

new penal law, to deprive us of our Hierarchy, or to impede or hamper its free action amongst us, is a direct act of persecution and a violation of our liberties as Englishmen.

IX. We declare that, inasmuch as by our religious principles we are bound, and as by our rights as Englishmen we are entitled, to maintain the spiritual and Ecclesiastical supremacy of our Holy Father the Pope over the Catholic Church—inasmuch as, by necessary consequence, we are bound to recognise and obey as our lawful Ecclesiastical superiors the Metropolitan and Bishops under whom, by the valid exercise of a power which belongs to himself alone, we have been placed—inasmuch as a refusal on our parts to recognise them, their jurisdiction, their titles, or their Sees, would, according to our conscientious belief, be a wrongful act, and a breach of the bond of unity which indissolubly binds us to the See of Rome—therefore, any legislative enactment subjecting any Catholic, whether Bishop, Cleric, or layman, to punishment or loss for his free and willing obedience to the authority of his Church, or prohibiting his full and entire compliance with the ordinances of the Supreme Pontiff concerning the restoration of our Hierarchy, will be by us considered as an unjust and oppressive infringement of the rights of conscience.

Lastly, having regard as well to the proposed law as to the many monstrous and tyrannical schemes and measures which, during the recent agitation, have been proposed and suggested for our oppression; considering that small and vexatious interferences with freedom of conscience involve the whole principle of religious persecution, and may be used as precedents and excuses for the most intolerable tyranny; holding also that our religious freedom is the dearest and most valuable of our rights; as the one for whose sake we and our ancestors have borne and suffered most, so as not to shrink from the sacrifice of our civil and political privileges, our property and our lives in its defence; remembering, moreover, that not we only are attacked, but the millions of our Irish Catholic fellow-subjects are engaged with us in defending our common cause:—we do solemnly declare that we are firmly determined, for their sakes as well as for our own, to resist, by every legal and constitutional means within our power, every attempt to deprive either ourselves or them of the least portion of our religious liberty.

THE SCOTTISH CATHOLICS—THE RIGHT REV. BISHOP GILLIS.

The following letter has been written by Bishop Gillis to the Earl of Arundel and Surrey:—
TO THE RIGHT HON. THE EARL OF ARUNDEL AND SURREY.

My dear Lord,—As I find that your lordship will lead the opposition against Lord John Russell's "Ecclesiastical Titles' Assumption Bill," will you allow me, in the name and on behalf of the Vicars-Apostolic in Scotland, to draw your attention to a view of the measure, in as far as it is intended to affect us, which has not yet been brought before the public, and which, if we are to be justly dealt with, is certainly entitled to due consideration, while, framed as the Bill has been, it points, I think, to the only honest ground on which the Bishops of the Episcopal Church in Scotland can be exempted from its provisions.

According to Lord John Russell, in his letter to the Bishop of Durham, the reason why the restoration of the Catholic Hierarchy in England imperatively called for the interference of parliament was, that the said measure was an insult to the country, because in itself an assumption of power inconsistent with the Queen's supremacy.

In the Queen's speech, her Majesty was made to take the same view of the obnoxious measure, and to say, "I have assured them (my subjects) of my resolution to maintain the rights of my crown, and the independence of the nation, against all encroachment, from whatever quarter it may proceed."

In describing the object, and so far the nature of the bill, Lord John Russell said, on the 7th February, "What I propose is, in the first place, to prevent the assumption of any title taken not only from any diocese now existing, but from any territory, or any place, within any part of the United Kingdom. I think, in this respect, we prevent that which I consider an insult to the crown of this country, an interference with the rights of the Established Church of this country, and an attack upon the independence of the nation."

Following up Lord John Russell on the same evening, Mr. Roebuck said, "If he had gathered its purpose rightly, from the noble lord's description, the bill to be introduced meant that Bishops of the Catholic Faith should not call themselves Bishops of any place in the three kingdoms, or in any part of her Majesty's dominions."

Upon which Lord John Russell immediately interposed to define the precise limits within which the proposed act of parliament was to have force, and exempted from its enactment all the colonies, saying, "No; only in the three kingdoms."

The nature of the offence calling for the bill was again described by the Attorney-General on the 10th of February, as consisting of "the introduction of a Bill by which certain persons were entitled by the Pope of Rome to assume to themselves certain Ecclesiastical titles, as being Archbishops and Bishops of certain territorial Sees, defined within certain limits throughout England and Wales."

From the above, I draw the inferences which follow:—

1. The exclusive nature of the offence which Lord John Russell's bill is intended to meet is, that it is an act done by a foreign power in defiance of the spiritual supremacy of the Queen, an interference with the rights of the Established Church of England, and

hence an act insulting to the independence of the nation.

2. The ground, therefore, on which Lord John Russell rests his claim to be heard in bringing in his bill is, that as Prime Minister of England he is bound to uphold the spiritual prerogatives of his Sovereign, the rights of the Church of which those spiritual prerogatives constitute that Sovereign the Supreme Head, as well as to vindicate any insult offered to the independence of the nation.

3. Hence the colonies of Great Britain are excepted from the provisions of the bill, because there the nature and existence of the offence, as described, are impossibilities, there being no colony in Great Britain in which the spiritual supremacy of the Sovereign is acknowledged as it is in England, or of which the Church of England is by law the Established Church.

Consequently, the Pope, in establishing Archbishops and Bishops, with territorial jurisdiction, in any of these portions of "her Majesty's dominions," does not, according to Lord John Russell, offend against the Queen's supremacy, or interfere with the rights of the Established Church of which the Queen is the Supreme Head, or in any way attack the independence of the nation. Nay, in some of said Colonies, her Majesty's Government, not only acknowledges the validity and lawfulness of such acts as done by the Pope, but even endows the Bishops.

4. The exception made by Lord John Russell from the provisions of the bill, in favor of the colonies, is tantamount to the admission that where no offence, such as he describes, is possible, as in the colonies, there can be no just grounds on which to rest the introduction of a bill such as his lordship meditates against the Catholics of the three kingdoms.

5. These premises being granted—and it seems difficult to deny their truth—the question naturally suggests itself—"What justifiable grounds can there be for including within the provisions of this bill the Catholics of Scotland?"

1. There is in Scotland no body of Christians of any kind or description acknowledging the spiritual supremacy of the Queen. There is none which does not emphatically protest against it.

The established Presbyterianism of Scotland rejects that supremacy.

Every branch of Presbyterian Dissent, the Free Church included, rejects it.

The Episcopalians reject it.

The Catholics reject it.

The Unitarians and the Society of Friends of course reject it. In a word, the whole nation rejects it.

2. The law of the land protests against the spiritual supremacy of the Sovereign. It was abrogated in Scotland when Episcopacy was abolished, in 1689—when "the King had chimney-money granted him instead of his supremacy." The abolition of said royal spiritual supremacy was confirmed in 1707, by the articles of Union, where the rights and privileges of the respective Churches of England and Scotland, were made fundamental conditions of the union of the two kingdoms.

3. As remarked by Mr. Keogh, in the course of the debate on the 12th of February, "her Majesty at her coronation swore to respect these statutes." That is to say, in the absence of any other evidence to the fact, we have her Majesty's own solemn oath to bear witness to the non-existence of her Majesty's spiritual supremacy in Scotland.

How, therefore, can that be offended against in Scotland, which does not there exist?

If the Catholics of England, in petitioning for, and obtaining from the Pope, the restoration of their Hierarchy, have interfered with the rights of the Established Church of England, that cannot surely be a just reason to file a bill of penalties against the Catholics of Scotland, who are in the utter impossibility of interfering with the rights of a Church of which the existence is in their country utterly ignored, even by its own royal spiritual head.

Can it be denied, then, that if this bill be carried, whatever the Pope may have done against the independence of the nation in England, Lord John Russell will have been guilty of a most unprovoked attack against the independence of the nation in Scotland?

In addition to the manifest injustice of Lord John Russell's Bill, as intended to affect the Catholics of Scotland, we have the unwilling acknowledgment of one of the very framers of the bill itself, the Attorney-General, to the fact that its introduction in regard of these same Catholics of Scotland would be a departure from sound policy, and a perpetration of what ought not to be done; and, strange to say, this admission if made, and emphatically urged upon the attention of the House of Commons, by the only law officer of the crown whose name is given as one of the makers of the bill, and at the very moment that he is pressing its adoption on the members of the legislature.

What have the Catholics of Scotland had to do with the evil or offence complained of, as having been perpetrated in the course of last year exclusively within the boundaries of England and Wales? Nothing: they have committed no evil: they are guiltless of all offence. What, therefore, ought the remedy of the bill, to have to do with the Catholics of Scotland? If its enactments are to be enforced beyond the Tweed, may it not be said with truth, in the words of the Attorney-General, that the remedy is in this case more extensive than the evil complained of? What, then, is the value of his solemn admonition, "You ought not to legislate beyond the ocean," while he, a law officer of the crown, and a member of the government, nay, the very framer of the bill, claims the privilege of acting in direct contradiction to the injunctions he so gravely lays down to others? Yet, so scrupulously precise are those same injunctions, that were any one to say—"True, the Catholics of Scotland have not yet obtained the restoration of their Hierarchy, nor have they even asked for it; but they may ask for it, and obtain it, and it is expedient to prevent them from doing so;" Sir John Romilly would be ready with his reply—"You ought not to seek to legislate against possible evils which have not at present arisen."

The worst, then, that can be laid to the charge of the Catholics of Scotland being, that although at present confessedly innocent, they may, at some future period, like most of their neighbors, perpetrate some "possible evils which have not at present arisen," the said Catholics, from the very showing of the Attorney-General now acting against them, ought unquestionably to be excepted from the provisions of a measure of which the real and exclusive object is declared to be to meet an evil and an offence of which they are avowedly blameless.

In conclusion, I humbly submit that from the above premises one of two inferences ought necessarily to be drawn. Either the Catholics of Scotland ought not to be included in the provisions of a bill destined solely to meet an exigency which has arisen in England and Wales—and this would be but bare justice; or, if they are to be legislated against notwithstanding their innocence, they are entitled to ask that it shall be upon such grounds as are not derogatory to the rights ensured to their country by the articles of Union, or inconsistent with the sacredness of her Majesty's coronation oath, in as far as it repudiates all claim to any spiritual supremacy in Scotland; in other words, the Catholics of Scotland have a right to insist that, instead of calling for restrictive measures against them, on the plea of an offence offered to the crown, which they have not only not committed, but which, from the circumstances of the case, it is impossible for them to commit, her Majesty's government will take its stand on what its duties may be towards the Established "Protestant Presbyterian Church of Scotland," as defined in the preamble of the present bill, and deal alike with all Dissenters as existing in Scotland in the eyes of the law, whether Catholics, Episcopalians, Free Churchmen, or other unestablished Presbyterian Christians.

I need scarcely observe that this latter line of action is not here suggested as indicative of any wish on our part to see others implicated in the unjust measure that threatens ourselves, but simply to call attention to the fact, that the only ground on which we, Catholics of Scotland, can be fairly legislated against in the matter in question is one which no possible ministry would for a moment presume to occupy.—I have the honor to be, my dear lord, yours very respectfully and truly in Jesus Christ,

† JAMES GILLIS,

In the name and on behalf of the Catholic Bishops, Vicars-Apostolic in Scotland.

Edinburgh, Feb. 24.

IRISH INTELLIGENCE.

The following Petition of the Irish Prelates against the Penal Law, was presented in the House of Commons by the member for Dundalk, Mr. McCullagh:—
Petition of the Archbishops and Bishops of the Catholic Church in Ireland.

"Humbly Sheweth—That we, the undersigned Archbishops and Bishops of the Catholic Church in Ireland, most respectfully approach your honorable house to declare our sense of the impolicy and injustice of the bill respecting Ecclesiastical titles, which has been submitted to the consideration of parliament.

"Petitioners look on this measure as one which, under the pretence of preventing their assumption of titles, is fraught with hostility to the dearest interests of the Catholic religion.

"Petitioners beg leave humbly to state that these titles are purely of a spiritual nature; that no secular power can confer or take them away; that they do not interfere with our duty to the throne, or infringe on the rights of any class of her Majesty's subjects; yet that the act prohibiting them interferes directly with the performance of our duties as Catholic Bishops, renders legally impracticable the observance of the essential discipline of the Catholic Church, and thereby inflicts great injuries on us and the Catholics of the United Kingdom.

"Petitioners beg leave further most respectfully to state that, in the opinion of the most eminent lawyers of Ireland, the proposed measure will control the free disposition of property, interfere with and endanger settlements made on the faith of existing laws, and in its results be productive of great embarrassment.

"That your petitioners, therefore, deem it an unjust interference with the rights of property, a gross violation of the principles of civil and religious liberty, which our beloved Queen, at the opening of the session, graciously expressed her determination to preserve sacred and inviolate, and that it is eminently calculated to revive religious animosities, fatal to the peace and prosperity of the country.

"Petitioners feel called on to inform your honorable house that, although the protection of the Catholic faith has been urged in justification of the measure, its bare introduction has already produced a manifestation of outraged feeling and indignation among the Catholics of Ireland, which nothing short of its rejection will be sufficient to allay.

[Here follow the signatures of the four Archbishops, twenty-four Bishops, and the Vicar-Capitular of Killaloe.]

The following is the reply of his Eminence the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, to the address recently presented to him by the trades of Cashel:—

"My respected friends and Brethren in Christ—I will not apologise for my delay in replying to your address, because I am sure you will easily understand how much of time and attention recent occurrences must have claimed from every Bishop of God's Church in this kingdom. Since, however, you were good enough to address me, in terms so warm and earnest, great changes have occurred in the aspect of that great question which gave occasion to your kind interest in me. When you wrote to me, it would scarcely have

been believed, that a measure calculated to wound so deeply the feelings as well as the spiritual interest of Catholic Ireland, was in contemplation. Providence has, however, allowed this, no doubt, for a great end; and, so far as it may be permitted us to read its designs, we may justly conclude, that to us, of England at least, this has been intended for a blessing.

"The unanimous feeling of indignation with which Ireland has received intelligence of the proposed measure, and the earnestness of intended resistance to its becoming a law, which has been exhibited throughout your country, will, no doubt, oppose a more formidable obstacle to its evil success than any arguments of word or pen. The contest, therefore, and the struggle for the continuance of religious liberty, is now again in the hands of those who so nobly gained it; and then we are sure it will be triumphant. Indeed, already symptoms are appearing of a most encouraging nature.

"One effect, I am sure, the present efforts will have upon you, and upon all true-hearted Catholics, will be that of attaching them to their Holy Religion and to their tender Mother, the Church. For never are Catholics so zealous, and so affectionate towards her, as when she is an object of persecution.

"In return for your kind sentiments in my own regard, I pray God to bestow upon you, and your families, every choicest blessing, temporal and eternal.—I am, ever, your affectionate servant in Christ,

† N. CARDINAL WISEMAN.

John R. English, Esq., Cashel, Ireland.

MR. ANSTEY AND HIS CONSTITUENTS.

The *Cork Examiner* publishes the correspondence between Mr. Anstey, M.P., and Mr. John O'Brien, the chairman of the meeting of Youghal electors, which adopted the requisition calling upon Mr. Anstey to resign his seat. The hon. gentleman having denied that he ever gave the pledge referred to by his constituents, Mr. O'Brien writes thus in reply:—

"You emphatically deny that you ever promised to resign if your constituents would desire it; and you state that 'my silence on that point is an admission of the superior accuracy of your recollections over those of the requisitionists.' Now, if you had not put the matter in that pointed manner, I would pass it by, from motives of delicacy. But I do say here that you made that promise repeatedly in the hearing of hundreds of persons, who have now as distinct a recollection of it as I have myself.

"You allude to the support you have received from Protestants, and you speak of the requisition as emanating from only some of your constituents. Yes, two Protestants voted for you, and you know yourself if their votes were needed.

"As for us, we have done our part. You may not, indeed, resign; but it will be well understood how far you shall be representing the feelings and opinions of the people of Youghal.—I remain, Sir, your obedient servant,

JOHN O'BRIEN, Chairman of the Meeting.

T. Chisholm Anstey, Esq."

THE AGITATION IN IRELAND.—Meetings are held daily in various parts of Ireland to protest against Lord John Russell's Bill. At Limerick the Rev. Dr. O'Brien, alluding to the abstinence of the priests in 1848, said:—

"There was neither cowardice nor knavery—we simply made up our minds that there was not an adequate cause. Lord Russell seems to hurry towards a consummation when we shall no longer be able to offer such a plea for our quiescence; and, let me say, I do not believe that many priests will hesitate to stand in the ranks of faith, though martyrdom were the penalty—(great cheers). Here there will be no doubtings by which loyalty might be guarded, even limitation of resources can offer no terrors—death will be sought as God's most transcendent blessing, because haloed round by the bliss of eternal and celestial promise—(vehement cheering). I am not now speaking politics, but religion—(hear, hear). We must speak out—(cheers). Let us hope, however, that statesmen will be more wise—that they will pause on the road to ruin; or, if not, let us hope that future times shall be able to say of us as we can say of our fathers—'They have kept the faith'—(long-continued cheering, amid which the Rev. Dr. O'Brien sat down).

At Carrickmacross, county of Monaghan, the Rev. Mr. McNally, spoke as follows:—"Catholics, the Rev. or Papists as he would call them,—and he gloried in the name—he asked them, were they ready to come forward and defend their religion?—(cries of 'We are,' and cheering). They could not leave that to be done by their two representatives; they should do it themselves—(a voice—'We are ready at a moment's warning'). Well, then, let them come forward and declare that they were ready to do so, although it might cost them the last drop of their blood!—(enthusiastic cheering). He trusted by thus manifesting their feelings, and declaring firmly and boldly their resolution to be free and unshackled, that they would crush to pieces the false and tyrannical measures of the Whigs, and teach them that it was not safe to meddle with the Hierarchy or the faith of the Catholic Church."

IRISH CATHOLIC MEETINGS.—A great meeting of the Catholics of Belfast was held on Monday last, on the subject of the persecution bill. The meeting was exceedingly numerous, and the best possible spirit and feeling was evinced by all present. Amongst the resolutions proposed and adopted with the utmost enthusiasm was one of sympathy and regard for his Eminence Cardinal Wiseman.—A numerous and influential meeting of the inhabitants of Rathfriland was held on Tuesday last, and a series of resolutions passed relative to the penal enactment.—An important meeting of the Clergy of Limerick was held on Monday, when resolutions condemnatory of the proposed penal law were unanimously voted.—A large meeting was held at Uffingford, county Kilkenny, on Sunday last, to petition parliament against the bill.

GREAT MEETING OF THE COUNTY KERRY.—On Tuesday week, pursuant to a numerous signed requisition, a meeting of the Catholics of this county was held in the County Court-house, Tralee, the use of which was granted by the High Sheriff, for the purpose of passing resolutions in reference to, and adopting a petition to the House of Commons against, the proposed penal bill of the Whig government. The body of the Court-house and the galleries seemed one living mass of human beings, while the most intense anxiety to hear was evinced, and the greatest enthusiasm manifested in the expression of their contempt for the ministers and their new measures of pains and penalties prepared against their holy religion.

MEETING IN WATERFORD.—A great meeting of our Catholic citizens was held on Sunday, in the Great Chapel, for the purpose of opposing the late ministers' anti-Papal bill; or any other measure hostile to the