

SOLILOQUY OF MARY, QUEEN OF SCOTTS, BEFORE HER EXECUTION.

To die! to die! O crownless Queen! 'Tis all that's left thee now; Thy kingdom and thy freedom 'twixt, This one, last boon, hast thou! O mighty gift! above the pow'r Of foes to grant or keep, I know thou'rt sent from Him, who gives "To His beloved, sleep!"

science or virtue of man; it depends on the assistance of God, which assistance, however, does not exclude study and research in Theology.

It would be impossible for them to fall into error in teaching doctrines of faith or morality. This has never happened. Here is the essential point. All that has been asserted and repeated on the subject of other falls, other mistakes of Popes, has nothing to do with the present question.

PRACTICAL CONCLUSION.

1. The definition has been made: it only remains for Catholics to bow in submission. But is this definition an advantage or a disadvantage? And first, was it necessary?

Not only was there need of it, but it was a veritable necessity. After the storm raised against the Papal Infallibility, the definition was not only opportune, but absolutely necessary.

2. But this blessed definition has given birth to discord and contradiction. See the conduct of certain governments, and the existence of the new heretical sect calling itself "Old Catholics?"

3. Yes; Infallibility is a fine privilege for him who is charged with teaching truth to the world; but does it not weigh heavily on those who must submit to its decision?

4. But in setting forth so conspicuously the principle of infallible authority, do you not suppress the liberty of science, of progress, of modern civilization, of reason itself?

5. I now understand that the decision having been declared nothing more remains for us to do but to submit to the Pope's decision, either through love or through force?

PALMERSTON AND THE PRIESTS.

No more instructive work has issued from the press than the so-called "Life of Lord Palmerston," which has just appeared. It is a revelation of the inner mind of British statesmanship, as regards Ireland.

lishmen? Were they not complimented by Lord Palmerston's Ministers—may, spoken well of by himself? How was it possible for them to imagine, then, that he was, with the most intense and crafty purpose, holding them up to infamy at Rome, and blackening their characters to all posterity, so far as he could, as assassins and murderers?

Let us now give a specimen of Lord Palmerston's letters to his agent at Rome. It was dated Dec. 3, 1847, and addressed to Lord Minto—an individual whose name was well known at that time in Ireland.

My dear Minto I send you a letter from Clarendon, the whole of which you may, I think, read to anybody with whom you are in communication on the part of the Pope.

1. What Clarendon says is tolerably well known. He was undoubtedly a political miscreant of the darkest dye, who stopped at nothing to carry his point. He caused letters to be opened in the Post-office. But he did much worse.

Clarendon being such a man, is it not plain that he did not keep within the limits of probability when the object was to defame the Irish Catholic clergy? We must assume that he painted them in pretty black colours so that they would have been unrecognisable, if they had seen the picture.

In simpler language, the English Premier might have said—"Our Viceroy in Ireland is too wary to invent the slanders we require—you may do the work safely—so go forth at once and tell the Pope's Ministers that Irish priests are all murderers, in act or desire.

Now, what were the priests about at this memorable period? How did they conduct themselves? We will not outrage our feelings by asking was there any colour at all for the infamous slanders flung upon them.

These were the men whom the English Premier confidentially informed the Roman Court were "THE OPEN, AND FEARLESS, AND SHAMELESS INSTIGATORS TO DISORDER, TO VIOLENCE AND MURDER!"

In order to give circumstantiality to his account, and thus enable Lord Minto to impose more readily on the unsuspicious of the Roman Ministers, Lord Palmerston cites some fictitious cases, which can, of course, stand no scrutiny in Ireland.

been assaulted. But even as Lord Palmerston states the case, its flimsy character is apparent. We do not think it worth while to insist upon this part of the subject—what we wish particularly to point out is the opinion entertained in England regarding Irish priests, and that it is a time when our clergy undoubtedly exhibited traits of devotedness shown in no other country, by no other clergy whatever.

Major Mahon, who was shot the other day, was denounced by his priest at the altar the Sunday before he was murdered. He might have been murdered all the same if the priest had not denounced him, but that denunciation, of course, made all the people in the neighborhood think the deed a holy one.

Do not waste your breath in exclaiming against the abomination of this extract—but make it clear to your minds that it is the composition of the "Prime Minister of Great Britain and Ireland"—in other words, of the English Government.

It was not the individual Palmerston who was moving in the matter. He had no personal agency at Rome, so far as we know. It was the English Government which was using all its apparatus of foreign agents—part paid by Irish taxation—to calumniate the Irish priests as murderers and to make the world believe that every decent man in Ireland as well as Great Britain wished to hang them.

Do you think the inference a forced one? Then read this extract, in which the Queen's Minister gives open and deliberate expression to his desire to get a priest hanged. The state of crime in Ireland at that period had been proved by Daniel O'Connell to be far less grievous than it was in England, where constantly murders of the foulest kind were perpetrated.

I really believe there never has been in modern times, in any country professing to be civilized and Christian, nor anywhere out of the central regions of Africa, such a state of crime as now exists in Ireland. There is evidently a deliberate and extensive conspiracy among the priests and the peasantry to kill off or drive away all the proprietors of land, to prevent and deter any of their agents from collecting rents, and thus practically to transfer the land of the country from the landowner to the tenant.

Firstly—It is to be noted that the Irish people were at that very period wonderfully quiet. Is this merely our assertion? No, every historian has acknowledged that the moral influence exercised over the masses by O'Connell was amazing, and altogether without parallel: all his energies had been devoted to drilling and disciplining them to peaceful ways, and it is confessed that he was thoroughly, perhaps too thoroughly successful.

Secondly—The people were not merely quiet; they showed a spectacle of sobriety displayed by no other nation, at that epoch. This is a fact of equally emphatic import—one which has been admitted by all writers. Who, indeed, forgets that Father Mathew, that new apostle, who might have stood among the Twelve of old, had extended his sway over the whole island, and that all the land was under the sovereign beneficence of his peerless sway.

Thirdly—Whilst we have (happily) these arguments of world-wide admittance to confute the English Premier, he it recollects that he knew the state of the country as well as we do—know that "moral force" reigned—knew that Temperance ruled—and that with this knowledge he instructed the English agents to utter the most foul and atrocious calumnies against the priests and people of this country.

Fourthly—Recollect where the English agent resided to whom such special instructions were sent: he was at Rome, and he was ordered to fill the ears of the Pope's Ministers with these foul slanders, in order to alarm his Holiness for the state of Christianity in Ireland, and to induce him to issue a mandate against the Irish priests—and when we say "priests," be it noted that Bishops were included in the calumny by the English Premier. For what grosser brand could be placed upon these Christian overseers than to declare that the clergy under their care were "open and fearless instigators of murder?"

Fifthly—What was all this but a repetition of the conduct of the English Monarch Henry II, when he complained to Pope Adrian that the Irish Church and people were sunk in such a state of barbarism that it was necessary that he—the murderer of St. Thomas A'Becket, Archbishop of Canterbury—should be commissioned by his Holiness to chasten, to purify, and to "ameliorate" it? Palmerston was the new Henry, and if an Irish priest or prelate were not murdered by his minions, it was plainly because they lacked daring, not because his words lacked stimulus.

What is the moral we would draw? We leave every reader to draw his own moral: and conclude with an epigram written in the language of ancient Rome, which may be read in modern Rome, with profit when dealing with English politicians. A Pope said of some fair-haired Anglo-Saxon children who he saw at Rome, that they would be "Not Angels but Angels, if they were only Christians." Referring to this saying an Irish poet, whose verse is found in Hardiman's collection, pointed out the peculiar species of Angels to which The Englishman (typified by Palmerston) does truly belong: Angliens angelus est cui nunquam credere fas est, Cum tibi dicit aere, velut, ab hoste cave.—Dublin Irishman.

THE BRITISH NAVY.—Mr. G. J. Reed, in a letter, maintains that there are only twelve ships at the present moment which constitute the seagoing iron-clad navy of Great Britain.

THE MOTHER OF THE REFORMATION.

A great deal of history has been made during the last quarter of a century, and most of it has been very delicately cooked to suit the various palates partaking thereof. The published summaries of the twenty-five years commencing in 1851 and reaching down to last January sufficiently prove the cleverness of the historical chef, while many of the manufacturers must be fairly habber-gasted at the recorded versions of events that have passed under their very eyes, while being moulded by their very hands. A great event cannot be concealed, but the circumstances can be mystified, the springs of action leading up to it may be covered up, and the motives causing it may be distorted beyond recognition.

There are two stories of the forced apostasy of the nation under the Tudors, Henry, Elizabeth, and Edward; and, while Protestants ascribe what they are pleased to call the glorious Reformation to the infamies of the Church, Catholics place those infamies to the right account in the ledger, that of Henry VIII. Our opponents, working through false-historians, represent the secession from the Faith as the result of conviction; we say that the birth of Protestantism first shone through Boleyn's eyes, and it would appear, as shall be presently shown, that the Faithful are right, the unfaithful wrong.

It was not the individual Palmerston who was moving in the matter. He had no personal agency at Rome, so far as we know. It was the English Government which was using all its apparatus of foreign agents—part paid by Irish taxation—to calumniate the Irish priests as murderers and to make the world believe that every decent man in Ireland as well as Great Britain wished to hang them.

From this we can see how history has been, and in all probability will continue to be, dish up for politico-religious purposes, and we are sorry to have to expose a damning fact in connection with Protestantism and those things of which we have been treating. While Mr. Brewer was producing his first three volumes, he found no opposition whatsoever to his labours; when he had to tell the truth about the Reformation, a clamour was instantly raised for the stifling of that truth, and the present Master of the Rolls (Sir George Jessel) has been persuaded by the ultra-Protestants to restrict such men as Mr. Brewer in their labours, in a manner that is intended to maintain what is fiction at the expense of that which is fact. No one objected to Mr. Brewer's labours until he, a Protestant, tapped the right spring whence has flowed out Protestantism; the moment the discovery was made it became necessary to strangle it at any cost; and we are sorry to learn that a man occupying such a high office as does Sir George Jessel should lend his countenance to the transaction. He and his Protestant instigators seem now to see the evident necessity of giving a new reading to a grand old maxim, and of crying out, not "great is the truth and it shall prevail," but "so great is the truth against us, that it must be kept back."—Liverpool Catholic Times.

IRISH INTELLIGENCE.

The Belfast Corporation has adopted a petition in favor of the Irish Sunday Closing Bill. Mr. T. D. Sullivan has consented, in answer to a request from the citizens of Tuam, to deliver a lecture in that town at an early date. The death is announced of Mother Mary Clare O'Brien, Superioress of the Convent of Mercy, Nenagh. Thirty Home Rulers voted with Mr. Osborne Morgan in favor of his Burials Bill. Last session 25 members supported the Bill. The Very Rev. Dr. Cleary, of St. John's College, has been appointed parish priest of Dungarvan, in succession to the late Very Rev. Father Halley. The Irish Times says:—"During the last week the waters of the Shannon have risen considerably, and large tracts of land, comprising thousands of acres, are under water." LATE DR. KEANE.—A crystal memorial altar has been recently erected in the eastern transept of Fermoy parish church in memory of the late Dr. Keane, Bishop of Cloyne. MOUNT MELLERAY ABBEY.—The Abbot and Community of Mount Mellerey have acknowledged the receipt of a very valuable library, presented by Mrs. Sutton, of Victoria-road, Cork. A VALUABLE EVE.—A ewe gave birth to five lambs on the 3rd March, at Carragee, near Nenagh, the property of Mr. Wm. Carroll, 14, Mary-street, Dublin. Four of the lambs are ewes and one a waddler. All are alive and likely to live. Lord Justice Christian proposes a scheme involving the suppression of the four lesser Irish Equity Judgeships and the concentration of all Irish Equity business in three Courts of First Instance in the Chancery. CONVERSION OF THE SISTER OF VISCONT MASSARENS.—The Hon. Mrs. John Ross, of Blindensberg, daughter of the late and sister of the present Viscount Massarens and Ferrard, has been received into the Catholic Church.

LITTLE CATECHISM ON THE INFALLIBILITY OF THE SOVEREIGN PONTIFF.

DESIGNED TO AID IN THE COMPREHENSION OF THE DOGMA.

(Continued from last week.)

DIFFICULTIES SUGGESTED BY REASON AND HISTORY. 1. You have now explained to me what Papal Infallibility is, and what it is not. I have a few more objections to propose in order to ascertain if you are capable of refuting the errors of our day on this point. What would you answer to those who say that God alone is infallible, and that every man is subject to error? Certainly, God alone is infallible by nature; but it is precisely this infallible God, who, according to His own promise, assists His Vicar, preserving him from error and communicating to him a ray of His own Infallibility. Thus, for example, God alone can work miracles; He alone can read the future; and yet innumerable saints, by a special gift, have wrought miracles and prophesied. 2. But there still remains the argument that every man is subject to error, and that the Pope has the same liability? When he speaks as man, he is so indeed; but when he speaks as Pope, in the name of God, he is not subject to error. When he so speaks, it is not man who pronounces, but God who speaks by his lips. We must always return to the first principle of his infallibility, that is, the promised assistance of the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of Truth; we will thus comprehend that the Pope cannot err when teaching the faith and morality. 3. But you admit that the Pope is not impeccable; in a word, he is a man, prone to human weakness. Might it not then happen that in dictating a definition of faith or morals he would permit himself to be guided by some human passion, or that caprice might influence his decision? No; for God, who has promised Infallibility to the Pope, could not permit that, through passion or want of reflection, he should give an erroneous definition. We always return to His fundamental point; the Infallibility is not founded on the