

mitate this course in Longford, but a more worthy resolve was taken: John Martin of Roskove...

Ireland, and England, too, looked on in intense amazement and curiosity. Here was a great problem brought to a critical test...

There was no misunderstanding all this. No Irish Protestant patriotically inclined, could any longer be scared by the bigness of Catholic intolerance...

On the night of Thursday, the 19th of May, there were quietly assembled in the Bilton Hotel, Upper Sackville street, Dublin—the most exclusive and aristocratic of the quasi-private hotels in that city...

Not many months later the climax was capped by the triumphant return of Mr. Martin for Meath, probably the most Catholic constituency in Ireland...

As this assembly has become in a degree historical, it may be interesting to give the following list (never before published) of those who attended it...

- The Right Hon. Edward Purdon, Lord Mayor, Mansion House, Protestant Conservative. Sir John Barrington, ex-Lord Mayor, D. L., Great Britain street, Prot. Cons. E. A. Kinahan, J. P., ex-High Sheriff, Merrion Square, Tory. James V. Mackey, J. P., Beresford Place, Orange-man. James W. Mackey, ex-Lord Mayor, J. P., 40 Westmorland street, Catholic Liberal. Sir William Wilde, Merrion Square, F. R. C. S. I. Prot. Con. James Martin, J. P., ex-High Sheriff, North Wall, Cath. Lib. Cornelius Denehy, T. C., J. P., Mountjoy Square, Cath. Lib. W. L. Erson, J. P., Great Charles street, Or. Rev. Joseph E. Galbraith, F. T. C. D., Trinity College, Prot. Cons. Isaac Butt, Q. C., Eccles street, Prot. Nationalist. R. B. Butt, Eccles street, Prot. Nat. R. W. Boyd, banker, College Green, Tory. William Campbell, 26 Gardiner's Place, Cath. Lib. William Daniel, Mary street, Cath. Lib. Wm. Donker, P. L. G., Eden Quay, Prot. Cons. Alderman Gregg, Sackville street, Prot. Cons. Alderman Hamilton, Frederick street, Catholic Repealer. W. W. Harris, LL.D., ex-High Sheriff of the co. Armagh, Eccles st., Prot. Cons. Edward M. Hodson, Capel st. Prot. Cons. W. H. Kerr, Capel st. Prot. Cons. Major Knox, D. L., Fitzwilliam Square (proprietor of the "Irish Times"), Prot. Cons. Graham Lemon, Town Commissioner of Clontarf, Yew Park, Prot. Cons. J. F. Lombard, J. P., South Hill, Cath. Rep. W. P. J. McDermott, Great Britain st. Cath. Rep. Alexander McNeils, 104 Gardiner st., Prot. Cons. W. Maher, T. C., P. L. G., Clontarf, Cath. Rep. Alderman Manning, J. P., Grafton street, Prot. Cons. John Martin, Kilbroney, "Forty-eight" Nationalist, Presbyterian. Dr. Maunsell, Parliament st., (editor of Evening Mail) Tory. George Moyers, Richmond st., Or. J. Nolan, Sackville st., (Secretary Fenian Amnesty Association), Cath. Nat. James O'Connor, Abbey st., (late of "Irish People") Cath. Fenian. Anthony O'Neill, T. C., North Strand, Cath. Rep. Thomas Ryan, Great Brunswick street, Cath. Nat. J. H. Sawyer, M. D., Stephen's Green, Prot. Nat. James Reilly, P. L. G., Pill Lane, Cath. Nat. Alderman Plunkett, James street, Cath. Nat. Rep. The Venerable Archdeacon Gould, D.D., M. B., Prot. Tory—son of Gould of '82. A. M. Sullivan, T. C., P. L. G., Abbey st., Cath. Nat. Rep. Peter Talley, Henry street, Cath. Rep. Wm. Shaw, M.P., Beaumont, Cork (President of the Munster Bank), Prot. Lib. Captain Edward B. King-Harman, J. P., Creevaghmore, co. Longford, Prot. Cons. Hon. Lawrence Harman King-Harman, D. L., Newcastle, co. Longford, Prot. Cons. George Austin, Town Commissioner of Clontarf, Winstonsville, Prot. Cons. Dr. Barry, Rathmines, Cath. Lib. George Beatty, Henrietta street, Prot. Cons. Joseph Begg, Capel street, Cath. Nat. (Treasurer of Fenian Amnesty Association). Robert Callow, Alderman, Westland Row. Edward Carrigan, Bachelor's Walk, Cath. Lib. Charles Connolly, Rogerson's Quay, Cath. Lib. D. B. Cronin, Nassau street, Cath. Fenian. John Wallis, T. C., Bachelor's Walk, Prot. Cons. P. Walsh, Merrion Row, Cath. Nat. John Webster, Monkstown, Prot. Cons. George F. Shaw, F. T. C. D., Trinity College, Prot. Cons. P. J. Smith, Dalkey, Cath. Nat. Rep.

earnestly and long they discussed and debated and deliberated. The men seemed thoroughly to realize the gravity of what they were about...

A dozen men rose to second this resolution of Mr. Butt, which was carried in the meeting not only without a dissenting voice, but with enthusiasm...

This was the birth of the Home Rule movement. The course of procedure adopted, following upon the above events, was one quite unique in Irish politics...

This was all Butt's sagacity. Festina lente was the motto that befitted work so grave and momentous as an effort to lift Ireland up and bid her hope and strive once more...

It was expected that the greatest difficulty would be with the (Irish) Fenians; but this was not so. Mainly through Mr. Butt's great influence with them, but partly because adversity had taught them useful lessons...

A much more formidable work it was found to be to assure the men of large property that this was not an embryo scheme for rebellion and revolution; to persuade the Catholic clergy that it was not either a cloak for Fenianism or a snare of Orangeism...

A clear conscience is the best law, and temperance the best physic. Many adorn the tombs of those whom, living they persecuted with envy. Laziness travels so slow that poverty soon overtakes it. Pride often builds a nest in which poverty hatches out its sorrows. Vanity is ill at ease under indifference as tenderness is ill at love which it cannot return. The most powerful of all beauty is that which reveals itself after sympathy and not before it. Who supposes that it is an impossible contradiction to be superstitious and rational at the same time.

George E. Stephens, Blackhall Place, Prot. Cons. Henry H. Stewart, M.D., Eccles street, Prot. Cons. L. J. O'Shea, J. P., Margaret Place, Cath. Rep. Alfred Webb, Abbey street, Nat. Quaker. "This association has never proposed to itself the position and duties of such a great popular organization as must eventually take up and carry out to the victorious end the national question. It has rather proposed to itself the less arduous task of preparing the ground for such a comprehensive organization."—FIRST REPORT OF THE IRISH HOME GOVERNMENT ASSOCIATION, Dublin: Falconer, Upper Sackville street, 1871.

B. POPE EUGENE III AND ARNOLD OF BRESCIA.

By J. F. L., D.D.

It is the destiny of the Church, to issue triumphant from one tempest only to be plunged into a fiercer. In fact she is oftentimes assailed from different quarters simultaneously.

Particularly stormy were the days of Eugene. His predecessors had struggled to preserve the liberty of Europe against the German. At the accession of Eugene, this ancient struggle, although lulled by no means ended; for Saladin was growing up in the East, and Barbarossa in Germany.

Before the twelfth century the relations between the Pope and the Roman people had been generally harmonious. In the wars with the Emperors and with the Barons of Rome, the Pontiffs and their people had fought and suffered together.

Arnold of Brescia according to the report of contemporary authors seemed to have been formed by nature as an heresiarch and demagogue. From his native town he went to Paris and there attended the school of Abelard, of whose errors he became an ardent exponent.

The Bishop of Brescia had passed very stringent laws against simony and incontinency. But he met with such opposition from his disolute clergy that he was forced to flee from the city.

A lover of singularity and novelty, he would not follow a beaten track nor search out the tradition of the Fathers. Without asking permission to preach he went around "deceiving the rude by learned words." His favorite topic was the lives of the clergy, and it must be admitted, says a contemporary poet, that there was truth mingled with his calumnies.

Veraque multa quidem, nisi tempora nostris fideles Resperant monitis, falsis admixta monebat. He erred more seriously in his conclusions than in his facts. He contended that the clergy should possess nothing, but should live on the alms of the people; that all earthly things belonged to the Emperor; and that he could not bestow them upon any but a layman.

He proceeded further in his errors, and attacked the Blessed Sacrament and Baptism. It was time to put a stop to the declamations of the frantic monk. At the Council of Lateran, he was accused by his Bishop and banished from Italy. He retired into France and afterwards into Switzerland, followed wherever he went by the vigilant eye of St. Bernard. See the picture which this true reformer draws of the impostor: "Would that his doctrine were as sound as his life is austere. He is a man who neither eats nor drinks, but with Satan hungers and thirsts after the blood of souls, one of those whom the Apostle warns us against as having only the appearance of godliness, and concerning whom our Lord said, 'They come to you in the clothing of sheep, but inwardly they are ravenous wolves.' Wherever this man has trodden he has left such frightful traces after him, that he dare not return there again. He is an enemy of the Cross of Christ, a sower of discord, an inventor of schisms, a disturber of the peace. When by blind discourses and by affectation of virtue he has secured the good will of the rich and noble, he rises, propped up by military despotism, to invade against the Clergy, the Bishops, and the whole Hierarchy."

But the cockle which Arnold had sown in his native land had taken a deep root, and was blown rapidly throughout the peninsula. Muratori asserts that the monk of Brescia had preached his perverse opinions in Rome itself before his banishment, and such may have been the case. Certain it is that a powerful faction of Arnoldists was formed in the city, professing that the Pope was in conscience bound to abdicate his temporal sovereignty and content himself with the voluntary offerings of the people. The extent and strength of the faction was made manifest in the year 1140.

The inhabitants of Tivoli had rebelled against the Pope, but terrified by his excommunication, they begged for pardon. The Romans, envious of the growing power of their neighbors and smarting under several repulses received from them, demanded that the place should be destroyed. This, Pope Innocent would not permit, whereupon the Romans turned their wrath against him. The sedition which had long been brooding, broke out. They rush to the Capitol declare themselves independent of the Pope, reestablish the Senate, and choose a leader to whom they swear fealty and obedience. Filled with classical enthusiasm these sons of the Scipios declare war against Tivoli "in the name of the Senate and People of Rome." But victory no longer perched upon their eagles. Their legions fled back to the city in utter disorder. Evidently Rome's destiny is now to rule the world not by arms but by religion.

Meanwhile Innocent died and his successor, Celestine II, followed him to the tomb six months later. The "Roman Republic" had grown so insupportable that the principal families in Rome forgot their dissensions, and united with Pope Lucius II to eradicate it. The republicans seeing the storm lowering, had recourse to the Emperor Conrad, and begged of him to transfer his seat to Rome,

and thence rule supreme over the whole world, and force the Pope to pay him tribute.

Cesaris accipiat Cesar, quicquid sua praeul Ut Christus jussit Petro solentis trib tum.

Conrad had the good sense to laugh at the proposal, knowing that Rome was destined to be the Seat of Peter, and that all attempts to wrest it from Peter must prove fatal to the attempter! The Romans, irritated by the Emperor's contempt, became more furious than ever. They demolished the houses of the Cardinals; plundered the towers of the Barons; sacked St. Peter's, and turned it into a fortress; extorted large sums from the foreign pilgrims, and murdered those who refused to pay, upon the very threshold of the Basilica.

Does it not read like a recital of the doings of Mazzini's crew in 1848? Lucius II. fell a victim to their fury. He was leading an assault against the capitol when he was struck by a stone and killed on the 15th of February, 1145. I believe this is the only instance of a Pope having been killed by his people. Pius IX. might have been a second if Providence had not rescued him.

This was the posture of affairs when Eugene III. was dragged from his monastery to receive the tiara.—Catholic Standard.

MR. BUTTS' LAND BILL.

The Solicitor-General for Ireland in closing the debate on the Land Bill expressed a hope that the people would feel, when the saw the overwhelming majority by which it would be defeated, that measures of that character would never recommend themselves to the British Parliament. We do not feel sure that the people of Ireland will quite take that view of the matter. The people of Ireland are tolerably well accustomed to seeing "an overwhelming majority" not only of "English representatives," but of "members for England, Scotland and Ireland combined," against any measure of justice to themselves. They have hardly ever made a claim that has been as yet conceded which was not met by such an "overwhelming" combination. Experience has taught the Irish people that the House of Parliament is a combination of English, Scotch and Irish members, if not exactly formed for the purpose, yet so consistent in denying justice to the people of this country that they could easily imagine that it was the chief object of its being. There has been no important act of justice ever done to the Irish people the proposal of which was not first rejected by an overwhelming majority. The fact of a demand being Irish was its condemnation in the eyes of the House of Commons for a long time. It was not considered eligible for consideration at all until it had first been scouted with indignation, and then defeated over and over again in a manner which to the eyes of the Solicitor-General appears so impressive. When at last it came, it came not as an act of grace, but as wrung from unwilling hands, and sorely maimed. A man was once described to us by the phrase—if he was compelled to give you a pin he would make it crooked before handing it. This is the way in which the British Parliament has made its gifts. Accordingly, when they are got they are not received with gratitude, and when they are refused, no matter by how overwhelming a majority, the only consideration of the people is how that Parliament can be forced into enlightenment and justice.

The savage attack made by Mr. Plunkett, the Conservative member for East Gloucestershire, upon Mr. Butt, was typical of the frame of mind in which the great bulk of the House of Commons approaches an Irish question. No knowledge of history, no experience of the past appears to be sufficient to get out of the heads of the mob of members that Irish grievances are all sham, or got up by patriots for their own purposes; and that landlords and agents are shot at the dictation of persons spouting on platforms. The honorable member spoke in a way of Mr. Butt personally for which he had to apologise. He not only violated the rules of truth, decency, and good taste, but he infringed on the rules of the House. For the last offence he apologized, but in true curriish spirit he did not apologise for the falsehood on which he based his argument. The statement that "the bill was the last desperate resource of a man who had cut himself off to a great extent from his professional brethren," was an insinuation that Mr. Butt could not find a livelihood at the bar, and, therefore, resorted to professional agitation. This reckless and stupid slander possibly was unaware that Mr. Butt had sacrificed a splendid career in devoting himself to the popular cause, and that at any moment he chose to quit politics he would find it still open for him. Probably he did not take the trouble to enquire, probably he would not have wished to learn the truth, but quite hugged himself in the belief that the falsehood he uttered was well founded. Very likely he would feel downright angry at any man who convinced him before hand that the statement he was about to make was an injustice of the heaviest and most scandalous character. Well, that man was probably more typical of the feeling which crushed Mr. Butt's Land Bill than the Marquis of Hartington or any moderate opponent of the measure. He was more coarse and brutal than—let us hope at all events—most of the 200 who composed the majority. But his ignorance, wilful and unbecoming, his absurd logic, his determination not to know or to understand the measure he was condemning, was probably a very fair average representation of the state of mind of most of the 200 whose decision the Irish Mr. Plunkett hoped would so profoundly affect his countrymen.

Mr. Butt at the close of the debate abandoned details, some of which it was admitted were open to objection, and went on the two principles of sixty of tenure with fair rents to be settled by valuation. Regarding these two principles as all that he sought to enforce, it is not difficult to comprehend the wild declamation employed against the measure by the more sober speakers? What other than declamation can it be called when men talk of such a bill reversing the position of landlord and tenant, and declaring that if it were passed there would be a general emigration of the landlords of Ireland? What does the landlord at present own that would be taken from him, except the right of capricious eviction? Do the landlords, then, only remain in Ireland for the pleasure of evicting their tenants? These denunciations are not, however, new. They are of the same strain that has been heard in the House of Commons since ever the land question was broached. There rarely was a sentiment more cheered in that august assembly than Lord Palmerston's when he said "tenant right meant landlord wrong." And so it does to this day in the minds of the great mass of those who oppose Mr. Butt's measure. They believe that it is a wrong to the landlord that the tenant should have rights. They talk about the landlord's property, but what they really mean is his privilege; they prate about the landlord's rent when what they have in their eye is feudal authority. Their desire is that the tenant should remain to his landlord in something the relation of a serf to his owner. We do not say that they intend the landlord shall abuse his prerogative. All they want is that he should have it to abuse if he chooses. Many of them are personally good landlords, and they would, no doubt, all of them advise landlords to be good, as they are themselves; but the notion of the tenant being independent of his landlord's goodness is just the one thing they cannot abide. It is from the prospect of that they shrink, and it is the contemplation of the possibility which makes them rush into the false logic, the monstrous predictions, and the wild declamation which formed the staple of what they were pleased to dignify as

the arguments against Mr. Butt's Land Bill. It will be seen that we do not seek to misrepresent the motives of the landlord party; we do not want to quarrel with or decry them. We regard them simply as we do fanatics in religion, who quite honestly do great wrong to those who differ from them.—Cork Examiner.

ANCIENT SCOTCH FUNERAL CUSTOMS.

The funeral of the late Dowager Lady Lovat, widow of the 14th Baron Lovat, the head of the clan of the Frasers, one of the oldest and most powerful Catholic families in Scotland, took place last month at Beaufort Castle and at the Catholic Parish Church of Eskdale.

On the lid of the coffin was a plate with the inscription:— THE RIGHT HON. CHARLOTTE GEORGIANA, LADY LOVAT, ELDEST DAUGHTER OF GEORGE WILLIAM, 8th BARON STAFFORD, WIDOW OF THOMAS ALEXANDER, 1st. AND 14th BARON LOVAT, BORN OCTOBER 8, 1800, DIED MAY 28, 1876. R. I. P.

The pall-bearers were Lord Lovat, Lord Stafford, Colonel Alister, Fraser of Lovat, Colonel Henry Fraser, of Lovat; Sir Piers Mostyn, Mr. C. Scott Murray, Mr. Fitzherbert, and Mr. Corbaldis, Kilmuir. The coffin having been placed in the hearse, the pipers struck up the solemn dirge of "The Children's Lament," and the melancholy procession slowly proceeded through the castle grounds. The pipers in attendance were pipe-Major MacLennan, Inverness, Tulloch's piper, and Lord Lovat's own piper. The Laments played in the course of the journey were "Lament for the dead," "Only Son's Lament," "Glengarry's Lament," and "The Blue Riband."

The number of those who walked on foot could be no less than a thousand. Behind those who accompanied the hearse came a long string of about a hundred carriages containing the chiefs of clans and gentry of the neighboring districts. Among those present were Capt. Chisholm, of Glasgow; Sir Geo. Macpherson Grant, Bart; Capt. Fraser, Balmain; Brodie of Brodie; Mr. Forbes, of Culoden; Major Lyon Mackenzie, of St. Martins; Mr. Davidson, of Tulloch; The Mackintosh; Mr. Mackintosh, of Raigmore; Major Mackenzie, of Flowerburn; Mr. Fraser, of Reilig; and many others. The procession must have been considerably over a mile in length. A walk of about four miles brought them to Eskdale chapel, wherein is the family vault of the Lovats. Arriving at the Bishop's chapel the mourning carriages drew up to the door, where they were received by Rt. Rev. Dr. Macdonald, Bishop of Aberdeen, and the clergy of the diocese.

The coffin was carried down the centre aisle and laid before the altar. Here it was covered with a gorgeous crimson pall surmounted by the coronet of the family. The galleries, railings, and pulpits were draped in black, and the altar was similarly covered, but relieved with a large white cross. On the black drapery of the gallery were written in white letters R.I.P. Around the coffin the chief mourners took their seats, each with a candle in his hand. Six tall candles in muffled candlesticks burned around the coffin, and the altar was similarly illuminated. The burial service of the Catholic Church was then gone through. The Bishop of Aberdeen presided, and was assisted by the Rev. Dawson, deacon; Rev. Mr. Mackenzie, sub-deacon; Rev. Mr. Bisset, master of ceremonies; Rev. Mr. Grant Eskdale; assisting, the Rev. Messrs. Coll Macdonald, John Thompson, Archibald Chisholm, Eneas Chisholm, John Cameron, Allen Macrae, John Chisholm, and Mr. Fraser, Dufftown. Professor Morine, of Elgin, presided at the organ. The service consists of Psalms 129 and 50, "The Canticle of Zachary," Luke 1, and appropriate anthems, responses, and prayers. Mass concluded, the Rev. Mr. Grant ascended the pulpit and delivered a feeling and appropriate address taking as his text Proverbs xxxi, verses 10, 11, 12, 20, 23, and 28—"Who can find a virtuous woman? For her price is far above rubies," etc. Mr. Grant said:—

"A twelvemonth has not yet passed since I had to address you at the funeral of the father, the late lamented Lord Lovat, head of the clan of the Frasers, and now I have to perform the same duty for the mother of the first family amongst us. It is a good thing to know that in either case death was not unexpected or unprepared for. The lady whose dust we receive to-day, was of a noble family in England, who can trace their lineage back to Canute. Members of that family have made the name renowned in English history. The lady early left her English home and united with one of the first families here. Her life and her death were such as to cast a lustre on her own family, and that of which she became a member. She was honored and loved, and respected by all, and evil-spoken by none. In addition to the gifts of a high and influential position, God had bestowed on her a dignity of person, aspect, and grace, a noble and thoughtful countenance. "Strength and beauty clothed her, and she shall laugh in the latter days." During half a century her noble example had been an encouragement to all good and virtuous actions; and withal she had produced, a true, calm, energetic judgment, which was always a guide to those whom she loved. Her family and those in her own neighborhood looked up to her and revered her. What good has she not done among her people? What enemies has she not reconciled? She hath opened her hand to the needy, and stretched out her hand to the poor. God loves the merciful. "Blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy." How much misery there is in the earth! The whole world is full of sorrow. But if afflictions are many, the charity of Christians are as many. In her charity she had a quiet, thoughtful and purposeful way. Even when on her sick bed her thoughts went out to the poor and suffering; and now her deeds speak for her before the throne for a better resurrection. Even when people gave cause for wrath, her voice was always for forgiveness or mitigation. "Were I speaking only to my own people, I would speak of her piety, her love for the Sacraments, and her frequent communions. Her heart went out especially for the young, and she raised for us schools and churches which a poor communion like ours, who had lost our all had required.

"She had been to her husband a true and loving wife while he lived, and in death they were not long divided. In all the busy cares of life he had her true, steady, softening strength to support him. When she felt her strength failing, she thanked God that he had left her as long as he had lived. Only one of her children predeceased her. Those who grew up to the years of knowledge revered and loved her. When she came to die, she had a comfort which many mothers have not, the cheering and comforting presence of dutiful children. Thus when her old age came, with her many merits, cheered by the love of God, and surrounded by her loved ones, her soul went out on that journey which is sure to have a blessed end. The coffin was put into the vault. The coffin lay beside that of the late Lord Lovat, and in the same chamber were the coffins of George Stafford Fraser, their infant son, Mrs. Fraser, of Strichen, and of Simon Joseph, the Master of Lovat, and son of the present Lord Lovat.