

FEB. 27, 1884.

CONFESSIO.

The Proof that Our Divine Saviour Instituted the Sacrament of Penance.

A VERBATE REPORT OF A SERMON DELIVERED BY THE CELEBRATED JESUIT MISHIONARY, REV. ARNOLD DAMES, S. J.

"That you may know that the Son of Man hath power on earth to forgive sins, then did Jesus say to the man sick of the palsy: 'Take up thy bed and walk into thy house.' MAT. IX.

DEARLY BELOVED CHRISTIANS:—I announced to you that on this evening, I would lecture on Confession, and prove that Confession is an institution of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

There is hardly a doctrine of our holy religion, on account of which we are so frequently calumniated, slandered and misrepresented, as on account of Confession. How often have you heard it asserted, sometimes by ministers of the Gospel, sometimes in Sabbath Schools, and sometimes in books, in which we are calumniated and slandered, that Catholics believe that, in order to obtain the pardon that you have never had, is to go and tell them to a priest, to ask for having done so they can commence again their course of sin; and others have gone so far as to say that we, Catholics, have to pay to the priest a certain amount of money in order to obtain the pardon of our sins;—and a certain English minister, or preacher, has even ventured so far as to give the various prices for which sins are forgiven in the Catholic Church. He says that when a Catholic has been guilty of murdering his father or his mother and wishes to obtain pardon for the sin, he has to pay a pound sterling, that is \$5 00; when he has been guilty of whipping his wife, a crown, or \$1.00, and when he has been gloriously drunk, a shilling will do.

"Well, now, all of you, my dear Catholics, you, who have been going to confession all the days of your life, well know that you have never paid one penny to obtain the pardon of your sins. What must we think of such men, who preach the Gospel, and what must we think of such a religion that endeavors to put down another by calumny and slander? Is that the religion of God? Is that Christianity? I leave it to your own good sense to judge, to the good sense of those who are not Catholics, who have heard it repeatedly. Is that the spirit of God? Is that the spirit of charity?—to put down another body of Christians by slandering and misrepresenting their doctrines. Why do they not attack the real doctrines of the Church? Why have they beaten the air attacking doctrines, of which, in reality, their ignorance clearly shows they know nothing.

Every Catholic abhors the idea of believing that sins can be forgiven for money. The Catholic Church considers it one of the greatest sacrileges in existence. If a priest were to take money for forgiving sins, according to the laws of the Catholic Church, that priest could never exercise priestly functions any more; but there never has been an instance of that kind, for that priest would be degraded for life.

What, then, is the Catholic doctrine on the subject of confession? The Catholic Church teaches that no sin can be forgiven without true and sincere repentance on the part of the sinner for the sins by which he has offended God, and firm resolution to avoid all sins for the future. Ask any Catholic, "Can the priest forgive you your sins if you are not sorry for them?" Even the most ignorant Catholic will answer you, "No, sir."

No sin can be forgiven without true and sincere sorrow and repentance for them. "Do you not believe in that, my dear Protestant friends?" "Of course I do," you say in reply. Now that is the Catholic doctrine.

Then again the Catholic Church teaches that no sin can be forgiven, even if you have true and sincere sorrow for the same, unless we are fully determined to do all in our power to avoid sin for the future; for there would be no sincere repentance unless there was also a determination to commence a new life to avoid sin for the future. My dear Protestant friends, have you any objection to that? "No, sir, that is precisely my opinion." Well, then, you are so far a Catholic without knowing it.

That is the Catholic doctrine; you see, if you only knew the Catholic religion, many of you would abandon your errors and you would embrace the truth. But the misfortune is this, that many of you do not keep you in error and they will not let you see the doctrine of the Catholic Church, for they know very well if you were to know the doctrines of the Catholic Church, you would become Catholics, unless some human considerations would hold you from embracing the truth.

So, then, the Catholic doctrine is, that when a man has true and sincere repentance for his sin, and a firm resolution to do all in his power to avoid sin for the future, and when with these dispositions he confesses his sins to the priest of God, that then the priest has the power of forgiving his sins in the name of God, and by the authority of God. "So that," says my Protestant friend, "you believe the priest has the power of forgiving sins." Well, now, I do not believe in that, that a man can forgive sins—I shall never believe in that. Is not the priest a man? "Why, of course he is a man, he is not a woman?" "Well, then, I shall never believe that the priest can forgive sins."

Now, my Protestant friend, are you reasonable in your objection to this? Let us examine whether God can give such power to man to forgive sins in His name, and by His authority, if He chooses to do so. What do you say about that? Can God give such power to man? "Of course," says my Protestant friend, "God can do anything, God is all powerful." If God wishes to give such power to man, He can do it—who is to hinder Him from giving such power to man? Well, I am going to prove to you now, that God has given this power to man. "No, sir, you can never do that," says my Protestant friend. But I will prove to you that God has given such power to man—for no man with common sense or reason can doubt for a moment that God can give this power to man. I shall prove to you from the Bible, and that is the book you like, do you not, my dear Protestant friends? It is the book of God for which we Catholics have a very high veneration,

and it is from this holy book of God that I shall prove that God has given such power to man.

In the ix. chapter of the Gospel of St. Matthew we read that on a certain occasion there was brought before our Divine Lord a man sick of the palsy, and when our Blessed Lord saw the poor pained man He was moved with compassion, and said to the palsied man: "Son, be of good heart, thy sins are forgiven thee." And the Scribes and the Pharisees heard the Blessed Saviour say, "Thy sins are forgiven thee," and they murmured within themselves, and said, precisely as our Protestant friends say, "Who can forgive sins but God?" And Christ, reading the secret thoughts of their mind, said: "Why do you murmur at this? Which is easier to say, 'Thy sins are forgiven thee,' or, 'Take up thy bed and walk into thy house?' "But," said he, "that you may know that the Son of Man—He does not say that you may know that the Son of God, but—'that you may know that the Son of Man.' You know Christ was both God and man. He is God Father and the Holy Spirit, equal to the Father and the Holy Ghost, and he became man eighteen hundred and eighty six years ago, when He was born in the stable at Bethlehem—'Hath the power on earth to forgive sins.' And then did he say to the man sick of the palsy: 'Take up thy bed and walk into thy house,' and he took up his bed and walked into his house. Here our Divine Saviour performed a miracle to prove that, even as man, He had the power of forgiving sins.

Now, in St. John, xx. chap., our Saviour says: "All power hath been given to me in heaven and on earth, therefore as the Father hath sent Me, I also send you." As I have been vested by the Father with all power, so I also send you upon them, the Apostles. He said: "Receive ye the Holy Ghost, whose sins you shall forgive they are forgiven them, and whose sins you shall retain they are retained."

Now, my dear Bible friends, you who say the Bible is your teacher, I beg of you in the name of God to divest yourselves of all prejudices—of all preconceived notions, and kindly, sincerely, before God, study the Bible, study the words of Jesus Christ. What did Christ mean when He said, breathing upon His Apostles: "Receive ye the Holy Ghost?" Who is the Holy Ghost? The Holy Ghost is the third person of the adorable Trinity. "Receive ye the Holy Ghost," that is, "Receive ye the power of God," for Holy Ghost, in the Holy Scriptures, frequently stands for the power of God, as in the first chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, our Divine Saviour says: "Not many days hence you shall receive the power of God." What was that power of God? It was the reception of the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost. "Receive ye, therefore, the power of God, and forgive them." You shall forgive them, and they shall be forgiven. Is not that clear and explicit? What did our Divine Saviour mean when He said: "Whose sins you shall forgive they are forgiven them." Did He mean what He said? Most assuredly so. There was no duplicity in Christ; there was no double dealing in Him. He did not say one thing and mean another thing. When He said to His Apostles: "Whose sins you shall forgive they are forgiven them," He gave them the power of forgiving sins.

Some years ago, when I was pastor of St. Francis Xavier Church in St. Louis, Mo., I was called to a sick lady, and when I came to the house I found with the sick lady a Protestant doctor. I asked the doctor to leave me alone with the lady for a few moments, and he did so. In the meantime I heard the lady's confession, and administered to her the consolations of our holy religion. The sacraments of the Church. Having got through, I said to the doctor that he might come in, but the doctor was a Yankee, and you all know that the Yankees are a very inquisitive people, and always want to know the ins and outs of everything, and so the doctor said to me: "What have you been doing, sir?" "Well, doctor, that is a very impertinent question, but I know what you are driving at, I will answer you. I heard the confession of that lady." "You do not pretend to forgive sins, do you?" said the doctor. "Yes, sir, I do," "Well, sir," continued the doctor, "that is a very extraordinary power." "Yes, sir, it is, but you do not believe in that power," said the doctor. "No," said he, "no, no, I do not believe in any such nonsense as that." "Well, doctor," said I, "do you believe the Apostles had the power of forgiving sins?" "No, sir," said he, "I do not." "Well, doctor, what did our Divine Saviour mean, when breathing upon His Apostles He said: 'Receive ye the Holy Ghost; whose sins you shall forgive they are forgiven them.' What did Christ mean, doctor, at that time?" "Well, I declare," said he, "that is a tough question." "A little tough, doctor, will you be kind enough to answer it?" "Well," said the doctor, "I am not prepared for that now. I am here on professional business, and am not prepared to answer you now. But I will see you again." "Do, doctor, please see me again."

The doctor was a sincere and honest man, and when he arrived at his office, he remembered his promise to see me again, and knowing that he should become familiar with the subject in order to talk with me, he procured himself some books on the Catholic doctrines, and read them through very carefully, until he became convinced that confession is of Divine origin. He became interested in the matter and procured more books, and finally became convinced that the Catholic Church is the only true Church of God. Three weeks after that, there came a rap at my door—"Walk in," said the doctor. "Walk in," said he, "will you be kind enough to hear my confession?" "Eh, doctor, I hear you confession? Why, you do not believe in that?" "I do, father," said he, "and I believe in all the other doctrines of the Catholic Church. I am thoroughly convinced that it is the only true Church of God, and I would like to make my confession." "All right, doctor, get on your knees." He got on his knees and I heard his confession and received him into the Church.

Well, perhaps some of my Protestant friends will say to-night: "Was he not a fool of a man?" "No, my friends, he was a very wise and well-educated man, a very smart man; and so wise you would be,

my dear Protestant friends if you would only take the trouble that the doctor took to examine both sides of the question. But here is your misfortune; you are a one-sided people; you never examined both sides of the question. Tell me candidly, now, did you ever read a Catholic book in your life? "No, sir, I would not take up a Catholic book." "But you have read a great many books against Catholicity?" "Yes, I have, and that is the very reason I do not want to read any more about it." Well, that shows you are a one-sided people. How can you give an impartial judgment, when you have examined but one side of the question?

What would you say of a judge who sits in the criminal court when a policeman brings in a poor fellow, and says to the judge: "Judge, this man is guilty of such a crime." "Well, then hang him," says the judge. "But," says the poor man, "Judge, I am innocent, and I am able to bring you evidence and witnesses to prove that I am innocent." But the policeman insists that he is guilty. "Well, then," says the judge, "hang him anyhow."

What would you say of such a judge? "Ah!" you would say "an unjust, cruel blood-thirsty man—you are guilty of shedding innocent blood. Why do you not hear the man? Why do you not hear his evidence, and his witnesses, and his proofs? You are guilty of the blood of an innocent man, and you have condemned him without examination." Well, now, my dear Protestant friends, allow me to tell you (and I hope you will not be offended, for no man of sense can be offended by the truth), that is the way you have been treating the Catholics all the time. "Hang them, anyhow," you say.

Did you ever examine the doctrines of our holy religion? Did you ever read a Catholic book? Never in your life—and then you condemn us without knowing what we are. Is that the part of a sensible man? Is that just, I ask you? It is very hard to tell you that you have been acting so unjustly to us, Catholics; but, certainly, none of you can be offended, for you have read a great many books against us, you have been turning us into ridicule; you have been holding us up to the odium of the people, without knowing what the Catholic religion is at all.

That is the way Jesus Christ was treated and that is the way you are treating the followers of Jesus Christ. Oh! my dear Protestant friends, become more just more fair, more honest and charitable towards your fellow-man. Condemn him not without knowing that he really deserves to be condemned. Do not examine one side of the question, but give a fair hearing to both sides. Do I ask any thing unreasonable? Is that not fair and just? I would therefore recommend to you to procure yourselves Catholic books, in which our doctrines are thoroughly stated and thoroughly defended. I recommend to you the three following books: "Protestantism and Catholicity;" second book, "Points of Controversy;" and the third book, "The Manual of Instruction."

I must continue with my proofs from the Bible, on Confession. In St. Matthew, our Divine Saviour says, xviii. chapter: "I will give to you," says He to His apostles, "the keys of the kingdom of Heaven, and whatsoever you shall bind on earth shall be bound in Heaven, and whatsoever you shall loose on earth shall be loosed in Heaven." Here you see our Divine Saviour gave to His Apostles a very extraordinary power. For what purpose were the keys? Why, of course to open the door. They were given for the purpose of unlocking Heaven to the repentant sinner. Here again, our Divine Saviour confers the same power on His Apostles as He conferred upon them in the Gospel of St. John.

Now, did the Apostles understand these words of Christ, in the same manner as we Catholics understand them in the nineteenth century, and as they have been understood for so many centuries? Did they really believe that they had the power of forgiving sins? They did; and they gloried in that power. St. Paul, in his epistle to the Corinthians, says: "Let a man so look upon us as the ministers of Christ and the dispensers of the mysteries of God, for we are the ambassadors of Christ." Now, what is an ambassador? An ambassador is one who is sent by one power to another power to act for the power that sent him. If, for instance, the English Government sends an ambassador to Washington, that ambassador acts in the name of the English Government, and whatsoever he does in Washington is considered as done by the English Government itself; his acts are the acts of the English Government. "Now," says St. Paul, "we are the ambassadors of Christ." When did Christ constitute them ambassadors? When He said: "I will give to you the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatsoever you shall bind on earth shall be bound in Heaven." It was then that Christ constituted His Apostles and their lawful successors in the ministry, the priests and bishops of the Church, His ambassadors.

Again, says St. Paul in his second epistle to the Corinthians, "We have the ministry of reconciliation. What does he mean by that? Why, of course he means reconciling sinners to God. But how can you do so? Only by forgiving them their sins in the name of God. The sinner only becomes reconciled to God when his sins are forgiven." So says St. Paul, "He has placed in us the word of reconciliation, the power of reconciling the sinner to God, by forgiving him his sins."

And therefore, St. John, the Apostle, in his first epistle, and first chapter, says: "God is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from our iniquities if we confess them." "If we confess them." There St. John the Apostle makes confession a condition, without which no sin is forgiven. God is faithful and just to cleanse us from our iniquities, "if we confess them," "if we confess them."

Hence, we see, that in the primitive days of Christianity, the Christians went to confession. In the ix. chapter, 18th verse, of the Acts of the Apostles, we read: "And many of those who believed,

came, confessing and declaring their deeds." The multitude of the people—those who had been received into the Church—they "came," says the Bible, "confessing and declaring their sins." They did the same as Catholics do now, they came in crowds to confession, as Catholics do now at great festivals, such as Easter, Christmas, etc. So says the Bible. Did the primitive Christians not know the Catholic doctrine? Were they ill-instructed? They knew its doctrines from the very lips of the Apostles, and hence the Catholic religion is now as it was in primitive days—in the days of the Apostles.

And St. James the Apostle says to the priest of the Church: "Confess your sins one to the other, and pray one for the other, that you may be saved." Here, you see, St. James the Apostle makes the confession of sins a condition of salvation also, on the priests of the Church. In the Catholic Church, it is not merely the laity, that are bound to go to confession and tell their sins, but also, the priest is bound to do so, and so also must the bishops and the cardinals, and even the Pope himself is bound to go to confession. Should he have the misfortune to fall into sin, for he is a man like the rest of us, and any man may fall into sin. Confession is a Divine law, and must be observed by all. The priest, however, does not wait to fall into sin before he goes to confession; for as a general thing, the priests of God strive to lead pure, moral and holy lives, and keep themselves free from sin, but even if they do not commit any sin, twice a month or so, and when they have nothing to confess, they confess the sins of their youth, of their young days, in order to humble themselves before God, and once more obtain the forgiveness of Christ.

On the 14th ult., Archbishop Walsh, at the invitation of Archbishop Croke of Cashel, visited Thurles, for the first time since his return from Rome, and was accorded a magnificent reception. His Grace, accompanied by the Rev. W. Murphy, left Dublin by the 1 o'clock train. At Inchicore a large number of the workmen engaged in the railway works, bearing that he was travelling by train, assembled, and as the train passed manifested their feeling of respect and admiration for him by loud cheers. At Newbridge his Grace was joined by the Very Rev. Dr. Brown, President of Maynooth College; and at Kildare the Very Rev. Dr. Kavanagh, P. P., entered the carriage in which the Archbishop was travelling and accompanied him on his journey. At each of these stations, and at Monasterevan, Portlannington and Maryborough, some of the people collected on the platform recognized his Grace and cheered. As the train left the station at Ballybophy a large crowd which had collected on the platform expecting to see the Archbishop pressed round the door of the carriage, cheering enthusiastically. The Rathdowney brass band took their position opposite the carriage, playing national airs. As the train was about to leave the station his Grace stood at the carriage window and gave his blessing to the people. At Templemore the entire platform was crowded with people, who cheered vigorously as the train approached. Thurles was reached at 4.30. Enthusiasm is but a small word to describe the welcome which was accorded to the Archbishop on his arrival. The entire station and the approaches to it were packed full with a dense mass of people, who cheered as if their lives depended on the strength and vigor of their shouts of welcome. As many as were able gave additional vent to their feelings by waving hats and handkerchiefs, but his Grace was so closely pressed together that most of the people were obliged to content themselves with cheering.

AS USUAL TIPPERARY MEN CAME. Outside the station were the Thurles, Loughmore, Holycross, Borrisholeigh, Moyne and Templetooby bands, with several patriotic inscriptions, the Borrisholeigh flag being especially noticeable. The horses were untried from the carriage, and his Grace and his host were drawn to the college by a score of brawny arms. The distinction of drawing the Archbishop's carriage was a coveted one. Even at this early hour, before twilight had commenced, some of the houses displayed illuminations, the bells of the beautiful Cathedral rang out a peal of welcome, and a striking effect. Opposite the college the vast crowd assembled on the stage. In reply to an address presented him by the priests and people of Thurles the Archbishop made a grand speech, thanking them for the heartiness of their welcome, and continuing thus: "I am to-night reminded especially of one of my former visits to this town, five years ago, at the time that I was in Thurles. It was just twelve months ago. It was a memorable occasion. You remember it. It was when Mr. Parnell was here—when he came to preside at that magnificent convention of your magnificent county which was the first of those great assemblies to make plain to all Ireland, and all England, the worst enemy, the spirit of discord, had at length been banished from among our people, that a new spirit had entered in, and that now and henceforth there was no sacrifice, whether of personal or local feeling, be it of town or of country or of province, that Tipperary, and with Tipperary all Ireland, was not prepared to make, and would not gladly make, for the cause of an unbroken national union. I will remember that on the evening of that day it was remarked to me by the Archbishop that we had been witnessing the close, and the glorious close, of one great chapter of the political history of Ireland. But looking back now upon that day, ever memorable as it will be in the history of the nation, I do not shrink from the contemplation of so sad a prospect. Let us trust, then, that those statesmen in whose hands, under Providence, lie the issues of the immediate future, will be wise in time. No nation, surely ever had a stronger claim to be dealt with on the broad, plain principle of justice than Ireland has to-day. We are a united peo-

ARCHBISHOP WALSH.

HE VISITS ARCHBISHOP CROKE AND MAKES HIS VISIT ARCHBISHOP CROKE.

On the 14th ult., Archbishop Walsh, at the invitation of Archbishop Croke of Cashel, visited Thurles, for the first time since his return from Rome, and was accorded a magnificent reception. His Grace, accompanied by the Rev. W. Murphy, left Dublin by the 1 o'clock train. At Inchicore a large number of the workmen engaged in the railway works, bearing that he was travelling by train, assembled, and as the train passed manifested their feeling of respect and admiration for him by loud cheers. At Newbridge his Grace was joined by the Very Rev. Dr. Brown, President of Maynooth College; and at Kildare the Very Rev. Dr. Kavanagh, P. P., entered the carriage in which the Archbishop was travelling and accompanied him on his journey. At each of these stations, and at Monasterevan, Portlannington and Maryborough, some of the people collected on the platform recognized his Grace and cheered. As the train left the station at Ballybophy a large crowd which had collected on the platform expecting to see the Archbishop pressed round the door of the carriage, cheering enthusiastically. The Rathdowney brass band took their position opposite the carriage, playing national airs. As the train was about to leave the station his Grace stood at the carriage window and gave his blessing to the people. At Templemore the entire platform was crowded with people, who cheered vigorously as the train approached. Thurles was reached at 4.30. Enthusiasm is but a small word to describe the welcome which was accorded to the Archbishop on his arrival. The entire station and the approaches to it were packed full with a dense mass of people, who cheered as if their lives depended on the strength and vigor of their shouts of welcome. As many as were able gave additional vent to their feelings by waving hats and handkerchiefs, but his Grace was so closely pressed together that most of the people were obliged to content themselves with cheering.

AS USUAL TIPPERARY MEN CAME. Outside the station were the Thurles, Loughmore, Holycross, Borrisholeigh, Moyne and Templetooby bands, with several patriotic inscriptions, the Borrisholeigh flag being especially noticeable. The horses were untried from the carriage, and his Grace and his host were drawn to the college by a score of brawny arms. The distinction of drawing the Archbishop's carriage was a coveted one. Even at this early hour, before twilight had commenced, some of the houses displayed illuminations, the bells of the beautiful Cathedral rang out a peal of welcome, and a striking effect. Opposite the college the vast crowd assembled on the stage. In reply to an address presented him by the priests and people of Thurles the Archbishop made a grand speech, thanking them for the heartiness of their welcome, and continuing thus: "I am to-night reminded especially of one of my former visits to this town, five years ago, at the time that I was in Thurles. It was just twelve months ago. It was a memorable occasion. You remember it. It was when Mr. Parnell was here—when he came to preside at that magnificent convention of your magnificent county which was the first of those great assemblies to make plain to all Ireland, and all England, the worst enemy, the spirit of discord, had at length been banished from among our people, that a new spirit had entered in, and that now and henceforth there was no sacrifice, whether of personal or local feeling, be it of town or of country or of province, that Tipperary, and with Tipperary all Ireland, was not prepared to make, and would not gladly make, for the cause of an unbroken national union. I will remember that on the evening of that day it was remarked to me by the Archbishop that we had been witnessing the close, and the glorious close, of one great chapter of the political history of Ireland. But looking back now upon that day, ever memorable as it will be in the history of the nation, I do not shrink from the contemplation of so sad a prospect. Let us trust, then, that those statesmen in whose hands, under Providence, lie the issues of the immediate future, will be wise in time. No nation, surely ever had a stronger claim to be dealt with on the broad, plain principle of justice than Ireland has to-day. We are a united peo-

ple. Your priests, your bishops are, with you in your constitutional demand. Unlike the leaders of wicked revolutionary proceedings in some other countries that I could name—leaders whose aim and effort it is to suppress every vestige of religious influence or control—unlike those foolish and mistaken men, your leaders have most earnestly sought and prayed for the help and strength that could not fail to come to the movement from the council and the guidance of the priesthood of the nation. That council, that guidance, is with them and with you to-day. Under its holy influence, wherever it is free effectively to do its work, crime and outrage have ceased throughout the land. No English statesman who may have the courage to face the solution of what all men now know by the name of the Irish question need fear the taunt that he is yielding to violence, to clamor or to threats. If the Irish question stands to-day in this hopeful position, you know how deep a debt that your priests are with you. And now, in conclusion, I will say only the other word, that for this blessed union of priests and people you are indebted to, under heaven and under the free and fettered action of the Holy See, to the chivalrous and fearless prelate at whose hospitable invitation I am here to-day.

PROTESTANT CLERGYMEN ON HOME RULE.

A short time ago the Protestant Deacon of Clonfert told the Derry Orangemen in plain terms that they should welcome, not denounce, Home Rule for Ireland; that their affected fears of such a measure were absurd, and their threats of war silly. Moreover, the Deacon spoke in a generous and just spirit of the sentiments of Catholic Irishmen towards their Protestant fellow-countrymen, and declared that there was no reason why all Irishmen should not under the benefits of Legislative Independence work in harmony and rectitude for the common weal. There is reason to believe that the Deacon of Clonfert's patriotic and just views are spreading in the North, and their influence will soon be felt in the South.

A SOUTHERN PROTESTANT MINISTER'S VIEWS.

In the South we have a striking example of Protestant clerical opinion in the same direction. A respected Protestant clergyman, the Rev. R. O. Anderson, of Dunmanway, supported the Nationalist candidate against his landlord, opponent at the recent Parliamentary election, and when assailed by a brace of narrow minded co-religionists writing respectively as "An Irish Landlord" and "An Irish Churchman," in the columns of the Ecclesiastical Gazette, he boldly and effectively defends his action in the following letter addressed to the editor of our contemporary:

SIR—It is perfectly evident that the letter of "An Irish Landlord" in your issue of the 12th instant answers itself, and that, too, in a manner strangely conclusive. Beginning with the assertion that my "charge against landlords is devoid of foundation," he goes on—in the very next sentence, mark you—to write his own condemnation in the words, "I regret to say that Protestant tenants have not been encouraged." Do, sir, take notice of that delicious euphemism "not encouraged." What a phrase it is to another down countless bad stories of exaction, and cruelty, and wrong! "Not encouraged!" Nothing could be neater, and with friend Gratiano I exclaim, "I thank thee, Jew, for teaching me that word." Now, your correspondent, "An Irish Churchman" works off upon a different line. He attempts no defence of Irish landlordism, nor does he, in any serious way, question the reality of the grievances to which I have called attention, but proceeds to conjure up all the sorts and kinds of the possible and impossible ills which could fall upon our unhappy land if Mr. Parnell gets his way and an Irish Parliament sits in College green. For the present, at least, I must decline to debate with him on the question of a "Parliament of one house," and content myself by simply stating my belief that all this childish darning of our Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen has its unhappy origin in our Protestant ignorance of the true nature and character of the people amongst whom we live. For my own part, I can never be persuaded that the men around me, whom I have known, both in my sickness and health, to be the best and kindest of neighbors, are nothing better than rascally hypocrites, who, upon the transfer of legislative power from one side of St. George's Channel to the other, will, without provocation, belie all their previous history and begin to play the persecutor's part. Nor can I, in this connection fail to remember that it will be the certain interest of the responsible Government, under Mr. Parnell, or any other same Minister, to deal tenderly and respectfully with the feelings and susceptibilities of a minority numerically quite large enough to give endless trouble if badly handled or despitefully used. And this one other thing I would dare to mention as a reason for my present confidence, that I cannot imagine any circumstances, or combination of circumstances, under which the power of the truth we have amongst us can be lessened or destroyed. As Protestants we lawfully make boast of the light in which we walk and the truth upon which we build. Can Home Rule extinguish that light or take away the truth?

R. O. N. ANDERSON, Clerk. Drinagh Rectory, Dunmanway, December 14, 1883.

FOUR "BALLYKILBEG'S" SILLY REPRISAL.

This temperate but telling rejoinder of the Rev. Mr. Anderson, we trust, embodies the opinion of very many of his clerical brethren upon the momentous question now at issue. What a contrast—the wise and liberal utterances of the Protestant pastor, to the foolish and bigoted yet deliciously jarrical threat of Ballykilbeg Johnston, that "the day the royal assent is given to Home Rule the Orangemen of the North will declare civil war, and fight their last battle for the Bible and the Crown." Did it never strike poor Mr. Johnston how ludicrous it is to talk of defending the Crown by taking the field against the Queen's measures? Do not see an "Hibernicism" has rarely been perpetrated.

ized from first to last the triumphant progress of the Irish cause in the conventions and general elections of 1885. How, then, do we stand to-day? Triumphant—triumphant all along the line. Our people politically united, as the people of no other nation on the face of the earth ever were united before. On the eve of the elections we were appealed to, as you no more remember, though many strangely seem to have forgotten it—we were appealed to by the foremost statesman of England to speak out our minds now that, as he reminded us, we were for the first time afforded the opportunity of doing so in the same measure and degree in which the people of England and of Scotland have so long enjoyed the privilege and the right of speaking out their minds upon the great questions of the day. May I remind you of Mr. Gladstone's words? Here is what he says: "Down to the present time the constituency of Ireland has been miserably narrow; it has not had the same representation, not even the same comparatively contracted representation—I speak of the countries particularly—that has existed in England and Scotland. I need not go into details, but its constituency has been so limited that we can hardly recognize its utterances as the voice of a nation. It was the voice rather of a class." And then mark what follows: "I do not know whether in consequence of those circumstances, but certainly in conjunction with those circumstances, during the whole time I have sat in Parliament the Irish representation has been so divided that it is impossible to say where was to be found the voice of Ireland. The Irish members have been divided on every question in the last Parliament into three parties, and these had been three minorities—one party, termed itself National, led by Mr. Parnell; another party, its supporters respect their confidence to the Government, and the third the Tory members returned for various Irish constituencies. None of these have been entitled by their numerical strength to say, 'We speak the voice of the whole people.' But Ireland has now a constituency as broad and as extended, as qualified to speak their wants and their wishes as

THE SOUTH OR ENGLAND?

And then he went on to proclaim, in words which need not detain you by repeating, but of which I do not hesitate to say that, in my opinion, they adequately sketch out both the nature and the limits of that demand which your elected representatives are now about to make for you with one united voice—he went on to proclaim that if that demand were constitutionally put forward by Ireland—if the wishes of Ireland in respect were constitutionally ascertained, it would be not only allowable but beneficial to the empire at large that this right to which we lay claim, the right of governing ourselves in all our own affairs, should be granted to us. Well, that is all we ask for, and the question of the day now is, whether it is to be granted to us or not. The issue was plainly put before us by Mr. Gladstone in the words that I have quoted for you. He appealed to us for an answer that he could regard as the answer of Ireland. He did not give it to him? This great province of Munster, with its twenty five constituencies, absolutely unanimous in the return of its members; the province of Connaught, with its thirteen constituencies, absolutely unanimous in the return of its members; and, what is better, because more significant than all the rest, we have even Ulster at length pressing forward to be received with open arms within the national ranks, having now returned to the new Parliament a clear majority of her members pledged to the support of our united Ireland. Thus, then, Ireland has responded to Mr. Gladstone's appeal, calmly, and confidently, but at the same time anxiously, I for one await the issue; calmly, in the spirit in which that answer of our people has been given and their claim has been put forth; confidently, for I see no reason in this world more than in those other instances in which

TIME WAS JUSTIFIED BY WINSON

of many of his other anticipations. I see no reason, I say, to question the political foresight of your great parliamentary leader, whose declaration stands publicly on record that it is to Mr. Gladstone he looks for this crowning act of statesmanship. But, as I have added, I must also say that I await this issue with deep anxiety. And why? Because already we have heard from across the channel some foolish threatenings from English public opinion, threatenings of revolt within Mr. Gladstone's camp and within the ranks of his trusted lieutenants, threats to disregard the issue of our elections, threats, I must say, that—though for a time they may unnerve the courage even of the veteran statesman who is pledged to do us justice—cannot but be eventually, and, I fear, speedily, to one and all result. The result may be deplored, and will be deplored by your Archbishop and by me, and by all of us who have stood together in our effort to instill into the minds of our people the spirit which has inspired our present constitutional movement—the belief that a nation's voice is not only an instrument of national regeneration worthy to be relied on by you as the people of a Christian and in the main a Catholic, nation, but one likely to be more effective for the accomplishment of its purpose than those other weapons to which unfortunately we are even now some desperate men awaiting their opportunity to have recourse—the dagger of the assassin, and those other and in some sense more fearful engines of destruction which have been placed in the hands of those who make no secret of their determination to seek for the last hope of

FREEDOM FOR IRELAND.

if they cannot find it elsewhere, amid the ruins of English cities and of English civilization. You, the men of Tipperary, shrink with no less horror than I do from the contemplation of so sad a prospect. Let us trust, then, that those statesmen in whose hands, under Providence, lie the issues of the immediate future, will be wise in time. No nation, surely ever had a stronger claim to be dealt with on the broad, plain principle of justice than Ireland has to-day. We are a united peo-

A STILL MORE GLORIOUS CHAPTER.

of our history—that chapter which has put on record for all future time the story of the marvellous organization, the calm and steady discipline, the unbroken and unbreakable unity that has character-

THE SOUTH OR ENGLAND?

And then he went on to proclaim, in words which need not detain you by repeating, but of which I do not hesitate to say that, in my opinion, they adequately sketch out both the nature and the limits of that demand which your elected representatives are now about to make for you with one united voice—he went on to proclaim that if that demand were constitutionally put forward by Ireland—if the wishes of Ireland in respect were constitutionally ascertained, it would be not only allowable but beneficial to the empire at large that this right to which we lay claim, the right of governing ourselves in all our own affairs, should be granted to us. Well, that is all we ask for, and the question of the day now is, whether it is to be granted to us or not. The issue was plainly put before us by Mr. Gladstone in the words that I have quoted for you. He appealed to us for an answer that he could regard as the answer of Ireland. He did not give it to him? This great province of Munster, with its twenty five constituencies, absolutely unanimous in the return of its members; the province of Connaught, with its thirteen constituencies, absolutely unanimous in the return of its members; and, what is better, because more significant than all the rest, we have even Ulster at length pressing forward to be received with open arms within the national ranks, having now returned to the new Parliament a clear majority of her members pledged to the support of our united Ireland. Thus, then, Ireland has responded to Mr. Gladstone's appeal, calmly, and confidently, but at the same time anxiously, I for one await the issue; calmly, in the spirit in which that answer of our people has been given and their claim has been put forth; confidently, for I see no reason in this world more than in those other instances in which

THE SOUTH OR ENGLAND?

And then he went on to proclaim, in words which need not detain you by repeating, but of which I do not hesitate to say that, in my opinion, they adequately sketch out both the nature and the limits of that demand which your elected representatives are now about to make for you with one united voice—he went on to proclaim that if that demand were constitutionally put forward by Ireland—if the wishes of Ireland in respect were constitutionally ascertained, it would be not only allowable but beneficial to the empire at large that this right to which we lay claim, the right of governing ourselves in all our own affairs, should be granted to us. Well, that is all we ask for, and the question of the day now is, whether it is to be granted to us or not. The issue was plainly put before us by Mr. Gladstone in the words that I have quoted for you. He appealed to us for an answer that he could regard as the answer of Ireland. He did not give it to him? This great province of Munster, with its twenty five constituencies, absolutely unanimous in the return of its members; the province of Connaught, with its thirteen constituencies, absolutely unanimous in the return of its members; and, what is better, because more significant than all the rest, we have even Ulster at length pressing forward to be received with open arms within the national ranks, having now returned to the new Parliament a clear majority of her members pledged to the support of our united Ireland. Thus, then, Ireland has responded to Mr. Gladstone's appeal, calmly, and confidently, but at the same time anxiously, I for one await the issue; calmly, in the spirit in which that answer of our people has been given and their claim has been put forth; confidently, for I see no reason in this world more than in those other instances in which