

limits within which the Church may exercise authority. — [Alloc. Singuaria quadam, Dec. 9, 1854; 'gratibus,' Dec. 17, 1860; 'Maxima quidem,' June, 1861.]

20. The ecclesiastical power must not exercise its authority without the toleration and assent of the civil government. — [Alloc. 'Memorandum uniusquisque,' Sept. 30, 1851.]

21. The Church has not the power of defining dogmatically that the religion of the Catholic Church is the only true religion. — [Lit. Apost. 'Multiplices inter,' Jude. 10, 1851.]

22. The obligation which binds Catholic teachers and writers does not apply to matters proposed for universal belief as articles of faith by the infallible judgment of the Church. — [Let. to the Archbishop of Fribourg, 'Tuas liberatur,' Dec. 21, 1863.]

23. The Church has not the power of availing herself of force, or any direct or indirect temporal power. — [Lit. 'Ad apostolicas,' August 22, 1851.]

24. The Roman Pontiffs and ecumenical councils have exceeded the limits of their power, have usurped the rights of princes, and have even committed errors in defining matters relating to dogmatical morals. — [Lit. Apost. 'Multiplices inter,' June 10, 1851.]

You see, beloved brethren, from the tenor of all these propositions condemned, that the State seeks to make the Church its handmaid—to do its bidding—to be a sort of police, in order to keep her subject quiet. The State wishes to force men to the conviction that the Divine Founder of the Church—Jesus Christ—did not constitute the Church a perfect society in itself, with its heavenly functions, rights, and attributes independent of the world, which it was to teach, reprove, and judge; that its power to teach and govern was so dependent upon the civil authority that St. Peter and St. John did wrong in not obeying the ruler of the Temple, and ceasing to preach the Name of Jesus. But they preferred to obey God. And Christ, too, was wrong in disturbing the people with a new doctrine, and would not obey when he was ordered to cease preaching that he was the Son of God. Christ instituted an infallible Church, because He promised that the gates of hell—that is, of error—should not prevail against her, and that He should continue with His Church in the work of saving souls unto the consummation of the world, not merely during the lifetime of the Apostles, but to all ages. The Apostles were sent to the whole world; but they did not go through the whole world. Their successors did; for their sound went forth throughout the entire world. Still, the Church, under the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, for Jesus said he would send the Holy Ghost to instruct her in all truth, continues the mission of Jesus; and she presumes to take her proper place, assigned to her by her Divine Head. The world is angry, because she proclaims that she is what she is. It would be indeed a piece of cowardice, if a legitimate child would not proclaim its legitimacy, because the feelings of the illegitimate are hurt. In one of these propositions, again, it is said that Catholic teachers and writers may teach and write as they please, and must not be condemned, except by the universal Council of the Church. Now, these Catholic writers and teachers must, indeed, be great men. How many of them exist? What are their talents? What amount of Catholicity do they possess? We can judge certainly by their pride. They say that a General Council must be called to examine their books, before they are condemned. But how can Councils be assembled to examine into the works of each? It is impossible. And still there must be a judge. But that judge cannot be any other than the Roman Pontiff—the successor of St. Peter. How often can a Council be called to examine Catholic writers? These are distributed over the world; and must we have a General Council sit constantly, and move from place to place, wherever a book of theirs is printed? Their pretensions are preposterous. We will put them aside. How ridiculous it would be for the Church to take cognizance of their foolish assertions. Christ has placed us in authority over His Church, while He has given us commandment to feed with sound doctrine, and to confirm the brethren that their faith fail not. 'I have prayed,' said He to St. Peter, 'that their faith may not fail.' I say to these men, that if learned Bishops of the Church submit humbly to the teaching of St. Peter and his successors, the Roman Pontiff, as the amiable Fenelon and others did, who burnt even their books publicly in their pulpits, because they had been condemned by Rome; they may certainly, without compromising their pride, follow the example of these illustrious prelates.

But now we come to another charge—That the Roman Pontiffs and the Ecumenical Councils have overstepped the limits of their powers, have usurped the rights of princes, and committed errors in their definitions on points of dogmas and morality. This is a very general accusation. In what have Roman Pontiffs erred? When, and who says they have erred? To judge that they have erred, the judge must be infallible—must be superior to any judge—to Popes, to Bishops, to the whole Church. These great men must have in truth been the successors of the Apostles, in fact, the Church itself. They say, 'no, we are fallible.' Then you may be deceived in your judgment of the Roman Pontiffs and the Councils. Again they say that the rights of princes have been usurped. I would ask them—What rights? Have they the right to appoint bishops and regulate the temporal affairs of the Church? But where do we read that our Lord Jesus Christ gave princes these rights? We do not read them in the Bible. We read that three kings came to adore Jesus in the stable. And He might have sought them when He was about establishing His Church; and give them certain rights over it: return for the homage and gifts; but He did not do so. He gave to twelve poor fishermen, as His Apostles, this great authority—this authority to rule consciences and souls. Napoleon the First, in a fit of rage, because he could not conquer the constant and patience of the great Roman Pontiff Pius VII, to make him to do what his con-

science would not permit him—is reported to have said, 'that the priest rules over the souls and throws me the carcasses.' I would say to him, 'If you want to govern souls, the noblest part of man, you must have a divine vocation and be called to the priesthood. Your rage is useless. The divinity has not deserted the earth, nor are the minds and consciences of men placed in the hands of fickle-minded and self-seeking princes; but our Lord has left them to the wisdom of the Church, and it is not a humiliation to be submissive to the Church, as it would be no humiliation to submit to Christ, for Christ has said—'He that hears you hears Me, and he that despises you despises Me.' To submit, therefore, to the Church appointed by Jesus Christ, is to submit to Jesus Christ Himself. Now, does any one give up his manhood when he submits to the tribunal constituted by Jesus Christ? No, he subdues his pride—and prides excludes from the kingdom of God. A struggle has been from the commencement between the world and its princes and the Kingdom of God and its ministers. It commenced with Christ. He wished to subdue the world to the humble teachings of the Gospel, and He did not exempt the rulers of the world from this, His sweet yoke and His sweet law. And Christ conquered the world, and declared it, 'I have conquered the world.' He sent His Apostles to continue this conquest, and they set about it without the sword, indeed, but with the sole power of the Word and the Divine Sacraments. They flung themselves into the combat with the world, and after three hundred years of torture, and bloodshed, and catacombs, and confagurations, burning, breaking on the rack, exposure to wild beasts, working in mines, being dragged by wild horses, the young, the old, the fair delicate virgins, tender boys, yet twenty millions of martyrs, patiently suffered death, rather than renounce Jesus Christ. The deserts are filled with hermits, the tops of the mountains are inhabited by holy recluses, and after wondrous heroic suffering the world is conquered by the Gospel of Jesus Christ; and the apostate Julian, throwing his clotted blood against heaven, cried out, 'Galilee, thou hast conquered me!' The world is conquered, indeed, and the Church might be considered now as sitting supreme, and giving her laws of peace and humility disinterestedly to the world. Alas! how long will the world be unwilling to submit itself to the sweet yoke of Jesus Christ. The world is Christian, indeed, in a great part; but has it lost its worldly spirit? In some degree it has, but it will soon revive. The world is the world all over. It is not Pagan now, it is true—it is a Christian world; but the triple concupiscence is there still, and Christian princes will claim distinctions, honors, and authorities, in spirituals as well as in temporal, and after doing wrong will require the Church or its ministers to do them homage before the people, as Saul did in the case of Samuel. Constantine the Great, though allowing great privileges to the Bishops of the Church, considering his time, and contributing to the building of churches from his revenues, formerly consumed in the worship of false gods, surrounded by courts and courts imbued with the errors of Arius, yielded to false impressions, and persecuted the great St. Athanasius. His son, Constantine, openly persecuted the Church and its bishops, and strove by bribes to bring the Pope Liberius over to his views of Arianism. The Byzantine Court continued its persecution of the Church and favored heresies, and allowed a Heresiarch to harass the Popes. Thus the persecution which the Church suffered from the Pagan world was continued by the Christian. The world is the world, I have said, all over. Count Montalembert beautifully says the Roman Empire became converted to Christianity; but does it become humble and meek attached to heavenly things and obedient to the laws of the Gospel?

The Church emerging from the battle with Paganism with her twenty millions of glorious martyrs, who generously laid down their lives for her honor, and died in her arms full of faith, hope, patience, and virtue, giving battle to Christian princes, conquered like her Divine Master from the gibbet of ignominy. Montalembert again remarks: 'Constantine and his successors were baptized, it is true, but not the empire or the imperial power. The emperors aspired to become the masters, and oracles of the religion of which they ought to have been the children. They no sooner recognized her right to existence than they claimed the right to govern her. The baptized of the evening expected to be the doctors and the Pontiffs of the following day.' Leo X, Emperor of Constantinople, tainted with the Caesarism of his age, intruded into the principal See of the East unworthy creatures, retained Photius in the See of Constantinople contrary to the will of the Pope, and Michael Cerularius consummated the schism of the East, which has been the ruin of so many souls, and all this in direct opposition to the ruler of the Church of God set over it by Christ Himself. So much for imperial interference in the affairs of the Church. But the Byzantine empire passed away punished for its sins; Mohammedanism sits enthroned on the altar of Christianity in the Church of the Holy Ghost in the city of Constantinople. The German empire, or the empire of the West, rose over the prostrate power of the Byzantine empire. It was Christian, also; but did it respect the dearest rights of the Church, and elect its Popes and its bishops—to set holy men and not court tools in the highest seats of dignity and responsibility in the Church of God? Oh, no; the world is still the world. They claim the sovereign Pontificate as well as the protectorate over the Church. The illustrious and immortal St. Gregory VII, Pope, persisted in resisting this profane usurpation. He was persecuted and driven from Rome by a prince calling himself a Christian—Henry IV, of Germany. This Holy Pope died in exile, if the Pope can be said to be in exile, for his spiritual kingdom is limited only by the boundaries of the world, into which Jesus Christ has sent him to convert and reprove. For Jesus said to Peter and the Apostles 'Go into the whole world and preach the Gospel to every creature.' Henry after a time repented, and wrote to the Pope, accusing himself of having Simoniacally sold the benefices of the Church, usurped the right of conferring them, and grievously abused it by promoting persons most unworthy and unfit for their position. Henry's repentance was merely a pretext, for he continued his Simoniacal practices during the pontificate of Victor III, Urban II, Pascal II, and his son, Henry V, who instigated the wickedness of his father, during the pontificate of Pascal II, Calixtus II, and Calixtus II, when, at length, moved by the grace of God, he abandoned his wickedness, and allowed the Church to elect its own bishops and enjoy its revenues in peace. But did the Church fare better in England after its conversion? For a short time the Church was free, and decrees were passed, forbidding the ambitious to hinder the free working of the Church. We read in the history of the Church written by the venerable St. Bede, that a charter was drawn up by the king of Kent: 'It is worded thus: That no layman should contravene the institute of our forefathers, possessing himself of a Church, or of anything belonging to the Church; and hence, in the name of

Almighty God, the king goes on, 'and of his saints we forbid to all Kings, our successors and aldermen, and all laymen, any lordship whatever over the Church, and over their possessions, which I or my elders of olden days have given as an everlasting inheritance to the glory of Christ, of our Lady Saint Mary, and of the Holy Apostles, and observe:—that, whenever it shall happen that a bishop, or an abbot, or an abness, shall depart this life, it shall be made known to the archbishop, and by his counsel and advice let such an one be chosen as his successor. It is the duty of kings to appoint earls and aldermen, shire reeves and judges, and of the archbishops to instruct and advise the community of God, and of bishops, abbots, and abbesses, and priests and deacons, to choose and appoint and consecrate and establish, by good precept and example, lest any of God's flock should stray and be lost.'—The Church did not long enjoy its rights. The spendid nobility envied the Church her possessions, and the minor kings strove to replenish their coffers by assailing the rights of the Church, taking possession of her property, intruding Court bishops into the sees, and Simoniacally disposing of the Church investitures. William the Conqueror invaded alike England and its Church rights, and forbade free intercourse between the bishops and the Pope, and even usurped the right of declaring who was the Pope. He forbade the bishops to enforce any salutary Church law for the correction of morals without his own royal authority, and hindered the bishops in every way in their efforts to govern their flocks with salutary laws. Every student of history knows how William II, called Rufus, to supply his profligacy and extravagancies, kept bishoprics vacant, in order to enjoy their revenues. St. Anselm, a noble archbishop of Canterbury, refused submission to these unjust laws. He claimed the rights and property of his Church; but he was cited before the Council on a charge of treason, and he retired from the country in disgust to Rome, and died there. The usurpation of Church rights and property continued the same, with some honorable exceptions, till Henry II's time; when Thomas a Becket, every body knows, suffered martyrdom in defence of the rights of the Church invaded by that monarch. After his death, the immunities of the Church were not secured from kingly interference. They would not let go the grasp which they held on the Church or Church property. They wielded the sceptre and the crozier, till at length the climax of scandal was reached and perfected in the person of Henry VIII, of infamous memory—the mitre and the crown were bled together on the head of a monster of iniquity, whose hands, stained in the blood of women, carried off the sacred vessels of the sanctuary to revel in luxury. And what is the present state of the established religion in England, that acknowledges Caesarism—the spiritual and temporal authority centred in one head. Everybody knows that the Ministry govern the temporal and spiritual affairs of England. The Queen gives her sanction and consent to the laws. And this Ministry, whose faith in the Bible is doubtful from their acts, and a few belonging to the aristocracy, have the appointing of the bishops and ministers of that church; and those gentlemen, with their wives and families, are contented to enjoy the revenues and the livings, though to the honor of a vast number we must say they are groaning under the servitude. They must receive the decision of the Court of Arches, and subscribe to formularies which they publicly abhor—their consciences abhor. The common logic of Englishmen dissent from this state of things, and are forming independent congregations or churches, for they cannot see, in reading their sacred book, the Bible, that Jesus Christ, appointed kings to govern the churches; but thank God a brighter day is rising for the Church in England as the multitude of conversions attest. But this grasping for Church power and property was not confined to Germany, or England, or to the minor States. The French monarchs were men of the world, too—they, also, claimed to govern the Church; and appropriate the money of the poor to their own purposes. In former times they managed to give Bishops to the younger sons of the nobility; monasteries to the sons and daughters of their court favorites. Under the Pontificate of Boniface VIII, the Christian world of old saw the scandal of the French Clergy yielding their liberties and rights to Philip le Bel. The chains of servitude were tightened by the declaration of the liberties of the Gaelic Church under Louis XIV, which may be called more appropriately the third, than the second, of the French Clergy yielding their liberties and rights to Philip le Bel. The French clergy paid too dearly for its too servile adherence to the crown and its tyranny, and expiated the sin in the best blood of its clergy in the revolution of 1794, when the altar and the throne were levelled to the dust. But even this revolution did not teach successive monarchs a better lesson. Napoleon, no sooner seated on the throne of France, but he endeavored to submit the Church to his will, and his failure is too well known. Charles X, whilst tottering on his throne attempted the same and also failed; prevented papal letters to be received in France. Napoleon III, a man for this world if ever there was one, and who glories in having a providence specially his own, is using his power, even now, to oppress the Church, and hinder the voice of its Supreme Pastor and glorious Pontiff from being heard through the empire; but the Episcopacy and Clergy of France are not going to submit to this tyranny. The minor Kingdoms of Europe followed naturally the example of their more powerful brethren and even poor Ireland itself was not free from this fit of Caesarism.

It is true, many kings did not usurp the benefices of the Church, but private families did, and we all know that the Archbishopric of Armagh for many years was invaded and held by a kind of lay bishops. At the present moment in Italy, Victor Emmanuel is revealing as far as he can go in Churches, and Church property, and Church institutions. Reasons of State, he says, require that he should take possession of the Convents, and the nuns are sent on the world with five or six cents per day to live upon, those holy women who gave up their fortunes and entered into those monasteries. We all know how Russia is also treating her convents and monasteries. To bring home the matter to ourselves, and suppose this Caesarism prevailed in Canada, who would like to see the nuns of our convents, and the sisters of charity, out of their homes that they built at their own expense and their own little savings from their school. Would not, we all cry out, this is a violation of all right and all property, and if it is wrong here it must be wrong elsewhere; and if the king or a government should say, 'this Cathedral should be ours, it must serve for another religion; would not the poor, by whose efforts, and by whose dollars this Cathedral was built, finished, and preserved, would they not cry out and say: 'This is ours, you have no right to it?'

But in the Old World matters are going (to use a common expression) upside down. Rights are trampled upon, the rights of the poor, the rights of the people, the rights of religion, the rights of bishops and priests; and the kings and emperors want to set themselves up as gods. This Caesarism, that is the giving unto Caesar the things which belong to God, and also giving unto Caesar that which belongs to God, is raising wild and rampant over the world. But the true maxim of the Gospel is, 'give unto Caesar an earthly prince and governor, that which belongs to him'—allegiance, obedience to just laws let us pay taxes, &c.; but when it comes to matters of God and conscience, and of right, we should obey God. Let us follow and walk in the teachings of our Lord Jesus Christ, and then we shall give unto God the things that belong to God, whilst we give also unto the State that which belongs to the State.

His Lordship concluded by saying—We shall continue these lectures every Sunday evening, until we finish the Syllabus.

IRISH INTELLIGENCE.

PASTORAL OF THE ARCHBISHOP OF DUBLIN. His Grace the Most Rev. Dr. Cullen, the Archbishop of Dublin, has addressed a Pastoral to the secular and regular Clergy of the Diocese, from which we take the annexed:—

'With these few lines I send you a copy of an address delivered at an aggregate meeting convened by the late Lord Mayor, to whom we all owe so much for the Catholic spirit of which he gave so noble an example during his period of office. The three important questions which occupied the attention of the late meeting are of deep interest to every Irish Catholic. The first regards education, on which the future welfare of our religion, chiefly depends. You all know how Ireland was situated in reference to this important matter in past times. When the Reformation proclaimed liberty and enlightenment, as if to give a practical proof of its insincerity and hypocrisy, all Catholic schools and Catholic teaching were strictly prohibited in Ireland. This system of persecution was carried on for about two centuries and a half, so that, at the end of the last century, there were scarcely any Catholic schools in Ireland, and knowledge was a sealed fountain. Since then Catholics have done a great deal, by their private exertions, to repair the losses, and Catholic education has made great progress. All this has been effected by private donations, and by the charity of the faithful, not by the State. But what has been done to repair past evils? What is the character of the schools endowed or supported at public expense? In the first place, there is a large number of royal, charter, diocesan, parochial, and other endowed schools, which are altogether under Protestant management. The large incomes of those institutions, derived from landed property and other sources, is all devoted to the support of Protestantism. In the second place, there is Trinity College, with nearly 200,000 acres of land and other endowments, managed by Protestant Clergymen on ultra Protestant principles. Catholics are admitted to some inferior degrees; but if they enter the college, they expose their faith to the greatest danger. Several Irish families owed their perversion to some of the members who graduated in this institution. There are at present Bishops and Archdeacons, and other dignitaries of the Protestant Establishment who commenced their career as Catholics, but who lost their faith in the university. If some Catholics preserve their religion in their college course, it is to be regretted that they generally remain without a grain of Catholic spirit, and that they abandon all the practices of their holy religion. Within the present month a specimen of the teaching to which Catholic parents expose their children by sending them to Trinity College, has been given in a work of the Rev. Mr. Barlow, Fellow and Tutor of that College, in which he denies the eternity of punishment in another life. The Catholic student who adopts the views of his master on that point ceases to belong to the true Church, and falls into the abyss of heresy. What an awful responsibility do fathers and mothers incur by thrusting their children into such dangers. Certainly, such parents are unworthy of the Sacraments of the Church, and ought to be excluded from them. Then come the Queen's Colleges, in which the teaching is more dangerous than in Trinity College. They have been justly called a gigantic scheme of godless education, and condemned by the Pope and Bishops as dangerous to faith and morals.

Next, we have the National Schools, which are founded on the principle of mixed education—a principle fraught with mischief, and which is not tolerated in England. The Government schools in England are all denominational, and English Protestant Bishops and noblemen have publicly condemned the mixed system. In the report of the endowed schools, there is an excellent letter upon this subject by one of our distinguished judges, Baron Hughes, who states his conviction 'that the mixed system is wrong in principle, and cannot, even if right, be carried out in Ireland. What is of more importance for Catholics, the Pope, among other propositions condemned by him, and lately published, censures three which bear on the system of mixed education. You will find these propositions in the number of the 'Irish Ecclesiastical Record' for February. In the same number there are many important documents; and I hope that every Clergyman will procure a copy and read the Pope's Encyclicals and annexed documents, with all the respect and submission which are due to the words of Christ's Vicar on earth. Mixed education could not practically be carried into effect in a great part of Ireland, where there are no Protestants. However, the theory or principles of that dangerous system are generally applied, and hence there is a great deal to be condemned in the National Schools. In the first place, all model and training schools where Catholics are mixed up with Socinians, Unitarians, Swabblers, Presbyterians, and Protestants, and from which all religious influence is banished, are most dangerous. In the second place the ordinary National Schools in which Catholics are instructed in religion by Protestants, and use Protestant religious works, are deserving of the severest condemnation. From a parliamentary return obtained by Mr. O'Reilly, M.P., last summer, it appears that in one province alone several thousand Catholic children are imbibing religious instruction from the lessons of Presbyterians or other similar teachers. This is a frightful abuse. Third, the books of the national system have been all composed by Protestants, and imbued with an anti-Catholic spirit. No Catholic was employed by the Board to prepare any of the books connected with Scripture history or moral training. Such works, though destined principally for Catholic use, were drawn up under the direction of the late Nationalistic Protestant Archbishop of Dublin. Fourth, though knowledge should be followed by religion all religious practices and religious teaching are prohibited in class, even in the thousands of schools in which there is not a single Protestant child. Fifth, the whole tendency of the National system is to give to a Protestant government unlimited control over Catholic education, and to place the training of our masters and the management of our schools in the hands of men, or bodies of men, the majority of whom are Socinians, Presbyterians, Protestants and Freemasons. For these reasons, I think it most important that we should all unite in asking for a different system of education. We have a right to a Catholic University, to Catholic middle schools, Catholic elementary schools, and to a perfect equality with Protestants in regard to every branch of education.

Having said so much on the first object proposed to itself by the new Association, I shall merely say, in reference to the protection of the tillers of the soil, that no one can look with indifference on their sufferings, and that it is a great work of charity to make every exertion to prevent their total ruin. Coming to the last subject proposed by the Association, I mean the Protestant Establishment, every Irish Catholic must look on it as a burden, and also a permanent insult to this Catholic country, and also the prolific of baneful dissensions. It was forced on Ireland by fire and sword, by confiscation and penal laws; it was always the enemy of religious freedom; it did everything possible to degrade our people by prohibiting Catholic schools and Catholic education, and to sink them into the depths of ignorance. Unhappily, its anti-Catholic spirit is still active, as we have seen in the case of the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill, in the attempt to place convents under police inspection, and, as we see every day, in the vile system of pecuniary proselytism which is so wickedly carried on. Why should we not make an effort to put an end to the source of so many evils?'

'Persuaded that we have a full right to Catholic education, and that in this agricultural country the tiller of the soil should be protected, and that it is most expedient to disendow the Protestant Establish-

ment, it appears to me that the new Association, which proposes to itself the attainment of those objects, is worthy of the name of Beneficent—the demands which the Association has determined to make being lawful, moderate, and necessary. I trust that they will be listened to by the justice of the British Parliament, and I am confident that they will be supported by the good sense and liberality of the great body of the population of England. As so many respectable laymen have undertaken to conduct the business of the Association, and so many Priests and Bishops have already given in their adhesion to it, it would afford me great pleasure to see as many of you, as can spare time take part in the good work, and aid in carrying it out, by your influence, in obtaining associates and members, and by your counsel and your contributions. In promoting this undertaking, of course none of us can be expected to neglect any of our duties, or to do anything inconsistent with the ecclesiastical state. We must keep in mind and be guided by the maxim of the Gospel; 'Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and His justice, and all these things will be added to you.' Matt. vi. 33. It will be necessary also to be directed by the decrees which all the Bishops of Ireland adopted in the year 1854, for the guidance of Clergymen in reference to temporal matters—decrees which were approved by the Holy See. I enclose a copy of them, which, you will find, were framed with great moderation and wisdom.'

THE CASE OF MISS QUINON.—The extraordinary case of an illegal marriage by a Catholic priest at Enniskillen, which months ago occupied public attention and was the subject of a prosecution, has ended as most people anticipated that it would, namely, in the legal annulment of the union. An application was made yesterday to the Master of the Rolls, the lady (Miss Quinon) having attained her majority, and his lordship directed that a settlement should be drawn up, leaving her the control of the remainder of her fortune, which the legal proceedings have reduced from £800 to 4000. Peterson has, we understand, been employed as an attorney's clerk in Liverpool.—Daily Express.

The O'Donoghue has issued an address to the electors of Tralee. As I anticipated in a former letter, his motive for applying to that borough is the fear of losing his present seat at the general election. He says:—'To you, the archbishop, bishops, clergy, and people of Tipperary, for whom my heart overflows with love and gratitude, I say that I have come to Tralee to obtain that which I know I could obtain in gallant Tipperary, did freedom of election really exist—viz., a secure seat.' He therefore appeals, above all, to the Catholic clergy, of whom he declares himself to be a devoted son. As to his political principles, he holds that a native Parliament is the sole remedy for all Irish grievances, and with out security of tenure it is idle to talk of a mere compensation Bill being of any essential service to the tenants. A part of the address is directed against the claims of Mr. McKenna, whose address is described as 'a string of sentences obviously concocted, not for the purpose of announcing his political views, but for the purpose of catching votes and mystifying the public.'—Times Cor.

THE SMITH O'BRIEN MOVEMENT COLLECTION.—We have ascertained that the statement made at the last meeting of the Smith O'Brien Committee, that only 7s 6d was contributed to the fund by the Protestants of the city, and nothing by the Quakers, was not the exact truth. But one gentleman of the Society of Friends was asked to contribute, and though he refused, he did so in the most courteous and gentlemanly way; while of the ten Protestants solicited for subscriptions, five gave sums amounting altogether to 13s, and others promised to subscribe, but were not afterwards called upon, as the committee had resolved to close the collection on that particular night. Taking into account the contributions sent to the central committee in Dublin, before the collection was organized here, over £80 was collected in Waterford for the Smith O'Brien Monument.—Waterford Citizen.

The Dublin Express says:—'A correspondent informs us that great excitement prevails amongst the populace of Carlow, in consequence of the recent arrest of some young men who were charged with being members of the Fenian Society. They were taken into custody in consequence of papers having been found on the person of one of the fraternity, who was intoxicated, and brought before the magistrates, who held an examination in private, and remanded them for further inquiry.'

INQUEST.—The dead body of a man, name unknown was cast ashore on the beach near Whitehaven on Monday morning last. It was a mere trunk, wanting the head, both arms and only one leg, was partly covered by a blue Guernsey shirt, under which was an old brown cloth waistcoat, a leather strap buckled tightly round the waist, and a pair of dark tweed trousers with a small white check (like plaid) through them. An inquest was held on the remains by Dr. Callan, when from the evidence brought forward it was believed that deceased belonged to an Arklow fishing smack, which went down in a gale of southerly wind off Cooey Point, in October last, and the mast of which appeared over the water for some time after. There were three men on board of her (whose friends came there to make inquiries after them) not one of whom has ever since been heard of, and it seems a remarkable thing that as the boat was lost within less than half a mile of the shore, not one of the bodies (except this) has been recovered. Verdict, found drowned.

Presbyterian Ulster is it is modestly alleged, the social Paradise of Ireland. Calvinists are the most loyal, the best educated, the least pauper, the least criminal, the most prosperous, the most virtuous people in the island. If the teaching of their Ministers have produced such happy results, material no less than moral, surely they must have failed to inculcate one Divine precept, at least—"they who preach the Gospel should live by the Gospel"—else, why call on those who repudiate their preaching to pay for it. These social Pharisees stand up in the secular temple and pray Plato that they are not as other men—not even as that poor, trembling uneducated Papist that crouches afar off, yet, from whose poverty, they would glean, in order to promote further abuse of him and his faith. May we ask the Deputation when has Cork, Limerick, Waterford, Galway, or Dublin been under the operation of the Orange and Outrage Act?—when have their streets been occupied for weeks, as camps, to prevent brutal murder of Protestant minorities, such as we have witnessed in 1857 and again last year, in Belfast? Are there stated days in the year in the three Catholic provinces on which the lines of religious minorities are so perilled as scarcely to be safe as subjects for an insurance company? Yet, these gentlemen audaciously assert that their teaching has permanently shut the temple of Jahus in Ulster.—Dublin Irishman.

THE LATE EVICTIONS AT RATECOR.—Trim, Jan. 28.—The display of police force at Ratecor during the late evictions—altogether about one hundred and fifty of the constabulary from every part of the county (thirty miles' distance, in some cases)—was quite unnecessary, as the unfortunate victims neither offered the slightest resistance nor indulged in a murmur at the treatment to which they have been subjected in the name of the law. The cottiers were allowed to retain their houses for a few days, while the doors of the farmhouses were looked behind their owners, and a fortnight allowed them to clear off the lands. Most of the lands had been ploughed, and in some cases crops of wheat had been sown, which, of course, they must leave for other hands to reap. Mr. Fowler, jun., with the generous feeling of his family, let 25 for the poor. A series of auctions are about to take place, on the farms of the ejected parties, whose destination, in most cases, will probably be America or Queensland.