

ham to feign a similar reluctance. But out the truth would come at last. We should find that each politician, who reviewed his chances of forming and maintaining a Government, felt that Ireland was his worst difficulty, and felt also that the cause of her being so was the existence of the overpaid and undersold Saxon Protestant Establishment, the ascendant Church of that eminently Celtic and pre-eminently Catholic country.

"Oh, that Ireland's Established Church were the Church of the great mass of her population, as is the case in Presbyterian Scotland, and in Episcopal Protestant England! At least, oh, that we were not compelled to recognise, and to try to maintain as predominant over her Catholic millions, their priests and prelates, this unhealthy offshoot of the Anglican communion! How easily then could this harrassing topic of Papal Aggression be dealt with! In Protestant England and Scotland, we should have the popular feeling with us in any temperate measure of resistance, as far as regards those countries, and in Catholic Ireland we should prevent the Pope and his emissaries from exercising any undue influence by a proper Concordat about the appointment of the Catholic Irish Bishops, and the independent action of the Catholic Irish Church, in the same way that the governments of other Catholic countries deal with the Court of Rome on these matters. But this may not be. We are bound to maintain the Protestant establishment in both islands, and therefore we cannot take the easy and efficacious means which offer themselves for pacifying both countries, in allaying this fanatic excitement, pro and con, about the Catholic Sees. We cannot take the best method for at once saving Ireland from the benighting influence of Ultra-montane bigotry, and for removing, permanently, the most rankling source of her turbulent disaffection to the English Crown. The fatal obstacle to all is the Irish Church."

THE PARTY MOVEMENTS OF THE WEEK. (From the same.)

The drama which has been performed during the week, the "Queen in search of a Cabinet," is one of the most exciting that has been performed for many years on the public stage. A glance at the hurrying to and fro may be useful. The composition now before the country is brittle enough, and from what has occurred, we may conjecture what is possibly in store. As will be seen from Lord J. Russell's statement in the House of Commons on Monday night, the first effect of the dissolution of the Cabinet was to induce her Majesty to send on Saturday for Lord Stanley with a view to the formation of the new Government. That nobleman proceeded to obey the Queen's commands in conjunction with Mr. D'Israeli; but before many hours had elapsed the Protectionist leaders were understood to have renounced their undertaking. Notes passed in the afternoon between the Earl of Aberdeen and Prince Albert, and in the evening the Earl of Aberdeen, Lord John Russell, and Sir James Graham, had an audience of her Majesty.

On Sunday morning, the Marquis of Lansdowne received visits from Lord J. Russell and the Earl of Carlisle; Sir James Graham and the Earl of Aberdeen visited his lordship; the noble earl also visited Lord Stanley. Late in the evening Earl Aberdeen had an interview with the Queen and Prince Consort.

On Monday, it will be remembered, Lord John Russell had agreed to attempt a reconstruction of the Cabinet. Previous to the assembling of Parliament, his lordship received Viscount Palmerston and other members of the late Cabinet at his private residence. Within a few hours of the delivery of Lord John Russell's statement to the House of Commons in the afternoon, another interview took place at the palace between his lordship, Lord Aberdeen, and Sir James Graham. The result was the abandonment of the attempt to reconstruct an Administration under Lord John Russell, with the addition of some of the principal members of the Peel Cabinet. Upon the announcement to her Majesty of the failure of this combination, the Queen desired Lord Aberdeen to undertake the formation of a Cabinet; but this task was respectfully declined by that statesman, on the ground of the want of parliamentary strength to carry on such a government. A second summons was then addressed, by her Majesty's command, to Lord Stanley, who had the honor of an audience of the Queen in the course of Tuesday. On leaving the palace, Lord Stanley had interviews with Mr. D'Israeli, Viscount Canning, and the Earl of Aberdeen. In the evening, communications again passed between the Queen and Lord Stanley.

On Wednesday, Mr. Gladstone arrived in town from Paris. After an early interview with the Queen, Lord Stanley waited upon Mr. Gladstone, the conference being of short duration. The Earl of Aberdeen was visited in the course of the day by Mr. Gladstone, Sir James Graham, the Duke of Newcastle, Viscount Canning, and the Right Hon. E. Ellice. Viscount Canning also visited Lord Stanley. At the close of the day the upshot of the interviews was known—Lord Stanley had offered Viscount Canning (a Free-trader) the office of Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, and the offer had been declined. Mr. Gladstone had refused to join the Tory Government, because (says rumor) Lord Stanley contemplated the imposition of a five-shilling duty on corn!

Thursday was a day of great excitement at Carlton and elsewhere. Towards evening it became known that Lord Stanley had once more resolved to resign his commission for the formation of a Government, into the hands of her Majesty. This determination is understood to have been caused by the unwillingness of Mr. Gladstone and Viscount Canning to agree to "certain arrangements" under which Lord Stanley proposed to carry on the Government.—A despatch, written by Prince Albert, was at once for-

warded to Lord John Russell, and communications passed between the Queen and Sir James Graham. The Earl of Aberdeen, Mr. Cardwell, and Sir James, were in constant communication during the day. The Times, on Friday morning, added to the public curiosity by stating that the Members of the Whig administration were to meet that morning in their private capacity at Lansdowne House, "to consider the course that it becomes them to pursue, since they are thus thrown back to office by the failure of all competitors," and that in the House of Commons, in the evening, Mr. Cobden was to give notice that he will submit a resolution expressive of the determination of the House to refuse its support to any Administration that is not prepared faithfully to adhere to the Free-trade policy adopted in the year 1846.

As regards the course taken by the Free-trade press, it may be said that the Times, with its usual alacrity, has quite forsaken the fallen Government, and after reading its present anti-Russell articles, one would imagine it had never said a fair word of the deceased. The Morning Chronicle, as the organ of the "Peel Cabinet" that was to be, has been exceedingly wary in its remarks, its object being a change of men rather than of principles. Early in the week the Daily News expressed honest indignation at hearing of no Royal messages to the leaders of the really Liberal party in the House of Commons. It was a disgrace to England, our cotemporary maintained, that "men who achieved the greatest of social and economical ameliorations, should be sedulously thrust and spurned from the threshold of power, which the possession of an aristocratic name daily enables even the political tyro to overlook. A philosophic statesman like Lord John Russell, who can overlook the dull routine of official life and public service, must see that there is something fundamentally wrong in the working of a political system that perpetrates such ingratitude, and that in the middle of the nineteenth century persists in confiscating popular eminence and talent for the exclusive illustration and enrichment of lordlings." Some remarks in the Times of the following day led enthusiastic members of the National Reform Association to believe that the "lordlings" had been put aside, and the probabilities of Mr. Cobden's acceptance of office was eagerly discussed. The Times said that no reluctance had been shown "to strengthen the Administration, if possible, by the introduction of some men taken from a more advanced shade of liberal opinions." A "bold and liberal policy" was what the country really wanted, and more than all, "a large, popular constituency, strongly bent on some sound and practicable measures, fairly represented in Parliament, and satisfied with their rulers." In the course of twenty-four hours the idea appeared ridiculous, the kaleidoscope had turned, Lord Stanley appearing as the centre piece.

The Morning Chronicle has some timely conjectures, as to the results of a general election, should that step be made necessary:—

"The counties have nearly done their best and their worst. They may still return, here or there, a Protectionist in place of a more liberal member; but the numerical strength of parties will not be materially changed in England; and in Ireland the balance will be entirely opposed to a retrograde policy. Lord Stanley can no more shake off the No-Popery prejudices of a portion of his supporters than he can dispense with the Protectionist fallacies of the bulk of the party. He must appeal to the enlarged constituencies of Ireland as a representative of the enemies of the religion to which they are attached; although it is fair to admit that he has himself seldom introduced religious bigotry into politics. The great towns and the manufacturing and commercial districts may not, perhaps, add greatly to the present number of the Free-trade representatives; but an election will give them an opportunity for agitation by which they will not be slow to profit. The new majority of the House of Commons will represent the same doctrines which prevailed at the election of 1847; but it will be the organ of very different feelings, and of passions far more deeply excited. Mr. Cobden, with a mission to perform, and an opponent to overcome, will be a more formidable antagonist than he may appear to those who only judge him when he is seeking to divert the enmi of security by incidental political digressions. After agitating the country, and inflaming political animosity, Lord Stanley would only find that a dissolution had left him more hopelessly overpowered than ever."

FIRST FRUITS OF THE "PAPAL AGGRESSION."

(From the Tablet.)

The "Papal Aggression" has already borne most wonderful and unexpected fruit. So singular is the issue, that worldly politicians cannot be but struck with awe. A Government apparently strong has dissolved before it, and without a contest crumbled into dust. The proud Whigs, who began to make war upon the Catholic subjects of the Queen with every human prospect of complete success, have found themselves deserted by their usual allies, and objects of execration to their very friends. Lord John Russell has become impotent, his Cabinet is broken up, and his Radical allies are denouncing loudly, and repudiating the dynasty of the Whig family.

The Whig Ministry simply dissolves; it is not destroyed by a hostile opposition. It perishes without a blow, save that inflicted on itself by the criminal folly of its head. Lord John Russell undertook to punish the Pope, and the weapon which he hurled in his malice against the Holy Father recoils on his own head, so that he is politically *felo de se*. Such is the fate of those who fight against God. The armies of the Assyrian beleaguered the city of Jerusalem, and in a night they perished, but not by the hands of man.

It is not the unsatisfactory Budget of the Chancellor of the Exchequer that has brought ruin on the Ministry; nor is it distaste of power, and a longing for the Opposition benches. The Whigs have, before now, re-constructed their Budget at the bidding

of their foes, and have clung to place till their friends were weary of them, or ashamed. Neither are there any symptoms of penitence for their insults to the Holy See, or of an honest desire to practise charity and justice. They go out of office, as usual, ignominiously, with the contempt both of friends and foes. They go out most unwillingly, and after an attempt at a coalition at the bidding of their most implacable opponent.

Retribution rarely comes quickly in this world; but as a great sin was committed, and a greater sin attempted, justice speedily overtook the offender in the midst of his pride, and in the full consciousness of his deceitful strength. The man who denounced the true religion as a mummery is become himself a mummery. His power is gone, and his pride is humbled. He who counted upon rich spoils out of the treasury of the Church is spoiled himself; he who had made a treaty with traitors is deceived; and the innocent victim of his perfidy escapes, not by craft or strength, but by the mercy of God, who would not yet deliver it over into the hands of its enemies.

CATHOLIC INTELLIGENCE.

EXTRACTS FROM THE PASTORAL OF THE ARCHBISHOP OF TUAM.

TO THE CLERGY AND FAITHFUL OF THE ARCHDIOCESE OF TUAM.

St. Jarlath's, Tuam, Feb. 13, 1851.

Very Rev. and Dearly Beloved Brethren—On the face of the habitable globe there has not been any people that prized more the blessings of education, especially as far as its light enables one to see more clearly the beauty of our Divine Religion, than the faithful people of Ireland, whose schools were open to the nations of Europe, giving gratuitously to the numerous strangers who flocked to them books and hospitality. You may judge of the anguish that pierced their souls when those two objects, the dearest to their hearts, were forcibly torn asunder, and they were presented with the fearful alternative of learning, but with the loss of the Catholic Faith, or, if they preferred the Catholic Faith, with all its perils, to be utterly debarred from the consolations of learning. It was a terrible trial to a people so intellectual that education became to them a second nature. Their choice proved their fidelity and wisdom: they chose the lesser evil, and, like the wise man in the Gospel who sold all he had to purchase a field in which was hidden a real treasure, they consented to lose all for the treasure of the Faith, which they were long obliged to hide from violation.

Again, however, they can, thanks to the Almighty, have the blessings of learning united with those of their religion, if they but make the exertions of children worthy such faithful fathers. A University—a Catholic University—for educating your youth, first recommended by the great Pontiff who now sits on the chair of Saint Peter, and whose recommendation on a subject connected with Faith and learning, should be a command; this University, sanctioned, too, by the highest authority of our Church at home, that of a late National Synod of its revered Prelates, is now about to be opened—an opening through which may be seen the dawn of the coming splendor of the Church in Ireland. We therefore trust that on the auspicious day set apart for this collection—Sunday, the eve of the Feast of St. Patrick, our great Apostle—there will not be one who will not cheerfully contribute his offerings towards an object fraught with such national blessings, and that there will be a generous rivalry between all classes, the rich—who are, I regret, so few—giving out of their abundance, whilst the poor, like the widow in the Gospel, will contribute out of their necessities. And if any circumstance can give a still stronger impulse to the generosity of the Faithful in forwarding an object in which the interests of knowledge and religion are engaged, it is the threat of forging fresh penalties for your Hierarchy, and again subjecting to the persecutions so heroically endured by their predecessors, the Bishops of Ireland, as well as those of England, for no other offence but for their fidelity to their Faith, resolved to hand it down, with all its social blessings, to their successors. Let every flock send forth petitions without delay against this persecuting measure against their Pastors, and their prayers to the Throne of Mercy that He in whose hands are the hearts of kings may change the hostile councils of their servants.

It is not the Catholic religion alone we will preserve in its purity by thus securing an entirely Catholic education in our new National University, as well as in our schools, but we will be contributing to the interests of peace, of justice, and order, by arresting the diffusion of those destructive doctrines of Communism and Socialism that aim at the stability of the Throne, and spread the most corrupting immorality among the people. You have recently witnessed and deplored the disastrous effects of such wild and profligate teaching, in the utter confusion which it spread throughout the Continent, and especially in the capital of the Christian world, where the apostles of those levelling and licentious principles of Socialism succeeded so far as to make one of the best of Pontiffs an exile from his dominions. To give you an idea of the hideous profligacy that follows in the train of such apostles, we need but remind you of the life of the great St. Dominick, so much revered in Ireland, and over the entire Church, especially for his introduction of that most instructive and popular devotion of the Rosary. During several years of his laborious life, this great preacher was employed in the South of France preaching to the deluded followers of a sect the exact type of the Communists and Socialists, whose principles and practices were so revolting and abominable, so subversive of order and domestic purity, as to be almost unfit for utterance.

If the Catholic University and other Catholic Colleges in succession were not to be opened, we should still deem it a sacred duty to caution the youth from touching those poisonous fountains, the condemned Colleges, out of which those who enter can hardly come without their Faith and innocence being impaired. Twice has the Head of the Church, the successor of St. Peter, to whom the government of his entire flock has been committed by our Divine Redeemer, pronounced, after a patient hearing of all the parties concerned, the irreversible decree of their condemnation. The short period of their rickety existence has but too clearly illustrated the justice of that decree. If you are to know the tree by its fruit—(St. Luke, vi. 43, &c.)—we may well judge of the nature of that tree, one of the earliest fruits of which—perhaps the first work of any pretension it has sent forth—has been, like its parent stem, struck with the blighting anathema of Rome.

In vain will you look for obedience to the Church, reverence for its Pastors, respect for its canons, or a profound and heartfelt homage for its Chief on earth, among the fruits of those Colleges, that are similar to those Colleges that have already spread Socialism, and infidelity, and anarchy, through Europe. On the contrary, do not their defenders and their advocates generally remind us of the picture of St. Jude—"Clouds without water, which are carried about by winds; trees of the autumn, unfruitful, twice dead; raging waves of the sea, foaming out their own confusion; these are murmurers, full of complaints, walking according to their own desires, and their mouth speaketh proud things, admiring persons for gain's sake."—(St. Jude, i. 13, &c.) As well might you expect that a tree struck by the lightning of Heaven would bloom with vigor, as that those institutions can ever recover or flourish under the anathemas by which they have been doomed.

To your manifold sufferings we are not insensible. Such have been the portion of those chosen servants on whom the Almighty poured most abundantly his spiritual favors; for, as St. Peter tells us, "this is thankworthy, if for conscience sake towards God a man endure sorrows, suffering wrongfully. For what glory is it if, committing sin and being buffeted for it, you endure? But if doing well you suffer patiently, that is thanksgiving before God..... Think not strange the burning heat that is to try you, as if some new thing happened to you. But rejoice, being partakers of the sufferings of Christ, that when his glory shall be revealed you may also be glad with exceeding joy."—(1st Peter, ii. 10, &c.) Amen.

Your faithful and affectionate servant in Christ, + JOHN, Archbishop of Tuam.

PASTORAL OF HIS GRACE THE ARCHBISHOP OF DUBLIN.

TO THE CATHOLIC CLERGY OF THE DIOCESE OF DUBLIN.

Beloved Brethren—The hand of persecution is about to be once more extended over us, and a new element of civil discord cast amongst us. Under the pretence of resisting what is untruly called a "Papal aggression," a Bill has been introduced into Parliament subversive of our religious discipline, hostile to the freedom of our religious worship, and fraught with mischief to the interests of our poor. In the bitterness of my heart, therefore, I call on you and your flocks to send up to the Lord of Mercy your fervent supplications that He, who by his wisdom hath appointed man that he might have dominion over the creature that was made by him (Wisd. 9, 1, &c., &c.), may vouchsafe to inspire our rulers with that wisdom that sitteth by His throne, that they may execute justice with an upright heart, not for the benefit of a faction, but for the peace, and happiness, and social welfare of the entire people over whom He has placed them.—Besides calling on your flocks for this salutary purpose, you will please to add the Collect, "Pro Prælati et Congregationibus Eius Commissis," to the other Collects of the day, in every Mass which shall be celebrated, as long as this persecuting bill shall be under the consideration of Parliament.

The proposed measure is called "A Bill to prevent the Assumption of certain Ecclesiastical Titles in respect of places in the United Kingdom." It is nominally directed against your Bishops, but it is in reality aimed against your religion.

With respect to titles, your Bishops claim no inherent right to any of those which are derived from any earthly fountain of honor. But the Spiritual titles derived from the Church—their titles to their Episcopal Sees, derived as they are from the divinely constituted fountain of Spiritual Jurisdiction—they are not free to surrender. Those titles are registered in Heaven. They have not been given by any secular power, and no secular power can take them away. We know our flocks, and they know us. They recognize in us their spiritual pastors, exercising episcopal jurisdiction over them in the sees in which they reside. We are their Bishops; they know us to be so, and yet a law is proposed forbidding us under penalties which we could not pay, and the non-payment of which would doom us to a prison, to acknowledge, even to our own flocks, that we are what they know us to be, the pastors whom the head of our Church, acting according to its known discipline, has placed over them. What adds to the palpable injustice of such a law is the insulting mockery of pretending that it leaves untouched our religious liberty. No; the variety of ways in which this grievous law, if strictly enforced, would harass us in the unavoidable exercises of our merely spiritual functions, would take away from you as well as from us even the semblance of religious freedom. But this is not all. The poor also are to be made its victims.—Famine and pestilence have not, it seems, done enough to render this unfortunate country one of the most afflicted nations of the earth; this law was still wanting to fill up the cup of its affliction. Its poor are not yet wretched enough, the current of charity must be stopped. If a pious Catholic, moved by the express command of his Saviour and his Judge to "give alms," should entrust the fruits of his benevolence to his spiritual pastor, and call him, even through mistake, by his proper title, the holy gift is torn from the destined objects of his charity, and may be employed by Protestant hands to corrupt the faith through which he hoped for salvation. And this too, is for us called religious freedom; and this is the return which the Catholic Clergy are to receive for their efforts in the