

...for him to rebuke,—when they found the Rev. Prelate describing the acts of the landlords in Ireland as being equal to the acts of a Nero or Caligula—when they saw the Bishop of Limerick, to whose character Mr. O'Connell, and other members of the House of Commons vied with each other in paying the warm tribute of respect for the invaluable assistance he rendered to Government—when we find him condemning the acts of landlords' terms equally severe, how could they be surprised to find these landlords describing the Right Rev. Prelate's addresses as incentives to assassination (absurdly false as is such an imputation), or how could any one say with truth that the spirit which has hitherto existed against that country had been at all changed? The object of Government was always said to be the protection of life and property; of life firstly, of property secondly. It was an admitted principle of Catholic morality as it was of English law, that where these two interests conflict, the right of property which has but a human origin, must give way to that which has a divine. In England this principle was fully acted upon. He was not advocating such principles as those now rising in France, and which seemed to threaten such ruin and misery, nor on the other hand was he alluding to such improvements in the condition of the operative as they might hope for in England, by an improved social economy. He was speaking only of what an Englishman had and an Irishman had not—a legal security against actual death by hunger. Before the famine had visited Ireland, some years ago he had a conversation with a professor of political economy in Oxford, who told him that the deaths in Ireland by direct and actual starvation were annually counted by thousands. (Sensation.) He did not say that the rights of property were inconsistent with proper laws for the protection of life. This was for the Government to consider. But this he did say, that until they could be made consistent, the rights of property by divine law, and according to the sacred principles of justice, must give way. (cheers.) With such a state of things in Ireland, who could wonder that there should be crime and atrocities of a fearful nature? It was far from his intention to extenuate the crime of assassination. He could understand striking an enemy in the face, that might be a mistake but it was a generous impulse. But what could be more base than skulking in a place of concealment till the unsuspecting victim comes near, and then taking his life without personal risk or danger? There was one thing, however he thought still more base,—for a man to sit down quietly in his drawing-room, in London, or Dublin, and to issue orders that must result in the certain death of thousands of persons, while he himself was free from risk. (Tremendous cheers, which were again and again renewed.) The ruffianism was the same in both cases—the cowardice the same. There was no difference except the accident that human law allowed the one and punished the other. (Cheers.) It was, therefore, because the Irish Priesthood judged according to the laws of God, not those of man, and denounced the assassin landlords as vehemently as the assassin peasants—it was for this cause they were slanderously reported as the instigators of assassination, and as denouncers from the altar. He would not trespass further upon their attention. [Cries of "Go on, go on."] He would conclude with earnestly addressing two humble suggestions to the people of Ireland, which, after what he had said, they could not suspect of being from an enemy. He would first earnestly entreat them not to suppose that the middle and lower classes of England are necessarily and hopelessly their enemies. The English had their faults, but they were at bottom a truth-loving and a justice-loving people. The fact was, and he could speak from his own experience, the great body of the English people know no more of what is going on in Ireland—no, nor so much—as of what is going on in China. And this led him to his second suggestion—that the Irish would appeal to the justice and good sense of this country by figures of arithmetic rather than by figures of rhetoric—that they would put facts before the country in a definite and authentic shape rather than the mere language of invective. He [Mr. Ward] believed from his heart that if the English people knew but one hundredth part of the oppressions which the Irish suffered, they would stand appalled, and the Irish would find from them an active and energetic support in their just claims upon Government of which they but little dreamed. [Cheers.] He himself had been re-

claimed from the strongest prejudices and the deepest ignorance on the subject, and he believed the rest of the English people would be equally reclaimed by having access to the same sources of information. [Enthusiastic applause, which lasted for several minutes.] The resolution was then put and carried amid great and unanimous applause. The Rev. J. O'Neal proposed the second resolution. "Resolved—That this meeting has heard with the utmost indignation, through letters from Rome printed in the newspapers, and through other channels, that attempts have been made, not merely by Protestants but by Catholics, to promote the arrangements expected to follow, should this bill become law, by spreading in the highest quarters in Rome the most incredible slanders against the Catholic Clergy of Ireland—slanders which we rejoice to learn have been rejected by the Sacred College of Propaganda, and by the Holy Father himself." The Rev. Frederick Oakeley rose, amid much cheering, to propose that the Memorial to His Holiness be adopted and transmitted to Rome. His subject, he said, had been already explained in the excellent speech of the respected mover of the first resolution [Mr. Lucas]. He [Mr. O.] gladly availed himself of the opportunity thus given him to make a public avowal of his sentiments on the two points comprehended in the Memorial,—the question of Diplomatic Relations with Rome, and the question of the Irish Church. [Cheers.] He came not before them as a politician, but he would avow it, as a Priest. He had rejoiced to find, by a recent correspondence between a distinguished Irish Prelate [the Archbishop of Cashel] and persons in high authority at Rome, that the distinction between the right and the wrong interference of Priests in politics had been sanctioned in the highest quarter of the Church. [Hear, hear.] There could, indeed, be no doubt that the obvious truth on this matter would receive that high sanction; namely, that while a Priest would step out of his sacred province by taking part in the mere fleeting politics of this world, he would be guilty even of a dereliction of duty by not lifting up his voice in season and out of season, when the liberties of the Church were endangered. [Cheers.] It could be nothing now to those who had known him [Mr. Oakeley] for some years past to find him strenuous against the encroachments of the civil power upon the sacred rights of the Church. He had felt strongly on that matter before he was a Catholic, and was not going to change his mind now he was one. [Cheers.] From the learned and esteemed friends and instructors with whom he was connected at Oxford, he had learned to regard the doctrine of Ecclesiastical independence as second only to Faith itself. [Cheers.] From those honoured guides he had first learned to venerate the names of the Gregory's and Innocents of times past, and all those other great Saints, all of whom had fought and some of whom had bled for the liberties of the Church. [Cheers.] Under their guidance he first studied the biography of that great Martyr as well as Saint, under whose patronage they were then assembled—St. Thomas of Canterbury. [Enthusiastic cheers.]—the patron of their association, the patron, he rejoiced to find, of the London District, with which [Mr. Oakeley] was connected, and one of the patrons of that interesting and important seminary in which it was his happiness to be now resident—St. Edmund's College: one of its patrons and, he might add, one whose name was deeply venerated, and whose spirit was not extinct. He could not assure that meeting that the Church had no more loyal sons, the world no more uncompromising enemies, and the poor no more hearty advocates—[loud cheers]—than the studious youth of the London District—the hope and flower and promise of the mission. By Ecclesiastical independence he Mr. Oakeley understood the proper liberty of the Church, whether as threatened with State tyranny or lay dictation—miscalled patronage. The Church of God needed no human patrons; she included all, rich and poor, high and low, all political parties and all social ranks, under her own sheltering patronage. It was not she who gained from the great, but the great who were favoured in being allowed to serve her. Of the Diplomatic Relations with Rome the meeting had probably by this time—for the hour was a very late one—heard nearly enough. He would trespass but briefly upon their almost exhausted patience. The general question of these Relations was one

upon which he really had no opinion. It might be left by those to whom it appertained. For himself he was far from thinking that, under the overruling mercy of Divine Providence, these relations might not prove even beneficial. They might soften prejudices. To recognise the Pope "even as Sovereign of the Roman States" was a great step, where he had been formerly regarded as an enemy and a bogbear. To recognise him in a political relation might be the beginning of a course which would end in his being loved as the beneficent Father of Christendom, and exclusively of English Christendom. (Hear, hear.) But this good would depend, in his Mr. Oakeley's opinion, upon the relations being confined within strictly political limits. (Hear, hear.) He dreaded any interference with the Church. It had been, he would not say our pride, but our subject of thankfulness to God, that our Church had been the greatest in Europe. Might it remain so! And for this reason the meeting might wonder at his saying—yet say it he would—that deeply as he regretted the modifications of the Bill in its progress through Parliament on account of their arrogant and insulting character, he was far from thinking that they were necessarily an evil, inasmuch as they all tended to strip the Relations of an Ecclesiastical tendency, and to confine them within the proper province of State negotiation. (Hear, hear.) Let them not be deterred from free action on the present matter by any fear of disloyalty to the Sovereign Pontiff. He Mr. Oakeley had reason to know from the independent testimony of persons upon whose statements he could place entire reliance, and whose means of knowledge he knew to have been the best possible—hear—that not one person in that meeting and this was saying a great deal was more desirous of guarding the Church of this country from secular interference than the Sovereign Pontiff himself. [Loud cheers.] He would now speak of Ireland. He deeply lamented to find, from something he had lately seen in the *Tablet*, that an impression had unaccountably got abroad in Ireland of some want of sympathy, on the part of recent converts, towards the Irish Church. The converts are cold to the Irish Church? Impossible. [Loud cheers.] They who had embraced the Faith from pure love of it—[hear, hear]—be indifferent to a Church so holy and so zealous? He repudiated the charge with honest indignation. He would speak, at any rate, for himself. From Ireland were derived some of his strongest attractions towards the Catholic Church, when he was yet no member of it. What he had seen in Ireland helped him to become a Catholic. He was once in Ireland, though but for three weeks, and in one part alone—in the county of Cork.—He was then no Catholic, and he lived with Protestants—with a friend who was himself an exception to the general run of Irish landlords.—Yet even there he saw enough to convince him on two points: first, of the devotedness of Irish Faith; next, of the miseries under which Ireland laboured. (Hear, hear.) His heart bled to hear those miserable ejections—[hear, hear]—described as a thing of common occurrence and unavoidable necessity. He heard of poor persons having their wretched abodes burned over their heads, and being scattered abroad on the moors and the mountains, to pick up what they could from precarious charity. [Hear, hear.] But it was not from ocular evidence alone that he learned to prize Irish zeal and Irish faith. Sure was he that till Ireland was blotted from the face of the earth, the Faith of the Gospel would never want an asylum and a home. Whether he looked to the uniring zeal of the late Mr. O'Connell—to the recent demonstrations in favour of Ecclesiastical independence for Irish Bishops and Archbishops—demonstrations which he would say reminded him of better days of the Church, or, again to an evidence which to many, and he would admit to himself also, was of a more interesting kind—the unexampled patience of the Irish poor under the heaviest visitations of God and the cruellest oppressions of man—he had learned alike to value and love the Irish Church. [Loud cheers.] And to that Church he was further engaged by the ties of affection; for some of his most valued friends in the Catholic Church had been nurtured under its fostering shelter. And here he would willingly stop, but that the same desire of obviating misstatement and misunderstanding which had led him to speak of Ireland, required him also to say a few words on another and most painful subject. He alluded to the recent acts of a certain nobleman in relation to the Irish Church. No one could

feel that he Mr. Oakeley was likely to be personally prejudiced against the aristocracy. His birth, education, early associations, and, he would add, many natural prepossessions had connected him with the higher ranks of society in this country. This made his testimony the stronger. And especially was he not likely to be prejudiced against Lord Shrewsbury; for personally he valued that nobleman, and had experienced his kindness. But no consideration of this kind—no tie of gratitude or human feeling of regard would prevent him Mr. Oakeley from condemning in words as strong as he could command the recent acts of that nobleman. Lord Shrewsbury had said in public that no Priest had administered to him a word of rebuke, or publicly expressed any disapproval of his acts. This seemed strange, all things considered. But at any rate continued Mr. Oakeley, with great emphasis, it is now in my power to destroy that boast whatever it may import. The humblest Priest of God is still a Priest, and as a Priest, although the humblest, I now publicly lift up my voice against those acts. I regard them as utterly unbenefiting the character which I am still unwilling to deny to Lord Shrewsbury, of a loyal son of the church. (Hear, hear.) I lament those acts, I lament especially that they have been subsequently defended and multiplied. Yet knowing what I know of Lord Shrewsbury, I am not yet without the fervent hope, suggested by the holy season in which we meet, that he may yet by one great penitential reparation—extricate himself from those moral and spiritual embarrassments in which they have involved him—and which will not only prejudice his public influence in the Church, but alas, I fear me much, will check the free play of those generous virtues which we have hitherto admired in him; of those virtues which depend upon humility, as those actuating and regulating principle; upon that cardinal grace which can never be used without endangering the wreck of our whole moral and spiritual nature. He would conclude by submitting the motion to their votes, or judging from past experience, he would rather say to their acclamations. The Rev. Speaker sat down amid loud cheering.

ST. PATRICK'S SCHOOLS.

The Hon. Mr. Young of the Executive Council has addressed a letter on the above subject to the Editor of the *Sun* which we transfer with pleasure to our columns as an act of justice to all the parties concerned. The *Sun* had published two articles on the illiberal spirit manifested by the *Liberal House* respecting the just claims of the Catholic body, and we believe that public opinion in this city, and especially amongst Catholics themselves, has been very loud in reprobation of the low and unmanly trickery by which our rights have been defeated by the soi-disant Liberal members. From the Opposition we could expect nothing but hostility, and to do them justice they openly avowed it. They opened a battery upon us a year ago with five pieces of cannon. We returned the fire with interest, and if we may judge from present appearances, our opponents have gained nothing but mortification by their unexpected onslaught. It is natural however, that although they provoked the quarrel, they should feel a little sore with those who belaboured them so roundly, and who lent a heavy hand in reducing them to their present plight.—For all this we were prepared. But that our Great Liberal friends should unite with the common enemy in putting this indignity upon us—that they should refuse so plain, so palpable, a right through a contemptible, beggarly economy—that they should *scud round the hat*, as it were, to various schools of our fellow-citizens to employ a small alms a piece for 1200 of our children,—this was not what we had a right to expect from them,—and this, we can assure them has sunk deeply into the Catholic mind of Halifax. We are glad the Upper House rejected the paltry Begging Box expedient. We did not want to defraud any School in the City of its promised allowance. We petitioned for our own undoubted right, and justice might and ought to have been done to us without injuring the righteous claims of others. We are thankful for Mr. Young's advocacy of our claims. We believe that in the Committee as well as in the House he has been consistent and earnest in supporting the Catholic Petition. With regard to his Letter, the facts detailed there, speak for themselves. We must however, respectfully disclaim the epithet of 'Set' which, without any offensive purpose no doubt, he be-