

—a creation of his own fancy, like the Chinese that make monsters that their soldiers carry before them in battle against other Chinese, at the sight of which their enemies turn and run away.

So, Protestantism, for three hundred years, has been making a most horrible bugbear of the Catholic Church, giving it horns, hoofs, and tail, a flaming tongue of fire, and great goggle eyes, and says to the men of the nineteenth century, who boast of their intelligence: "Don't look at it! Don't speak to it! Run away! It will bewitch you. Hate it, detest it! Don't trust the Catholic Church! If you do, she will put an end to your liberties, your happiness, your all!"—And the big boobies of the nineteenth century get frightened and run away.

Now, the subject on which I propose to address you this evening is the glorious theme that the Catholic Church is not the danger, but, under God, the future salvation of this grand and magnificent Republic of America. I confess to you, my friends, that, as firmly as I believe in the Catholic religion, convinced as I am that that religion is the only true religion; convinced as I am that that Church, under God, is the only means of salvation, out of which there is no salvation, save and except under the mean pretext of invincible ignorance—which means that if men knew a little more they would be damned—they are just ignorant enough to be saved; a little knowledge would be the ruin of them;—believing all this, I would not have the heart nor the courage to speak to the people of America and preach Catholicity to them, if in the secret recesses of my heart and mind I had the faintest idea that the Catholic religion would be dangerous to the State. In this age of ours, men are not even willing to accept the Kingdom of Heaven at the cost of any great sacrifice. If God would offer them Heaven on condition of giving up certain advantages, they would be unwilling to accept it at such a price. But no single earthly advantage is sacrificed, but everything is gained, when a nation rises up, as Ireland rose up under the hand of St. Patrick, and like one man opens its eyes and heart to Catholicity.

First, let us reason a little on this great theme.—I suppose all men, Protestants and Catholics alike, acknowledge that when Christ, our Lord, founded our religion on this earth, He founded that religion for the express purpose of saving the world—that that religion was to be the salvation of mankind. Now, from what did Christ purpose to save the world? What was the evil that he came to remedy? Answer—the first evil our Lord came to remedy was ignorance—ignorance the most deplorable, the most profound. Could anything be more terrible than the state of ignorance in which Christ found the world? Men of intelligence, splendid minds, varied and profound genius, bowed down and worshipped their own vices and their own wickedness, and called those vices God. The whole world worshipped impurity under the name of Venus; they worshipped dishonesty under the name of Mercury, who was the God of Thieves; revenge under the name of Mars; every vice and passion, even to the passion of avarice, that eats the heart out of the miser, which they adored under the name of Pluto, who was the protector of riches and of those that sought them. It was had enough to be ignorant of the truth; but they went farther; they not only lost sight of Heaven, but not content with the darkness of earth, they went grovelling down into hell, to find their God there.

The second evil that Christ found in the world, wide-spread, was the evil of impurity, sapping and destroying the vital energies, physical and mental, and the power and strength of men. He found as soon as manhood began to dawn upon them, as soon as they began to feel the throbs of virile blood in their veins—He found them yielding to every prompting of the baser instincts, going out ravelling to gratify the strong, unreasoning, earthly passions that poisoned the spring of life and destroyed all hope of future manhood. He found impurity all over the world, so that the virtue of chastity was not only not to be found amongst men, but it was not even known amongst them—it had no name. His Virgin Mother, the purest of God's creatures, had her virginity laid as a reproach upon her. From this impurity it would follow that there was no such thing as the family circle, with its blessed and holy influences. The Roman wife was a slave, dependent upon the mere caprice of her husband, who, when time had worn the bloom off her cheek, exchanged her for another and a fairer and a younger woman.

In the third place, Christ found the evil of dishonesty. No man's word was to be depended upon; commercial honesty seemed to have perished. The old straightforward manner of the first republican Romans had departed; and in the tottering, effete empire of dishonesty—commercial, social, international—was the order of the day.

These were the diseases under which the world suffered. Men sinned because they knew no better; they were ignorant. They were steeped in impurity—their manhood was gone out of them, so that a few thousand barbarians easily broke up and smashed to pieces the mighty Roman empire, and overcame those once invincible legions that had given law to the whole world. And dishonesty had crept into every rank of life; society was rapidly breaking up into chaotic elements.

What did Christ say and do? He told men that he had come down from Heaven expressly to teach them, in order that all men might know the truth. He emphatically declared that from His lips, and from the lips of those he appointed to teach them, the world should gain—not a spirit of inquiry, my friends, not a spirit of Protestantism looking for the truth. Not but He said: "You shall know the truth; you shall have knowledge of it, fixed, clear, and definite, and in that knowledge you shall find your freedom! You shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free!" And then the Son of God laid His hand upon a little child and said:—"Blessed are the clean of heart, for they shall see God!" And to all men He said: "Unless you become even as this little child, you shall not enter the Kingdom." As if He would say: "Behold this child! no impure thought has ever soiled its innocence; no unlawful crime or sinful passion has ever entered its breast. Unless you become as this little child, ye shall not enter the Kingdom of Heaven!" And then He declared the sacred principle of conscience—that every man should act to his fellow-men as he would wish them to act to him; that every man who perpetrated an outrage or injury should not enter Heaven until he repaid the last farthing! He established the principle of social, commercial, and international honor—truth, chastity, and honesty! Behold the three elements of the religion of Christ—the three grand sanitary powers that He put into His Church when He declared it to be the salt of the earth. It is by truth, chastity, and honor that the Church has saved, is saving, and is destined unto the end to save the world. Without truth, chastity, and honor there is no salvation for the people.

Reflect, first, upon truth. Why is truth the salvation of the people? For many reasons. I will give you only one. I don't know that it is the highest reason, but it is the one that bears most directly upon myself. The salvation of a people lies in unity. To be a unit is the first necessity of a people. Christ, our Lord, Himself declares that a house divided against itself must fall. And the first element of national existence, and national progress is that the people should be united; and that the enemy of public freedom and the liberty of the people in all ages has always begun his infernal work by trying to create divisions and dissensions amongst them. I might point as an illustration, to Ireland, the Niobe of nations, the martyred mother who bore me. For 700 years we have groaned beneath the tyrant's hands, pitiless and unrelenting,

unrelaxing in his grasp. Why? Because he governed a divided people. It was but the other day that an eloquent Englishman in New York said, in our very teeth, that Ireland was a slave because she was divided; and on the day that she was united, no power under heaven could bind her into slavery for a single hour.

Union being the first element of national existence and progress, I ask what is the first element of this union? What is the strongest bond that can bind a people together and keep them together? I answer at once—the principle of religious unity; it is the most sacred of all bonds, because it is the most binding, the most unchanging; it is a bond fixed by Almighty God Himself. Nations are sometimes made one by the accidental circumstances of conquest. But that union that is effected by the sword must be preserved by the sword, or it ceases to exist. Take the Union of Ireland and England. It was effected by the sword—a sword that was never allowed to rust as long as there was Irish blood at hand to keep it clean and bright by the tears and blood of the people. But that sword has begun to rust to-day. It is no longer the powerful falchion it was once in the hand of a fearless nation. It rusts in its scabbard; the nation that owns it is afraid to draw it; and the people of Ireland are waiting, waiting thinking that the rust will come over the brightness of the blade; and the moment it does, that moment the union which was effected by the sword, will be broken by the sword. Why? Because such a bond is not of Heaven, but of earth.

Again: the accidental circumstances of mutual consent may bind nations together. For instance, the various States of this American Union; they have agreed and united upon the basis of the mutual independence and State Rights. So they have been united, and so they are united; and may God in Heaven bless that union, and inspire every American citizen, great and small, no matter who he be, with respect for the sacred principles which the nation adopted, for it is only by respecting those, on the solid foundation of the law, that a people can be kept together.

Nations, again, may be bound together by mutual commercial interests. England and France made a commercial treaty a few years ago. But France found the treaty worked disadvantageously to her, and dissolved the treaty, and the *entente cordiale* of which we hear so much was broken.

There is only one bond that can bind a people and keep them together in a union that can never be destroyed, and that is, the union of the heart, soul, mind and sympathy that springs from one undivided and common faith. Every other bond may be shattered, and yet a people remain essentially one. Every other preserving element of a race may be destroyed, and yet a people will retain their national individuality, alive and vigorous, in spite of everything on earth, because their union comes from God. Behold a case in point. For 700 years, the people of my native land have been subjected to a series of the most terrible persecutions and trials that ever any nation in the world suffered. Her enemies wished to break in pieces the individuality of Ireland, so that the *disjecta membra*, the broken fragments might be cast into every nation on the earth, and amalgamated with them, but that the Irish as a people might be wiped out from the face of the earth. For 700 years, in spite of the fact that the Irish were divided on every other point, in councils, in politics, in sympathies—even in race and blood—Ireland preserved her nationality, and to-day represents a compact, strong, individualized nationality, full of life, youth, vigour, intellect, and energy. Why? Because God blessed us in the midst of our misfortunes with the blessing from Heaven of Religious Unity. Now, I ask you, as reasoning men as you are, did Christ say anything about the idea of unity? The night before the Son of God suffered on the cross, He had his Apostles around him; at the last supper He lifted up His eyes and hands to heaven, and made His prayer for His Apostles and His Church and for every man. What do you think he prayed for? He said: "O, Father, I pray for these that they may be one. Keep them in unity, as you, Father, and I are one." He repeated this over and over again, and every Apostle of them took up the same message. Thus says St. Paul: "Brethren, let there be no division among you, no schism, no heresy. I pray you in the Christ and the Holy Spirit, that ye be of one mind." These are the words of St. Paul. Therefore, that unity springing out of religion, a common faith, enters distinctly into the ideas as it entered into the prayer of Christ.

The next question is, where does that religious unity exist? Let us for a single instant suppose that the Catholic Church no longer exists in America. Have you then left a single principle of religious unity? Not one; not one. The Unitarian denies the inspiration of the Bible. You say there is one common idea in the Protestant sect—that is the divinity of Christ. Not at all. I can take you to Protestant churches in New York and Brooklyn, and before you are there five minutes you will hear the preacher deny the divinity of Christ. Not a single principle of religious unity outside the Catholic Church—but in its place you have Shakers and Quakers, and Baptists and Anabaptists, and Methodists and Mormons. In the midst of them all; in the midst of the jarring discord, the sounds of their bickering and quarrelling; in the midst of their mutual hurling of denunciation at each other, one having as much authority to do it as the other, rises the awful figure of the Catholic Church, gigantic in her proportions, rising over the whole world, many-tongued in her voice, for her word is heard in every tongue which man expresses his sorrows and his joys; crowned with 2,000 years of undisputed glory; standing upon a pedestal sunk deep upon the rock of ages, and built up with the blood of her martyrs; there she stands, speaking the self-same words that she spoke 2000 years ago, preaching the same truth, proclaiming the same authority; "I come from God. My message is from God. I stood by the Saviour at His cross. I stood by His empty tomb on Easter morning. I stood with the fiery flames over my head on the day of Pentecost. I speak the words I have always spoken, and defy the whole world to contradict me in one word of my speech." She alone can create unity, because she alone will permit no man to contradict her. As she has her message from God, and as that message must be true as God, who sent it, the man who contradicts her must be a liar, he must be an enemy of the truth, and the moment he raises his voice against the Church, though he were the first of her bishops, or the most powerful king in the world, the Church shuts his mouth with her hands and says: "Kneel down and repent—or else let the curse of excommunication be upon you. Begone to wither and die, and fall into hell!"

What is the great difficulty with the nations to-day? For fifteen hundred years the nations were united in their faith. No nation was Christian that was not also Catholic. But Luther came and the nations were divided. One of the most celebrated and greatest statesmen that ever lived was William Pitt, Earl of Chatham, who governed as Prime Minister, England and Ireland, in 1800, the year that Lord Castlereagh, that amiable man who afterwards cut his throat, made his union between England and Ireland. Pitt was decidedly one of the greatest minds in England, yet he was obliged to resign the Premier'ship because he declared he could no longer govern England and Ireland, because the people were divided in their religion. He solemnly promised the Catholics that he would grant them emancipation in 1800—twenty-nine years before it was forced—he pledged his almost royal word that it should be done. But as soon as it was known in England, and as soon as Protestant Ireland knew it, they stirred such a clamour that

the very greatest man in the three kingdoms resigned his position, and declared that it was impossible to govern a people divided in religion. Two hundred years ago, in 1649, Charles the First promised to relax the penal laws against the Catholics. He saw their injustice. The moment that it was known in England, such was the turmoil and threats that the king was obliged to break his royal word and put his broken promise in his pocket, and let the misery go on.

The present Prime Minister of England is a very fair-minded man, if they would only let him. He sees the injustice with which Catholics are treated. He sees that whilst every petty Protestant school in Ireland has its endowment and its charter, when the whole Irish nation founded a university in Ireland, they refused to give them a charter. They didn't ask for a halfpenny, only a charter. Gladstone would be glad to do it; but he is afraid. One of the grandest ideas of this age of ours was the unification of Germany. Bismarck, a man of wonderful genius, conceived that idea and carried it out practically—a magnificent achievement; but he is so short-sighted as to be now at work exasperating sixteen millions of the German people who are Catholics by persecuting their religion, shutting up their schools, driving out their nuns and Jesuits, and shutting their hospitals. He is doing a foolish thing; but he can't help it, because the nation decided he must do it. I must say, as a student of history, that while they lay to our doors the charge of persecution, nowhere do we read in the annals of the world, of persecution carried on with so much gusto and enjoyment as the persecutions of Protestants when they have the upper hand. You see it to-day in Germany. The Protestants there have but a small majority, but they exercise their power pitilessly. How easy it would be for Bismarck to avoid all this, if Germany were again all Catholic, as she was under Charles V. How easy it would be for Gladstone to govern England and Ireland, if they were a unit in religious faith; for when this great screw in the political union is loose, the whole machine is rickety, and is liable to come to pieces at once. The Catholic Church alone can create it. And yet men say that the Catholic Church is dangerous to America when disunion, mutual distrust and mutual disaffection, becomes one of the elements of the greatness of a nation, and not until then.

The next element of greatness, power and strength in a nation, is the virtue of purity. Every evil, every sin, in the long run, tends to the destruction of man, no matter how pleasant it may be at the moment; and every act committed by a nation, as well as an individual in the long run, although a hundred years may elapse, the punishment may be traced back to the crime that caused it. The vice of impurity has this peculiarity, that it is destructive not only of the individual but of the race; and it is noticeable, that though in punishing other crimes, God visited individuals, in punishing this, He has afflicted whole nations. The Flood and the destruction of Sodom and Gomorrah were quoted by the lecturer as examples of this principle.

Father Burke here drew a beautiful picture of the Church, the spouse of Christ, calling her ministers to serve at her altars, but demanding of them as an essential qualification a virgin body, allowing no hand to assist in her holy rites, no voice to be raised in consecrated service but those of men and women who could bring to their work purity. He also showed how the Church demanded from all her members equal purity; from the maiden and young man virginity, and from the married fidelity to the marriage vow. To enforce this purity, the necessity and use of the confessional becomes apparent, for the knowledge that confession must be made teaches every man to watch his own actions, words—any, his very thoughts. He contrasted the purity demanded by the Catholic Church with the impurity licensed, and even made a duty, by Mormonism, the last form in which Protestantism shows itself to the world. This is the last issue of Protestantism, just as the last issue of Protestant philosophy is Darwinism, that we are descended from apes. These are the metaphysics and ethics of the nineteenth century among Protestants.

And, finally, honesty is an element in the greatness of a people. It is getting scarcer every day. Sometime ago I was in a railway carriage, and a gentleman quoted the poet, "An honest man's the noblest work of God;" when another man cried from the other end of the carriage, "I am sorry to say that God Almighty doesn't seem to spend much of His time producing works of that kind now-a-days." I don't speak from experience; I know nothing about society; I don't belong to it; I belong to the cloister. I find those amongst whom I live are honest. It is easy to be honest among us, for we haven't anything, so nobody can take anything from us. But I read the papers, and hear great complaints of commercial dishonesty.

Father Burke here dwelt at some length on the prevailing forms of dishonesty, adulteration, cheating, international dishonesty, social dishonesty, alluding to the occupation of Rome by Victor Emmanuel as a piece of robbery paralleled by that of a burglar, who would make out his title to your effects by virtue of his six-shooter, and showing that the Catholic Church inculcated honesty of all kinds.

If then, O people of America, if union founded upon the grand principle of religious unity, if the preservation of strength, manhood, genius, and intellect, if honesty, public and private; if these three things are necessary for you in America, you must come to the Catholic Church to get them, because you cannot get them elsewhere. If, on the other hand, these things are dangerous, then the Catholic Church is a danger to America. If America looks upon these things as dangerous—any nation that looks upon these things as dangerous is already self-condemned. But America does not look upon these things as dangerous. No. The intelligence that has been thus born and cradled in freedom never yet turned away from the glorious light of the Catholic Church, but sooner or later turned to it. The nation that has opened her imperial bosom, irrespective of previous antecedents, to all who have been driven from other nations by religious or political tyranny, that nation sooner or later will become Catholic; and in the day when mighty America becomes Catholic, in the day when the genius of Catholicity, the foster mother of human liberty, the guardian of human purity, the proud shield of the dignity of womanhood, the splendid and unchanging voice proclaiming herself the strong preserver of public and private honesty—in the day when the genius of this Catholicity enters into the mind and heart of America, when this mighty people will be united as one man by the sacred union of religious unity, based upon freedom, based upon integrity and upon justice—tell me is there any man living—tell me is there any philosopher upon earth, poet or orator, whose vivid imagination can approach to the magnificent realities, the intellectual, moral and physical grandeur that America will present to the world in that glorious day that is before her.

IRISH UNIVERSITY EDUCATION. (From a Correspondent of the London Times.)

The time is at hand when the Administration will have to redeem the important pledges as to University education in Ireland which it has freely given on several occasions. Two of three parts of Mr. Gladstone's programme at the General Election of 1868 having been accomplished with the assent of Parliament, the third must soon attract attention; and, as in the instances of the Church and the Land, the Legislature will, it is to be hoped, remove whatever abuses and wrongs exist in the higher instruction of the sister country. The question, however,

it is vain to deny, is beset by difficulties even greater than the cognate problems, of 1869 and 1870; and though these obstacles may be surmounted, they will test severely the skill of the Cabinet and the moderation and prudence of the House of Commons.—Not to speak of "Conservative reaction," and alleged "divisions in the Liberal camp," University education in Ireland is in itself a very different subject from those which were its immediate forerunners, and it will be discussed under different conditions less favorable to the hopes of those who wish to see the success of justice. The State Church of Ireland being a bad institution, condemned for years by most thinking persons, fell at the first real attack of public opinion, but though they must be thoroughly reformed if right is to be sincerely done, the centres of Irish academic teaching deserve in a large measure respect, and will find numbers of attached defenders. If the Irish Land question shocked our notions about property in land and free contract, these prepossessions quickly disappeared when the facts of the land system of Ireland had been fully explained and perceived; but, in the case of the higher Irish education there has been no such training of the popular mind, and, though real and serious grievances exist, they are not equally, or at all, appreciated. So, too, the policy of the Ministry was not impeded in 1869 and 1870 as it has been, and will be again in 1873, on the present question by specious, but illusory schemes of reform; and it must be added that the whole subject of Irish University and Collegiate Government is calculated in a special manner to arouse the jealousies and suspicions of a Legislature National and, in the main, Protestant, and that many causes of late have concurred to give peculiar force to these sentiments.—For these reasons, the task before Mr. Gladstone is one of no ordinary risk; and if, as we have a right to expect, he endeavors boldly and once for all to redress the inequalities and mischiefs of the University system of Ireland, to place it upon a sound footing, and to do in this matter complete justice, we do not doubt that he will be assailed by a combination which may prove an embarrassment and a danger. Yet we feel assured that the House of Commons, which has already left a broad mark on history by its beneficent legislation for Ireland, will here, too, support the cause of right if the truth on this subject be fairly told; and with this object we purpose briefly to review the controversy in its chief bearings, and to examine the real points at issue. And if we show, as we think we can, that the University system of Ireland in its present state is unjust and anomalous, and affords solid grounds of reasonable complaint to a considerable section of the Irish community, we know that Englishmen will not permit themselves to be led away in forming conclusions upon the subject by artful appeals to irrelevant topics, will not approve exclusive preferences to effect a settlement of a great question which really will do worse than nothing, will not allow even respectable prejudice to stand in the way of plain equity when legislating for the Irish people.

The first point in the question before us is whether the Irish Roman Catholics—the immense majority, be it observed, of the nation—have in this matter a substantial grievance. Is this section of our fellow-countrymen excluded largely from the higher education? Does it practically shun, to a great extent, the seats of academic learning in Ireland? Our information on this subject cannot be as complete as we wish, yet it leads decisively to but one conclusion. The 4,141,933 Roman Catholics of Ireland furnish, taking the average of the last few years, a quota of 300 University students, against 1,800, or six times as many, furnished by the 1,214,533 Protestants, and this huge disproportion, even making every allowance for differences in rank and wealth between the members of the two communions, affords a presumption that, for some reason, the Roman Catholic contingent is unduly deficient. A similar result is attained by going more closely to the root of the matter. Taking the classification of the Census of 1861—that of 1871 has not yet been published—there are 3,576 Roman Catholic proprietors of land in Ireland, and 563,824 Roman Catholics engaged in commerce, trade, manufactures, mechanics, and in the learned and liberal professions, the Protestants in the same categories being 4,836 and 264,291; and it might be expected that these figures would indicate, in some measure at least, the proportions of Roman Catholics and Protestants who availed themselves of the higher education, especially as a very large portion of University students in Ireland is composed of youths of the lower middle orders. No such correspondence, however, exists; instead of being, as might be supposed, in a majority, or even in equal numbers, the Roman Catholic University men are, as we have seen, compared to the Protestants, in a ratio of one to six only; and it seems to us impossible to conceive that they would amount only to 300 students out of an upper and middle class of 867,390 persons unless some steady and potent cause repelled them from academic teaching. A comparison, between the systems of secondary and University education in Ireland indisputably points to a like inference. Taking once more the Census of 1861, 6,243 Roman Catholic boys are taught in the superior schools of Ireland, the Protestant boys of all persuasions being only 6,993, though nearly all the endowed schools of the country are Protestant foundations in the strictest sense; and this approximate equality, in such strange contrast with the extraordinary difference to be found in the next rank in the scale of instruction, is strong evidence that Roman Catholics distrust Irish University training. Additional proofs could be made forthcoming; for example, it is ludicrous to imagine that, if it were not repugnant to them, the Queen's College of Belfast would have but 17 Roman Catholic students out of a body of 351; but enough probably has been said to satisfy any impartial person. Those indeed, who attempt to dispute the position are forced either to obscure the truth or rest their arguments on unsound assumptions. For instance, it is possible to show, by a dexterous manipulation of figures, that in the University-going classes of Ireland the Roman Catholics ought to be but one-fourth of the Protestants, and easy to infer that there is no need of any decided change in the present state of things; but it has been proved that this calculation omits large University-going classes in which Roman Catholics immensely preponderate, not to allude further to the obvious fact that these premises do not bear out the conclusion, since, under the existing order of affairs, Irish Roman Catholic University students are but as one to six, and not one to four, compared with their Protestant fellows. Again, it has been plausibly urged that the deficiency of Roman Catholic University students is attributable to the great number of youths preparing for the Irish priesthood, for it has been contended that this last-named class should be reckoned as academically trained, and that, if so, the alleged disproportion will nearly, if not altogether, vanish. This argument is entitled to weight, but it is unsatisfactory if dispassionately reviewed. In the first place, it assumes that young men being educated for the Irish priesthood should never seek University teaching even if it were in accordance with their sympathies; and, in the second place, what is more important, it assumes that this class represents exactly the great body of Roman Catholic Irishmen likely to take advantage of University life if it fell in with their tastes and wishes. This assumption, however, is without warrant; and, considering that a very large proportion of the students of Maynooth and kindred institutions is composed of youths who hardly belong to University-going classes at all, it leads only to false conclusions.

We agree, therefore, with Mr. Gladstone that "a large and evident gap" exists in the higher Roman Catholic education of Ireland; that the University

system of the sister island keeps out a not inconsiderable number of Roman Catholics from its sphere, and if we would calmly examine the facts, we see that the cause of this exclusion is to be found in the nature of the institutions for University teaching across the Channel. The only Universities in Ireland—that is, the only bodies legally capable of conferring degrees in that country—are Trinity College and the Queen's University, and the character and tendencies of these organizations are such as to make them to say the least, not acceptable to Roman Catholics; and to alienate persons of that communion from them, in the present state of Roman Catholic opinion. Let us first state of elder foundation, the venerable and justly honoured Corporation, whose squares, quadrangles, and gardens form such a noble portion of the architecture of Dublin. Trinity College is, and has always been, the chief nursery of the late State Church in Ireland; and it remains simply an untaken bastion of the conquered citadel of Protestant ascendancy. The Governing Body must be in the main composed of Protestant Episcopal Divines; every dignitary on the foundation must be without exception of the favoured creed; until 1793 it was accessible to Protestant students alone; and though, owing to the influence of Mr. Pitt and not at all to a movement from within, this last restriction was then removed, and the College has since laudably made Nonconformists to the Anglican Communion eligible for a variety of prizes, it is still, to quote the emphatic words of a recent manifesto of its authorities, "based on the principles of the Protestant religion," and distinguished "by its Protestant constitution." Moreover, whatever may be the spirit of modern liberality in the place, and opinions widely differ on the point, its whole history and associations are purely and exclusively Protestant; and its literature and philosophy are to this day in a great degree of a Protestant complexion. In these circumstances we feel surprised that excellent as is its teaching, and enjoying as it practically does a monopoly of the highest education in Ireland, the number of Roman Catholic students in Trinity College is exceedingly small, that it has averaged only from 50 to 80 out of a population of more than 4,000,000 of souls, and that it amounts from five to seven per cent. only of the members of the entire society? Considering the nature of the institution what else was to be expected from it but that it should possess attractions for Protestants alone, and should be viewed by the Roman Catholics with little sympathy? It is easy to denounce Ultramontane bigotry, but could we conceive the classification of creeds in Ireland suddenly transformed, and a similar change to be made in the College, would the feelings of the majority in that case be very different from what they are in the present; if the great mass of the people of Ireland were Protestants in no doubtful sense, and the principal University in the land were a very Roman Catholic type, would it be a favourite place of Protestant resort, or would it not rather be shunned by that Communion, more especially if the whole history of the country had been a calamitous succession of Protestant and Roman Catholic hatreds and discords? We shall not reason with these who imagine that such questions admit of uncertain answers.

Let us now turn to the second foundation, the Queen's University, with its Colleges in the provinces of Ulster, Munster, and Connaught. These institutions were chiefly established for the higher education of Irish Roman Catholics, a want being felt in this respect as long ago as 1835, and it being acknowledged that the Protestant constitution of Trinity College was ill-suited to them. The principles on which the Queen's Colleges and University have been organized correspond to those on which it was sought to found the primary national education of Ireland; these principles, however, be it remarked, having been, even in the last-named instance, either tacitly abandoned, or widely relaxed, in consequence of the steady opposition of Irishmen of all religious persuasions. The object of Peel and his successors was to moderate the sectarian rancour of Ireland, and to diffuse elements of future concord, by uniting young men of all creeds in the association of common instruction; and it certainly was an end as laudable as ever was set before the minds of Statesmen. For this purpose it was provided that the education of the Queen's University and Colleges should be of a purely secular type; the course of studies in these institutions was limited to merely secular subjects; the Colleges and University were thrown open to all comers irrespective of creed. The same rule was applied to their dignitaries, examiners, and professors, and no kind of religious teaching was made a necessary part of collegiate discipline. At the same time encouragement was given to the voluntary religious teaching of the students; the clergy of all the Irish Churches were invited to minister to their spiritual wants, subject to the approval only of parents and guardians; and precautions were taken to make their morals conform to a reasonably high standard. By these means Peel and others expected that a system of moderately high education would grow up, which would tend to promote good will and harmony, and would prove an instrument of civilization; and they never doubted that Roman Catholics, whose benefit they had mainly in view, would resort to the Colleges in large numbers. A generation, however, has since passed away; and while, on the one hand, it may be questioned whether religious animosities are not as bitter in Ireland at this time as in 1845, so on the other, the Queen's University and Colleges have failed to gain the confidence of the class for the uses of which they were chiefly set up, although they have been lavishly endowed by the State, and the education they afford is really good. It is worse than useless in our judgment, to shut our eyes to the truth on this subject. The students belonging to these institutions being for the most part of the lower middle class, we might fairly suppose that the Roman Catholics would, at least, equal the Protestants in number; and yet, on an average, the Roman Catholic students have not been more than a third, and in some years a fourth part of the Protestant, and there are no signs that this proportion will change. Nor is the reason difficult to discern, apart even from the denunciation of these institutions by the Roman Catholic hierarchy. The principle of exclusive secular instruction and of purely voluntary religious teaching falls in with the sentiments, in a great measure, of Irish Protestants of the middle orders, and especially of the Irish Presbyterians; and, accordingly, persons of these communions like the system of the Queen's University and Colleges, and send their sons freely to them. But the same principle, which is that of Secularism in education however qualified, is essentially repugnant to Roman Catholic minds, with their sacerdotal and dogmatic tendencies, and hence Roman Catholics do not commonly regard these institutions with good-will, and generally think them unfit for their children. Nor is this mere Ultramontane superstition; it was not a Roman Catholic, but a representative of Oxford who stigmatized the Queen's Colleges as "godless," a very large number of English parents would assuredly disapprove such training for their sons; and it deserves notice that while O'Connell supported the scheme of primary education in Ireland, he distinctly predicted that Sir R. Peel's experiment would fail as regards his own Communion.

It is, therefore, we think, evident that Irish Roman Catholics do not resort to the Universities of Ireland in due numbers, not even to the University designed for them. The Protestantism of Trinity College and the Secularism of the Queen's University and Colleges are felt by them as deterrent influences; and a certain portion of our fellow-subjects is excluded from University life because they cannot, in conscience, approve the University teaching offered to them. In other words, they are placed