

well aware of, and the long lashes sank downwards again upon the pale cheek that recent sorrows had robbed of its bloom. "Come, Sir," said Gerald, "after such a day of fatigue as yours has been, some refreshment will be welcome," and the Englishman, presently, by deeds, not words, commenced giving ample evidence of the truth of the observation. As the meal proceeded, he recounted some of the mishaps that had befallen him, all of which Gerald knew before, through Rory Oge, who was in the house at that very moment, though, for obvious reasons he did not make his appearance; and, at last, the stranger put the question to his host, if he knew any one in that neighborhood called Gerald Pepper.

naturally lead us to indulge in these pleasing anticipations. Certainly, your lordship must now clearly see that the management of the Patriotic Fund was not so satisfactory as you imagined, and the arrangements for the endowment of public institutions were not agreeable to "all classes and every denomination of Christians." The letter of the Duke of Norfolk, one of the most illustrious noblemen of England, the testimony of so many other Catholic gentlemen, and the voice of the Catholic press, must have raised serious doubts in your mind as to the correctness of the opinions you expressed. Whilst truth, notwithstanding the many efforts made to suppress it, is thus advancing into day, perhaps I might abandon things to their natural course, and leave the vindication of my letter to time and the progress of events. However, as your lordship condescended to notice that letter, I fear I might be considered as wanting in courtesy or respect, were I not to offer some observations to explain or confirm what I wrote. I shall do so as briefly as possible, hoping to convince your lordship that the views I entertained of the questions now under discussion were correct, though the reasons for adopting them were scarcely hinted at, and especially that I had good grounds for calling into question the management of the Patriotic Fund, and for complaining that public funds, whether at home or abroad, were made engines of proselytism against Catholicity. If, in this reply, I should use any expression inconsistent with the high respect due to your lordship, I beg to protest beforehand, that it will be altogether against my intention; and if, through inadvertence or prepossession, I should fall into any mistake, I will be ready to correct my error, when pointed out. I wish, however, that it should be distinctly understood that we are not examining whether relief is to be given to the Indian sufferers, or not. There can be no difference of opinion on that question. Every one must detest the atrocities committed by the Sepoys, and sincerely desire that the sufferers should be relieved. It is true, indeed, that here we cannot do much: in our towns, and even in this city, we live in the midst of scenes of misery, and destitution, which, though regarded with indifference by many, can scarcely be equalled, even in a country laid waste by fire and sword. Were your lordship to visit some of the ruined lanes and streets of Dublin, your heart would thrill with horror at the picture of human woe which would present itself. Long and galling persecutions, as well as the late famine, and the clearance system unhappily adopted by some landlords, have brought about this state of things. Hence, our charitable resources are wholly insufficient to meet the continual calls made in urgent and pressing cases of distress. Yet, there exists a general desire to make every sacrifice to alleviate the sufferings of our brethren in India, and to help to supply their wants even from our own poverty. This desire is perfectly consistent with the persuasion that charity and religion require that money given for the relief of human misery should not be perverted to the propagation of error, or to other unworthy purposes. We are not deaf to the cries of suffering humanity, but the history of the past, as well as the daily occurrences which we witness with our own eyes, give evidence of such a propensity on the part of many to interfere with the education of Catholic children, and to seduce them from the religion of their fathers, that the duty we owe to God and His holy Church, compels us to be watchful and even jealous on so vital a matter, and to insist on obtaining safeguards for faith, a virtue, for the loss of which no earthly treasure can compensate. In approaching the principal business of this letter, you will allow me to assure you that I fully agree with your lordship, that "this is not a time to add a drop to the cup of bitterness between the churches." Neither on the present, or on any other occasion, have I had recourse to so unworthy an expedient. Though I have been sometimes obliged, as the guardian of the flock, to raise my voice against false prophets who approach the fold in sheep's clothing, but within are ravening wolves, seek to devour the tender lambs, yet, I have always inculcated peace, charity, patience, and forbearance. Such is the general practice of the Catholic pastor everywhere; and we may boast that in Belgium, Bavaria, France, Austria, and other countries where the influence of the Catholic clergy is very great there, those who differ from us in religion are treated with the greatest liberality, whilst in some of the northern kingdoms, such as Sweden and Denmark, where Protestantism is all-powerful, most galling penal laws are enforced against Catholicity. In our churches in Ireland, though we teach with the Scripture that there is but one true faith and one true Church, we never indulge in invectives against those who profess another religion, and you might pass years in our houses of worship without hearing the name of Protestant or Dissenter mentioned from our altars or pulpits. We teach our flocks to love all mankind, and this universal love is manifested in the management of charitable institutions, such as those of St. Vincent of Paul, and the Sisters of Mercy and Charity, who give relief to the needy without distinction of creed or country. Thus, Catholics, though they are often assailed as bigots and intolerant, practise true charity and Christian toleration, clinging firmly to truth, condemning doctrinal errors, but loving all, and praying for their salvation. Unhappily, my lord, I am obliged to state, and I do so with deep regret, that a large portion of the Protestant clergy of Ireland do not exhibit the same charitable spirit. They add not drops, but torrents to the cup of bitterness, not only between the churches, but between neighbor and neighbor, master and servant, landlord and tenant. It is a sad fact that, during the past years, they have excited a most violent persecution against poor Catholic servants rendering themselves answerable to Heaven for having reduced many fellow-creatures to misery and starvation, because they would not consent to violate the dictates of conscience. Perhaps your lordship is not aware that the churches of these clergymen continually resound with the fiercest denunciations of Ca-

tholically, the themes of their sermons are frequently placarded on the walls of this city, and published in some newspapers, in which Catholics are stigmatised as guilty of idolatry and superstition, and charged with teaching that lying, theft, and other crimes, are lawful. Even on the day set aside by her Majesty for public humiliation and prayer, some reverend orators exhausted their eloquence in proving that Catholicity is worse than Paganism or Mahometanism, leaving their audience to conclude that the poor Irish soldier, now fighting the battle of England in the burning sands of India, is worse than the brutal Sepoys to whom he is opposed; and instead of humbling themselves, as they were invited to do, they boldly proclaimed, like the proud Pharisee, that they were not like other men, nor such as those millions of Catholics.— In the meantime, whilst breathing nothing but hatred, and desirous to oppress, these preachers hold themselves forth as models of toleration and liberality, and condemn all others as lovers of despotism and tyranny. It grieves me to add that her Majesty's Protestant soldier is marched to churches where the preaching is so uncharitable, where the doctrines of Catholics are described as worse than those of the Hindoo or the Moslem, and where, if nothing else, the offensive placards exhibited at the church door, are calculated to fill them with prejudices. By preaching after the manner I have described, by attempting through the instrumentality of insulting placards, handbills, and invectives, to propagate religious views in a new fashion, our modern apostles have succeeded in poisoning the minds of many with the bitterest hostility against their Catholic brethren on account of their religion; Indeed I may safely say, that many of their hearers have been worked into the persuasion that if they hate a phantom called Popery cordially, they have fulfilled the law and the prophets. Undoubtedly the liberal and enlightened Protestants of this country, and, happily, they are numerous and influential, are unanimous in condemning the unholy warfare of calumny and vituperation which is carried on with relentless fury against the ancient religion of Ireland; yet it is too true, that many sanction and encourage it.— Among those are to be numbered, I regret to state it, dignitaries of the establishment, even in this city, and the great confederacy of Orangemen, who, within the last few months, have carried their violence so far, and allowed themselves to be excited by street-preaching to such transgressions of the law, that the Lord Chancellor of Ireland—a man of great forbearance and moderation—has found it necessary to exercise his authority in bringing them to a sense of duty. Where bigotry and violent fanaticism are so rife, are we to be surprised that attempts should be made to divert charity from its heavenly destination, and to make it an instrument of proselytism? Your Lordship, judging from your own high feelings, thinks that it would be treason against human nature to imagine that so base a perversion would be possible; yet, its actual existence cannot be denied. Look to the workhouses, the goals the hospitals, the union schools, and examples of such treason will be found even in England. The history of the famine in Ireland affords another illustration. Human misery in every form—starvation, sickness and death, overshadowed the land. What feelings but those of pity and compassion could have entered the heart of man in the midst of this universal desolation? Yet, the sad tale is recorded in history, that many calling themselves ministers of the Gospel of Peace, and many others led astray by their words or example, did not hesitate to avail themselves of the direful condition of the country to insult the feelings of the poor, and to attempt to rob them of their faith. Relief was oftentimes refused, except on the condition of apostasy, and the starving man was called on to choose between the death of his body or of his soul. At the same time, proselytising schools were established, and spread like a nett-work over the country, and starving children invited to frequent them, and to barter their faith for food and clothing. In many instances, children have been purchased from a miserable mother, that they might swell the ranks of sectarianism. The system, inaugurated in the hour of darkness and trial, though defeated generally in its main object, has, nevertheless, produced great evils, driving its victims into hypocrisy and lying.— Unhappily, it is still urged on with vigor, and we have to regret that many good and benevolent Christians in England are induced by the reports of interested preachers, to contribute immense sums to its support. Now, having a knowledge of the party and the feelings which I have described, was I not, my lord, justified in inquiring by whom the funds about to be collected, were to be managed—whether by men of honor and charity, or by men who on other occasions had not hesitated to traffic on human misery? Had I not a right to ask, without incurring the guilt of treason to human nature, what protection was to be given to poor Catholic orphans, in whose souls a traffic, worse than the slave trade, is sought to be established? I perceive that an inquiry almost similar was considered expedient by a colleague of your lordship in the management of the Patriotic Fund—Sir John Pakington. "There exists," so we read in a letter of his to the Times, "in the public mind, in combination with a desire to subscribe, a feeling that no adequate security has yet been offered with respect either to the responsibility under which the fund is to be administered, or the principles, regulations, or conditions under which it is to be applied." When such an uneasiness about the fund existed in England, where fair play is the general rule, and where no attempt is ever made to injure the religion of the great mass of the people, could it be considered strange that doubts of a similar nature should be raised in Ireland, where bigotry and intolerance have left indelible traces on the soil? Nor, my lord, was the management of the various funds collected for the relief of the sufferers in the late Russian war, calculated to make us place unbounded confidence in every future collection. In many cases the sums raised were openly applied to the purposes of proselytism. A respectable lady living in Ireland, the widow of an officer, assured me some time ago, that, having applied to one of the societies established for relieving sufferers in the army, she was promised the means of educating her son and daughter, but was informed, at the same time, that they should attend Protestant service at the school in which they were to be placed. I believe some of the public committees, and the founders of Hampstead School, did not attempt to conceal their proselytising tendencies. Greater regard to justice and charity was certainly displayed in the management of the Patriotic Fund, and undoubtedly your lordship and your colleagues undertook that work of benevolence in a most impartial spirit. That, however, in carrying it out, grounds for complaint have been given, and arrangements attributed to your body or your agents, have been looked on justly with dissatisfaction. I trust I shall give you convincing proof. Far be it from me, however, to charge you or your colleagues, with a desire to do anything unfair, though I cannot but condemn some of the proceedings for which your are

held responsible. Probably, whatever was defective or reprehensible in your administration, is to be attributed to under-agents of biased minds, whilst all the good that was done is referred to the direct agency of the Commissioners themselves. Yet, my lord a general persuasion prevailed in this country that a tendency to proselytism was evinced in the management of the Patriotic Fund, that the same provision had not been made for the education of Catholic as for Protestant children, that the surplus funds had been allocated without any regard to Catholic rights, and that even Catholic children had been sent to Protestant schools. I participated, I must confess, in the prevalent feeling, and I was influenced by facts which came under my knowledge. Reports of cases of proselytism in England, and in other parts of the empire, have tended to confirm my conviction. I will not now enter into an examination of those reports, but I beg to solicit your attention to the merits of a case which has occurred here in Dublin. I select it in preference to others: because, having, in my hands the original letters of the persons concerned in it, its proof does not depend on vague reports, or oral evidence which may be easily misunderstood. Among the many brave soldiers who lost their lives in the service of their country during the late Russian war, we find the name of Sergeant Kirley, of the Fourth Dragoon Guards. Kirley was a native of Louth, and a Catholic. When dying, he left behind him, in this country, a wife and three children. Unhappily, her afflictions preyed upon his wife's mind, and after some time she was placed in a lunatic asylum in this city. In the mean while, the report having gone abroad that the children were about to be sent to Protestant schools, the Rev. Canon Grimley, a clergyman who had devoted many years to the religious instruction of the Catholic soldiers in Dublin, wrote to Major Harris of the Royal Hospital of this city, informing him that the young Kirleys were Catholics, and protesting against any unjust interference with their religion. Major Harris did not give a decisive answer to Canon Grimley's letter, but stated that he would refer the case to the consideration of the Commissioners of the Patriotic Fund. The question of the education of three Catholic children was thus fairly brought before the Commissioners, or those who were acting in their name.— What their decision was, we learn from a letter of Major Harris, in reply to Canon Grimley, who, having waited for several weeks without hearing anything further about the fate of the young Kirleys, begged of the major, in a second communication, to let him know what was the decision of the Commissioners. Here is Major Harris's letter, of which I hold the original:—"Royal Hospital, Dublin, April 26, 1857. "Sir—I have the honor to acknowledge your note of the 19th inst. It does not appear that the children of Sergeant Kirley were ever, at any time, brought up by their parents in the Roman Catholic faith, and therefore they have been sent to a Protestant school where they will be taken care of by the Royal Patriotic Commission. Had these children been Roman Catholics, they would have been sent to a Roman Catholic school, and the same care would have been taken of them. "Should any further correspondence on this subject appear to you to be necessary, I beg you will be so good as to address it to the Honorary Secretary of the Royal Patriotic Commission.—I have the honor to be, Sir, your most obedient servant. (Signed) R. R. HARRIS. Major and District Officer. "Rev. Thomas Grimley, &c., St. Paul's Church, Dublin." Let us examine, my lord, the various circumstances of this case, so as to decide whether they justify the proceedings of Major Harris. 1. Sergeant Kirley was always a Catholic; his father and mother, now dead, were Catholics; his brother and sister, still living, are Catholics; he himself went to Mass and performed other duties of our church. Nor was he indifferent to the religion of his children. When stationed in Dundalk, he brought them himself to the schools of the Sisters of Mercy, and made a particular request that every attention should be paid to their religious training by the sisters. The superiors of the convent bears testimony to the fact. (See Appendix I.) Besides, when the Rev. Mr. Hart, chaplain of the troops in Dublin, had proposed to Kirley to send one of his girls to England, to be brought up by a Protestant lady, he stipulated that the child should be educated in her own religion, and wrote two letters on this head to a Protestant gentleman in Dundalk, which letters I hold in my possession. 2. That Mrs. Kirley also professed herself a Catholic, cannot be denied. The poor woman during her husband's absence, or after his death, was committed several times to Grangegorman penitentiary. Major Harris, when about to dispose of her children, called at the penitentiary and inquired what was her religion, and the religion of her children. The governor gave him all the information that was required, and showed him the books of the penitentiary, in which Mrs. Kirley and her children were entered as Roman Catholics three or four successive times. I publish the governor's letter, which proves that Major Harris received full information regarding the religion of Mrs. Kirley and her children. (See Appendix II.)—From the same letter of the governor it appears that Mrs. Kirley was in a lunatic asylum for some time, and that she was entered there as a Catholic. I add the important testimony of the chaplain, Rev. Mr. White, who states that the Kirleys were Catholics, and that he instructed the eldest child for the sacrament of penance, which she approached several times. (See Appendix III.) Such was the state of things when Major Harris of the Royal Commission had to determine in what religion the young Kirleys were to be educated. The father being dead, and the mother a lunatic at the time, they could not be consulted. But the religion of the father was known, the religion of his brother, the natural guardian of his children, was, or could easily be known. It was known that the children had been entered in a public institution of this city as Catholics several times, and it was, or could have been easily known, that they had been placed by their father at a Catholic convent school in Dundalk; yet, notwithstanding all these reasons, it was decided to place the children in a Protestant school, and to make them Protestants. Major Harris, assigning a reason for the step he had taken, says, the children were not brought up in the Roman Catholic faith. I dare say the Major is not well qualified to decide what constitutes education in that faith, or to examine children in the doctrines and practices of our Church. We cannot accept his assertion as evidence in such matters. But even if they were uneducated, the course dictated by justice would have been to send them to a Catholic school, to be educated in the religion of their father and their natural guardian, his brother, their mother being then a lunatic. Does Major Harris pretend that all ignorant children should be taken and sent to Protestant schools, without regard to the religion of their parents? But were they in reality left without any Catholic education? Certainly not; for, as we have seen, the father had brought them to a Convent school in Dundalk, requesting that particular care should be taken to instruct them in their religion, and, besides, we have the important testimony of the chaplain of the penitentiary, that he himself paid great care to the instruction of the eldest child, and prepared her for confession. Now, let me ask, my lord, was it just to order these poor children, Catholic themselves, and the offspring of Catholics, to be brought up Protestants? Do we not find here a bias in favor of Protestantism, whilst we are told that all religions are to be equally protected? Reverse the case for a moment; suppose Kirley had been a Protestant; suppose his wife was now morally dead, having lost her mind; suppose the father's brother was a Protestant, and that the children had been at some Protestant parochial school; would Major Harris have entertained for one

instant the proposal to have them educated Catholic? But, if considered fair to use other measures and other weights where there is question of our rights. It is the lot of Catholics, as it has always been, to suffer. A slight is cast even on the memory and religion of a brave Catholic soldier, who died in the service of his country. Alas, he would have deplored—his heart filled with sorrow—the unhappy lot that compelled him to leave his offspring under the control, and at the mercy of strangers. Nor is it to be supposed, my lord, that the sentiments attributed to Kirley exist in imagination, or are not generally participated in by Catholic soldiers in the army. We have most conclusive proofs that such feelings are general, and are manifested even on the battle-fields and in the hospitals of India. A most respectable officer of the East India service—Thomas Staunton Cahill, Esq., M. D.—when examined before the Committee of Indian Territories, gave important evidence on this subject. The following question was proposed to him:—"9169.—Have you known soldiers who had either been wounded upon the field of battle, or who were on beds of sickness from other causes, complain that, in the event of their deaths, their orphan children would be left wholly unprovided for?" The reply was as follows:—"Complaints have been made to me by men of different regiments, when they were dying in the hospital. They felt unhappy and discontented at the recollection of the fact, that while the Protestant portion of the children were the objects of the care of the Government, their own children were compelled to abandon what the fathers believed to be the only proper religion. That feeling, I think has been general among the Roman Catholic soldiers, particularly on service and when sick in hospital. Those who had children, were naturally anxious about them, and always regretted that they had not a Catholic orphanage to put them into. That regret, I may say, has been universal."—Sixth Report on Indian Territories, 1853, page 108.) The feelings which must naturally arise in the bosom of a dying soldier animated with a firm and lively faith, as to the religious education of his children, are here so well described, that it is not necessary to add a word of comment or illustration. You have now my lord a sad story before you. Whether the evil done to the young Kirleys (and how many other children are sharing their fate?) will ever be repaired I cannot conjecture. Probably such impressions have been made upon their minds in the past months, that they are now determined enemies of the religion of their father. I know that when very young Catholic children are induced to spend a few weeks in the ragged proselytising schools of this city, they are assiduously taught to hate everything Catholic, even the name of the Blessed Virgin, and the sign of the cross of her Divine Son. The young Kirleys, now so many months under training in a Protestant school, may have been acted on in the same way. Perhaps, also, their mother may now approve of what has been done. It can scarcely be expected that a poor woman whose mind has been shattered by poverty, affliction, and a residence in a lunatic asylum, will have courage to condemn the measures of an officer whom persons of her rank are accustomed to regard with reverential awe. But whatever may be the fate of the poor children, whether or not they have lost that faith without which it is impossible to please God, when the facts to which I have referred presented themselves to my mind, had I not grounds to doubt about the fair application of the Patriotic Fund, and to express a wish to have measures taken that the Indian Fund should be managed with a greater regard to Catholic interests? A similar case to that now stated lately occurred at Chatham, where an attempt was made to pervert the children of an Irish Catholic, Corporal Guillefoyle. I subjoin in the appendix the narrative of the fact, written by the Rev. Mr. Morley, Catholic Pastor of Chatham, and published in the Dublin Evening Post of the 21st of October last. Though it is not connected with the management of the Patriotic Fund, this plain and detailed statement of facts will show your lordship how ready some officers are to tamper with the religion of Catholic children, and will convince you that vigilance and caution on our part are not superfluous or uncalled for. (See Appendix IV.) Having said so much on the danger of proselytism, you will now allow me to examine the allocation of the surplus fund made by the Commissioners. My statements on this point have not and cannot be contradicted, as they were founded on a report of the Commissioners themselves, inserted in the Times of the 9th June, 1856. According to that report, the following grants had been made:— 1. For endowing a school for 300 girls, children of soldiers or sailors, £150,000; or according to a later statement, £180,000. 2. For endowing a school for 400 boys of the same class, £25,000, to be added to allowances already granted. Total amount not given. Probably it may be 60,000. 3. To the Wellington College, £25,000. 4. To the Cambridge Asylum for widows, £3,000. 5. To Naval School, Newcross, £8,000. 6. To Female School, Richmond, £3,000. 7. To Naval and Military School at Plymouth, £2,500. 8. To similar school, Portsmouth, £2,500. Besides the sums here specified, amounting to more than a quarter of a million of money, perhaps other grants may have been made, for the report published in the Times sanctions "the purchase of presentations to already existing asylums and schools for similar objects." From an anonymous memorandum published some time ago in reply to my letter, and which is attributed by the press to the Royal Commissioners, we learn the character of some of those institutions. Speaking of the naval and military schools at Plymouth and Portsmouth, it says:—"Those Schools, no doubt, are for Protestants." Speaking of some other endowments, the same document says: "Further sums also were granted for the purpose of purchasing nominations in institutions established by laymen for the benefit of children of officers of the army and navy. These, no doubt, are Protestant in their teaching, but there are no others for this purpose where the religious teaching is different; and it was not competent for the Commissioners to endorse, even partially, institutions that were not specially intended for the benefit of these classes." The other schools, mentioned in No. 1 and 2, are what we call mixed schools here in Ireland, and which, when under Protestant management, as they will be in England, are quite as dangerous as, or more so than, purely Protestant schools, inasmuch as with positive error, they introduce an indifference to every religion, than which nothing more fatal can be conceived. The memorandum tells us that the schools recently endowed are to be conducted on the principles of the Union Schools in England. What is the character of the teaching in these schools? A gentleman, well acquainted with England, describes them in a few words:—"The Union Schools are openly and almost avowedly proselytising." Whilst all the vast outlay we have mentioned was made in England for the endowment of Protestant establishments, was there a single grant made to any Catholic Institution? We have, both in England and Ireland, many excellent orphan asylums, especially for girls, in full operation; they would have afforded a safe place of refuge to Catholic soldiers' children, had any provision been made for their support. But the Commissioners, overlooking these institutions altogether, reserved their grants for institutions favored class. They made grants to institutions which "no doubt are for Protestants," and which "are Protestant in their teaching," as they

LETTER OF THE MOST REV. DR. CULLEN ARCHBISHOP OF DUBLIN TO LORD ST. LEONARDS.

The following able letter, has been addressed by the Most Rev. Dr. Cullen, Archbishop of Dublin, to Lord St. Leonards, in reply to the remarks of the latter respecting the management of the Patriotic Fund. TO THE RIGHT HONORABLE LORD ST. LEONARDS, ETC. Dublin, Nov. 21, 1857. MY LORD—On returning a short time since from the Continent, where business detained me for some weeks, I learned that your lordship had considered it necessary to take exception to some statements made in a letter addressed by me to the Very Rev. Monsignore Yore, Vicar-General of the diocese of Dublin. I cannot but feel indebted to your lordship for having thus contributed to attract public attention to the questions briefly alluded to in my letter, viz., the education of the children of Catholic soldiers, the application of public moneys to proselytising purposes, the management of the Patriotic Fund, and the endowment of Protestant institutions out of that fund. These important questions are now before the public; they will be discussed with warmth, and probably many hard and unpleasant things will be said; yet, we may confidently hope that the good sense of the people of this great empire, and their love of impartiality and fair play, will declare in favor of justice and truth, and that in the end the grievances of which we complained will be redressed. The results already obtained by this discussion