religious habit,—in his consideration, uniting all that is purest, highest, and holiest with all that is tenderest and most human,—is an argument in itself made upon the little mind, that there is something better for men to live for than the things of earth. The image of the Infant Jesus is put before that little child; it captivates the young sense, and teaches that little creature the beauty of heaven, before that creature's eyes open to see and comprehend the dangerous beauty of the world. Reason dawns upon that child; but that child has already turned its thoughts upon the Lord of Heaven. The devil comes to tempt that little child with the opening eye of passion, with the opening eye of reason; but that little child is already instructed beforehand in the thoughts and in the things of Jesus Christ. The Church, as soon as that child comes to the use of reason, begins to teach him the first lesson of man's responsibility to God, by teaching that child how to prepare for his first Communion. That little child is taught, as soon as ever it becomes able to think for itself, the first lessons.—"For every thought, for every word and act, you are responsible to God and to your own conscience." That responsibility is brought home to the young soul by the preparation for Confession,—which is one of the first duties taught in the Catholic school. And when the time is come, when the intellect is more perfect when the heart, more grown, is capable of higher and more magnificent ideas, that little child is brought, with its baptismal innocence shining upon its soul, and receives the body of the Lord in Holy Communion. Then, during the subsequent years, for every lesson that is taught of human knowledge, there is also a corresponding lesson of Divine knowledge. Every new idea that is brought into the mind is accompanied with new forms of grace, falling upon the heart and will; for as knowledge is the education of the intellect, grace divine is the education of the heart of man.

This is the Catholic system of education. This is the system of Catholic education that sends out, in a few years, a man able to contend with all his competitors, in every rivalry of intellectual knowledge, in every race of life; a man who is able, by the fact of his education, to take any position that is possible to be filled by any of them; a man that is fully as well educated as any of his Protestant brethren in the land, with this difference,—that he brings forth from that school a soul that has grown in purity, a maturity of intellect without forfeiting a single ray of the purity or of the innocence of his childhood.

Now, my friends, I appeal to your intelligence, and to any person who is not a Catholic, in this room.—Which of these three systems, do you think, answers most fully and most completely to the definition of the word "Education," to educate, to bring out? Which of these three systems is the most perfect? I ask you as parents, as men, can you afford to give your children that Godless education where the name of God is not mentioned? Can you Protestants of this country, ask you, your Catholic brethren, to believe as you do that which is but a part of all that our religion teaches, as you do when you say it is an advantage for our children to be brought to a common level, and stand on a "common Christian basis?" It is too common (alas) that we should be addicted to it. We know and believe Christ, our Lord, to be present on His altar; but you cannot recognize this truth;—you so intellectual, so high-minded, so refined. You are willing to embrace that, gladly, if you only could believe that He is there. But you do not believe. And as you believe it not, do you mean to tell me that you are able, that you will educate, and fit a man to receive his God, and receive Him frequently? Do you believe it? No, certainly not. Now, I ask you, my Protestant friends, have you any right to educate our children as if they believed it not? Have you any right, I ask you, to give that child such an education, as to make him a very good Protestant, but a very bad

Catholic? A very bad Catholic is one who deems it a preparation for Confession by an examination of conscience; and a very good Protestant who never thinks of one or the other. He is a very bad Catholic who doesn't hear his Sunday's Mass, and he is a very good Protestant who never crosses the threshold of a church at all. A very bad Catholic, he is who has hardly any love, affection, or veneration for the Mother of Jesus Christ,—the woman who said, "Henceforth all generations shall call me blessed." And he would be a very bad Protestant if he had any principle of devotion to the Blessed Virgin Mary. So you see the essential difference.—The Catholic Church says to the Protestant children: "If you will come, such as I have, I give to you, I have sacraments; I have grace; I have remission of sin; I have sacramental power; I have examples in millions of saints and philosophers to encourage and develop all that is highest, holiest and purest. And with all these in my hand, I offer it to you.—Do you Protestant children; and if you do not accept it I will not force it upon you; I will educate your children in simple obedience." "But," says the Protestant, "what right have you to force your mysterious religion upon us?" If a man had a dinner of roast beef and a magnificent turkey set out before him; and another man, sitting near him, had but two salt herrings.—If the man with the roast beef and the fine dinner should say to the other,—"Come over and sit with me; let us eat together and be neighborly." "No," says the other. "Very well," says the first; "I will not press you." But if the man with the two salt herrings should say: "Leave your beef and turkey and eat a herring with me" (laughter), it would seem to me to be pretty much the same as the case between the Catholic and Protestant. They tell us, "It is bad,—actually bad in itself,—for you Catholics to send missionaries out to build schools for education, when you know well to have the means in our schools to impart it." The Catholic says, "It is very hard to be compelled to contribute to their support, without any benefit; but I believe we must send our children to our own schools, because we have things in our schools that we believe to be absolutely necessary for ourselves and our children." To be sure, I know very well it is a hard thing. Both here and in Ireland we have to bear the common burden of the State education; which is a hard thing to bear, especially when we cannot avail of it. It is something hard on Catholic parents, not only in America, but in the old land,—it is too bad that they cannot send their children to the Queen's College, or to the Model School; as, indeed, I remember a man coming into our house when I was being educated; and he said to my mother, "A great fool you are, paying twelve pounds a year for a classical education for your boy, when if you send him to the Queen's College, he will be educated for nothing; and if he gets a prize, he will bring you home twenty pounds." My mother answered, "He will bring me home twenty pounds! Not far ten thousand pounds will I allow him to cross the threshold of their Queen's College; for the lessons that I want my child to be taught," said she, "are that he shall know his duty to God, and his duty to me; and there he won't be taught either one or the other" (applause). I say again, it is a hard thing to have your well-earned money wrong from you for the building up of State schools; and when the priest is at you hammer and tongs, about his schools (laughter). But, my friends, when you consider all that the Catholic child requires, all that the Catholic child cannot get outside the Catholic school, all that that Catholic child requires, the Eternal God has said, and the Church has said, he must get,—when you consider all this, all you can say is, that you give but little, much as you give, compared with what you receive, when you receive from the hands of the priest, the monk, or the nun, a boy not ashamed nor afraid of his religion; not ashamed of his parents, not ashamed of his duties; and a girl that comes home to you captivated with the beauty of the Mother of God, and reflecting that beauty in the purity of her own angelic soul (applause).

What shall be the future of this question in America? I cannot help in everything asking myself, "What is to become of it?" or as we say here, "It is bound to be this; it is bound to be that." At home in Ireland, some how or other,—because it was an old country, perhaps,—we were constantly "boohing" crying over the glories that are gone, talking about the persecutions that we suffered hundreds of years ago, and talking about Brian Boru (laughter). We seldom or never started the question, "What is in store for old Ireland for the time to come?" But, since I came to America I look upon everything as yet in its infancy, every great question yet unsolved in these infant States, every great interest almost untouched; and I am constantly asking myself, "What is the future of this thing or that thing?" In what way will commercial interests develop themselves? What is the religion of America to be? What is the political action of America to be? And, as I believe in my soul, that the future of America will be the future of a glorious united and enlightened Catholicity, so I believe in my soul that God has reserved for this mighty country the blessing of a pure, universal and Catholic education (loud and prolonged applause). I cannot believe that the American mind will ever consent to banish God from its schools and from its teachings (applause). I cannot believe that the American intelligence will not consent to arrive at the wise conclusion, that the education of the heart by grace, is as necessary as the education of the intellect by knowledge. And in the day that America arrives at that conclusion,—in that day America will open her schools to educate throughout the land, in all the sacraments for God's service, all the truth of Catholic teaching, acts of devotion to the Virgin Mother and the Saints; all that cheers and delights the infant, or brings grace upon the young heart; in that day America will open her schools in order that the Lord Jesus Christ may take possession of them, to sanctify them by His strength, purifying them to enable the future action of the most enlightened people to be the very perfection of Christianity, to uphold through all nations,—wherever the name of an American shall be heard,—the very idea of right and of justice, of legislation for God and for His eternal law (loud applause).

IRISH INTELLIGENCE.

The "Times" on "Home Rule."—The *Times* says Ireland begins the year now opened with a material prosperity little inferior to that of England. In all that makes, or should make, a nation rich she is evidently flourishing, and we are not rich as the opinion that a people so situated will be led astray by the chimerical vision of Home Rule. If the Irish wish really to manage their own affairs by attending to their own local interests as is done in England, they can begin that work as soon as they please, and nobody will desire to thwart it. On the contrary, the co-operation of this country will be readily forthcoming. We should like to see the Irish developing their splendid fisheries, and for our own sakes no less than theirs. We wish every Irish railway paid as good a dividend as our best trunk ones. If Irish bogs can really be made to yield a cheap substitute for coal, the event would be amongst the most welcome of the year of 1873. If such things can be done, and are not done, the fault will not be ours. The legislation of a hundred years since will not be repeated in these days. Ireland will have fair play; not to say more, and it rests only with herself to turn to good and permanent purpose such opportunities as she is now obviously enjoying.

The *Observer* on St. George's.—It is officially announced from Rome that the Sovereign Pontiff has conferred on Keyes O'Clery, Esq., of the Middle