### AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE. -AUG. 25, 1876. THE TRUE WITNESS

can be no more than two, parties in the House .namely, "Her Majesty's Government" and "Her Majesty's Opposition." American legislative oham-bers, as well as French, German, Italian, Austrian, are constructed and seated in a semicircle or amphitheatre. The British, on the contrary, is an oblong hall or short parallelogram, divided right and left by a wide central avenue running its full therefore, no middle seats; every one must sit on one side or another-with the Ministerialists or Tories on the right of the chair, or with the Op-position or Liberals on the left. Half way up the floor there runs (right and left to each side of the chamber), at right angles to the wide central avenue above referred to, a narrow passage often mentioned in newspaper reports as "the gangway." "Above the gangway" (or nearest the chair) on each side sit respectively the thick and thin followers of the present or late ministry. "Below the gangway" (or farthest from the chair) sit on each side men who would occupy some section of the middle seats. if the House possessed any-the right and left centres, so to speak. The Home Rulers sit in a compact body " below the gangway," on the opposite side.

2

In their third session public opinion has now pretty well guaged and measured the ability and resources of the Home Rule party. In their first campaign, 1874, though much praised because they were infinitely better in every respect than most people expected, they exhibited plentifully the faults and shortcomings of "raw levies." Their farmal debate on Home Rule, on the 30th of June and 2nd of July was utterly wanting in system and management, and would have been a failure had not the anti-Home Rule side of the disscussion been incontestibly much worse handled. But never, probably, in parliamentary history has another body of men learned so quickly, and so rapidly attained a high position, as they have done. By the concurrent testimony of their adversaries themselves the Home Rule members are the best disciplined and best guided and, in proportion to their numbers, the most able and powerful party in the British House of Commons. In order to have a complete and accurate conception of all that relates to the Irish Homy Rule movement, there remains only to be considered the policy or line of action on which its leaders propose to operate. How do they expect to carry Home Rule.

At no time have the criticisms of the English press on the subject of Home Rule exhibited anything but the shallowest intelligence; and many of the Home Rule victories have been won because of the stolid ignorance prevailing in the English camp. The English journalists disliking the Irish Government, believe and proclaim to their readers only what accords with their prejudices; and, accordingly, upon them has fallen the fate of the general who refuses to reconnoitre the enemy and accurately estimate his strength. On this subject the British journalist will have it that he "knows all about it," and has no need to investigate things striously. From the first hour of the Home Rule movement he has declared it to be " breaking up." "failing," "going down the hill." It has been so constantly going down that hill in his story that one can never find out when or how it got up there, or whether there is any bottom to the declivity which it can ever reach in such a rapid and persis tent downward motion. On no feature of the Home Bule question has there been more affectation of knowing all about it, and more complacent dogmatism as to its inevitable fate, than this of the Home Rule plan of action. The way these people look at the matter explain their consolatory conclasions. They view the Home Rulers simply as sixty members in a House of six hundred and fiftyeight. "Six hundred to sixty-surely it is absurd ! Are the Irish demented, to think their sixly will convert our six hundred ?"

The mistake of viewing Mr. Butt and Home Rule, just as they view Sir Wilfried Lawson and prohibibition is just where the English show their unpardonable and fatuous want of intelligence. Indeed, others besides commentators fall into this error they imagine the Home Rulers contemplate working Home Rule through the House of Commons by bringing in a "Bill" and having an annual "vote" upon it, as if it were the Permissive hill, or the

still make a great struggle to have it regarded as a game." Suppose, again, Mr. Disraeli adopts a "constitutional theory" that there must be two, and | middle course and says : " This is an excellent bill in many respects, but really we have not time to consider it this year." A londer shout than ever greets such a statement: "There is no room for Irish busines?. Then let us transact it here at home."

It is a matter of notoriety, that there is growing up among Englishmen, within and without the House of Commons, a feeling that, even apart from length from the entrance door to the "table of the all political considerations; something must be done House" fronting the speaker's chair. There are, tolighten the work, and remit to other assemblies s large portion of the legislative business now at tempted there. The House is breaking down under the load laid upon or undertaken by it. So would Congress, if, in addition to its own functions, it attempted to do the work of the State Legislatures besides. There are hundreds, it may be said thousands, of influential English politicians who, seeing this, regard as simply inevitable something in the direction of the Home-Bule scheme only, of course, "not so extreme," as they call it. Nothing but the bugbear of "dismembering" the ompire" prevents an English cry for lightening the ship. The Home Rulers watch all this, and take very good care that the load which the House prefers to retain shall press heavily on it. Not that they pursue or contemplate a policy of mere obstruction, which many persons, friends and foes, thought they would. Mr. Butt has again and again repudiated this. He knows that such a course would only put the house on its mettle, and would defeat his scheme of si. lently sapping the convictions of the more fairly | am chief if you deny me the dominion ?' You are disposed Englishmen. He knows that the present | chief, but in solicitude. So the steward has control system cannot last many years. He knows that the of the farm, and the pedagogue of his little master, English people, once their convictious are affected although neither the farm belongs to the steward, soon give way before public exigency. To affect those convictions and to create that exigency is the preside in the character of a minister, procurator, Home Rule policy. It is all very well, while the skies are clear and tranquil, for English Ministers, is no poison, no weapon so much to be dreaded by past and present, to bluster greatly about the impossibility of entertaining the Irish demand. It is to fancy that you have received greater gifts than all very well, while the present Tory majority is so the Apostles, one of whom said, to the wise and the strong, for both parties to protest their hostility to unwise I am not ruler, but debtor." Home Rule. Opinions change wondrously in these cases. When the Disraelian majority has in the course of nature dropped down to forty, thirty, twenty, and ten; when the Liberal leaders find they can attain to office with the Home Rule vote, and cannot retain office without it, they will-offer Home Bule? No. Offer palliatives-good places for Home Rulers, and good measures" for Ireland? Probably. But when these offers are found to be vain; are found to strengthen the power and intensify the resolution of the Home Rule party, the transformation which England went through on so many great questions-Catholic Emancipation, etc. (each in its day just as solemnly sworn to be "impossible")-will begin to set in; and-all the more loudly if such a moment should happen to synchronize with a deadlock in the legislature, peril abroad, and popular resentment at home-from England itself will arise the cry that" Ireland must be fairly dealt with." At such a moment a British minister will easily be found to "discover," as it were most fortunately, that "the question has hitherto been misunderetood," and that it is Eng-

land's interest not less than Ircland's to have it satisfactorily adjusted. For it is not with Ireland alone British ministers will have to settle. Although no reference has previously been made here to the fact, the strongest arm of the Home Rule party is in England itself. Within the past thirty years there has grown up there, silently and unpoliced, a new political power-hundreds of thousands of Irishmen who, having grown in citizenship, power, and influence. From Bristol to Dundee there is not a large city that has not now on its electoral roll Irish voters whose action can decide the fate of candidates. Coincidently with the establishment of the "Home Government Association' in Ireland there arose in England, as a co-operative but independent organization, the "Home Rule Confederation of Great Britain." This body has organized the Irish vote all over England and Scotland, and holds virtually in its hands all the vast centres of political though and action. Reflecting their sentiments and their influence, Dundee, Newcastle, Tynemouth, Cardiff, and more than a dozen other important English and Scotch constituencies returned English friends

## ST. BERNARD "ON CONSIDERATION" TO B. EUGENE III.

Præsis, ut prosis .- St. Bern. De Cons. L. III.

## Br J. F. L., D.D.

## (Continued.)

"If I were more fully informed how you have taken my efforts hitherto, I should proceed either more confidently or more cautiously or else desist altogether." With these words St. Bernard begins his fourth book, De Consideratione, resolved to leave off, if his freedom have given offence; but, if requested to continue, determined to speak the truth.

After having invited the Pontiff to enter upon a serious examination of himself, the Saint directs his attention to the things which are under him. " If you ask me, O Eugenc, best of priests, what these things are, I shall ask you what things are, not under you? Whose would find anything not under your care, must seck it outside of this earth. Your birthright is the universe, not that it belongs to you for you are not he of whom the Prophet said : The whole earth shall be his possession. It is Christ who claims the possession by right of creation, by merit of redemption, and by the gift of His Father. Ilis is the dominion, thine the management. Be careful that you do not usurp what is

not yours. "'But,' you will say, 'how can you admit that I "'Dut,' you will say, 'how can you admit that I nor is the pedagogue lord of his master. Thus you servant. . . 1 insist upon this, because there you as the lust of power. Certainly you ought not

The Pontiff being a steward, it follows that he will be held to a strict accountability. It is expect ed that he use all means in his power to extend the possessions of his Divine Master by the conversion of the heathen; that he do his utmost to correct schismatics and heretics if possible, or at least prevent them from ravaging the flock ; and that he enforce discipline and extirpate vice within the fold. While indelity, heresy and vice shall last, the sword of the Gospel, the word of Faith, must not be hung up in his halls. St. Bernard exhorts him to move forward his missionary army. "How long shall we detain God's truth unjustly? Are we to expect that the Gentiles shall believe by chance? But who has ever believed without a preacher? Peter was sent to Cornelius, Philip to the cunuch. and if we seek a more recent example, Austin was dispatched by Sr. Gregory to preach the faith to the English. Do you in like manner.

Then giving a glance at the internal condition of the Church, the saint discovers an ample field for the exercise of Apostolic zeal.

"Behold ! we all of us are intent upon our own interests. Hence it comes that we envy one another, we take up arms to injure and quarrel, we are prone to detractions, we break out into curses, we are oppressed by the stronger, and oppress the weaker. How well and worthily may your heart's meditation occupy itself with this pestilentious folly, which has occupied the body of Christ, the multitude of the faithful. O ambition ! thou cross of the ambitious! how dost thou still please all though torturing all ! Nothing is so bitterly racking, so ruthlessly troublesome, yet nothing by wretched mortals so universally courted. Does not ambition bring more votaries to the tomb of the Apostles than piety? Is it not with her prayers that your palace resounds? Is it not she that disturbs your rest, interrupts your religious exercises ? Does she not take advantage of the right of appeal, in order to rule the Church through your authority ?" The question of appeals to the Apostolic See was

one which Bernard had studied profoundly in all its lights and bearings.

"The right of appeal is of prime necessity-as necessary to mortals as the sun itself; but if abused, it may occasion pernicious evils. Appeals reach of Home Rule to Parliament. It was not the mere you from all parts of the world, and indeed they matter of so many votes that lent such value to this are a witness to your primacy. Would they were fact; it was the incentive which it gave to the as fruitful as they are nccessary! Would that when growing feeling (amongst the English working the oppressed man cries, the oppressor should feel it, when the poor is in grief, the wicked had no reason to be proud! What is so becoming as that the oppressed should rejoice, and the oppressor tremble, when your name is invoked? On the other hand, can there be anything so preposterous as that your name should shield the wicked and annov the just? You are most inhuman if you are not moved to compassion toward one whom injuries endured, a laborious journey and heavy expenses have laden with grief; and you are shamefully sluggish if you are not moved to anger against one who of so many calamities has been partly contriver and partly cause. Be watchful, man of God, when these things occur, and be aroused to pity and indignation, to pity towards him who suffers, and to indignation against him who caused the injury Let the former be consoled by compensation for his losses, by satisfaction for his injuries, by the cessation of calumnies; and let the latter be forced to repent of that which he dared to do, and not be suffered to laugh at the grievances of the innocent." Thus far Bernard has been treating of one who appeals with reason. But what if he had appealed without cause ? "Let an unreasonable appeal be of no use to the appellant, nor an obstacle to the appellee; for such an appeal is unjust, and if allowed to go unpunished, will breed numberless others as unreasonable as itself." When is an appeal unjust? "Whenever," answers the saint, " the appellant has recourse to it, without being forced to it by failing to obtain justice at home." Hence it is not lawful to appeal before an unjust sentence has been pronounced, unless the grievance is palpable. "Whoever appeals before he has been aggrieved, evidently is seeking either to aggrievo or to gain time. But appeal is a refuge not a subterfuge. How many we know who have appealed, simply that they might be allowed in the interim to do that which is never allowed We know several that on the strength of an appeal have continued to the end of their lives in incest and adultery. Is it not absurd, that what was in-stituted in order to strike terror into the scandalous should be made to patronize their scandals? Awake and consider this great confusion and abuse of appeals. They are made against right and justice, against usage and order. They have become a terror to the just in the hands of the wicked, and this great antidote is changed into poison. "But, you will say, why do not those who are unjustly appealed from come and prove their own innocence, and the malice of the appellants? I will tell you what they used to say on this point. We do not wish to trouble ourselves in vain. There are those at court, who are ever prone to favor appellants and encourage appeals. It is better to yield at home than yield at Rome."" St. Bernard next exhorts the Pope to respect the several grades of dignity in the Hierarchy, and not allow them to be confused or disturbed. He ought to be content with the fulness of power which he possesses and not envy others the small remnants assigned to them, or imitate the impious King Achab, who, though of sovereign authority, was restless until he had deprived his neighbor of his humble vineyard. By weakening the authority of the Bishops, discipline becomes lax; by granting untimely exemptions and dispensations, the Church become mutilated and disorder reigns. "If justice consists in giving to every one his i count of the speech of another man or even of my

of their Bishops, Bishops of their Archbishops, Archbishops of their Patriarchs or Primates! Does this look well? It proves indeed that you are full of power, but not that you are full of justice. You do it because you can, but the question is whether you ought. You err if you think you are sole as well as chief authority. There are others in the Church, some with intermediate, some with inferior, power; and as we are not to separate what God has conjoined, so neither must we equate what He has subjoined. Would it not be monstrous to subfract the finger from the hand and make it depend from the head? A similar monstrosity is produced whenever you locate the members of the Church. otherwise than Christ has disposed."

"It now remains that you take in with a glance the general status of the Church. Consider whether with due humility the people are subject to the clergy and the clergy to God ; whether in the monasterics and religious houses discipline wakes, order reigns; whether the ecclesiastical censures against vice and heresy are enforced ; whether the vinyards are flourishing with a respectable and virtuous priesthood; whether the fields are whitening with a faithful and dutiful laity; in fine, whether your Apostolic mandates and decrees are observed with the becoming diligence. Do not doubt that you will find many a thing left untilled through negligence or pilfered by fraud."

In the next book the holy Abbot passes to consider the things which are about the Pontiff, the Roman clergy and people, his Cardinals, the court and household. Nothing escapes the vigilance of Bernard, not even the table and kitchen of the Pope. He desires that everything should be ex-emplary in the Eternal City. If any abuses are tolerated in the centre of Catholicity, what pretext can Eugene allege in extenuation? "And, first of all, your clergy ought to be well conducted, as they are the pattern of the clergy throughout the world. It deeply concerns the reputation of your Holiness that those who are under your eyes be the embodiment of respectability and discipline. .

. . . If the priests of your household are not more orderly than the other, they are sure to be the laughing stock of all.

"What shall I say of your people? They are Romans, I could not more briefly or more forcibly express my sentiments regarding them. Populus Romanus est. What is so notorious from of old as nation unaccustomed to peace, accustomed to tumult a savage and intractable race, never obedient except when they are powerless to resist." St. Ber nard, will not, however, despair of their conversion He exhorts the Pope to take upon himself the burden of preaching the Gospel to them, instead of entrusting it to others. "Your satraps will cry out that I am counseling an unheard of thing, but they cannot depy that it is just. They fear forsooth, that it may lessen your dignity to assume the office of pastor. But you must either deny that you are pastor to these people or show that you are such. You will not deuv it, lest you denv that you are the successor of Peter. It is in your pastorship that you succeed to Peter: in your gems, and silks, and horses, and soldiers you are the successor of Constantine. Tolerate these, but let not your purple and gold prevent you from performing your pastor al duties.

I should be obliged to transcribe the entire work if I wished to lay all its striking passages before my readers. There are properly speaking, no salient points in any of St. Bernard's compositions. Every sentence is pithy and contains a new idea. We shall also pass over the last book in which the holy abbot opens heaven to the consideration of the Pope, and leading him through the Angelic choirs, conducts him to the Throne of God and develops the mystery of His Unity, Trinity and infinite Perfections.

Eugene did not long survive to profit by the instructions of his great adviser. He died on the 8th of July, 1153, about a month before the death of St. Bernard. The remains of the Pontifi were carried in state to St. Peter's and buried before the main altar He was even then looked upon and invoked as a saint, and miracles were not wanting to confirm the opinion of the people. He had borne the honors and hardships of a stormy Pontificate for upwards of eight years .- Catholic Standard.

own, how can it be just to deprive every one of what is his? And yet we see abbots independent from your mind the impressions you have not be the internet of the impressions on have not be the internet of the impressions on have not be the impression of the impres from your mind the impressions you have received. -I remain, sir, your faithful servant,

"W. E. GLADSTONE." " TO THE RIGHT HON. W. E. GLADSTONE, M. P. "19 Seymour-street, Portman-s.luare, W. July 19th, 1876.

"Sin-I beg to acknowledge your letter of the 15thinst, which I have just received on my return to town. It is useless to discuss the conduct of M. Loyson, as, if you consider that a man who has deliberately broken his vow to Almighty God of perpetual chastity, and his solemn oath of allegiance to the Holy See, can be 'frue and honourable,' we have no common ground to go upon. As far as I can understand the drift of your letter you are prepared to defend the allegation that nearly all the Catholic clergy have been living for many centuries in habitual vice and profilgacy, though you are willing to except from this wholesale indictment those of the present day. If this is so, the case assumes a far worse aspect than before. The Guardian's report made M. Loyson assert that the clergy of the present day were immoral-a frightful calumny undoubtediy; but according to your explanation it is not one single generation, but the entire body, who for hundreds of years have been indulging in impurity. If such be true, when did they cease to be bad, and how is it that a practice which according to M. Loyson and yourself bas produced such evils in the past has suddenly lost its perpicious character? If nearly all our priests in former days were bad, how is it that those of the present day are good ; and if clerical cellbacy prodaces virtuous priests in the nineteenth century, why should it not have done so in preceding centu. ries? I also gather from your letter that statements of this kind, though unjust when made against a body of living men, when hurled against those who have passed away become legitimate even if 'erroneous' in point of fact. Such may be your view of moral theology-it is not mine. I believe false accusations, or, as you perfer to call them, 'erroneous and unfavourable judgments,' of the living to be wicked and unjustifiable, but when such are made against those in their graves who cannot answer them or defend themselves, the sin and the slander become, in my mind, increased and intensified. If it is wrong to accuse one generation of a crime which they have not committed, a fortiori it is improper to slander many generations of men. It is plain, however, that as regards the lawfulness of assailing personal character you and I have nothing in common. I would merely observe that 'unfavourable and erroneous judgments,' if passed upon the character of a particular ecclesiastic, would not be held to be charitable or justifiable in an English court of justice, as M. Loyson would find out if he had the courage to fix his misrepresentations upon some living representative of the clerical order. The assertions of Paolo Sarpi, to whom you refer me, have no weight whatever with Catholics ; very much the reverse. Nevertheless, I fully admit that at the period in question great scandals did prevail among a portion of the German clergy. Any Church must have been corrupt which produced such men as Luther and his follow-workers, but the question is not whether a particular portion of the Church was at a particular time and under particular circumstances corrupt or not, but whether the great majority of the clergy in all ages and in every country have been, while preaching purity and morality, living in vice and hypocrisy of the most odious description or not. This is the question at issue, and the only difference between the Guard. ian's report of M. Loyson's speech and your recollection of it is that while the former makes him impugn the character of one single generation of priests the latter takes in in one widespread and telentless condemnation the virtues and purity of countless generations. I cannot accept as any justification the difficulty you mention of giving an account of the speech of another. If a public man who has occupied such exalted positions in England and whose words carry such weight with millions of his countrymen, undertakes to preside at a meet ing where statements of the most sweeping and terrible nature are made affecting the personal

Woman's Suffrage, or the Game Law Bill. The Home Bulers laugh heartily over all this sort of criticism. They dream of nothing of the kind. There is another way of looking at the Home Rule party and the Home Rule question in the House of Commons.

Six hundred men can, indeed, very easily vote down sixty, and make short work of their opposition; always supposing these latter to be units from places wide apart, representing scattered in-terests or speculative opinions. The House of Commons deals every year, session after session, with several such sixties and seventies and cighties and nineties. But it would be a woful apology for " statesmanship" to regard the Home Rule sixty in this light. In their case the government have to do, not with sixty of their own general body of British members, but with the Irish representation. The question is not with sixty members of the House, but with Ireland. In any crisis of the empire, as the English Chancellor of the Exchequer said recently about the British representatives on the Suez Caual Board, " their votes would be weighed not counted."

The purpose of the Home Rulers, for the present, at all events, is much less with the flouse of Commons than with the country ; they operate on the country through that Honse. They want to get Ireland into their hands; and even already they have very substentially done so. They want to convince and conciliate and enlist the English democracy ; and they have very largely succeeded. With this key to their movements, the supreme ability and wisdom which they have displayed will be better recognized, They have taken the whole of the public affairs of Ireland into their charge. They have taken every public interest in the country under their protection. Whoever wants anything done or attended to, whether he be Catholic. Protestant, or Dissenter, now looks to the Home Rulers, and to them alone. Not the humblest peasant in the land but feels that, if a petty village tyrant has wronged him, the Irish party in the House of Commons will "know the reason why." They have seized upon every subject deeply affect. ing the people as a whole, or important classes among them, and showered bills dealing with these subjects on the table of the House of Commons. The distracted Premier knows what is beneath all this; he detects the master hand of Isaac Butt in this deep strategy. These are not sham bills, merely to take up time. They are genuine bills, ably and carefully drawn, and every one of them dealing with a really important and pressiog matter for Ireland. Every one of them hits a blot ; they are nearly all such bills as our Irish Parliament would pass. Some of the subjects (such as the "Fisheries Bill") are popular with very nearly all classes in Ireland; then there are the University Education Bill, the Land Tenure Bill, the Grand Jury Bill, the Municipal Privileges Bill, the Franchise Bill, the Registration Bill, besides a host of others. Suppose the Government give way, and accept one ; there is a shout of triumph in Ireland ; " The Home Rulers have forced their hand I" and a

cry of diamay and rage from the irreconcilable Orangemen : " The Government have succumbed. to the Jesuits ;" Suppose they resist and vote down the bill ; matters are worse. The Irish people are inflamed, and even Ministeralists sulk and say : 'This is bad policy ; 'tis playing the Home Rule is frequently mistaken.

classes especially) that the Irish question was one to be sympathized with. An event which occurred in England barely a few weeks ago was, however, beyond all precedent in the sensation which it creat-

ed. This was the recent Manchester election. A week previously, in Burnley, it was found impossible to return any but a Home Rule Liberal, and such a man accordingly headed the noll. In Man chester Mr. Jacob Bright (son of Mr. John Bright) was the Liberal, and a Mr. Powell the Conservative candidate. It became clear that the Irish vote would decide the issue. One morning the news flushed through England that both candidates, Liberal and Conservative, had undertaken to vote for Mr. Butt's motion on Home Rule ! What ! Manchester, the political capital of England, gone for Home Rule? It was even so, and Mr. Bright, being preferred by the two, was trimphantly returned by the Irish Home Rule vote.

All this means that on English ground Ireland now has hostages-hostages of s-curity that no during act of armed violence shall be attempted against her; hostages of feiendship, too, as well as of safety; centres of a propagandism, of conciliation; citadels of political power. The growth of feeling in England in favor of the concession of Ireland's national autonomy is simply incontestible. It may well be that, as many Irish politicians declare, "the battle of flome Rule for Ireland will be fought and won on British soil"

And this is how Ireland stands in 1876-erect, powerful, resolute, united. What the future may have in store for her, victory or defeat, is beyond human ken. This effort too may tail, as many a gallant endeavor in her behalf has failed before All that can be said is that so far it has progressed with a success upparalleled in Irish political an nals; that it is wisely guided, boldly animated, faithfully upheld. Much depends on her own children, at home and in foreign lands; on their devotion, their orudence, their courage, their perseverance. May this new dawn of unity, of concord of conciliation herald the day they have so long hoped to see!

"And thou, O mighty Lord! whose ways Are far above our feeble minds To understand, Sustain us in these doubtful days, And render light the chain that binds Our fallen land ! Look down upon our dreary state, And, through the ages that may still Boll sadly on, Watch thou o'er hapless Erin's fate, And shield at least from darker ill The blood of Conn."

Men may blush to hear what they were not ashamed to act.

If every man had his own ends, all would come to a bad end.

Sin is like a bec, with honey in its mouth, but a ting in its tail.

Imitate the dove in innocence, and the serpent in wisdom.

He that believes bis own relatives his best friends

# CATHOLIC PRIESTS AND THEIR VOWS.

MR. GLADSTONE AND PERE HYACINTHE. The following correspondence between Mr. Owen Lewis, M.P., for Carlow, Ireland, and the Rt. Hon. W. E. Gladstone, will be read with interest :--

### " TO THE RIGHT HON. W. E. GLADSTONE, M.P. "19 Seymour-street, Portman-square, W., July 14th, 1876.

"Sin-The Guardian of July 6th contains a report of a meeting held in St. James' Hall, on the 28th of June, at which you presided, when an address was delivered by M. Loyson, a suspended priest, formerly known as Father Hyacinthe, of the Order of Mount Carmel. At page 883 he is stated to have used the following words-"The present system-he was compelled to say it-led to in morality. A minority of the priesthood kept their vow of chastity; the majority did not. But the immorality which destroyed souls was preferred by the Papacy to marriage, which saved them.' As a Catholic layman, I have a right to inquire'if this charge of wholesale immorality against our clergy all over the world-a body of men numbering half a million-was made in your hearing and with your approbation, as you are not reported to have made any expression of dissent. I do not believe that any Catholic would have brought such a charge against the clergy of the Church of England. calumny not being one of our arguments; but had any one done so at a meeting, of which I was chairman, I should have instantly and indignantly rebuked the slanderer. The opinion of M Loyson matters little to Catholics, for we know that some men are ant to measure the morality of others by their own fidelity to their vows; but it becomes a different matter when an illustrious English statesman appears to indorse it, even by his silence. The Catholic clergy need no defence from me. They are men upon whose lives, with infinitesmal exceptions, the shadow of suspicion has never rested. It would be wasting words to refute or to characterise the statement of Mr. Loyson ; suffice it to say a more gross and deliberate felsehood has never been uttered -I have the honor to be, sir, your

"TO OWEN LEWIS, ESQ.

"Sin-Passing over the parts of your letter which

animadvert on the character of Pere Hyacinthe, who

is one of the most true and honorable men I have

ever known, I beg to assure you that you have been

innocently misled by an inaccurate report. The

distinguished speaker made no charge whatever

against the purity of Latin priesthood at the pre-

sent day. I will not pretend to recall the whole of

gave embraced all the centuries since the general

enforcement of celibacy began. This I conceive to

be an historical question, on which an unfavorable

judgment may be passed without any fault of slan-

der or uncharitableness, even if it be erroncous .--

You may perhaps remember the statement of one of

the greatest of all historians-Father Paul-on this

his words, but I remember well that the opinion he

" 73 Harley-street, July 15, 1876.

" Owen LEWIS."

obedient servant,

tion of his name. Ultramontane as you would call me, I should blush either to make or to sanction such, call them charges, insiduations, what you please, against the clergy of the Church of England whether in the present or in past generations. Their views I believe to be erroneous: the men themselves I do not consider to be profligates and hypocrites .--I have the honour to be, sir, your ob-dient servant, "Owen LEWIS

character of a numerous body of ministers of relig-

ion, whether in the present or in past generations,

he should be prepared to assume the full responsi-

these charges to which he lends the fanc

oility of

## The General Councils of the Church.

The Nineteen Councils which have taken place in the nizeteen centuries of the Christian Eia may be thus epitomised :-

I. The Council of Nico (i), in 325, when 318 bishops were present. Arianism being condemned. II. That of Constantinople (i), in 381, when there were 150 bishops, and Maccdonius was condemned.

III. That of Ephesus, in 431, when there were 200 bishops, and the Nestorians were condemned. IV. That of Chalcedon, in 451, when there we:0 630 bishops, and the Eutychians were condemned.

V That of Constantinople (ii), in 553, when there were 165 bishops, when the three chapters of Theedorus were condemned.

VI. That of Constantinople (iii), in 681, when there were 170 bishops, and the Monothelites were condemned.

VII. That of Nice (ii), in 787, when there were 367 bishops, and the Iconoclasts were condemned.

VIII. That of Constantinople (iv), in 870, when there were 102 bishops, and Photius was condemned.

IN. That of Lateran (i), in 1123, when there were 1,000 bishops and 600 mitred abbots, when the contest regarding investures was settled.

X. That of Lateran (ii), in 1139, when there were 1,000 bishops, and the errors of the Albigenses were repressed

XI. That of Lateran (iii), in 1179, when there were 300 bishops, when a better form of clecting the Sovereign Pontiff was prescribed.

XII That of Lateran (iv), in 1215, when there were 412 bishops and 800 abbots and friars, when a short exposition of the Catholic Faith was made out in opposition to the errors of the Waldenses and Albigenses.

XIII. That of Lyons (i), in 1245, when there were 140 bishops, and the Emperor Frederick II. was deposed and excommunicated.

XIV. That of Lyons (ii), in 1274, when there were 500 bishops, and the Greeks returned to the unity of the Church.

XV. That of Viepne in France, in 1312, when there were 300 bishops, and the Order of the Knights Templars was abolished.

XVI. That of Florence in 1438, when there were 200 bishops, and the Orientals were again united to the Catholic Church.

XVII. That of Lateran (v), in 1512, when there were 120 bishops, and the Pragmatic Sanction was abolished.

XVIII. That of Trent, in 1545, when there were 200 bishops, and Catholic doctrine was clearly expounded in regard to the Holy Scriptures, Tradition, Original Sin, Justification, and the Seven Sacramentr.

subject with regard to the German clergy of the sixteenth century. I should not wish to quote or XIX. That of the Vatican, in 1869, when 704 describe it. It is not casy for me to give an achishops were present, and the dogma of Papal Infallibility was defined.