

1832
Education
J. E. Deveraux
Letter

With Respects from the
Author —

Letter to Protestant
Bishops &c. on
Messrs. Stanley & Wynn's
Education Bills

1832

Letter to the Hon. Secy
of the Navy
Prof. Stewart
Washington D.C.

1835

LETTER

ADDRESSED TO

THE MOST REVEREND AND RIGHT REVEREND THE PRO-
TESTANT BISHOPS OF IRELAND, AND THE VERY REVEREND
THE MODERATOR, AND THE REVEREND PRESBYTERIAN
MINISTERS, AND THE VERY REVEREND AND REVEREND
THE METHODIST MINISTERS OF IRELAND,

ON

MESSRS. STANLEY AND WYSE'S

LIBERAL SCHOOL

EDUCATION BILLS,

FIRST PUBLISHED IN THE DUBLIN EVENING POST,

WITH ADDITIONAL MATTER.

By J. E. DEVEREUX, ESQ.

DUBLIN:

(Printed by Thomas Reilly, 17, St. Andrew-street.)

PUBLISHED BY SCULLY, ORMOND-QUAY, DUBLIN; TAYLOR, WEXFORD
FELLOWES, LUDGATE-HILL, AND KEATING AND BROWN,
DUKE-STREET, GROSVENOR-SQUARE, LONDON.

1832.

LETTER

APPENDIX.

	PAGE.
A—Answer to an Utilitarian attack on the Catholic Church in the COURIER,	61
B—Louis XVIII. and the Libereaux,	68
C—Right Rev. Doctor DOYLE and the Education Board,	71
D—Poor Laws,	85

MR. DEVEREUX'S LETTER,

ADDRESSED TO

THE MOST REVEREND AND RIGHT REVEREND THE PROTESTANT BISHOPS OF IRELAND, AND THE VERY REVEREND THE MODERATOR, AND THE REVEREND PRESBYTERIAN MINISTERS, AND THE VERY REVEREND AND REVEREND THE METHODIST MINISTERS OF IRELAND,

ON

MESSRS. STANLEY AND WYSE'S

LIBERAL SCHOOL EDUCATION BILLS.

(From the *D. E. Post*, 29th November, 13th, 15th, and 22d December, 1831.)

*Most Reverend and Right Reverend Lords, and
Very Reverend and Reverend Sirs,*

GIBBON, in his description of the siege of Constantinople by Mahomet II., holds up to the contempt of all ages those Greeks whose only occupations were their bitter disputes about the Homousion and the Homoiousion, whilst the infidel was scaling their walls; and I maintain that the Protestant, Catholic, Presbyterian, or Methodist, who at this day would throw away their time in vain disputes about their respective tenets, whilst infidelity or liberalism threatens to sweep Christianity off the face of the earth, are fully as worthy of the contempt of mankind, as were those foolish Greeks described by Gibbon. Christianity is our common cause, infidelity or liberalism the common enemy; let us then forget our private differences, and join hand and heart against the common enemy.

The great question which now occupies Europe is this—Is Christianity a good *per se*, and for the happiness of man to be maintained; or, as the *Liberaux*, *Utilitarians*, *Infidels*, &c., contend, is Christianity an evil from which, for the

happiness of man, the earth must be set free? If, Reverend fellow Christians, the latter proposition be yours, then you will support Mr. Wyse's liberal, and the other liberal bill; if, on the contrary, your opinion be, that Christianity is a good *per se*, and ought to be maintained, then you will use your utmost efforts to oppose Mr. Wyse's *liberal*, and the other *liberal* bill. But, Reverend fellow Christians, if you wish that Christianity should be maintained, you must not allow Catholicism to be overthrown, for if the oak be felled, the plants which derive life from his substance soon wither and decay; and I will show you that, in like manner, where Catholicism is extinguished, unless political causes intervene, Protestantism soon disappears. Next I will show that it is the interest of each of you to preserve your individuality, for if you do not preserve that individuality you merge into Infidelity, and Protestantism and Christianity disappear altogether.

The provisions in Mr. Wyse's liberal bill, and the bill going under the name of Mr. Stanley, (but which I do not believe to be his production, though I have no authority whatever for that doubt other than the evidence on the face of the bill, that it is Irish manufacture,) though they, in the first instance, tend to destroy Catholicism, I will prove ultimately, tend to destroy Christianity itself—therefore I will make it evident, that it is your interest, as Christians, in the first instance, to join us, Catholics, against that measure, as the only means of securing your future safety.

But before I can pretend to the honor of your co-operation, I must stand *Rectus in Curia*, that is, I must show that there is nothing capricious—nothing factious, in my opposing those measures.

There are three points upon which this charge of faction might rest. First—I am factious, because I oppose a bill supported by Mr. A. R. Blake, whose opinions, he being a Catholic, are believed by many Protestants to be the opinions of the Catholic body. Secondly—I am factious, because I oppose a measure which has the name of an eminent person, we all revere, in its support. Thirdly—I am factious, because supporting Lord Grey's government, I oppose a measure brought forward by his administration.

First—Mr. Blake was often employed by government to support measures obnoxious to the Catholic body, and never had a party in that body, save some few persons called *liberals*, who were ready to join government in degrading our

clergy, and subjugating our church; and I will here recite some acts of that gentleman, upon which I will leave you to pronounce whether he was a friend or an enemy to the Catholic body. It is notorious that our adversaries entertained inveterate prejudices against the religious orders of our Church, and that government had long sought for means to destroy them. Mr. Blake, in his examination before the committee, being questioned about those religious persons, as it were to extract from him (a Catholic gentleman,) such answers as might be used at a future day to lay the foundation of Parliamentary enactments for the destruction of those communities; that is, in order that a numerous and highly respectable body of his countrymen and fellow Catholics, Priests of his Church, many of them eminent for their piety and learning, and irreproachable in their conduct, should experience the same fate which has just now been inflicted on the equally exemplary and meritorious monks of La Trappe, expelled out of their possessions by the lawless* and ferocious stock-jobbers and usurers, who, aided by their base valets, the *liberaux*, now hold France under their galling and ignominious yoke. The examination of Mr. Blake is as follows:—

Q.—“Do you know what number of religious houses there are in Dublin?”

A.—“I do not; but I have heard there were more than desirable.”

Q.—“You say there are more than desirable; what mischief do they do?”

A.—“I have heard that they increased the demands upon the lower orders, and did not in general perform any religious duties in aid of the parochial clergy.”

Though, my Christian friends, we may disagree in spiri-

* I find that I was perfectly correct when (November 27th) I stated that the attack of the stock-jobbers and usurers, and their base valets the *Liberaux*, on the Trappist Monks of La Melluraie, was a *lawless* attack; for that exemplary and distinguished man and accomplished gentleman the Superior, formerly a Colonel, whose name of religion is Pere Antoine, has brought this worthy government of Jews and *Liberaux* before the tribunals of the country, and has cast them; all the soldiers have been withdrawn from the premises, of which he is in complete possession, and is now suing Government for heavy damages, (Dec. 30th, 1831.) This is the rule of *Liberaux* and *Utilitarians* who, when in power, will, of all remorseless tyrants, prove the most reckless; these are the *Liberaux* and *Utilitarians* who wore the ensanguined bonnet *Rouge*, and the *Liberaux* and *Utilitarians* who, covered with Napoleon's embroidery, were the most abject of his crouching slaves, and who never utter three sentences without proclaiming the march of intellect and “the lights of the age.”

tuals, there is one thing in which, as Irishmen, we are of one mind—that is, in our love of fair play. Now, I ask you, is this fair play? Mr. Blake knows nothing of himself of those religious persons, yet he comes forward here to swear to hearsays, to give the weight of his oath, as it were, to imputations on his innocent fellow Catholics, which may be wrought up to their destruction; and you will further perceive that there is nothing here to show that he believes one word of those hearsays. But what will you say, Reverend Sirs, when I show, that those hearsays were point blank falsehoods, and yet such is the case, such the evidence given by one of our Prelates; for the Right Reverend Dr. Doyle, in his examination before the same Parliamentary Committee, being questioned about our religious, swears that—“They assist in performing, I might say, every duty of the Ministry; they preach, they hear confessions, they catechise.”—Will you then, after reading this testimony, and reverting to Mr. Blake’s examination, be still of opinion that the Learned Gentleman is a friend to the Catholics?

Again, in 1825, the Commissioners of Education, of which Mr. Blake was one, published official documents which we Catholics, one and all, considered to be a studied compound of calumnies and falsehood against our Clergy and Religion; now, though Protestants from those prejudices, now no more existing, might then conscientiously believe those things, we can never admit that any Catholic would believe absurdities which every Catholic, man, woman, and child in Ireland would immediately declare to be false, and which said official documents, the Right Reverend Dr. Doyle declares to have been “fraught with bad faith,” in his pungent letter, dated Carlow, June 16, 1825, and directed to Anthony Richard Blake, Esq., one of the Commissioners of Education. Here, my Reverend Friends, I ask you, can we believe that man who was a party in concocting those official documents “fraught with falsehood” against our holy religion, to be a friend of ours, a friend to the Catholics of Ireland?

Again, this Catholic gentleman having supported measures calculated to degrade our Clergy and subjugate our Church, that is Clergy pensioning, declared that “he supported those measures because those measures would greatly invigorate and increase Protestant ascendancy.” You, I admit, may naturally approve of this, as your opinion may be that Protestant ascendancy would be advantageous to the

country, and therefore you may here consider that Mr. Blake proves himself your devoted friend; but, as we want neither Catholic nor Protestant ascendancy, we are of opinion that here Mr. Blake proves himself an enemy to the Catholics of Ireland. I could adduce more cases in point, but those I have brought forward are, I presume, more than sufficient.

These charges against Mr. Blake, however, I must beg leave to inform you are nothing new; they were all made and specified in the resolutions of the Catholics of the County of Wexford, 5th Dec. 1825. Of course this exposure made a noise, and one day Mr. Blake's friend, Mr. Sheil, got up in the Association and attempted a vindication of his friend. I was in the County Wexford; on hearing this I immediately set out for Dublin, and at the next meeting of the Association I referred to what Mr. Sheil had said. I made a plain statement of facts; Mr. Sheil rose and explained, and after saying many more kind things of me than I deserve, sat down. Thus, the charges made against Mr. Blake were so palpable and so evident, that even his own able advocate and friend, Mr. Sheil, could not attempt to palliate them, and there was not one man in that assembly, then fully crowded, that did not go away with the full conviction, which he retains to this day, that Mr. Blake was not a friend to the Catholics of Ireland. Mr. O'Connell was in the room, but said not a word. I have thought it the more necessary to state these facts, as I find it trumpeted forth that this Bill of Mr. Stanley's is a boon conferred on the Catholics, who cannot but have full confidence in that measure, as Mr. Blake is at the head of it.

Here, Reverend Sirs, you may say, we admit that there is nothing factious in your opposing Mr. Blake's Bill, for you have clearly demonstrated that Mr. Blake is not a friend to the Catholics; and you will now ask how I shall be able to show that I am not factious in opposing a bill honored by the name of an eminent person we must all revere.

It would not be easy to find words to express the veneration in which we hold the virtues of that eminent individual, the profound respect we feel for his person, and our high sense of his abilities; but the very virtues of those eminent persons ever are to their disadvantage when their candor and frankness has to encounter trick and fraud; besides, this is no spiritual matter, but one involved in many lay considerations of great moment, therefore laymen have

a right to give their opinion, and as that first of men, the best and most judicious friend we ever had, that is Edmund Burke, has given his opinion on a similar subject, we cannot but pay attention to that opinion. Mr. Burke says in his letter to the Right Reverend Doctor Hussey, Bishop of Waterford:—"If you (the Catholic Bishops,) have not wisdom enough to make common cause, they will cut you off one by one. I am sure that the constant meddling of your Bishops and Clergy with the Castle, and the Castle with them, will infallibly set them ill with their own body. All the weight which the Clergy have hitherto had to keep the people quiet will be wholly lost. If this once should happen, *at best you will have a marked schism of more than one kind, and I am greatly mistaken if this is not intended, and diligently and systematically pursued.* Your enemies are embodied—what becomes of you if you are only individuals?"

Here, then, my Reverend Christian Friends, is the authority we have to be on our guard against the machinations of our adversaries, and which warrants us to exercise our free judgments on a lay measure, though even that measure may have met with the momentary approbation of those we reverence, before whom the case may not have been exposed in all its various bearings, but purposely and artfully misrepresented.

But you will say, there is another point in which we appear factious, that is, in opposing a bill proposed under the administration of Lord Grey and the Lord Lieutenantcy of the Marquis of Anglesey, as we have declared that we reposed implicit confidence in that administration. To this I answer, that we do place implicit confidence in Lord Grey and the Marquis of Anglesey—that we are convinced they are incapable of all fraud and circumvention; but we do not say that either of those Noblemen are more devoted to the interests of Ireland than were Mr. Fox and Lord Fitzwilliam; and yet, when Lord Fitzwilliam was Lord Lieutenant, what did Mr. Burke, the man whose esteem for Lord Fitzwilliam was beyond that he entertained for any other being, advise? Did he advise us to place implicit trust in the government of Lord Fitzwilliam? No—he did no such thing; but, on the contrary, he advised us to distrust even that government: therefore, as we cannot be held to pay a bad compliment to the Marquis of Anglesey when we place him on a level with Lord Fitzwilliam, we will, in obedience

to Mr. Burke, in this matter, distrust the government of the Noble Marquis. What, I ask, would that illustrious man (Mr. Burke) have said, if at that time a bill like the present had been under consideration, a liberal bill worthy of the *liberaux* Robespierre and Marat, or the equally unprincipled *liberaux*, the ferocious uncircumcised and circumcised Jews who now rule France, the one and the other equally execrating Christianity, and finding no means more effectual to extirpate Christianity than by placing religion under the hoof of Avocats, under a board of Avocats; and we see that at this day, in humble imitation of such precedents, we are thus to have here all the beatitudes of a Star Chamber, and those of a *comite de Salut Public* concentrated in one. That is, the Christian Ministry of Ireland, Protestant, Catholic, Presbyterian, Methodist, are to be deprived of their functions, of that right which, at all times and in all places, belonged to them by the discipline of every Christian Church that ever existed, and that belonged to them until the triumph of the enemies of God and man, the French philosophes, was accomplished by the French revolution; that is, the primary education of their children. In all Christian communities children were to learn their religion as they lisped their letters; but religion being now, after the Robespierre fashion, which has done such wonders in France in promoting Christianity, to be placed here in Ireland under a board of *Avocats*, children here in Ireland are no longer to learn their religion as they lisp their lettres. My Reverend Protestant Friends, I said in the beginning of this letter that this was a common cause, and you see this is a common cause; that this measure strikes at Christianity itself, and that this is the most direct mode of extirpating Christianity is proved by this fact, that the first principle insisted on by the *liberaux*; the execrators of Christianity every where they have power, is, that the child shall not learn his religion while he lisps his letters.

Thus if those liberal measures pass we shall see the Protestant, Presbyterian, and Methodist Ministers, and the Catholic Priests of Ireland, after the last Paris fashion, cast off like so many mangy hounds, and heard of no more.

Standing now, *rectus in curia*, I will enter upon the subject of Mr. Wyse and Mr. Stanley's Bill, they being essentially the same in their provisions, and I will show before I have done that these provisions are precisely those adopted by the *philosophes* and *liberaux* for the extirpation

of Christianity in France, and by the *neologists* and *liberants* for the extirpation of Christianity in Protestant Germany.

I now come to the provisions in Mr. Wyse's, and the other liberal Bill; though the mechanical parts differ, the essential provisions are the same, and I will by answering one answer both, and also notice some of the provisions peculiar to the other Bill. In both Bills we find the following principles established:—

1st.—Educating Protestant and Catholic children together.

2d.—The children not to learn their Religion as they lisp their letters.

In considering the above, I will show that No. 1 will have an effect which I am bound to believe the Honorable Gentleman does not mean, that is, it will tend to the extirpation of Christianity: and that No. 2 will not have the effect Mr. Wyse and Mr. Stanley intend, that it will not be productive of social harmony; and by the example of what takes place in England, where each sect has its own school, that it is not necessary for the purposes of social harmony.

No. 1. I prove will tend to extirpate Christianity; first, by the example of France, and next by the example of Protestant Germany.—[This I have thrown into a note at the end.]

The advocates of those liberal bills and liberal schools, say, that the children will learn their religion from their respective clergy; but so thought would be the case the good Protestants of France, and of Protestant Germany, when liberal schools were first established there; and so they sent their children to *liberal* schools, as you, my Reverend Friends, are invited to do here. But you have now the example of France and Protestant Germany, where you see that children going to schools where they do not learn their religion as they lisp their letters, has been the destruction of Christianity, and that, I trust, will act as a salutary warning to you. But those persons who so advise, must be grossly ignorant of the state of things, even in this country. How difficult is it often, for Ministers or Priests to get children, living at a distance from the school of their congregation, or otherwise employed, to attend their present Protestant Bible or Catholic catechistical schools; and if they make those excuses at present, will they and their parents not have another ground of apology when they can say, that all the time of the children has been taken up in

attending the liberal schools, which will be somewhat more inviting to the children, as there they will find all more warm and comfortable than is, at least, the Priests' schools, through which the four winds may be blowing. But the liberal school supporters will say, we don't prevent the Ministers or Priests having their own bible or catechistical school and schoolmaster. But I say you do prevent it, by giving superior inducements to the children to attend your liberal schools. So, then, it will come to this: if the Priest desires that his children should have the catechism, and the Minister desires that his children should have the Bible, they must keep up the same number of schools and schoolmasters (for, with all the zeal of the Priest and his Curate, still he will want an assistant for catechistical instruction,) they have at present, at their own expense, that is the same number of Christian schools, which now are more necessary than ever, in order to instil religion into the child, as an antidote to the no-religion of the *liberal* school; and thus, as to that most essential part of education in all Christian communities, the primary education of children in their religion, we see that this grant of £40,000 by government, will not contribute one shilling, leaving the Ministers and Priests, as before, to provide for the education of the Poor. Is it not, then, a mere mockery to call these liberal bills, bills for the education of our Christian People, or to represent that this £40,000 will relieve the People from the expenses of education, when it leaves them still subject to the expenses of that, to the People, most necessary of all educations, religious education.

But the grand argument of Messrs. Wyse and Stanley in support of their liberal Robespierian bills, (I distinctly say Robespierian bills, for till his time no such thing was known in any Christian community as a child's school where the child did not learn his religion while he lisped his letters, and I prophesy that if these liberal bills should be carried, they will as effectually tend to uproot society, as we see the measures of the liberal Robespierre and Co. have done,) is, that it will tend to unite Protestant and Catholic, and here I am at issue with those Gentlemen. For they must mean one of two things, either that Protestant, Presbyterian, Methodist Ministers, and Catholic Priests will cease to give religious instructions, or that they will continue to give religious instructions; but I perfectly agree with them, that in the first case the liberal school will unite the children that is ceasing

to be Protestant or Catholic and becoming infidels, there will be no differences in matters of religion between them, as we see in liberal schools in France and Protestant Germany. But is it the opinion of Lord Grey, or was it that of any other British Premier that ever existed, that it would be more for the interest of the empire, that the People of Ireland should become infidels than that they should remain Christians? In the latter case the Ministers and Priests will continue to give religious instruction to their children; but here my Reverend Friends you will admit, that among many Protestant schoolmasters of the lower order, an exposure of what they call the superstitions and bigotry of Popery, and of the idolatry of Papists, and that the idolater is to die the death, &c., is a part of the instruction they seldom fail to give to their children; now, will it be believed, that the Protestant child coming into the liberal school primed with those irritated feelings, and the Catholic child with political prejudices equally violent, that these feelings are to subside on entering the liberal school—my opinion is directly the reverse, for, on the contrary, I consider that the juxta position would embitter those prejudices. Now, let us just see amongst others, how a daily necessary occurrence would tend to keep up hostile feelings by this very juxta position so recommended. The Catholic child, I presume, is not, on entering the liberal school, to disavow his religion; it is not, I presume, required of him by our liberals that he shall give the promise of his being a future scoundrel by acting the renegade in his early years.

You know, my Reverend Friends, that time immemorial in Catholic schools all over the world, it is our usage to open the classes with a Mass to the Holy Ghost, with the hymn, "*Veni creator spiritus, mentes tuorum visita,*" that is, we implore the Divine Grace to visit our mind, in order that whilst we partake of the salutary fruit of the tree of knowledge, we may be strengthened against the evils of the enemy of mankind, who, under the congenial shape of a liberal, might for our destruction, tempt us to pluck the poisonous fruit which the tree of knowledge also bears. Now this which is performed in public at the opening of the classes, is daily done by the schoolmaster, in a short prayer as he opens our Catholic schools, and this it would be the duty of the Catholic child, if he attended a liberal school, to do by a short prayer as he opens his book. But all our acts of religion are to be sanctified by the holy sign of the

cross, in which, as Catholics, and therefore as men of honor and gentlemen, always open breasted, we ever avow our faith in the face of the world, whether before companions in tranquil schools, or before the knife of the disemboweller and his blazing fire at Tyburn. I cannot believe that in Ireland, a father so infamously base could be found who would tell his child that in the liberal school he is not to make the sign of our redemption, the sign of the cross, or if there was such a father, I hope that there would not be one child in Ireland, who, in base subservience to others, or in dastardly terror of their scoffing would be for one moment deterred from performing that religious duty. If there was such a child, and he grew up to be a Member of Parliament, we should be no way surprised at his repudiating the name of Catholic, at his declaring to the House that he did not appear there as a Catholic, but as a liberal, an illustrious exhibition of liberal magnanimity, at which every man of honor in the House would, no doubt, be entranced in admiration.

We have seen what were the feelings ingrafted by certain Protestant schoolmasters on the minds of Protestant children of the lower order, and I ask, would the scoffings of those poor deluded children at the Popish superstitions, as they are taught to call them, at the signs of the cross daily made before their eyes by all the Catholic children, much tend to mutual harmony? Numberless other matters to the same purpose might be stated. Why then establish those liberal schools where the practice of his religion must be forbidden to the Catholic, or attended with such consequences?

But I shall beg leave to show from another quarter the fallacy of the assertion on which those liberal bills are founded,—that is, that the juxta position of children in schools is calculated to do away prejudices. English and Irish Catholic children educated together in Colleges on the Continent and in England,—they entered those Colleges each with strong national prejudices, did this juxta position cause those prejudices to subside? I say it did not, but embittered them; for it is a known fact, the friendships between English and Irish Catholics, and *vice versa*, were seldom contracted between those who had been school-fellows. The above then shows how needless, to make use of no harsher word, are those liberal schools as to the Catholics, whose religion cannot be practised there without fatal consequences. On

the other hand, my Reverend Friends, it is part of your religion that the Bible shall be put into the hands of your children, in order that they may learn their religion while they lisp their letters; and why, I ask, are you, who have always been freemen, to be treated as slaves, condemned to obey an arbitrary dictate which violates both religious liberty and the intention of Parliament, by withholding the public money from your schools where the Bible is admitted as a school-book, and applying that money to liberal schools, where the Bible is not admitted as a school-book, and which, therefore, your children ought not to enter. The Hon. and Right Hon. Gentlemen giving no money to your schools, or what is to the same purpose, giving money to schools your children ought not to enter—thus, by their arbitrary will they employ that money in a manner in which it cannot be of use to your children, and thus violate the intention of Parliament which granted this £40,000 for the use of your children. But as I did not presume, that in our case it could be the intention of Parliament to make us give up our religion on entering any school, so neither can I conceive that they would require you to give up your Bible on entering any school, and that your children should thus likewise give the promise of their becoming future scoundrels, by their acting the part of renegades in their early years.

The Right Hon. and Hon. Gentlemen say, that liberal schools are necessary, in order “to promote mutual forbearance, brotherly charity, and the reality, and not the cant, of good will.” Well, to me, from the days of the famed liberal *Anacharsis Clouts*, the orator of the human race, to this day, the most disgusting of all cants is the liberal cant. But I would ask those gentlemen who complain of the want of good will in Ireland, between Protestant and Catholic, where is that want to be seen? for the momentary effects of elections or party politics, of course those Honorable Gentlemen do not pretend to say, that their liberal bills would cure. I maintain that no one complains of a want of good will in Ireland between Protestant and Catholic, except as aforesaid, where politics intervene. The social intercourse has been rendered what it should be by Catholic Emancipation; enmity was kept up by the monopoly of political power, and enmity has ceased with the fall of that monopoly—therefore Mr. Wyse and Stanley’s liberal schools are not necessary to “promote mutual forbearance,

“brotherly charity, and the reality, not the cant, of good will.”

Who ever complained that social intercourse was not, as it ought to be, in England, between Protestant and Presbyterian, and Methodist and Catholic : and yet we see, in every town throughout England, the National or Protection School, the Presbyterian, the Methodist, the Catholic Schools, and the children of those different schools always keeping separate, that is, never going from their own schools to the others. Now if, as it is thus proved, educating sects together is not necessary to secure social intercourse between those sects in England, why is it necessary in Ireland to educate those sects together to secure social intercourse? Having first proved that this bill would have an effect which I was bound to believe Mr. W. never intended, I have now proved, as I engaged to do, that it would not produce the effect he intended, that is, promoting mutual forbearance, &c. Why, then, impose liberal schools upon us here in Ireland? My Rev. Friends, I will give you my answer to this why, I will let you into the whole secret, and this matter intimately interests you, for, I repeat it, we have one common cause, and, as where the oak is fallen, the plants which derive life from his substance soon wither and decay, it is your interest to support us, for, if Catholicism goes, Christianity falls. No such beautiful things as this cherishing of mutual forbearance, this brotherly charity, and so forth, ever entered the heads of the machinators of this liberal school affair. As to Mr. Wyse, I look upon it that they were happy to see him get into this business, and they are profuse in his praise, and pat him on the back to make him go on, and thus unknown to the Honourable Gentleman himself (he being a Catholic) they use him here as a decoy. It has been proved that these bills were totally inadequate to fulfil their ostensible purpose; therefore, the deep ones who framed them had some other purpose in view than that which they exposed to the wondering eyes of mystified lay and clerical wiseacres. In 1792 that excellent Prelate, the Most Rev. Dr. Troy, from the confident simplicity of his heart, was well near falling a victim to the mystification of Castle intriguers, who persuaded him to join the notorious 68 Catholic addressers or Catholic castle-hacks, as they were usually called, who were sacrificing Catholic interests; and we, of the General Committee of the Catholics of Ireland, who opposed their measures, were accused (as I was

accused by the Editor in the *Dublin Evening Post* of Tuesday, Nov. 29th last) of flying in the face of our Hierarchy; to which we replied, that though entertaining the most profound veneration for the virtues of the Most Rev. Archbishop, however deluded he might be, still we did not consider that his Grace, and a few sycophant Priests, were the Catholic Hierarchy and Priesthood of Ireland, and we blew up the sixty-eight Castle-hacks, and our good and dear Doctor Troy and his sycophant Priests; and when the operation was over, the worthy Archbishop was quite delighted to have been delivered out of the trammels of his Castle mystificators and restored to his People. How is it that after this example, and what Mr. Burke has said, that persons will not see what is as clear as the sun, that on Catholic matters the Government (mark, I say, the Irish Government, for the worst enemies of Ireland have been found here,) is not to be trusted, and that when they entertain measures hostile to us, they lay hold of some of our Prelates, and that the late measures, so hostile to our Church, have one and all had the same object, and have been devised by the same persons as the present liberal Education Bill. Thus, Mr. Blake and his noble friend's measure of the Veto, Mr. Blake and his noble friend's Priest Bribery Bill, have, one and all, had one and the same object with Mr. Blake and his noble friends' present *liberal* Education Bill, that is, the degradation of our Clergy, and the gradual undermining of our Church, and this for the same purpose as the former bills, which were declared by his noble friend to be as *Buttresses* to the Church. But I maintain on the contrary, that this Education Bill, by unchristianising us, would tumble down *Buttresses*, Church, Temporalities and all.

A Right Rev. Prelate has said, that in London there was a pit dug to entrap them, which they avoided; and now there is a pit dug to entrap them by the same trappers who dug the former pit, for the said trappers and their present mystificators are one; and yet, they stand with confidence on the brink of the trap, ready to tumble into it, and this, notwithstanding they themselves declared, that the words of the trappers were "*fraught with bad faith.*" Was there ever such infatuation!

Here I again acquit the Honorable Secretary of evil intentions; but why, in the first place, when there was a measure of moral administration on the tapis, consult law-

yers, who, however ably they may advocate *pro* or *con* in or out of Parliament, are, by the common consent of mankind, deemed incapable of entertaining questions of moral administration—*Le Legiste nest point Legislatteur*. But perhaps the State measures those lawyers recommended had succeeded; now, if that had been the case, that would have been some excuse; but what shall we say when, on the contrary, every one measure they recommended was not only a failure, but roused the indignation of the majority of the Irish People, and brought Government into contempt and odium. Witness the *Veto*, the Priest Bribery Bill, and the Easement of Burial Bill—may we not then truly say, that the infatuation of the Right Honorable Secretary was not surpassed by that of our too confiding Prelates; and *cui bono*, that indeed it will require no great ingenuity to answer: for we shall just see what was the object of their former bills, and then we shall discover the *cui bono* of their *liberal* bill—that is, that this bill can have no other than the same object; and further, we shall see that it will be just as much a failure—just as little likely to fulfil its purpose as the said former bills, due to the statesman-like talents of the same operatives.

These Learned Gentlemen, the framers of the Education Bill, were the most active supporters of the *Veto*, and persons whose words were “fraught with bad faith,” who by this measure, meant to degrade our Clergy, and so gradually undermine our religion, and, by their failure, brought Government into contempt. Those same persons whose words are fraught with bad faith, were the supporters of the Easement of Burial Bill, which could not be carried into effect, and was meant to degrade our Clergy, and subjugate our Church to the State, caused the Government to be execrated in every parish in Ireland. Those same persons whose words are “fraught with bad faith,” were the indefatigable supporters of the Priest Bribery Bill, calculated to degrade our Clergy and bring our Religion into contempt, and gradually to undermine our Church, and brought contempt and hatred on Government; and what were all those measures by the authors themselves declared to be for? Why, as aforesaid, to be a “*Buttress*” to the (temporalities, of course of the) Church; and we shall see that this alone can be the intention of this present bill, whilst it will be evident by the context of this letter, that so far from fulfilling that intention, that, as aforesaid, if this bill passed, Churches, Buttresses,

Christianity, and all would tumble down together. These forensic Statesmen now said, we have hitherto completely failed in every measure we have ever attempted to subjugate and overthrow the Catholic Church in Ireland; but the thing is to be done, for Christianity has been all as one as extirpated in France by the *liberaux*. Let us then try whether the means they used to extirpate Christianity there would not answer us here in Ireland to undermine Catholicism. The means used by the *Liberaux* to extirpate Christianity were to establish *liberal* schools, where the child is not suffered to learn his religion as he lisps his letters. Let us then, in order to undermine Catholicism, establish *liberal* schools, where the child shall not learn his religion while he lisps his letters.

When we see throughout in sundry measures an unity of intention, we may fairly conclude that these measures have one and the same origin, therefore I presume that the reader will join me in opinion, that the authors of the recited bills are the authors of the projected Education Bill, introduced under the name of the Right Honorable Secretary. If this does not open your eyes, (you, my Reverend Friends, still bearing in mind that I consider it your duty, as Christians, not to suffer Catholicism to be extinguished in order to secure Christianity,) pray spell and put together the following: you know that many articles have appeared in a certain liberal Review against Catholicism, and many more articles in said Review against Christianity itself; you know that an influential member of the Cabinet declared in his place in the House of Commons, that "all was bad in the Catholic system." (See my letter signed Hibernus, one of the five delegates, &c., *Morning Chronicle*, July 29th, 1828.) Now if the Learned and Noble Lord still continues of the same mind, and there is nothing to show that he has changed his opinion, as a faithful subject to his Majesty, and as a confidential Minister to the Crown, the wish next to his heart must be to extirpate a system in which all is bad, that is, the gradual extinction* of the Catholic religion. Next you know that the *Courier* is a semi-official paper. Well, here is what the *Courier* says, as quoted in *Saunders's News-Letter*, February 25, 1831:—"If all the Powers of the Continent were blessed with free institutions, and constitutional, and good Sovereigns, like our own, the well disposed

* See Appendix A.

in France, having no fear of themselves, would apply their energies to the improvement of the moral condition of the French people—to the cultivation of commerce—to the establishment of order—to the gradual extinction of Popery, and the consequent increase of social enjoyment.”—Sir Thomas Baring, at the Bible Meeting held at Willis’s Rooms, King-street, St. James’s, some years ago, has told you that there was no longer any Christianity among French Protestants, but that with the superstitions of Popery they had thrown off all faith, and were become Voltarian infidels; and that distinguished person, the Reverend Mr. Shepherd, Presbyterian Minister at Liverpool, in his French Tour tells you, that “with grief he says it, faith in France is only to be found among Catholics.” So that you see here that there cannot be a question of Christian Protestantism in France, which does not exist, and therefore the extinction of Popery here means the extinction of Christianity, to which the writer wishes to make our good King accessory. It may then be safely surmised that if the present liberal bill, which tends point blank to the gradual extinction of Christianity in Ireland, was shown to the writer of that article, that said bill would meet with his unbounded approbation, and that most likely he had triumphantly mentioned this bill to his intimates as a step gained towards the subversion of Christianity. Again, see what that likewise semi-official Paper, the *Times* of April 14th, 1831, says—“With regard to Ireland, we acknowledge that the Reform Bill must be, as that of Emancipation ought to have been, accompanied by some new and decisive regulations for attaching the Catholic Clergy to the State. The entire Establishment of Maynooth must be reconstructed, or it will pour forth from age to age successive swarms of active conspirators against the Established Church.” Now, I appeal to you, are not these quoted declarations and measures of 1831 in perfect conformity with those of 1824 and 5, with Mr. Blake and Lord Plunkett’s Priest Bribery Bill of 1824, meant to be, as Lord Plunkett declared, a Buttress to the Established Church, to which the extinction of Maynooth is also to be a Buttress, as set forth in this semi-official Journal the *Times*, and which Priest Bribery Bill, as Mr. Blake declared, “would greatly invigorate and increase Protestant Ascendancy.” And Mr. Blake and his friend are the zealous supporters of the Education Bill! Clerks or Laymen who, after this clear *expose*, still continue blind to the intentions of this same

liberal Education Bill, may claim the Grand Cross of the Order of *Noodles* with acclamation.

As lawyers have a knack at mystifying, those forensic gentlemen have conceived that with a Board of *Avocats*, as pliant to the powers that be, and I do not say any more so than are *Avocats* in general, they could humbug the world; for how monstrous in itself is not the formation of such a Board? Let us suppose that £40,000 are granted to be applied to the formation of law schools, and that a board of Priests was named to direct and administer such schools, to appoint the Professors, and select the law books to be used, would not all Ireland be at once convulsed with laughter or indignation at this outrageous mystification of the People? and yet I do maintain that in every possible respect, Priests are better fitted to deal with law, than *Avocats* to deal in matters of moral administration, for which function Junius, Jefferson, Burke, &c., &c., &c., show they are totally incapacitated by the habits of their profession.

The present *Avocats*, however, otherwise incapacitated as we have seen, are Christians, but they are not immortal, and we are to guard against possibilities, and therefore we are not to give a power at present to persons who would not abuse it, when they might be succeeded by those who would make an ill use of that power. Take this case in point—the aristocracy of France having been destroyed by Richelieu, Louis XIV. did not consider his power sufficiently despotic until he had destroyed the independence of the Church, he framed his pretended gallican liberties, &c., by which the power of nominating the Bishops was vested in him: thus all independent power being destroyed, he said, and not till then, “*la nation c’est moi.*” I will not go into the deplorable consequences that followed from this measure. The point is this, the power of nominating Bishops vested in the Crown: whilst the state remained Catholic the evil was not so much felt; but the other day the Prime Minister, M. Cassimer Perrier, a Calvinist and liberal, arrogated to himself that power, contending, the State succeeding to the powers of the State under Louis XIV., and he, this Calvinist and liberal, was about to name liberal Bishops, when he was opposed by the Abbe Lemennais and the orthodox Catholics, and obliged to give in. Now, who can tell us that a liberal Minister may not at a future day be found, such a Ministry as the liberal who wrote the above quoted article in the *Courier*, for example, would select? and then he should have a board

of liberal or anti-christian *Avocats* administering our schools, naming liberal or anti-christian schoolmasters, and ordering liberal or anti-christian books into the schools, and thus would there be a short cut to the extinction of Catholicism and ultimately of Christianity, that is of Protestantism, Presbyterianism, and Methodism.

In order to show you, my Reverend Friends, how unfit are persons of different religions, and, *a fortiori*, how unfit are *liberaux*, who are of no religion, to select schoolmasters and select books for schools, I shall give you Mr. Burke's opinion, in his own words, on a parallel case, merely changing the word Priest into Schoolmaster, and the word Church into School.

In his celebrated letter to a Roman Catholic Nobleman, that illustrious Statesman, Mr. Burke, says:—

“Never were the members of one religious sect fit to appoint the schoolmasters to another. Those who have no regard for their welfare, reputation, or internal quiet, will not appoint such as are proper. But suppose that the present Castle be as well inclined, as I know I am, to do the Catholics all kinds of justice, I declare I would not, if it were in my power, take that patronage upon myself—I know I ought not to do it. Allowing that they find themselves capable to administer (the same may be said of interfering in) the government of a school. Whoever is censured by the Parish Priest, will be looked upon as oppressed; whoever is careless in his opinions, and loose in his morals, will be called a *liberal* man, and will be supposed to have incurred hatred because he was not a bigot. Informers, tale-bearers, perverse and obstinate men, flatterers who court the Protestant gentlemen of the country, will be the objects of attention—and then I run no risk in foretelling, that whatever order, quiet, and morality you have in the country will be lost.”

Notwithstanding those unanswerable arguments, we have in the *liberal* bill the Castle *Avocats* administering and interfering in those schools, and the Priest not allowed to interfere in the education of his children; but for yet a while I suppose he will be allowed to say mass in his parish, otherwise, as his most essential duty, the superintending the education of his children, is taken from him—he might almost as well be out of it as suffer the persecution, so well described by Mr. Burke in the above quotation, which he will have to

endure, should he find fault with the schoolmaster, from every Squirearch or meddling Squireen in the Parish.

That this is to be the Parish Priest's degraded situation is evident, when once the board has established its schoolmasters; the act, I think, if the papers are right, says, that if the Priest interferes he is to be fined, and that he can only remonstrate by affidavit. But there are fifty causes of complaint a Parish Priest may have against a schoolmaster, which he could not take an oath about, and these liberal schoolmasters, thus backed by the *Avocats* and set on to ride roughshod over the Parish Priest, may be more apt to seek occasions of difference, in order to show their authority, than to avoid them. If, for example, according to the habits of liberal schoolmasters in France, (for all these liberal bills, as you will hereafter see, are a mere aping of the French *liberaux*,) our liberal schoolmaster here should indulge his boys during recreation time, in the liberal diversion of hunting the Priest, and pelting him with rotten eggs, and he was to write to the *Avocats*, the next post would bring back his letter with strong expressions of reprobation for his interfering with the schoolmaster, desiring him to look at the act of Parliament, the Board advising him for the future never to address them without an affidavit, and for the present to wipe his face. But here is a still stronger case, the Priest has the intimate conviction, that the liberal schoolmaster, as is usual in liberal schools, is tainting the angelic purity of our Irish children. It is notorious that an abomination not to be named among Christians, is common in French liberal schools—indeed the *Liberaux* denominate this execrable liberal crime, “*une recreation classique et liberale.*” But how did French liberal colleges and schools attain this pitch of depravity? Why, by liberal primary schools, where the pupils do not learn their religion as they lisp their letters, that is, by schools on the same principle with those Mr. Stanley means to establish.*—

* These abominations are notorious in all *liberal* colleges and schools in France, that is those exclusively under lay administration. The municipality of Amiens having long complained of the depravity of students of the college, and their corrupting the youth of the town, at last an Inspector was sent down from Paris, and eighteen of the boys were turned out of the college, and only allowed a few minutes to leave the college and the town. The *Constitutionnel* is quite indignant that 18 of his brother liberals should have been so peremptorily dealt with—and says it is to give satisfaction to the Jesuits of St. Achevil, near Amiens.

“ Un Inspecteur General de l'Universite est arrive inopinément dans Amiens

Now, here the Priest dares not interfere though he knows his beloved children are on the road to destruction; for as he cannot swear to facts, he cannot send up an affidavit, and he is thus condemned to be silent, and behold liberalism and vice triumphant.

Under whatever form a board so constituted exists, it is impossible that where parties entertain such different views, and are of such different habits, that clashing interests should not arise; besides, why all this expense of Boards, Commissioners, Visitors, who may set all to loggerheads to make themselves useful, when all might be better done without expense?—and, why here establish a connexion between, I may say, Church and State (for education is a Church concern,) which we all abhor? This question will be repeatedly asked, and as no satisfactory answer will be given, it will be still surmised that Government, who has so often attempted to entrap us, has ultimate views not to our interest. Why, my Reverend Friends, all that is required, you can, without fuss or trouble or expense, at once accomplish, by each of you having your own schools; schoolmasters of your own choice, and under your own absolute dominion, teaching

“et soudain 18 élèves du Collège Royal ont été renvoyés à leurs parents. On ne leur accorde que quelques minutes pour quitter le collège et sortir de la ville. On se demande si une mesure de rigueur si extraordinaire a pour but de donner une espèce de satisfaction au R. R. P. P. de St. Achevil.”—*Constitutionnel*, 5th Mars, 1828.

The state of depravity existing in all those liberal colleges and schools of the University throughout France is such as no other country but *liberal* France ever beheld. Count Montalembert, 19th September, 1831, in the Chamber of Peers, speaks of those colleges as follows:—

“Vous le savez, y at-il, un seul établissement de l'Université ou un enfant Catholique puisse demeurer dans sa foi, ne requêt-ils pas sur toutes les jeunes âmes qu'elle prétend instruire? Ne sont elles pas toutes souillées, ou pétrifiées, ou glacées, l'immoralité la plus flagrante, la plus monstrueuse, la plus dénaturée, n'est elle pas inscrite dans les registres de chaque collège, et dans les Souvenirs de chaque enfant qui y a passé seulement huit jours? La contagion n'est elle pas chaque année plus mortelle, ne devoret elle pas chaque année des milliers d'enfants? Et cependant chaque année l'infame ne vient-elle pas élargir le cercle de ses ravages et arracher au foyer paternel de nouvelles victimes?”

Such are the abominations of *liberal* schools and colleges, which could not have existed had the children who frequent them not received their primary education in liberal schools, where they could not learn their religion as they lisped their letters—that is in such liberal schools as Mr. Stanley intends to establish in Ireland.

In front of the Count de Montalembert, as he pronounced this speech, were, amongst other liberals, the liberal Baron Pasquier, and the liberal Duke de Broglie, the great defenders and patrons of the University and its abominations; but they were mute, not one Peer dared to reply to this charge.—Liberal despotism rules, but does not condescend to argue.

your children their religion as they lisp their letters. This is so little unreasonable, that it is nothing more than what, as we have seen, your Reverend Brethren enjoy in England, and no more than that right which, as we have seen, every Christian community throughout the world has enjoyed from the time of the Apostles, that is, the right of children being taught their religion as they lisped their letters, and which right thus remained uninterrupted until the days of the *liberaux* Robespierre and Marat.

My Rev. Friends, the plain truth is, that all this Board affair is a mere humbug. When you patronised the Kildare-place Society, you did so for a conscientious purpose, to save our souls; but Government, who made those grants to Kildare-place, cared not one d—n for our souls. But in conformity *with* the besotted policy of Whigs and Tories, Tories and Whigs, who, carried away by their unstatesman-like prejudices, agree in one object, that is, in bringing about that which would be most injurious to the people of Ireland, most fatal to the interests of the proprietors of the Irish soil, and to the welfare of the Empire; that is the destruction of the influence of the Catholic Priesthood, which once gone, the people of Ireland would be placed under the then uncontrolled dominion of Terry-altism, Journalism, and variegated SOLONS: and we know how then would fare the general interests, for having cast off the only authority they respect, that of the Priests, they, the people, would despise all authority. Here then we have had the Tories, in order to destroy that influence, attempting, by this Kildare-place grant, to uncatholicise us by inducing us to adopt as the true religion, in *lieu* of Catholicism, any one of the thousand and one religions ingenious persons might make out between Genesis and Revelations; and here in like manner, we have the Whigs, who care no more for the *Belles Lettres* of our peasantry, than the Tories did for our souls,—attempting by this £40,000 and *liberal* schools to uncatholicise by unchristianising, and thus by other means to destroy the influence of our Priesthood. The patent fact which every one knows, that Catholics are the best subjects under any Government, and Infidels the worst, and this truth, that Catholics we must remain or infidels become, never having been understood by either party; both parties being alike guilty of the absurd conduct of still persisting in consulting on Catholic matters. Here a noble and learned lord, all whose schemes, as you have seen, have been failures; and in consulting in England on Catholic matters, a learned gen-

tleman of Lincoln's-Inn, all whose Catholic schemes from his blue book concern, and his *Veto*, to his protesting or Protestantising Catholic dissenter fancies have been failures, and this because the noble and learned lord, and the learned gentleman have the Irish and English Catholic liberaux along with them. Now if Whigs and Tories, Tories and Whigs, would condescend to enquire, they would at once discover that the English and Irish Catholic liberaux are not the Catholic people of either England or Ireland—so far indeed from that being the case, that every measure proposed, as aforesaid, by said learned gentlemen, and supported by the said Catholic *liberals*, was opposed by the Catholic people, and, as we have seen, proved a failure, and brought government into contempt.

Surely my Reverend Friends, you and your brethren the Catholic Priesthood, are as fit to choose school-books and schoolmasters for your respective flocks as are Dublin Avocats!

This *liberal* Education Bill appears to have been modelled upon all the several despotic devices applied by arbitrary government to Education. What was it, my Rev. Friends, that the religious fathers of some of you felt with most anguish in all the manifold tyrannies exercised against them by Louis XIV.? was it persecution, imprisonment, confiscation, or dragonades banishment? No, I say it was not; but it was that which Mr. Stanley's bill prepares for you; those pious men saw their children forced (and seduction is force) into schools where they could not learn their religion, where their bible was not allowed them; but Louis XIV. was a despot, and that was not inconsistent with that character. I would then ask Mr. Stanley, are we now under despotic rule that such a bill should be imposed upon us? What was the persecution which the Catholics felt most sorely under the *liberaux* Robespierre and Marat? Why, that their children should be forced into liberal schools? What was it created in Belgium that intense hatred for the Dutch King, but his inquisitorial persecutions of the Catholics and his establishment of his liberal or unchristian schools? And what was, and is, one of the most bitter persecutions carried on in France at this moment by the *liberaux*? Why, in violation of their charter, their denying to Catholics the choice of their masters, all freedom of education, and forcing children (for seduction is force) into their *liberal* schools, under the arbitrary rule of the University.

Not only have the above despotic precedents been followed, but the ordonnance of the *liberaux*, depriving the great majority of Frenchmen of religious education, has been copied with servility in Mr. Stanley's *ordonnance*, which would deprive the great majority of Irishmen likewise of religious education.

In 1828 the *liberaux* were in full power, and in April of that year was the famed Ordonnance prepared—"Ordonnance preparee par le Conseil l'Universite pour satisfaire au voie formé, par Mr. Duverquier de Hauranne, et rendre le Clergé totalement etranger a l'instruction primaire."—This ordonnance was in July carried in the Conseil d'Etat, by the instrumentality of Feutrier, the Gallican Bishop of Beauvais, these Gallican worthies being ever as ready to prostrate the Catholic Religion, as to prostrate themselves at the foot of any Throne.

This ordonnance which equally violated civil and parental rights, roused the indignation of all Frenchmen, except its authors, and to this indignation responded the Press of Belgium and even that of Protestant Germany. You will here see, my Reverend Friends, with what servility the ordonnance of the *liberaux* was copied in the Right Honorable Gentleman's ordonnance, by the spirit of the regulations to carry said former ordonnance into effect, which I have given in the following articles:—

1. In primary schools, schoolmasters to be laymen.
2. The schoolmaster in primary schools not to give religious instruction.—[The children therefore, as in Mr. Stanley's ordonnance, are not to learn their religion as they lisp their letters.]
3. No Clergyman not to interfere with the schoolmaster in primary schools, nor with the said primary schools.
4. The Agents of Government to exercise absolute control over all books used in primary schools.
5. The Agents of Government to exercise a complete control over primary schools, and to have full power to make such regulations in primary schools as they think proper.

Those adepts at unchristianising the *liberaux*, found no better means to unchristianise than the above—and Government, who, having failed to uncatholicise us by means of the Kildare-place grants of £25,000, considering that, as the next thing to be tried was to unchristianise us, an operation of more difficulty, have for that purpose allocated £40,000,

and this is expected to be brought about by following the operations of the *liberaux* step by step, which has been done, with implicit servility in the intended establishing of those liberal schools, and by the ordonnance of the Right Honorable E. G. Stanley, of October 1831, which you have seen is identical with that of the *liberaux* of 1828, and is besides identical with that signed Louis Philippe on the 16th October, 1830, which, reciting the ordonnance of 1828, again expressly excludes Priests from all intervention in popular education, upon which the head of the municipality of Paris sent his Alguazils into every school, and had every catechism seized, advising the children to study arithmetic.

A liberal, present Minister of France, (confidently intimate with many persons in London, and who travelled suddenly into Normandy, and was met there April, 1830, &c. &c.,) has, perhaps, given lessons on the art of extirpating Irish Catholicism. This liberal Minister confiscated the 1,200,000 francs per annum, by which 8,000 students for the priesthood were supported; this was on the 30th September 1831.—The next month, October, is, we have seen, “the date of Mr. Stanley’s ordonnance. Is this confiscation of the sum allotted to French seminarists to be followed as announced in the semi-official paper (the *Times* above mentioned) by the confiscation or suppression of what is allowed to the seminary of Maynooth? My readers may be assured, that it is the opinion of the *liberaux* of France, and of that French Minister, who has been destroying seminaries throughout France, that if you allow no seminaries for the Catholic Priesthood to exist and you establish liberal schools, and therefore do not suffer their children to learn their religion as they lisp their letters, that you will extinguish Catholicism in Ireland. I think *le noble Pair* and his fellows are wrong in conceiving they will succeed even in France, and that the Catholic Associations now in progress throughout France, will prove them to be so; therefore, our government would do just as wisely to let any such business as that alone, where they will inevitably be defeated in every move.

There is a talk about impartiality in Mr. Stanley’s ordonnance; but what is the fact? Why, the population of Ireland is eight millions, say two millions of Protestants, and six millions of Catholics. The Board is composed of eight persons, of which six are Protestants and two Roman Catholic. But the question is, whether Mr. Anthony Blake, having supported the *veto*, the Priest bribery, and signed

documents against us fraught with bad faith, would be considered by the Catholics as representing their or adverse interests? If the latter, one Catholic member alone remains, the Most Rev. Dr. Murray; but every one knows that all his Grace's hours are engaged, so that his Lordship could not be expected to find time to attend as often as our safety required it, even if his individual exertion, however zealous and powerful, could succeed against so many. Thus, the no-catholic Avocats who would, of course, be devoted to their maker—Turk, Jew, or Atheist, or worse than all, Utilitarian liberaux, or whoever they may be, would have it all to themselves, and this, the “all on one side, nothing on 'tother,” is that which Mr. Stanley understands by impartiality.

Surely, Reverend Friends, you and your brethren (the Catholic Priests) are as fit to choose books and schoolmasters for your flocks as Dublin *avocats*; but as the paymaster is master, and they are to pay the schoolmaster, the said schoolmaster who, according to immemorial Christian usage, ought to be your servant, will at their bidding leisurely seat himself on your necks and on that of the Priest. However, if it be your decided vocation and that of our Archbishops, Bishops, and Priests to be humbugged, so be it.

I have said, that this was not Mr. Stanley's Bill; and I say, with a still more firm conviction, that it is not Lord Grey's Bill, for it is point blank contrary to any opinion emitted, and to every principle professed, by his Lordship; for the Noble Lord's opinions are, that the experience of three centuries ought to convince any Minister of the absurd impolicy of interfering with the religion of the Irish People. That when government is satisfied that the ministers of any religion or sect do not preach doctrines contrary to morality, the civil power has no right to interfere with their religion, or with matters appertaining to their religion. But this bill interferes with ministers of religion, and with matters appertaining to religion, therefore this is not Lord Grey's bill.

I should rather conceive that if his Lordship intended an Education Bill for Ireland, he would first commence by placing the Board and all the Castle paraphernalia in schedule A, as being useless, injurious, and mischievous: useless, as we want no such machinery; injurious, as a large portion of the money of the Poor would be wasted on *Avocats*, their jobs, and other jobs; (that is, if it were

possible that *Avocats*, or an Irish Board, could job; and mischievous, as this bill would tend to rouse the indignation of Irishmen of all religious denominations against government. Was Lord Grey to propose an Education Bill, in my humble apprehension it would be somewhat to the following purpose:—

Whereas the sum of £40,000 has been voted for the education of the Irish Poor, and whereas the fittest persons to educate the said Poor are the Clergy and Ministers of their respective churches and congregations, be it therefore enacted, &c.—That a census be taken in the different dioceses in Ireland, and that the number of Protestants, Catholics, Presbyterians and Methodists, inhabitants of said dioceses, be ascertained—and that the said sum of £40,000 be distributed to the Most Reverend the Archbishops, and the Right Reverend the Bishops of Ireland—to the Most Reverend the Archbishops, and the Right Reverend the Catholic Bishops in Ireland—to the Very Reverend the Moderators or the Reverend Ministers of the Presbyterian Church, and to the Very Reverend and Reverend the Ministers of the Methodist Congregations of Ireland, according to the number of persons in their said respective congregations; the said sum of £40,000, so distributed as aforesaid, to be applied by the said Prelates, Moderators, and Ministers of the Protestant Church, of the Catholic Church, of the Presbyterian Church, and of the Methodist Congregations to the education of the poor belonging to their said respective Churches and Congregations, in and according to the manner which to them shall seem best. The said Prelates, Moderators and Ministers to make a return every three months into the office of the Right Honorable the Secretary of State for Ireland, specifying, day by day, the manner in which the sum or sums so distributed to them as aforesaid, were by them applied to the said purpose of educating the poor belonging to their said respective Churches or Congregations, as aforesaid, &c. &c.

Here we have economy—for not one shilling of the money of the poor is wasted—here Irishmen of all religious denominations are satisfied, and here administration is relieved from endless turmoil, trouble and vexation, hearing charges against the Board or the schoolmasters from every corner of Ireland, and the answers and defence of the Board and of the schoolmasters, and replies, rejoinders, and appeals,

petitions and remonstrances, supported by lots of letters, memorials, pamphlets, paragraphs, &c. &c. &c. So that did the liberal bill pass (which I deem impossible) at least one additional Secretary of State for Ireland would be required to keep it working.

Some such Christian Bill as above sketched, would, I am convinced, give perfect satisfaction to every one of you, my Reverend Friends, and equal satisfaction to your Christian Brethren, the Catholic Clergy of Ireland—and thus would give satisfaction to, and promote the happiness of, Irishmen of all denominations; therefore it is that I humbly apprehend, that if Lord Grey, who is neither a lawyer nor a liberal, but a Statesman and a Christian, was to give us an Education Bill, that some such Christian Bill would be framed by his Lordship, because there is nothing his Lordship has more at heart than the welfare of our glorious commonwealth, and that the satisfaction and happiness of the People of Ireland is essential to that welfare.

I have the honor to remain,

Most Rev. and Right Rev. Lords,
and Very Rev. and Rev. Sirs,

With respect, your most obedient
And most humble servant,

J. E. DEVEREUX.

One of the Five Delegates who, on the 2d of January, 1793, at St. James's, presented the Petition of the Catholics of Ireland to their late Royal Benefactor, his Majesty, George III.

Nov. 27, 1831.

NOTE REFERRED TO IN PAGE 8.

Protestants in France and Protestant Germany. Before the Revolution, the Calvinists of the South of France, and the Lutherans of Alsace, were both a religious people; the doctrines of the Philosophes, though they might have affected the higher, had scarcely penetrated the middle, leaving the lower order uninfected. The Revolution broke out, and the Calvinists and Lutherans, as well as others, gave into its excesses. The Lutherans were more calm; but allowances are to be made for the Calvinists; they saw the downfall of the Catholic Religion, but a Catholic Monarch had persecuted their Fathers; they saw the expulsion of the Bourbons, but they recollected the Dragonades, and the revocation of the edict of Nantes, and the expulsion of their Fathers by a Bourbon. Notwithstanding these excesses, and the spread of blasphemous works by the Jacobins, it may be said that, except in towns, both Calvinists and Lutherans remained, generally

speaking, attached to their religion. Their Pastors, for there are still some in the South of France, and Alsace, who remain Christians, bitterly lament the apostacy of their brethren, and say, that what was most detrimental to their flocks at all times, was the establishment of national or liberal schools, which the children were gradually induced to frequent, where they associated with the children of *liberaux*, and heard their perpetual ridicule and scoffs against Christianity; thus, by degrees, they abandoned the religious instructions of their Pastors, and more or less lost all sense of religion. That is, this effect was produced in France upon Protestants, which the same cause, that is Mr. Stanley's liberal schools, are meant to produce here upon Catholics.

Bonaparte put down Jacobinism, and by degress caused the disappearance of blasphemous, obscene, and anti-social works; he re-established the Catholic religion, and Christianity was no longer persecuted by the *liberaux*, who wore the skin off their knees by attending the Emperor at Mass. The Lutherans and Calvinists got back part of their flock; Napoleon re-established the College of Montaubon for the Calvinists, and that of Strasburg for the Lutherans, and thus a Protestant Christian Ministry was raised, social order was reviving, when the consequences of an insane ambition caused France to fall under the dominion of the worst man for France ever born, Louis XVIII. (See Appendix.) You know that from and after the Ministry of his favorite, M. de Coses, the *liberaux* inundated France with their obscene, blasphemous, and anti-social publications; they daily increased in France; liberal schools were carried on, and the education of Catholic children more than ever molested when being in full power. In 1828, they procured the above mentioned ordonnances. The past years, it may be said, from the revolution, were a time of trial for the vitality of religions—so that when I said that upon the oak being fallen the plants that derive life from his substance wither and decay, I might have said, that on the tree being merely wounded, the plants that derive life from his substance decayed, for Protestantism had not vitality to hold out in this wrestling against blasphemy and immorality, and, about 1828, the Calvinist Ministers of the Theological College of Montaubon, and the Lutheran Ministers of the Theological College of Strasburg, renounced the religion of their fathers, Calvinism and Lutheranism, and united in adopting the deistical catechism of Geneva, that is, renouncing Christianity altogether. This was brought about by the *manœuvres* of the *liberaux*, who by degrees in those two Colleges, got rid of Christian Ministers, and it is said that the base liberal renegades, who thus abandoned the religion of their fathers, did not injure either their own or the finances of their families, by this *utilitarian* conversion. What has perhaps given rise to this report is the number of Protestant Ministers' sons and

their connexions in the employment of the present Government. Thus, my Rev. Friends, if you do not maintain your individuality, you see, by the example of French Protestants, what risks Christianity runs with you, for though Catholicism, from its vitality, and all Catholic parents who can afford it, avoiding to send their children to such schools, would, as in France, survive the *liberal* schools, your Protestantism might, as we have seen the Calvinism and Lutheranism of France, disappear. Therefore, my Rev. Friends, as Mr. Stanley's liberal schools are still more dangerous to you than to us, it is still more your interest to prevent their being established than it is ours. So much for France.

All German, Lutheran, and Calvinist Ministers who are Christians, for some such still remain, though the majority of those who called themselves Lutheran or Calvinist, do not even affect to profess Christianity, are agreed that the progress of infidelity in Protestant Germany, has been more than to any thing else, owing to liberal schools, where the Lutheran, Calvinist and Liberal were educated together, and therefore did not learn their religion as they lisped their letters; and being thus educated without religion, they lost their individuality of sect, ceased to be either Lutheran or Calvinist, and merged into infidelity. These schools being everywhere advocated and encouraged by the *Neologists* and the disciples of the French *Philosophes*. Of this opinion is the Rev. Baron Stark, first Minister of the Consistory of Hesse Cassel, who wrote his Philosophical Dialogues about 40 years ago, and the Rev. Mr. Voight, Lutheran Minister; Weimar, author of the *Rhenische Geschechte*, and of that celebrated work, the Life of Gregory the Seventh; of that opinion is also the able author of the *Über Der Geist und folgen des Reformation*; and you will, I think, see something to that purpose in the lectures on Protestantism in Germany, by the Rev. Stewart Rose, of Cambridge.

Some further proof of the effect of those *liberal* schools, where Calvinists and Lutherans were bred up together in unchristianising Germany, will be seen in the following extract from Professor the Rev. Mr. *Marsheneke* of *Heidelberg's* Book, entitled, "On the true character of the Evangelical Minister."

"In consequence of this *liberal* education, Christianity is lost, religion is become the slave of the State, and it is permitted to look upon her in that state of debasement as the work of man, and even as an imposture; it is in our days alone that manufactures, commerce, rules for preserving health, rural economy, and matters relative to the police, occupy the Pulpit; the Minister is made to believe that he fulfils his destinies, and all his duties when he reads police ordonnances from the pulpit; he is bound in his summons to publish receipts against the murrain and other diseases of black cattle and of swine, to demonstrate the

"necessity of vaccination, and discourse on the best means of prolonging life," &c.

But here is something still more strange to prove the degraded state of the Protestant Priesthood in *liberal* Protestant Germany, brought about in the first instance by those *liberal* schools Mr. Stanley means to establish here, where children are not to learn their religion as they lisp their letters.

The author of a memorial addressed to the states of Hesse Darmstadt, a Protestant Government, having demonstrated how degrading it was to the Christian Ministry to make Ministers of the Gospel tax-gatherers, thief-takers, and *Recors* (bum bailiffs.) A correspondent of the Gazette of Darmstadt, 21st November 1830, adds, "All the above is too true, but at least those Ministers of the Gospel ought not, as they are in Hesse Cassel, to be employed in levying the tax on young women illegitimately *enceint*." Here in fact, the Government of Hesse Cassel virtually does no more than in one way or other all governments paying Ministers or Priests will do, that is, use them for their own purposes, and thus bring them and their religion into contempt, and that consequence would have followed had Lord Plunkett and Mr. Blake's measures for pensioning the Priests, so ardently desired by English and Irish Catholic *liberaux*, not been opposed—and with this measure we are still threatened. This, my friends, you see is the manner in which the Protestant ministry are treated by the liberal Governments of Protestant Germany, one and all anxious patrons of *liberal* schools.

You will recollect that I have throughout told you that ours was a common cause, and that you are at least as interested in opposing those liberal schools, whose ultimate tendency is to unchristianise all, as we are. You have seen how those governments of Protestant *liberaux* treat the Protestant ministry, and you will now see how they treat the Catholics, which the nefarious Holy Alliance has condemned to their rule; and this will show you that it is neither Protestantism nor Catholicism, but Christianity itself, that the *liberaux* hate, and this because there is a vital principle of liberty in Christianity, and that *liberaux* or *utilitarians* when in power are tyrants, as you will almost uniformly see them to be in their own houses. Those five Protestant States first commenced by obtaining Concordats from the Pope, and you must know that those Concordats have ever proved injurious, if not fatal, to Religion; they grossly imposed upon the Holy See, and no sooner was the Concordat granted, than they made it a means indirectly to persecute their Catholic subjects, and to attempt to bring their Priesthood into that degraded state to which you have seen that they had reduced the Protestant Priesthood. These *Mause Konighens* had their *loix organiques*, which totally defeated the protecting effect the Catholics were

taught to believe the Concordat would afford, just as the *loix organiques* of Bonaparte, which no Catholic Priest ought to mention without abhorrence, defeated the salutary clauses in his Concordat, and subjugated the Church to the State; for your liberal must have the spiritual and temporal power vested in him, these being in perfect accordance with his brother despots Henry VIII. and Louis XIV., this subjugation the un-circumcised Jews who rule France, and their base valets the *liberaux*, are now striving to revive, by maintaining the tyrannical dominion of the University over education, which will allow none but anti-Christian or liberal schools; whereas Napoleon used his power over education to make his youth soldiers, but not to make them infidels. In order to undermine Catholicism, and bring about an union with Protestantism, those five Protestant States have every where selected as the objects of their favour either immoral or ambitious Priests, and constituted them a sort of Patriarchs; each of these five States aiming at having a national or so to call it a Gallican Church of its own. Said Church to be subjugated to the State and hardly acknowledging the Holy See. The texts on which those sycophant and Gallican Priests are to hold forth is somewhat to this purpose, that in the points of disagreement between Protestants and Roman Catholics, viz., the canons of the Sacred Scripture, Faith, Justification, the Mass, the Sacraments, the authority of Tradition, of Councils, of Popes, the celibacy of the Clergy, and prayers for the Dead, the existing diversity of opinion arises in most cases from certain form of words which admits of satisfactory explanation. But what their manœuvres most anxiously tend to is, to force the Priests to marry, because they expect, that then, like the Protestant clergy they would lose their independence; for, my Reverend Friends, you are not to conceive that in Protestant Germany it is as it is here in Ireland with our Methodist Ministers, that they could be supported by their flocks, no, Liberalism has dried up all hearts, the *liberal* schools first taught the people to despise their religion, and then to despise the ministers of religion; and, my Reverend Friends, be assured that the same effect would be produced by the establishment of Mr. Stanley's liberal schools. Therefore there is no such charitable feeling there; they must support their family by their scanty pay from Government, and what other matters they can put their hands to.

These liberal despots who will suffer nothing independent in their States, cannot bear that the Catholic Priesthood should still maintain their independence and this sort of patriarchs selected for Silesia, by the King of Prussia, Mr. *Rohsbacker* tells us in the *Avenir*, (31st July, 1831.) is an Abbe Thayer, professor of Theology in the university of Breslaw, who has collected in one book every scandalous anecdote respecting Priests that has occurred

for centuries, and who holds this forth as the effects of celibacy to the young students in Theology, educated for the Ministry, and forced by the Prussian Government to attend this liberal college. The union of churches of all creeds, in one Pretorian band round him, being the inveterate hobby-horse of his Prussian Majesty.—The sort of Patriarch selected by the King of Wirtemberg for his national Catholic or Gallican church, is the Abbe *Reuchlin*, professor of Theology and Ecclesiastical History at *Fribourg*, in the *Brisgaw*, and said Abbe presents to his pupils the abolition of celibacy as the only means to reform the Church, telling them that in this measure the Bishops have no need of the Pope, as a simple *placet* from the Government will be sufficient, so that from the Bishop to the Priest it will be a mere administration business. Do those Patriarchs by these means succeed in making Protestants? They do not; but these liberal schools to which the poorest of the Catholic children are forced to attend to be there educated with Protestants, have precisely the effect which the promiscuous liberal education proposed would have here, for they seldom succeed in protestantising the Catholic, but if there is any christianity left those liberal schools succeed in extirpating it among Protestants.—But what they most depend upon to destroy Catholicism, and hitherto a rotten dependence they have found it, is, as aforesaid, to get the Catholic Clergy to marry; and this is likewise the most ardent wish of all Unitarian Deists, *Liberaux* and Utilitarians, all ardent supporters of Mr. Stanley's liberal school system; and I have no sort of doubt, that if those schools were once established, that two years would not pass before some attempts would be made to pension the Catholic Priests, and then to attack the celibacy of our clergy; this through the instrumentality of liberal Catholics of Jansenist, Gallican, or protesting or Protestantising Catholic Dissenters, by means of a Concordat. Lord Grey having stated in the House of Peers in 1824, that a Prelate of great authority in the Catholic Church had solicited for a Concordat—and aided by some of those pension-hunting dandy liberal Priests or Friars, of whom I say, in a letter in the *Morning Chronicle*, July 1828, “Worthies, who any evening would meekly resign themselves to be jammed in between a tea-table and a piano sooner than run the risk of disturbing a sick man in his garret.” These pension-hunting dandy Priests and Friars also vote themselves to be exquisite Legislators, and figure with distinction amongst our variegated Solons, composed of geniuses of every calling, craft and profession, all born public performers, Ciceros and Lawgivers, who, not only in Dublin but now in every corner of the country, delight and enchant the natives by their feats, not less than they edify them by their uniform stern independence, an evidence not to be controverted of that incomparable honesty and transcendent wisdom so befitting men

who performing for the public have "public lives," and names which after a time, will, no doubt, to use Madame de Staal's phrase, become historical, they never having been known to hail a measure one day with thunders of applause and tremendous cheering, and the next day to hail an opposite measure with the same thunders of applause and tremendous cheering.—These assemblies or troops of Solons have been of incalculable use to Ireland, for when the Catholic Emancipation Bill was passed we were threatened with falling into an uniform state of stagnation, a stagnation of inglorious peace and quiet not to be borne by these spirited sons of Solon and Lycurgus, of Numa and Manco Capac, when farmers were about to be reduced to the dull necessity of minding their plough, tailors their stitching, cobblers their vamping, mercers their silks and calicoes, grocers their sugars, priests their breviaries, friars their cells, briefless lawyers their tranquil cigars, quill-drivers unconscious of bills of costs to fashioning their aforesaid quills, distillers their puncheons, and brewers their vats—both the latter, though they may be good papists, thus ministering to the protestant vice, for, as you know, the Bible without note or comment and drunkenness came in together about the reign of Elizabeth.*

How could that apathick state with which the country was threatened, be compared to those animated enjoyments which those patriotic personages every where create, and how great must be the satisfaction which they one and all must feel at keeping the country all alive, and recreated by their sundry feats, their ground and lofty tumbling, and various other performances, as set forth at length in the bills? however mitigated that satisfaction must be by the consideration that all those exhibitions in which they so arduously labour, have been got up and are carried on for the sole benefit of the manager, and by the sickening prospect ever before their eyes, that when the said manager obtains a more advantageous engagement, he will by a vigorous application of his toe to their seat of honor tumble them all off the stage headlong.

But not only have our Solons themselves contributed to the amusement of the public, but to them it is exclusively due that other Solons have likewise been called forth to add to our recreation, and contribute their efforts to prevent the country falling

* "Call you this Gospel," says Wilson, a zealous Gospeller, "when men seke onlie for to provide for their bellies, and care not a groate though their soules go to helle! Doe you not see how every one catcheth and pulleth from the Church what thei can."—(Warton, Hist. IV., p. 163.) As far as England is concerned, one fact might set the question at rest. In our nation drunkenness first became prevalent in the reign of Elizabeth. Before that period, ever since the entry of the Normans, the sobriety of the English was remarked by all Europe. (Morus—Longman, Hurst, and Rees, 1826, 8vo. p. 93.)—By that accurate and profound historian and accomplished scholar, Kenelm Henry Digby, Esq., of the University of Cambridge.

into the dreaded state of stagnation before mentioned; for it cannot with any semblance of justice be denied, that it is to that noble emulation which their spirited manager has excited, that the public is indebted for the exertions of that other troop of Solons who have opened a Solon theatre at Morrisson's, where the ground and lofty tumbling is exclusively performed by clerks and lay preachers; the latter, I am told, beating the Indian jugglers all to nothing, as they play all their tricks, and practise all their deceptions with the whites of their eyes glued to the ceiling. Numberless troops belonging to the same firm and performing the same feats are, I am informed, now got up in several parts of the country, so that what with the performances of the former and those of the latter, Ireland is likely to have a happy time of it.

It is in the senior troop of Solons that our liberal Priests perform, mostly acting the part of *Claqueurs* or *Aboyeurs*, both parts so useful in all theatres to the interests of the manager, and which indeed no sensible manager ever fails to provide, but such of them who feel Demosthenes and Cicero lying heavy on their stomachs, do occasionally enact the part of the before mentioned famed liberal Anacharsis Clouts, the orator of the human race; they of course on all occasions heartily join in the vociferations for a repeal of the Union, and than their so joining no more incontrovertible proof could they give of their profound wisdom or of their prodigious knowledge of men and things; and this I say, notwithstanding that some non-liberals will have it, that of all brutally besotted beings the Catholic Priest who calls for a repeal of the Union must be considered as the most besotted; that is to say, if such Priest be truly a Catholic, and not at heart a liberal, alias an infidel, who would prefer being inclosed in bed within the arms of a healthy *flahulah* young woman of a frosty morning, to being roused up from his lonely couch to visit the sick bed of an old one.

Apropos—These liberal priests performing among the Solons, reminds me of the Priest's printer, for so a man entitles himself who is suffered to go at large, and beard the public though guilty of an enormous crime, to the great disgrace of the Dublin Police, the fact I shall mention to you my Rev. Friends, as you are acquainted with members of the Corporation, and may set this matter to rights. This man, a little dapper fellow, three feet four inches high, who lurks somewhere about Capel-street, has scribbled a paper, and dated it, Dublin, 9th of February, 1830, and which I give you here verbatim:—

“ But we rejoiced at that result, not more on public grounds
 “ than we did because we found ourselves discharged from a duty
 “ which necessity alone had allied to our ministry—a duty im-
 “ posed on us by a state of times which has passed, but a duty
 “ which we have gladly relinquished in the fervent hope that by
 “ us or our successors it may not be resumed. These are the

“sentiments which the spirit of our calling inspires, they are the sentiments which never cease to animate us, and which our clergy, always obedient to our voice, will cherish along with us, that as the Apostle commands, ‘all may say the same thing, and there may be no divisions amongst us.’”

Now, I do not blame him for writing the above paper, though it evidently was not meant for any useful purpose, but this was as innocent a way for him to pass his time as any other; but the crime I accuse him of is this, that he from malice prepense and to gratify his malignant hatred against twenty-seven highly respectable gentlemen, has had the audacity to forge their names to this paper, in order to bring their names into contempt. Now, from what passes in most parts of Ireland, from what we every day behold, it is not in the nature of things that those twenty-seven worthy gentlemen (their having signed is a thing quite out of the question,) but that they should ever have even seen the above paper; and yet this little dapper fellow has the overweening assurance to distribute that paper as bearing their respected signatures. I do say, my Rev. Friends, that such a criminal being at large is a disgrace to the Police of our Metropolis, and I hope that by your acquaintance with the Corporation you will put an end to this disgrace, by getting this said little dapper fellow securely caged.

I shall here address myself on this repeal of the Union, not to those liberal Priests of course, who look to the repeal of the Union as a measure which will place the *liberaux* in power, (and here I consider them perfectly correct in their view of the measure,) when Catholicism will be persecuted, and they will be let loose, and may jump into the bed of the *flahulah* young woman; but I address myself to those liberal Priests the *Claqueurs* and *Aboyeurs* above mentioned, who though besotted, may still have some shame left. In my address to the people of the County of Wexford against the repeal of the Union (*D. E. Post, Wexford Herald, &c. &c.* December 28, 1830), I showed why I considered a repeal of the Union impossible. I consider it so still, because I cannot conceive it possible that every man in England and Scotland, and every man in Ireland, with a pound or an acre in his possession, should not, upon reflection, oppose a repeal of the Union with all his might: now if that be the case, and there be no one but Mr. O’Connell to support the repeal, surely that measure must be considered as hopeless, for Mr. O’Connell himself is very far from being fixed in his determination of supporting that whim of his, as Mr. Joseph Hume called it, and which Mr. O’Connell has taken up or laid down as suited his purposes. So far indeed as considering it essential to the interests of Ireland, that whilst he who had studied all things relative to Ireland all his life, was deeply engaged in setting forth his patriotism to the best

advantage at the Clare election, that there he never mentioned that question, not conceiving that at that time any such idiots could be found as to be gulled by such an impudent humbug—next again at the Waterford election where he left no means unused to show off; he paid the same compliment to the Waterford men he had paid to the Clare people, by not considering there was a man among them such an idiot as to suffer himself to be mystified by such an absurdity; and again when Mr. Joseph Hume, Mr. O'Connell sitting before him, twice called this repeal of the Union question Mr. O'Connell's whim—putting this pungently home to the learned gentleman, did Mr. O'Connell, though no man more able and more ready at reply, make a reply or utter one word upon this galling attack? No, the learned gentleman was dumb, and admitted the perfect truth and correctness of the denomination given by Mr. Hume to this humbug question, that of Mr. O'Connell's whim. Mr. O'Connell has since sported his whim, and he was heard with thunders of applause, and laid down his whim, and this announcement was heard with tremendous cheering, and so off and on, sometimes a fiery repealer and sometimes a very cool one. Here then is the case, you have England and Scotland to a man, and every man in Ireland possessed of a pound or an acre, against, and Mr. O'Connell its only supporter, so little fixed is his opinion on this whim as to suffer his said opinion to rise and fall as the whim or interest of the moment directs. I will ask any impartial man, after this fair statement of the case, whether keeping the country in a state of turbulence by the agitation of such a hopeless question, is not either a very silly or a very criminal thing?

In order to show that of all men Catholic Priests ought to dread the rule of the *liberaux*, and therefore the repeal of the Union, I will show them the kidney of those *liberal*, journalists, &c., the most infuriate Union repealers, and they will then form some judgment of what treatment either they or their religion would receive from said *liberal*, journalists, &c. &c. To refresh their memories I will give an extract from my above-mentioned pamphlet on the repeal of the Union, to which I will add some observations:—

“Now, I maintain, on the contrary, that a separation would be productive of the greatest calamities to Ireland; for, under the present circumstances of the country, if we had a separate legislation, honest men would soon be silenced and disposed of; and as we are at this day more or less, as of old, *aut optimi aut pessimi*, the legislature would get into the hands of a reckless faction, combining all the want of principle of the *liberaux* with the ferocity of Jacobins, and Ireland, from one end to the other, would be one scene of massacre and devastation. Our worthy Priests, of course, would interfere to stem the popular fury, and they would be held up as traitors and public enemies, and hunted

down without mercy, for the then ruling faction, holding the press at its command, having, of course, followed the example of *La Grande Nation*, and placed such journalists and gentlemen of the press as adhered to them in all the high offices of the state, would easily direct the fury of the people against the clergy, who would every where oppose their butcheries and spoliations; and as such liberal faction, not more overburdened with religion than principle, would stop at nothing to gain its ends, we might even hear the Priests threatened with the "Goddess Reason" being set up against them, and the Catholic religion, which is the true religion of right and liberty, the religion of the freeman and the gentleman, inveighed against as the religion of slavery, as is the custom of every ignorant or designing upstart ruffian or fanatic. That this *liberal* ribaldry might be practiced without any great effort by certain liberal journalists would appear from the facility with which the most absurd calumnies against the clergy of Belgium, France, Spain, Portugal, and South America, copied from French liberal papers, were copied into them. This reckless liberal faction once in power, we might see our *liberal* bands sacking *Maynooth* and *Clongowes*, with the same satisfaction with which they had sacked Trinity College, as their liberal brethren in Paris sacked the Irish College with the same *gusto* with which they had sacked the Palace of the Archbishop of Paris, which sacking was provoked by the Friars firing shots out of the Palace windows on the people, though there is not a Friar in Paris, nor was there a single musket or pistol in the Palace, which absurd calumny was published in the Paris liberal journals, and, of course, religiously copied into the columns of certain Dublin liberal Papers."

Here the besotted liberal Priests, (for I do not address Catholic Priests who know their duty and are not to be mystified,) will see the chance they would have if a repeal of the Union took place, and liberal Journalists were in power. What was the conduct of those repealing *liberaux*, is a question I would ask those besotted liberal Priests, towards that highly distinguished person and exemplary Prelate, to whom the Catholics of Ireland are under such obligations for the ability with which he vindicated their religion against its adversaries, the Right Rev. Bishop of Ossory, because his Lordship did his duty, because he did not forget a paper signed 9th February, 1830, because the Right Rev. Doctor Kinsella is not only a man of honor but a man of nerve, and would not suffer any Priest in his diocese to lick up the factious slaver of Dublin *Avocats* and their sycophants; because he is the man who, if there was such an unclean animal as a liberal Priest, or a thousand liberal Priests in his diocese, would as little suffer himself to be bullied by the thousand as by the one, and forthwith orders were given that he should be crushed, or as it was termed, the Bishop

must be crushed; but Doctor Kinsella showed all this base sycophant rabble and their master that a Catholic Bishop was not to be crushed. Hence his Lordship has been honored by the envenomed scurrility of every unprincipled Bishop crushing liberal bandit who holds a quill. But another Bishop, forgetting his bounden duty as a Catholic Bishop, had not saluted the hoof of the repealing liberals, and of course his doom was instantly sealed; crush the Bishop of Leighlin and Kildare instantly was the order given to all the serfs of the Autocrat. Now though, as is notorious, the favorite mess of liberals, and *a fortiori* of liberal Journalists, is *de la chair de Jesuite*, yet the next thing they devour with most *gusto* is *de la chair d'Eveque*; a repealing liberal Journalist was accordingly hallowed at the Bishop, and the Bishop was attacked with all that greedy ferocity, with which that insatiable appetite for Bishop's flesh (Vice-Jesuits) ever actuates your thorough bred liberal.

Now, an animal attempting to tear his prey, and glut himself with carnage is so natural a thing, that it would have passed unnoticed, particularly as the liberal animal was not able to do more than to exhibit the reckless ferocity of his nature.

I therefore only mentioned these attempts to crush refractory Bishops, in order that the besotted liberal repealing Priests, the *Claqueurs* or *Aboyeurs* before mentioned, should see what they would have to expect if a repeal of the Union took place, when such a zealous repealing liberal Journalist as this Bishop devourer could not be made less than *Ministre des Cultes* at any rate.

Here the liberal besotted repealing Priests however may say that what I have shown only proves a desire to crush two Bishops on the part of repealing *liberaux*, but that it does not prove that liberal Priests, who have in all ways and at all times been the most obedient and most humble servants to command to all the *liberal Valetaille*, would be harshly dealt by: to this I answer, that the liberal Journalists who rent the air with cries of joy whilst the Bishops were butchering at the *Carmes*, were precisely the same liberal Journalists who rent the air with cries of joy when the Priests were butchering at the *Abbaye*; and that though one Priest declared that he was a *liberal*, he was not the less butchered, but with this consolatory valediction that this was fortunate, as they would thus have at least one *homme de bonne compagnie* to accompany them. But if this does not suffice, let besotted Priests attend to this other fact.

* The French government had long sought some pretext to

* The *liberaux* having by every possible exertion and by endless protestations and promises of assistance, roused the noble and gallant people of Poland to throw off the iron yoke of their masters, the enslavers of their country, and

quarrel with the Portuguese government, French *liberaux* were years back employed to insult that government and public worship; for that purpose, amongst others, one *Bonhomme* was employed at *Coimbra*, he had often insulted Priests and the Church ceremonies; but all this was overlooked, so anxious was *Don Miguel* not to give any pretext of quarrel to the *liberaux*. However *Bonhomme* was determined to commit such public outrage on religion as the Portuguese government would be compelled by the people not to

persecutors of their religion, left them to their fate, and when the last massacre of the gallant people had taken place, coolly announced to the Chamber of Deputies that "all was quiet at Warsaw." The same atrocious liberal perfidy marked their conduct in Italy; they by the same arts urged the silly liberal *Cogliones* of Italy to rise up against their mild and paternal government, and the uncircumcised rulers of France, and their base valets, the *liberaux* coolly looked on whilst the drummers and horseboys of General Count Frimont were daily, one after another, making a very irreverent use of the multiplied and lengthy diplomatic notes of son excellence le ministre des relations, exterieures, or of son excellence le ministre de la guerre.

Those uncircumcised Jews and their base valets the *liberaux* having thus rendered France as contemptible abroad as well she could be made, determined by one heroic act to regain all her honors. Liberal and utilitarian heroism is however of a peculiar nature, its principle being the very reverse of the *parcere subjectis et debellare superbos*. They crouched down under the Russian and Austrian Eagle, and they determined to throw all the former achievements of France into the shade, by pouncing down upon the defenceless *Sardinha*. As we have seen in the text, they long since employed *Bonhomme* to commit the mentioned outrages, and the *armees, navales* of the ci-devant Grande Nation were put in motion, to vindicate a French subject, *Bonhomme*, who the Portuguese government had the audacity to punish for an offence committed against the law of Portugal, and visited in every country by ignominious corporal punishment. But there being no law against sacrilege in France a French liberal is at liberty to commit sacrilege, every where he finds a feeble government, with impunity. *Don Miguel* was forced heavily to fine and dismiss the judges, and to pay indemnities to this *Bonhomme* who from being a *quasi* paper is become a rich man, having by the outrage in the Cathedral of *Coimbra*, one way or other, made from £15,000 to £20,000. Nothing could equal the joy and triumphant airs of the Paris Jews at this exploit, at this violation of the law of nations, and of all international law; the *liberaux* here proving that with the defenceless they are to know no other law but their will, and how happy it would be for the people of Europe to be subjected to their most righteous of yokes. Paris resounded with the praise of the Synagogue; their base valets, the *liberaux*, either prostrating themselves before them, with their nose in the *ruisseau*, or proclaiming the heroic glories of their honored masters, as surpassing all that was ever heard of *Fleurus* or *Hohenlenden*, *Marengo* or *Austerlits*. All the nurseries about Paris could hardly supply laurels enough to decorate the *Bourse* and *la Chaussée d'Antin*, and the *Rentes* having risen two per cent., the joint martial and monied enthusiasm caused a proposal to be made that a column like that in the place *Vendome*, but built of the last oaks of the forests of France, should be erected, *Place de la Bourse*, to be surmounted by a colossal statue of *Casimir Perrier*, in a blood colour Polish dress, crowned with withered oak leaves—the pedestal to be surrounded by *Agents de 'Change* larger than life, *rampant* and *volant*. But the *Rentes* falling, the *projet* succumbed along with them.

overlook ; accordingly he, with some liberal companions in Holy Week on Holy Thursday, in the Cathedral Church of Coimbra, brought with him two *liberal* or *utilitarian* women from the stews, and whilst the Blessed Sacrament was exposed on the high altar, he in a side chapel, in full view of the high altar, &c. &c.

Some people who witnessed these feats of liberalism gave information, but still government wished to hush up the matter and get him away ; but he openly boasted of what he had done, how he had insulted the government of the Portuguese, and went on with his usual ribaldry against priests, religion, and churches, which were mere stone buildings as convenient as any other place for the enjoyment of *liberaux*, and continued his liberal vociferations, and insulted the Hierarchy, Priesthood, and Catholic people of Portugal. The whole population of Coimbra was roused with indignation, government was forced to act, *Bonhomme* was tried, and after a long and impartial investigation he was found guilty, and sentenced to be publicly whipped, for a crime punished in every civilised country, an outrage on religion, and which Blackstone says is always visited with ignominious corporal punishment ; adding, for Christianity is part of the law of the land. Mark that the French government itself never questioned the guilt or the impartiality of the trial of *Bonhomme*, this was not their point.

This abominable outrage committed by that liberal monster *Bonhomme*, on the Catholic Hierarchy, the Priesthood and the People of Portugal, not one single orange or purple orange paper in Ireland published, and why ? Because though actuated by strong party and sectarian feelings against the Catholics, still they would hold themselves most base if they in any way sanctioned so abominable an outrage against the religion of any people, but then the editors of the orange or purple orange papers of Ireland, are not liberals, but men, and therefore not devoid of human feelings ; and those orange editors besides are not *liberals*, but Christians, and could not countenance such an outrage on Christianity. This liberalism was reserved for Catholic *Liberaux*, who I always have held, and do hold, to be the basest of mankind. A vindication of this liberal monster's abominations, perpetrated in the cathedral church of Coimbra, whilst the blessed Sacrament was exposed on the Altar, was published in a liberal repealing Irish pretended Catholic paper, this vindication occupied nearly one whole column of that paper, *and was unaccompanied* by any note or observation whatever. It is said to be copied from a London paper, without naming the paper ; but as there is no Catholic liberal editor of a London paper, and that no Protestant paper would vindicate the infamies of *Bonhomme*, I consider that this article was either fabricated by the liberal repealing Catholic Journalist himself, or that it came to him from Paris Jews or

liberals; many liberal articles in said liberal paper having apparently that origin, and of this opinion the public will probably remain until the name of the pretended London paper from which this defence of *Bonhomme* is taken be given; but if even the name of such London paper be given, still will this vindication of *Bonhomme* without note of disapprobation, be an act of outrageous insult to the Catholic people of Ireland, and this from a pretended Catholic!!

Now I will submit it to the candid reader which is the greater liberal hero of the two, the liberal monster, *Bonhomme*, the avowed execrator of Catholicism, who outraged the religion of the clergy, the hierarchy, and of the Catholic people of Portugal, in the cathedral of Coimbra as aforementioned, or our repealing liberal hero and Catholic Journalist who outrages the Catholic priesthood and hierarchy, and the religion of the Catholic people of Ireland, by occupying one column of his paper in vindicating this monster *Bonhomme*, whose guilt the French government itself never called in question. In my opinion the palm of liberalism belongs to the Catholic Journalist. After this will any one be surprised to see that this liberal repealing Journalist, the vindicator of the monster *Bonhomme*, should be the most eminent amongst the Bishop crushing liberal Catholic Journalists before mentioned. Yet these liberal Journalists are the very persons who, as I said in my letter above quoted of the 28th October, 1830, if the repeal of the Union took place, would hold the Catholic priesthood and hierarchy of Ireland within their fell grasp!

After this plain *exposé* will not the brutally besotted liberal Priests, the Reverend *Claqueurs* and *Aboyeurs* before mentioned, open their eyes; if not, why then let them keep them shut, and be d—d.

It is marvellous to see those besotted Priests, devoutly gloating over those liberal Bishop crushing Journals, which they ought not to suffer near them, and it surely would be difficult to say which in so doing is that conduct more silly or more base.

As we are apt to be attached to those who agree with us, I am, I own, quite in love with the Rev. Doctor Sadler, F.T.C.D., a Member of the Board, who, in his letter dated College, January 10, 1832, addressed to the Rev. Mr. H. Seymour, (*Dublin Times*, January 12, 1832,) quite agrees with what I have mentioned throughout my letter, that the real object in view in establishing those liberal schools was to Protestantise or add to the members of the Established Church—that the Kildare-place Proselytising, by uncatholicising, having failed, that is, in his own words, “I am perfectly satisfied, from the experience of many years, that the Roman Catholic peasantry will not receive

“religious instructions but from their Clergy,”—that other methods than that proselytising system must be tried, for, as he adds, “We may be sanguine as to the truth that “an educated people will gradually rise, either partially or “wholly, from their errors.” That is, in Protestant slang, will gradually forsake the Catholic religion.

Here the Reverend Member of Mr. Stanley’s Board of Liberal Education seems quite imbued with the Right Rev. Doctor Doyle’s fervid anxieties for our union with the Established Church. [See Dr. Doyle’s letter to — Robinson, Esq., Appendix C.] However, justice ought to be rendered where justice is due. The Rev. Fellow of Trinity College, in his letter, utterly disclaims all coercion, whereas the Right Reverend Catholic Bishop, in his letter, calls upon Parliament to assume dictatorial power to enforce this union of churches. Doctor Sadlier says—“There is no “man who would be more delighted at the conversion of “my Catholic countrymen to the doctrines of the Estab- “lished Church, nor more willing to devote his utmost “exertions, and devote his life to its accomplishment, than “I would, if I thought it were practicable. I am satisfied “that in the present time it is not so, I would therefore do “the next best thing, that is, I would prepare for it at a “future time, by educating the people, and by cultivating “habits of kindness and good will between Protestants and “Roman Catholics. I consider the plan proposed by the “new Board of Education, one of the best means of effect- “ing the first and third of these measures.” This is exactly what I have said throughout, that the new Board of Education was the best means that could be devised for gradually extinguishing the Catholic religion, and this further proves that I was throughout correct when I maintained that it was for that purpose that those *liberal* schools were established, and that the Protestant members of the Board “would willingly contribute their utmost exertions to the “accomplishment of that purpose.”

Here we have the best possible evidence to prove what the Board was established for, that is, “as one of the *best means*,” to undermine our religion, for this is the declaration of the member of that Board, the best informed and instructed as to the intentions of Government. The Catholics of Ireland owe no common gratitude to the Reverend Mr. Sadlier for the honorable frankness of his avowals, but I fear

that small thanks it is he will receive for that same, either from Lord Plunkett, Mr. Blake, Mr. Stanley, or the Right Rev. Prelate of Kildare and Leighlen. It may not likewise be unworthy of the notice of my Christian countrymen of all denominations, that Doctor Sadlier, member of the Board admits, in his letter to the Reverend R. G. M'Gee, dated, College, January the 9th, that "in these schools "under the care of the Commissioners which the Catholics "will permit and encourage the children to attend, the "schoolmaster may be an Unitarian."

But to return to Germany.

Mr. *Rohzbacker* thus concludes, "Catholic people of Protestant Germany, they wish to fashion you to servitude, for that purpose they wish to degrade your clergy, to make them fit tools to enslave you. Traitors sell themselves to the enemy, you will mark them and repel their approaches. They will labour to efface in themselves the indelible character of the Catholic Priest, the man of God and of the people, to substitute the servile badge of the Protestant Minister, the base slave of administration, the vile serf of the police."

However I am happy to say that those persecutions and indignities which the Catholics have suffered in those Protestant states have roused them against those traitorous Priests and under highly gifted and uncompromising priests and laymen of note, they are vindicating their rights, and to their success has not a little contributed the conversion to the Catholic Church of persons of the first distinction, and of some of the most eminent men of letters in Germany.

The present King of Prussia, the great proselytiser of the north, in the year 1817 attempted this union of the Lutheran and Calvinist Churches, to stop the torrent of infidelity overwhelming Protestant Germany; and instead of christianising, he has by these means still more unchristianised his country. The same consequences would inevitably be produced here by an attempt at uniting churches, and Mr. Stanley's liberal schools, where Protestants and Catholics are educated together, that is, as I said before, the £25,000 of the Kildare-place not having succeeded in uncatholicising by protestantising, this £40,000 is to uncatholicise by liberalising, alias unchristianising us. Frederic, in order to bring about his union of churches, blended together in the same schools the Lutheran and the Calvinist.—Now, what has happened? Why, that losing their individuality of sect, they have ceased to be of any religion, and thus has the little remains of Christianity, still kept alive by that individuality of sect, nearly disappeared; but one fact will suffice to show the state of things the consequence of the aforesaid liberal schools and edu-

eating different sects together—this fact is reported in the *Ami de la Religion*, of the 2d September, 1829, and took place at Cassel about that time. The event roused all the indignation of the *Berlin Ecclesiastical Gazette*, (Kirken Keitun) who says, that the Catholics would take advantage of this to say that the Protestants had abandoned what was considered as most sacred in Christianity; but the Kirken Keitun cannot help itself.

The young Countess of Reichenbach Lessowitz was confirmed in the principal Church of Cassel, by the Rev. Dr. Ernst, member of the Lutheran Consistory, and first preacher at the Court of Hesse Cassel. The Rev. Doctor had an account of the whole ceremony, and of the sermon he preached on the occasion, superbly printed—and here follows the verbatim translation of an extract from that sermon, preached by the said Rev. Dr. Ernst, member of the Lutheran Consistory, and first preacher at the Court of Hesse Cassel: “By the qualities of his head and of his heart, Jesus Christ infinitely surpassed the greatest of mortals, such as the Moses, the Socrates, the Mahomets, and the others who have obtained the greatest influence over the minds of man,” &c. Here, my Rev. Friends, the Doctor merely refers to the qualities of the head and heart of Jesus, instead of the divinity of his nature, in order to show his superiority over created mortals.

In the existence of a congregation who could listen to such things, and of a Rev. Minister who could utter them, you, my Rev. Friends, have in evidence the blessed effects produced by liberal schools, by educating children of different religions together who, consequently are not allowed to learn their religion as they lisp their letters; and who, foregoing their sectarian individuality, lose all sense of religion. You will not, you cannot, my Rev. and dear Protestant, Presbyterian and Methodist Countrymen and Friends, suffer this hallowed land to be desecrated by the appearance here at a future day of such a congregation as that of Cassel, and of such a Minister as the Rev. Doctor Ernst, member of the Lutheran Consistory, and first preacher at the Court of Hesse Cassel; you will, therefore, one and all, with all your power and might oppose our Learned Gentlemen’s Education Bill, *alias* the Ordonnance of the Right Hon. and Honorable E. G. Stanley, his Majesty’s Secretary of State for Ireland.

This system of governing Catholics by Ordonnances is what Lord Plunkett, it would appear by his answer to the Catholics of Fermanagh in 1825, would not much disapprove of, this is the system which Mr. Canning recommended, that the Catholics should be legislated for without being consulted, that is, that they should be virtually governed by Ordonnances; but if the Right Honorable Secretary had all the Catholic *liberaux* in England and Ireland in his pocket, he would not, at this time of day, succeed in govern-

ing us by Ordonnances, of which he has given a sample, for his letter to the Duke of Leinster bears all the features of an Ordonnance.

Of Catholic liberaux, I say in my letter, in the *Morning Chronicle*, March 12, 1829, "I do make bold to prophesy, that if any of those worthies (Catholic liberaux) should get into Parliament, no future Minister need apply to Protestants for aid, should there be again a question of a measure of persecution against us, for he will ever find the Catholic liberal the more ready and bitter persecutor of those who profess the religion of his fathers."

POSTSCRIPT.

I had sent the numbers of the *Dublin Evening Post*, containing my Letter on Mr. Stanley's Liberal Education Bill to that eminent Physiologist and Physician, Doctor Forster, of Chelmsford, Essex, amongst other scientific and medical publications the author of that standard work of the Atmospheric Origin of Epidemical Diseases, &c., &c. Whilst this Pamphlet was going through the press I received a letter from him, elucidating a curious physiological fact perfectly in point as to what I maintain, that is the necessity of early religious impressions being given to children, or, as I express it, that the child is to learn his religion as he lisps his letters. The letter is as follows:—

"Boreham, near Chelmsford, Dec. 28, 1831.

"DEAR SIR,—ALLOW me to call your attention to a piece of Physiology closely connected with your subject of early religious impressions being given to children. I discovered this fact I am going to state in pursuing my inquiry into the means of rendering old age happy. It is a known principle of human nature, that impressions made in *infancy* are recalled to memory in *age*, after the impressions of the middle of life are forgotten. This is one of the kind means by which God has prepared our nature for the permanent instrumentality of Religion; for if a child, as soon as he can lisp his letters, is taught Religion, the inspiring hopes of immortality, the animated pictures of the Catholic Heaven, the end of pain and the eternal Hallelujahs of the Saints will become his earliest thought, and being the fond anticipations of his childhood will by the law of our system referred to, become also the consolation of his old age, and the sustaining prop of declining senility and the foundation of *Bona Mors!* as the child grows up all his joys are connected with the feasts, fasts, wakes, and religious festivities of the Church; and he looks with holyday delight on Christmas, Easter, Pentecost, and the other days of devotion and of leisure; and thus with his earliest pleasures are the great events of sacred history united, and he descends down the steps

of the sepulchre with a mind stored and animated with imagery that carried his youth up the ladder to Heaven.

“If, on the contrary, the miscalled Philosophy, the cursed doubts form the business of youth, what but doubt will return with age—and thus I say it is that the whole education of Protestants and liberals is a cursed plan, for demoralising youth, opening the floodgates of sensuality on manhood, and embittering the descent to the grave by destroying the comforts of Christianity, &c. &c. &c.”

Doctor Forster in the above letter, it appears, considers that we are still a Catholic country here, that we have not been protestantised, and that still with us there are festivals for the children and the poor, but alas! we are protestantised; every day is a festival to the rich, and the poor are condemned to one continued round of toil, for they have lost their all, the mother of the poor is powerless, and the poor have been gradually robbed of those days of leisure for the profit of the rich; the last of those flagitious robberies of the poor for the profit of the rich having been committed by the robbery of their three holydays at Easter, and of their three holydays at Christmas, at the iron dictate, no doubt, of remorseless Protestant and liberal Catholic avarice. The next robbery of the poor for the profit of the rich will, as the lights of the age and the march of intellect progresses, will probably be as in France the robbery of their Sunday. What has the French labourer gained by the lights of the age and the march of intellect which required the abolition of holydays, why that he works without ceasing throughout the year, and for the year's work only receives the same sum he received for the year's work when he had those holydays for his spiritual or temporal enjoyments.

Bonaparte, when the Concordat took place, had abolished the patrons and seventeen holydays in the departments on the Rhine, that is, robbed the poor for the profit of the rich. When those Catholic countries came into the possession of the King of Prussia, he with great wisdom had those seventeen festivals and all the patronal festivals re-established, that is, he restored to the poor those days of leisure which they had been robbed of for the profit of the rich.

The Protestant gentlemen of Ireland, ought to look to this example, for this is not a religious question, but a question of pounds, shillings and pence, a question not of favour but of justice, not of charity but of restitution. Admitting that the celebration of the festival of a Saint was a thing to be abolished, was that a reason why the poor should be robbed of his immemorial right to this day of leisure, and condemned to toil on that day for the profit of the rich, in fact to toil for nothing. For by competition the wages of the labourer throughout the year become naturally calculated upon the

minimum of what will support him throughout the year, therefore those holydays which all antient legislators established, and the superhuman wisdom in all things, and in charities and protection of the poor against the rapacity of the rich of our Holy Church preserved and augmented, were not only an alleviation of the hardships of the poor, but gave him an increase of wages on his working days at the expense of the rich, the abolition of holydays, in fact lowering the wages of the poor. If then the Protestant gentlemen of Ireland cause those holydays to be re-established, they will do no more than restore to the poor their former advantages; that is, they will cease to continue that robbery of the poor in favour of the rich established at the Reformation, for which the present generation is by no means accountable; that is, in fact they will do no more than perform an act of justice, and by so doing justice to the poor, they will not fail to bring down the blessing of God upon themselves and their labours. It was by the establishment of those festivals that the people were humanised, so has their suppression been gradually brutalising our peasantry, altering their kindness of manner, giving to their manners that change for the worse, which is immediately perceived by the traveller, when from a Catholic he enters into a Protestant country, from a Catholic into a Protestant Canton of Switzerland for example; weakening the ties of relationship and the effect of that precept, which bids us love our neighbour as ourselves, and thus, as it were, preparing them for that Philosophy which, instead of Christian charities, replenishes the heart with hate, and makes man the enemy of man and of God. This suppression of festivals and patrons is a matter on which I and my father before me have always been at open war with our good Bishops, even with those our most dear friends. But the Demon of Protestant and liberal Catholic avarice, which extinguishes all feeling for the poor, prevailed, and forced the will of our Prelates.

I would add also another robbery and cruelty committed on the poor for the profit of the rich, when the poor lost their true mother the Catholic church, that is, the cruelty in forcing them to violate the Sabbath Day they are bound to keep holy, by working on Saturday evenings, and the robbery committed upon them of the labour exacted from them on the Saturday evening, and the further cruelty of robbing them of their amusements on Sunday evening, and of which last robbery no class in the community is more anxious and flippant at committing than the beforementioned performers at the Solon Theatre opened at Morrisson's, that is the lay preachers who, as you have seen, beat the Indian Jugglers all to nothing, playing all their tricks and practising all their deceptions with the whites of their eyes glued to the ceiling.

Those performers at Morrission's carry, it is said, Bibles in both pockets, and consider that they alone understand religious matters, of which they are in general profoundly ignorant, and they say that the Lord's Day ought to be kept holy, whilst every week of their lives they profane the Lord's Day.

Had the lay and spiritual Solons read their Bibles they would have known that the first day was the evening and morning, and had they known any thing of the Christian religion they would have known that, in commemoration of the resurrection of our Lord on the third day, the Christian festival was made to take place twenty-four hours after the Jewish Sabbath. The Jewish festival commencing Friday evening and ending Saturday evening; the Christian festival commences on Saturday evening and ends on Sunday evening; and if those spiritual Solons had known any thing of Church History, they would have known that in all ancient Christian Churches (I speak not of modern fancies) the Eutychian, the Nestorian, the Greek Churches, &c. &c. &c. as well as in the Catholic Church at this day, the canonical Lord's Day commences on the vigil, that is, on Saturday, and ends after vespers on Sunday, when the canonical Monday commences. Therefore I say, that when those persons labour, or employ labourers, or indulge in secular pleasures, go to the theatre or opera on Saturday, they violate, and force others to violate, the Sabbath Day, and that when they oppose the amusements of the poor on Sunday evening, though FENELON, who understood his Bible at least as well as the spiritual Solons at Morrission's, assisted at the dances of his peasantry, they exercise an act of unwarrantable tyranny over the poor.—Thus Protestant travellers throw up the whites of their eyes at the abominations of the Scarlet Lady when they see operas performed at Rome on Sunday evening, that is, on the commencement of Monday, whereas the abomination would have been if the opera had been performed at Rome on Saturday, on which day no public spectacle was ever known to take place, and yet in open profanation of the Sabbath and direct contempt of the Word of God, Saturday is the usual opera day in that land of Bibles, London—and on that day do the spiritual Solons at Morrission's bring their families to the opera, as it were, in derision of that very Bible they affect to hold in veneration.

When the poor of England had their mother the labourer was paid his week's labour Saturday included, but he, though paid for that whole day as for others, not a half but a whole day, never laboured after twelve o'clock, and the custom is still kept up at this day in many parts of England of unyoking the plough on Saturday at twelve o'clock. The labourer thus had the Saturday evening, that is, the commencement of the Christian Sabbath day, to prepare himself by confession or spiritual exercises for the

celebration of the festival to be held on the morning hours of the Sabbath day, so commencing at sun-set as aforesaid on Saturday evening, and terminating at sunset on Sunday evening. Thus the Saints' days in the same manner commenced before by the vigil and ended after vespers.

Now here a twofold robbery has been committed on the poor, as I said before, that is, the rich have robbed them of the labour of half Saturday, that is, robbed the poor man of twenty-six days labour in the year; and they have robbed him of his wholesome, cheering, and innocent recreations in the open air on Sunday evening, and brutalised him by forcing him to get drunk, and smoke and stink in an alehouse on Sunday evening, if he seeks recreation. But as this is the only recreation he can enjoy on the only day of leisure left him, he soon looks to this as his only recreation; and when he has leisure on week-days to the alehouse he goes to seek that only recreation, and thus from a jovial, sober, cheerful, and loyal people have the people of once merry *Engelonde* been converted into soddened, stupified, and seditious drunkards; and thus, as you saw before, did drunkenness and the Bible, without note or comment, which deprived him of his Sunday recreations, make their appearance in England together.

I have not the honor of knowing, except by sight, either Lord Lorton or Lord Enniskillen, but as if GOD ALMIGHTY writes a legible hand it is that we should read it, and that there is no man who cannot read in the countenances of those noble persons their true character, their expansion of heart, their kindness and benevolence, and their contempt for all that is base and vile, for all trick and deceit; I very humbly submit it to their consideration, whether they ought to place any further confidence in those persons, who, with the Bible in their hands teach them that they are to keep holy the Sabbath Day, and every week of their lives violate the holiness of the Sabbath day, and who in fact can in one moment be convicted of either ignorance or deceit by every man, woman, and child in Ireland who possesses a Bible. Why should not those Noble Lords, who are conscientious men as far as in them lies, re-establish the scriptural usage of all Christian Churches, that is, abstain themselves from dissipation and labour on the commencement of the scriptural Christian Sabbath, that is, on Saturday evening; will they not then cease to provoke their labourers to violate the scriptural Christian Sabbath by labouring on Saturday evening, or will they not then restore to their labourers their immemorial right to that half-day's pay, though they do not labour, and will they still continue the unscriptural tyranny of preventing their labourers from taking their amusements in the open air, when the scriptural Christian or canonical Sabbath day has terminated on Sunday evening, and when the canonical Monday has commenced? I say that both Lord Enniskillen and

Lord Lorton will ; and why do I say so ? Because GOD ALMIGHTY writes a legible hand.

One of the most flagrant and audacious of those Protestant robberies of the festivals of the poor for the profit of the rich, was perpetrated at Trinidad, a Spanish colony. When we took possession of that island, the British Government solemnly engaged to respect and guarantee all the rights, privileges, and immunities of the inhabitants, as enjoyed by them under the Spanish Government.

There were eighty holydays which the negroes as well as the whites enjoyed ; as the Spaniards are the best of Catholics, so are they of course the most humane and best of masters, the negroes were allowed to work during those eighty days for their own profit, a privilege which slaves enjoy in all the Spanish settlements, by the humane colonial laws of Spain, which said humane colonial laws are exclusively due to the earnest solicitations of those abominable idolaters and enemies of the human race, whose very name is held in abhorrence by all lights of the age and march of intellect men, *liberaux*, and *utilitarians*, that is, by Popish Bishops, Monks, Friars, and Jesuits. When the slave has by his own private earning collected the amount of the purchase money paid for him by his master, he may tender him that money, and the master is obliged to receive it and give him his liberty ; and this obligation the law enforces, and the Catholic Priesthood are ever watchful that when this is required by the slave it should be enforced. However, as those Popish masters are more fathers than masters to their slaves, the latter almost always prefer this slavery to freedom, and thus still remain slaves, though often possessed of wealth, under their kind masters. No sooner was Protestant possession taken of this Catholic colony than it was established, that no faith was to be kept with those black Papists, who, the Spaniards having mostly quitted the colony, had, for the beatitude of their souls, mostly fallen into Protestant hands ; those eighty holydays were abolished, all hopes of ever obtaining their freedom cut off from the slaves, and they were subjected to work for their new Protestant masters on those eighty days as on all the others. Of course this infamous act of perfidy was never noticed in or out of Parliament by those male or female saints so devoted to negro interests, and here they are not to be blamed, for it is his immortal part, the soul of the negro, and not his body, they have taken into their holy keeping, and the proof that they did not neglect those precious souls is this, that they carefully provided each one of those negroes with a Bible, an ample amends to those poor hitherto benighted black Papists, for the loss of those eighty holydays of Popish superstition, trumpery, priestcraft, and so forth, and for the loss of their benighted Popish masters, ever the

profane encouragers and promoters of their ungodly recreations; and in justice to those benighted black Papists this must be said, that they do not forget their Bible, but on the contrary; for on those eighty days the merciless lash of the *utilitarian* Scotch Calvinist driver never fails deeply to recal the Bible to their grateful sensations. God help the poor, either black or white, when they lose their mother!

This question about the robbery of the poor for the profit of the rich and the profanation of the Scriptural or Christian Sabbath, and the unauthorised tyrannical prevention of amusements on Sunday evening, that is, on the canonical Monday, is no new question to me: for about four years ago, being in London, an indirect attack was made by the then Bishop of Chester (now Bishop of London) on that admirable person, our ever to be respected and ever gratefully to be venerated protector, the present Bishop of Norwich, upon his playing cards on Sunday evening. I answered that attack in the *Morning Chronicle*, and my letter was re-published in the *Wexford Herald*, *Carlow Morning Post*, and other Irish Papers; and though I had been rather severe on the Prelate of Chester, in exposing his ignorance of Bible and Church History, my letter was not answered. But before I wrote that letter, in order to make my certainty doubly certain, I called on the Rev. Mr. STEINKOP, Chaplain to the Russian Embassy, at his house, No. 12, Welbeck-street, adjoining to the Russian Chapel; and to no other authority could I better apply than to an highly respectable Clergyman of the Greek Church, profoundly versed in Oriental Ecclesiastical History. I mentioned that I had called on him to obtain some information on the Greek Church. I then asked him whether it was a fact that plays and operas were performed at Petersburgh and Moscow on Sunday evenings, and that the people of Russia all were engaged in amusements and diversions on Sunday evenings; to this he answered, that was and had always been the practice in the Greek Church. I then asked him how could such a practice be held to be consistent with the Divine Ordinance, which orders us to keep holy the Sabbath day; to this he instantly replied, that Sunday evening was not the Christian Sabbath, the Lord's Day, but the beginning of Monday, as at all times in the Christian Church and throughout the East, the day commences when the sun goes down on the evening as it did on the first day, for the first day was the evening and the morning. Thus the Jewish Sabbath, and they refrained from servile work from Friday to Saturday evening, when all their amusements commenced; and thus all Christian Churches refrained from servile work from Saturday evening to Sunday evening, when their amusements commenced; and this, said he to me, is also the practice of the Catholic Church; not knowing

whether I was a Protestant or Catholic. This was sufficient, and I wrote my letter. Now this was also the practice of the Church of England, at the time her Prelates were the most eminent for piety and learning of any she ever could boast of; when work was not done or exacted *gratis* from the labourer on the Christian Sabbath, that is, on Saturday evening, and when the people had their amusements on the commencement of the canonical Monday, that is, Sunday evening, that is, on Sunday immediately after evening service, or three o'clock, as was then the practice all over England.

The Protestants, and since the Philosophes, have cried up the abolition of festivals, by which we have seen that the poor have been robbed for the profit of the rich, as being of advantage to industry; but the event has proved the wisdom of the Church, and, as usual, the folly of those who object to any of her institutions. For the bow cannot always be bent, and the poor made days of debauchery instead of festivals for themselves; besides all those patronal festivals were placed by the Church at those times when the peasant had nothing to do, and thus gave him occupation useful to society; and those religious meetings tended to civilise him and maintain him in a state of civilisation. To say they were injurious to industry is absurd, when we have Belgium, &c. &c. before us, to which we owe our manufactures, and whose unparalleled agricultural industry leaves us still far behind, and yet the Belgian people seemed to live in one continued round of amusements; and for all this manufacturing and agricultural industry and amusements they were indebted to the monastic orders. The working of a labourer or handicraftsman beyond his twelve hours would, in merry Old *Engelonde*, or in any Catholic country not liberalised, have been considered an act of tyranny on the part of the rich, and the public opinion was against it, so that the exhortations of the Church enjoining humanity to the poor were rendered unnecessary. Never under a Catholic non-liberalised or gallicanised government would children have been seen in those hell-holes, as Mr. Cobbett calls them, labouring eighteen hours a day; but I had forgot those children have the Bible; notwithstanding which I say, God help the poor that have lost their mother.

In Venice fewer crimes were committed than in any country in Europe, indeed it might be said that crime was unknown there, in no part of the world were the poor so much attached to their superiors, and in no part of the world had the poor so much enjoyment; for after his day's labour the Venetian had always something to amuse him. The poor must be supplied with food, and likewise with recreation, that pride and selfishness of the rich not considering the poor as the same flesh and blood with themselves, which the Catholic Church has ever laboured to ex-

tinguish, increases every step as we recede from Catholicism; thus the best Catholic, the Spaniard, is the best slave master, the former French the next; from thence amongst Seceders from us, the question is no more or less kindness, but of lesser or greater induration of heart and cruelty to the slave, until you come to the ferocious Calvinist and the still more ferocious Jew slave masters, he was held to be the *ne plus ultra* of ferocious slave masters; but he has proved a lamb to the *liberal* or *utilitarian*, as the wretched slaves at Martinico and Guadaloupe under *liberaux* can testify; the *liberaux* of Nantes are the only slave dealers, and they surpass in cruelty all that was formerly known of that horrid traffic. Hence the modern *liberaux* or *utilitarian* consider the poor man as no more than a machine, a one man power, to be worked to the destruction of the machine, if that be more profitable to the rich. Hence the modern doctrine that the competition between nations is now to be not whose people shall be most comfortable, but how the greatest possible quantity of labour shall be extracted from the marrow of the poor man, he living on the least possible quantity of potato skins. This, as is said, is for the good of the public, that is in the last analysis to fill the coffers of the usurer or capitalist, who is to be the only worshipful person. Thus are all those people bent upon the poor man's having no enjoyment, no holyday, from year's end to year's end; but this execrable and unchristian modern system is point blanc contrary to the wisdom of all ancient legislators human, or I may say divine; for Mosheim says that it was so arranged that the Jews had almost a continued round of amusement throughout the year; and the wisdom of Pericles is always mentioned with eulogy by the ancients, for his having re-established the ancient and created new festivals for the people. This mixing in their amusements is what in Catholic countries creates such a mutual feeling of good-will between the rich and the poor, and that distance kept up in England between rich and poor, may among other causes not be the last which creates the crime of incendiarism, which prevails more in England than in any other country. Now persons object to patrons in Ireland, because there are sometimes fights there, and why? because the rich keep aloof from those amusements; but let the Protestant gentlemen of Ireland cast off prejudice and go among the people, and there witness or join in their diversions, as the first people do in every country but England and Ireland, and all this barbarous custom of fighting will be more surely put an end to than by legions of Police. The fact is, that this fighting at those patrons originated in the degradation of the people into a caste of helots, for anciently no such thing was known as fights at patrons, which were also pilgrimages; on the contrary, though war should be raging between two clans, there was a truce to all hostility, a sort of *Treuga Dei*,

for so many days before and after the patron. There is an historical anecdote in point in Queen Elizabeth's time, in which some of my family were concerned. The Anglo-Normans of Wexford were at that time at open war with the sept of the O'Kavanaghs and their subdenomination, and yet they went securely through the O'Kavanaghs' country to the patron or pilgrimage of St. Molins, in the centre of that country. In like manner the O'Kavanaghs or Irish, though the war was raging, came to and returned from the patron or pilgrimage of the Lady's Island, in the centre of our Norman colony.

Man lives not of bread alone; but if all legislators were not fools, we must hold that not merely his labour, but likewise his recreations must be attended to. The abolition of patrons has been held necessary to prevent riots and fighting, upon that principle which knows no mode of rule but force; now I distinctly say that the re-establishment of those patrons, instead of tending to disturb would tend to quiet the country. For the information of such kind-hearted Protestant gentlemen, who consider that this government of mere force bespeaks a shallow head and an iron heart, and that another ought to be tried, and thus who would wish to show the people that they consider themselves the same flesh and blood with them by partaking in their amusements, I must let them know that our Bishops have forbidden patrons, no doubt with good intentions, and the means by which the amusements of the people may be secured, without infringing the Bishops' ordinance. A gentleman in the county of Wexford, of whose parish the patron saint is St. Lawrence, 10th of August, never keeps the patron on that day or in honor of the saint, but keeps it a day or two after, and it is advertised to be held, not in honor of St. Lawrence, but in honor of St. Lawrence's mother, as may be seen in the Wexford papers. Thus no offence is committed or given to the Prelate, and the people have their day's enjoyment. Now though thousands attend that patron, which is held in the gentleman's lawn, no outrage, or fight or quarrel ever takes place.

We do not despair to see this happy feeling of cordiality established between all classes, but for that purpose the country must be quieted, and therefore all well-wishers to the country look to the energies of Government at once to dissipate those pestilential assemblies, depraving all around them and unhinging society. Whether Ministers will act or await the energies of a reformed Parliament will be seen, but the longer their energies slumber the more the gangrene spreads.

How is this state of peace to be brought about? Now as every political quack gives his recipe, I may likewise be permitted to give my nostrum, which I here submit.

The Union of Ireland with England is indispensable to the ex-

istence of our glorious commonwealth. The repeal of the Union, however hopeless, is a question by which from its nature incendiaries may at any time more or less inflame the country, and keep it in a perpetual state of open or smothered excitation.

It was not more essential to the interests of Britain, that the House of Hanover should be firmly seated on the British throne, than it is to the interests of the empire that the Union of Ireland with Britain should remain undisturbed. Had government at that time, either through listlessness or want of energy, or deluded by the advice of perfidious or temporising lawyers, (who one and all are damnation to any minister who consults them on state matters) suffered the Jacobites to rise in every county and parish, and day after day to call in question the Hanover succession, why the illustrious House of Brunswick would not have remained securely seated on the throne; for by this impunity the Jacobites would have daily increased in strength, the Neutrals rallying to them as they saw their power augmenting, and sooner or later a civil war would have been rendered inevitable. What did the government? why, by penal enactment they made the calling in question the title of the House of Hanover to the throne a criminal offence, and thus at once destroyed the power and extinguished the hopes of the Jacobites, and rendered their subsequent attempts at disturbing the country miserable failures.

If I am right in my first position, viz. that the Union is as indispensable to the interests of the empire, as was the maintenance of the House of Hanover on the throne, why do we, when we have sound precedent before us, hesitate to adopt the same measures to prevent the Union from being called in question, which were with such success employed to prevent the right of the House of Hanover to the throne of these realms from being called in question. Thus at once would peace and quiet be re-established in Ireland, for thus at once would the means used by incendiaries to inflame the country be extinguished, and thus I may mention it, though it may be a minor consideration, would ministers be relieved from that disgraceful position in which they stand as ministers, and as gentlemen from that ignominious part which, by a vacillating policy of questionable merit, they have more or less been acting, by crouching down and parleying with beings they least worship. "If I were asked at what time such measures should be taken, I would answer not after but before reform, not next month but this month, not next week but this week, not to-morrow but this day.

Is there, I ask, one honest reflecting man in Ireland, Whig or Tory, Protestant or Catholic, possessed of a pound or an acre, that this measure would not delight? and is there in Ireland an incendiary, of any colour or degree, that this measure would not at once plunge heels over head into the slough of despond?

I am not without powerful and Protestant authorities to show how much the peasantry have been brutalised and deteriorated in Protestant countries by the abolition of festivals, and to prove that abolition to have been a robbery of the poor to the profit of the rich, for those assertions I appeal with confidence to the authority of the Rev. Baron Stark, president of the Lutheran Consistory in Hesse Cassel, in his Philosophical Dialogues, written about forty years ago, and to the Rev. Mr. Voight, of Weimar, in his Rhenische Geschechte; both are copious and emphatic on this subject; and as a further authority to the same points, I claim that of the Rev. Mr. Brereton, Rector of Great Massingham, in Norfolk, the author of an excellent pamphlet on the poor laws, who has made it as clear as any proposition in Euclid, that the abolition of festivals is a robbery of the poor for the profit of the rich.

Doctor Forster, besides his mistake in conceiving that we have still festivals and are not yet liberalised, is under another erroneous impression in his letter; for he talks of fasts, as if actually we had not been made to renounce such Popish superstition, priestcraft, and trumpery, to the triumphant joy of our adversaries, and to the intense regrets of our people. Now let us see whether there were sufficient reasons for thus abolishing the wise institutions of the Church. Those institutions which have been with such levity abolished, taken merely in a temporal point of view, were the most wise and judicious that could have been formed for the well-being and health of rich and poor. My respected friend, that eminent Physiologist and Physician, Doctor Forster, in his most useful and popular little work, *Medicina Simplex*, was so struck with the wisdom of our institutions relative to fasting, that he says, that if our fasts had been ordained by a Council of Physiologists, they could not have been better timed and adapted to the necessities of the case than they are at present.

In fact they are all in the most strict conformity with the rules laid down for the preservation of health by Hippocrates and Galen, Meade and Sydenham, Hunter, Abernethy and Forster; and the injury experienced by abandoning Catholic practices was immediately felt at the Reformation. Now let us see how perfectly identical is the wisdom of our Church with the best medical practice. Depletion in Spring has always been held to be desirable, and for many persons necessary, and here the Church by the fast of Lent obliges us by religious ordinance to do that very thing which is most salutary to our health: then again depletion, though in a smaller degree, is again useful in Autumn, and the Church enjoins the shorter fast of Advent. What happened at the Reformation, when those wise institutions were despised, and gorging and gormandising throughout the year was the order

of the day? Why this course did not render the spring and autumnal depletion less necessary, and then first came in the usage which lasted almost till our days, that of bleeding in spring and autumn; but surely this unnatural mode of lowering the system, by draining away the fluid of life, cannot be so salutary as the milder method of diminishing the quantity and lightening the quality of food. This bleeding is now abandoned, but as Protestants have not returned to the wise usages of their ancestors, the Lent and Advent fast, a succedaneum was to be found for the lancet, and that succedaneum is the apothecary's shop and the periodical drugging, to the injury of the stomach, now used spring and autumn. I will ask any rational person whether the Catholic system was not more wise and more conducive to health, than either the lancet or the apothecary's shop, which must be had recourse to, because the Catholic system is abandoned.

As to the weekly days of abstinence, what was it that John Hunter used to say? why that most people lived above par, which rendered the generality of diseases or of accidents, the more difficult to cure—and Abernethy said the same, and so does Doctor Forster, and so did Mead and Sydenham, and Galen and Hippocrates. Now, medically speaking, these two days of abstinence are more meant for the rich than for the poor, who every where have days of abstinence during the week; but this ordinance, though serving the rich, is likewise serving the poor; for here the poor are less humiliated by their inevitable condition, when they see that the rich likewise are two days in the week lowered to their level, that is, obliged to abstain as they do. Here the Church as usual manifests her invariable care to lower the pride of the rich and to raise up the poor, consulting even the feelings of the poor, which she is ever studious not to see slighted. God help the poor, I again say, who have lost their mother.

Now, as well as Lent and Advent this abstinence of two days in the week is equally what Hunter, Abernethy and Forster would approve of, as it is admitted that all who can afford to eat meat eat more than they ought to do, or as Hunter says live above par; and as it is further admitted by all, that occasional abstinence is better than habitual low feeding, as it affords the stomach an useful alternative from the customary heavy food, therefore this abstinence in the week which the Church enjoins, is precisely what the above physicians would and did commonly prescribe to the rich as the best means of preserving health.

Rightly then does Doctor Forster say, as before stated, that if the fasts of the Church had been ordained by a council of physiologists they could not have been better timed, and adapted to the necessities of the case than they are at present.

Independently of its spiritual utility, as a religious practice, in abstracting us from sensuality, and fitting Catholics for prayer and meditation, this practice of fasting or abstinence enlarges and gives new energies to the powers of the mind. Sir Isaac Newton said he could never have finished his *Principia* had he not restricted himself to a scanty diet of bread and water. Independently of this being an institution of our all-wise and holy Church, held sacred from the time of the Apostles, we have here shown that of all systems of health conferring practice, that system established by our Church was the best, so much so indeed that if you, my Reverend friends, Protestant, Presbyterian and Methodist, wish to enjoy health and long life, and for that purpose follow the advice of those eminent physicians, acknowledged to be the best medical advisers in the United Kingdom, you will exactly, Spring and Autumn and weekly, do that which our Church prescribes to us as a religious duty.

Yet these wise and salutary practices have been done away; is it on account of the poor, no; on account of the healthy, no; on account of invalids who could not comply without injury to their health, no, for they at all times were exempted from that which would be injurious to their health; so that this practice admitted to be generally so useful, could not in any one case prove injurious.

You then, my Reverend Friends, will marvel how this most admirable institution of the Church should have been abolished with us; how the religion of a whole people should have been insulted and brought into contempt; and how in thus bringing said religion into contempt, certain highly respectable individuals in different parts of Ireland have condescended to figure as candidates for the Grand Mastership of the Order of the *Girouettes*. At this, my Reverend Friends, you will marvel; but you will marvel still more, when you know the extreme and contemptible futility of the motives which caused this departure from ancient and sacred usages.

The motives, as I understand them, were the incessant worrying of our Prelates by Catholic *liberaux* and Catholic *Nouveaux*, *Riches*, and lords of the shop and counter. The worrying of those Catholic *liberaux*, those Veto, Priest-pensioning, Church-uniting, Gallican, Protesting, *alias* Protestantising Catholic Dissenters, who with that servile baseness which ever distinguished them, are ashamed of acknowledging themselves of that religion which was the pride and honor of the worthy and honorable fathers of those unworthy and dishonorable sons, consider it a proof given of their towering genius, of their heroical contempt for Popish superstition, trumpery, priestcraft, and so forth, to act as Non-Catholics at Protestant tables, but as they know this

makes them objects of contempt to all men of honor among Protestants, they wish to have all their base servility indulged by our Prelates.

As to the worrying given by the *Nouveaux Riches*, the lords of the shop and counter, it is somewhat on another ground; first, this worrying is due to their passion for aping their superiors the above named Catholic *liberaux*; but this worrying is infinitely more due to this, that those *Nouveaux Riches* and lords of the shop and counter, who themselves, or whose fathers may have feasted on potatoes and point, are now so qualmish, that they regularly get into hysterical fits, and make a show of themselves among their neighbours, at the thought of not being allowed, (now that they can afford it,) to gorge their maws with flesh six days in the week.

Oh then, I hear it said, that the lights of the age and the march of intellect render a relaxation of discipline necessary; now the very proof that such relaxation would be fatal to society is, that it is recommended by the lights of the age and the march of intellect men; that being the cant of those knaves who would upset society to get hold of the property of those fools who would listen to them. But I would ask was ever monastic order, army, or body kept together by a relaxation of discipline; and on the contrary, does not a relaxation of discipline ever tend to the dissolution of those bodies, and is it not an invigoration of discipline which tends to keep those bodies together.

What would have become of the British armies in the Peninsula had the Waterloo operative relaxed, instead of invigorated discipline.

Again it is said, that if the abject servility of the Catholic *liberaux* and the gluttony of the *Nouveaux Riches* and lords of the shop and counter be not indulged, they will drop off; and here I will ask what body has ever existed that was not more healthy for getting rid of its vermin. Catholic Priests and Prelates surely ought to know by this time that there are no terms to be made with liberalism, but that the conflict is *ad internecionem*, and that *stare super vias antiquas* is the way to keep out of the bog.

I am extremely sorry to have no better account to give to my friend Doctor Forster of our fastings than of our festivals. It is truly a melancholy sight thus to behold the religion of a whole people insulted and shaken, our social bond loosened, and a sacred institution despised, and all this for what? Why in order to compliment the base servility of the Catholic *liberaux* and the carnivorous gluttony of the *Nouveaux Riches*.

APPENDIX A.

Answer to the Utilitarian attack on the Catholic Church in the Courier.

Extract from what might be termed advice to the *liberaux* of France in the *Courier* above quoted, "to apply their moral energies to improve the moral condition of the French people to the cultivation of commerce, to the gradual extinction of Popery, and the consequent increase of social enjoyment."—*Courier*.

This is evidently written by an *utilitarian*, alias a *liberal*; this is the jargon of their school; they, as usual, talk of improving the moral condition of men, whilst their principles tend to universal demoralisation; of the cultivation of commerce which their system ultimately annihilates, as it constitutes the merchant the mere commissioner of the Jew or capitalist; and they propose to obtain an increase of social enjoyment by the extinction of Catholicism, the religion which expands the heart, and is therefore the true source of social enjoyment.

To conceive that the *liberaux* who have demoralised France, or that the *utilitarians* who are now demoralising England, could improve the moral condition of the People, or that they who are incapable of social enjoyment could increase said social enjoyment, are matters of equally difficult credence. Morals must have a standard, but they admit of none, as they recognise no law but that of self-interest; what is right or what is wrong being, according to them, to be determined by utility, of which utility every man's private reason or interest makes him the competent judge. This is the common doctrine of *liberaux* and *utilitarians*, who in fact may be considered as one. This accounts for the similarity of manner in which both the one and the other consider an abominable crime, which drew down the fire of Heaven on two guilty cities; the *liberaux* despising all divine and human law, as we have seen, consider that crime as a classical and liberal recreation, and that may perhaps be the social enjoyment the writer refers to, for *liberalism*, as well as its fellow *utilitarianism*, is a foe to social enjoyment, being a condensation of selfishness it is repugnant to all sociability; this indeed is so marked in the manner of the *liberaux*, that it is at once perceived by travellers; amongst others, the fair author of the interesting *Tour in France* by a Spinster, (London, 1826,) though strongly imbued with anti-popish prejudices, says, that the *liberaux* could be at once recognised by a certain rudeness, if not of ferocity of look and manners, how the doctrines of those people which caused this anti-social look and manners could insure social enjoyments, is a mystery which the writer in the *Courier* must solve. The fact is, that to them and their fellows the *utilitarians*, social enjoyments are as

much unknown as they are to beasts of prey, who only during the time they are satisfying their appetite on a common prey, may, if you please, be said to be social; for except vicious animal gratifications or the *quocumque modo rem*, the only enjoyment either *liberals* or *utilitarians* know is the swinish luxury which Tacitus calls the *foeda et inxplebilis epularum libido*, and which with them can never be considered a social enjoyment; for your *utilitarian* never enjoys it but alone or at another's expense, and then, as is notorious, his company is considered as a bar to social enjoyment; so confident am I of this as to put the question to the reader, whether he has not ever found that the mere appearance in society of an *utilitarian* was a damper to social enjoyment? As to the gratification of any appetite, the *utilitarian* equally admits with the *liberal*, that no divine law stands in his way.* Now shooting partridge, without a license may be considered as a social enjoyment, which a man may indulge in, if he thinks lightly of the statutory enactment which alone renders it a guilty act; upon the same principle, if the *utilitarian* despises the statute against an abominable crime, which alone, according to him, constitutes the guilt, he may, like his fellow *liberal*, indulge in abominations, and term them *utilitarian* recreations, thereby manifesting his contempt for superstition and priestcraft, and his reverence for the lights of the age and the march of intellect. For women, who are the true life and soul of social enjoyment, are, in that character, unknown to *utilitarians*, who consider them in no other light than as the females of the *genus homo*, to be prized only according to their animal utility.

The sex, however, is even with them. Women from their natural honest feeling and elevation of mind despise all that is base and vile; and the unsophisticated truth of their heart gives them an infinitely more correct tact in judging of character than our wise skulls ever afford—they therefore, one and all, hold Utilitarians in the more supreme contempt, and that is the reason why a *muil* Utilitarian is an animal scarce ever to be met with; and if one of them perchance gets among his fellows, he just fares as does the *muil* bullock at Ballinasloe; he is poked about by his horned brethren. Seldom is an Utilitarian three months after marriage to be seen with a smooth forehead; and if six months from his wedding-day, he should presume to show himself with an unornamented front amongst the branching antlers of his frater-

* “*Utilitarians*, a body in whose ranks it is pretty notorious that there are or have been members who have unblushingly advocated the adoption of filthy practices for the prevention of population on the plea of utility, and who have been heard to go so far as to maintain that there is only statutory guilt in those whose abominable practices have banished them from the country.”—*London Morning Journal*, October 29, 1829.

nity, he is at once butted out of meeting amidst the indignant scoffings of his antlered brotherhood.

There is a Club or Debating Society of Utilitarians held in London, in either Fetter-lane or Chancery-lane, every Saturday during Term time, which I hear is frequented by Irish Law Students, but I hope the report is unfounded, and where these Utilitarians debate, of course, (to use the words of Old Henry of Huntingdon, p. 234) “*magis curant an utiliter vel inutiliter, quam an juste vel injuste.*—Now, as these Utilitarian Neophytes may be coming over here during the vacations, I take the liberty of mentioning to you, my Rev. Friends, that it might be well if you were to put the youth in your neighbourhood on their guard against them, as, if we are to believe the *London Morning Journal*, it might be well that those Utilitarian Neophytes should be compelled to seek their “*greatest happiness principle*” out of this hitherto unpolluted country.

These people who have perverted and polluted the people of France, and who are now attempting to pervert and pollute the people of England, the writer in the semi-official paper, the *Courier*, says are “to improve the moral condition of the French, and those people to whom social enjoyments are unknown, who every where bring the name of woman, the harbinger of social enjoyment, into contempt, are to increase social enjoyment and how? Why by the extinction of Catholicism, which they were first obliged to destroy before they could demoralise the French people—before they could pervert and pollute the youth of France, of that religion which expands the heart and is parent to all that is charitable, kind, courteous, and social; of that religion by which woman, the harbinger of social enjoyment, which they only prize according to her animal utility, becomes to us Catholics, not merely an object of love but an object, I had almost said, of religious veneration; for, as Henry of Mainz, celebrated under the name of Doctor Frauenlob, says in his Poem on Woman, dedicated to the Emperor Henry VII. “The motives which oblige Christians to venerate the Blessed Virgin, the Mother of God, should bind them also to honor and love all women; and our own Chaucer says:

“For in reverence of the Heavenly Quene
We ought to worship all women that beene,
For of all creatures that ever were yet and borne,
This wote ye well, a woman was the best.
By her was recovered the bliss that we had lorne,
And through the woman shall we come to rest,
And been ysaved, if that our selfe lest.
Wherefore me thinketh, if that we had grace,
We oughten honour women in every place.”

How little do women who advocate protestantism or liberalism understand their true interests!

This is not all, this *Utilitarian* writes that the *liberaux* are by the extinction of Popery, to be enabled to apply their moral energies to the cultivation of commerce—why, you *liberaux* did extinguish religion as far as you could when you got possession of the government; and what did you accomplish as to commerce—I shall not touch upon your other feats, your disgracing the French name in Poland and Italy—your flagrant violation of, and leaving unfilled the promises made to the people of France by the Charter of July 1830, and which Charter, if carried into effect, would have been a blessing to the people of France, (notwithstanding the badness of the whole system) for it gave power to do good, and you have done none, and restrained you from doing evil; and then you violated the Charter—your manifold reckless persecutions, and your being guilty in one year of more acts of wanton arbitrary power than were perpetrated during the 14 years of Napoleon, or the 15 years of the Bourbons—your open plundering and transcendent jobbing—but you got into your hands in July 1830, you *liberaux*, the base Valets of your Jew Masters, a country respected abroad and flourishing at home—well, and as far as you could you destroyed religion, and did commerce fare the better for it? no, for in one short year you reduced that country to a state of misery and ruin, such as no other country has experienced; and this notwithstanding that you burnt bishops' palaces, destroyed churches, prostrated crosses, expelled Trappists, stoned Priests, drove out the brethren of the christian doctrine, persecuted Urseline Nuns and Sisters of Charity, and forced children into your *liberal* school—why, it is wondrous that all these heroic deeds did not bring you better luck!

Now I will tell you what happened where Popery was not destroyed, nor crosses prostrated, nor Monks, or Nuns, or Friars, or Priests persecuted, and where those enemies of the human race, as you call them, the Jesuits, not only exist but flourish.

I am not here to excuse all the acts of Ferdinand, that is not the question: but the question is, what has this same Ferdinand accomplished, though he did not destroy Popery, persecute Priests, Monks, Nuns, and Sisters of Charity, or commit audacious robberies on the public; and notwithstanding that property was not subdivided, nor the right of primogeniture abolished, nor every fourth house converted into an usurer's or discounter's shop, nor the whole country subjected to the galling yoke of uncircumcised or circumcised Jews, mostly foreigners, and their bandit valets, the *liberaux*; nor excite Poland and Italy, and then abandon them; nor send out his fleets to vindicate the rights of *liberaux* in any defenceless country, to commit abominations with *liberal* and *utilitarian* ladies, taken out of the stews, before the altar on Holy Thursday whilst the blessed Sacrament was exposed and on the altar;

nor seizing on British subjects residing peaceably, pursuing their industry, and converting tracts of sterile land into rich gardens by the sweat of their brow under the protection of existing treaties, treating them with every insult and indignity, and driving them before them at the bayonet's point like malefactors, to the sea-port and transporting them, because every light of the age and march-of-intellect-man contends that the *liberaux* have at any time, and at all times, a right to trample on the British name, any international law or any treaty notwithstanding; and notwithstanding that this impudent mountebankism of the *progres des lumieres* and the march-of-intellect-men was considered as such a miserable *Picaro Gavacho* farce as neither *Don Pedro* or *Juan Llanas* would deign to look at. Now, of not one of these recited deeds or advantages can Ferdinand boast, and yet this he has done. He, on his return to Spain, instead of being put into the possession of a country in the highest state of prosperity, as were the *liberaux* in July, 1830, found Spain in a state of waste from being for years the seat of wars and of contending armies, and Spain is now, unquestionably, not only the most prosperous nation in Europe but in a state of rapid progressive prosperity; every thing, every branch of industry has improved and is still improving, and what is the best test of real prosperity, that is, internal consumption has increased beyond belief.

Here the *liberaux* will say that their Atheistical *progres des lumieres* and march-of-intellect-system still has one manifest advantage over the Christian system of Ferdinand, that is in point of time, and this I must admit; for here the Atheists and Philosophes beat the Catholic Don out of the field, for whilst he took fifteen years to raise his country to that enviable state of prosperity Spain now enjoys, the *progres des lumieres*, the Atheistical march-of-intellect men, took but one short year and a half to accomplish the ruin of their country.

Every true Spaniard, every *Castillan* *Rancio* ought to be on his knees morning and night praying that Ferdinand, who has saved them from the curse of liberalism, may live out his *mille annos*.

Neither ought our most ancient allies be neglectful of their prayers for their *de jure* and *de facto* King, Don Miguel, or the monster Don Miguel, as the Jews and their valets, the *liberaux*, denominate him. The said monster, by-the-bye, belongs to an hitherto unknown *genus* of monsters, for he is worshipped by his subjects, whose prayers he well deserves, for he has already preserved, and will again, with God's blessing, preserve them from the curse of liberalism.—Every friend to the independence of nations, to the rights of the people, and to the rights of Sovereigns of the people's choice, and to civil and religious liberty, must anxiously wish for the annihilation of this liberal Bucan-

neering expedition which is to bring back the *liberaux* the foes to civil liberty, and the very *liberaux* who before they first were driven out of Portugal gave a sample of their respect for religious liberty by sacking and plundering Monasteries, Convents, and Churches, the produce of which plunders the Remonstrances, Chalices, and Church plate they were afterwards selling to the Jews in London. But Don Miguel, with his faithful subjects, will give a good account of his Buccanneering expedition, set on foot by the uncircumcised and circumcised Jews of Paris and London to whom, as the hunter sold the bear-skin before the bear was taken, the whole ecclesiastical and lay property of Portugal has been aforehand mortgaged.

I could really not account for it how that mass of most impudent, silly, and absurd lies about Spain and Portugal, should have been for years past so incessantly crammed down our throats; but the *liberaux* were to mortgage Spain to the Jews by an immediate creation of a national debt when they got to Madrid, so that the Jews were equally interested in the misrepresentation of Spain as of Portugal; and as Spain and Portugal are Catholics they were interested in virulently abusing Catholicism which stood in the way of this wholesale mortgaging—but however puzzled I might be the Westminster Review of July last has made all clear—for, he says, “there seems to be a general combination of the Press in favour of the Jews, they are in all the Printing Offices, and seem as if they commanded the types of all Europe.”

Now, these liberal and anti-Catholic lies are religiously copied into anti-Catholic Papers on one side, and into our liberal papers on the other, and all is thus accounted for. It is quite edifying to behold the Uction with which our liberal Priests and Friars gloat upon these liberal articles, though they ought to know that it would be the joys of life to the writers of them to see the last Priest strangled with the guts of the last Friar—and as in France such liberals would be the influential legislators with which a Repeal of the Union would bless our aforesaid profoundly wise Priests, as I before proposed in my letter against the Repeal of the Union, DUBLIN EVENING POST, Thursday, October 28, 1831.

The Papers are daily exclaiming against the insults British subjects receive from the Portuguese; this shows how easily John Bull and Pat can be crammed with absurdities. The Portuguese government, on the contrary, must be all vigilance not to give Britain offence; and if the truth was known, ninety-nine times out of one hundred British subjects who complain deserved worse than they got. There is nothing so insolent and overbearing as your half-bred Englishman, where he can be so with impunity. I deny that the people of the Continent, without particular excitation, insult Englishmen; on the contrary, I say that the name of Englishman is a passport throughout the Continent to

the consideration of all ranks. But the Jews and liberals wish to excite the public against Don Miguel, and their usual *mentire impudentissime* they employ.

The nations of Europe ought to enter into a Holy Alliance against the ABSOLUTISM of *liberaux* and *utilitarians*, and of Jews, whose dominion is a corollary of the doctrine of *liberaux* or *utilitarians*, who will ever prove the most grinding, ferocious, and remorseless of tyrants.

I think that I have now satisfactorily answered the noble or gentle, learned or unlearned *utilitarian* who wrote the article in the *Courier* above quoted, and who advises the *liberaux* of France to destroy Catholicism, in order to improve morality and commerce and social enjoyment; that is, in order that the people of France should enjoy all the beatitudes of *liberalism* or *utilitarianism*, the said noble or *utilitarian* not being an unlikely person to give the same advice to Government as to Ireland.

APPENDIX B.

Louis XVIII. and the Liberaux.

LOUIS XVIII. the worst man for France ever born, when Comte de Provence, or Monsieur, was remarkable for his dislike to the nobility, by whom he was generally despised. There were, it must be admitted, too many courtiers among them, for Louis XIV. had metamorphosed that, which is most respectable, into that which is most contemptible, the gentleman into the courtier: but the courtiers were not those he disliked most.—There were still, notwithstanding, the demoralization bequeathed by the Regency and the corruption of the preceding reign, fortified by the philosophes, ever the most servile of courtiers, still some men of the stamp of Fenelon's Duc de Montausier to be found at the French court.

The malignant ridicule of his virtuous and ill-fated brother and of religion, was a favourite pastime which Monsieur shared with his sycophants, philosophes and profligate men of letters, to whose obscene productions he sometimes contributed with his pen, and in whose vices he shared.

This corrupt mass of impotent and filthy depravity had not been two years on the Throne when he took a fancy to a lad who had just before been employed in the household of Madame Mere (Napoleon's mother.) This handsome lad, a very Antinous in person, became his favourite, but instead of erecting statues to him, as did a Pagan Emperor to another Antinous, the Most Christian King made his favourite Prime Minister of France.—The young man soon found out that he wanted support in his sudden and wondrous elevation, and the *liberaux*, to whom all means are indifferent to compass their end, who hold patriotism to be a word to gull the vulgar, and morality, ignorance and priestcraft, self being the only consideration which the march of intellect admits of, and who considered that it would be useful to their purpose that their demoniac yell of *Ecrasez l' Infame* should again re-echo through France, and that morality should be extirpated, offered the favourite all their support, provided that he would unite with them in a second demoralization of the French people, that is in reviving that general demoralization which, by means of an obscene and blasphemous press, the liberal philosophes of 1792 had disseminated, but which had been checked by Napoleon, whose laws and regulations on that subject were still maintained. For, unlike his successor, whose language with his intimates was obscene and blasphemous, that of Napoleon was ever chaste, and he could as little brook blasphemy as obscenity; during his reign he had not suffered the

republishing of the demoralising or anti-social works of the philosophes, and the police had strict orders to seize all publications tending to corrupt the people; obscenities, abominations and blasphemies only reappearing as 1792 in the shops and on the stalls, under Louis XVIII., and from and after the ministry of M. de Cases.

The favourite proposed this scheme as the only means to keep him in office. This was joyously agreed to. France was yielded to the *liberaux* with the more delight on the part of the philosophe on the throne, as he hereby secured that which, after the smiles of his favourite and *the savoir faire* of his cook he prized most, that is the extravagant and incessant flatteries of the *philosophes* and *liberaux*, which never could be too copious or too highly seasoned for his palate. Indeed this surrender of France to her unprincipled and most base and worst enemies, was made with the less reluctance, as the motto of our royal *philosophe* or *utilitarian*, as such was, of course, that of the *philosophes* or *utilitarians*, *Après moi le deluge*. He was therefore as totally regardless of the future fate of his people as of that of his family, not having even one thought for that being in whom centers all that is noble and elevated, and all that is charitable, meek and humble, the pattern of daughters, wives, and Christian women, an honor to the blood even of that mirror of chivalry and Christianity, the most perfect of Kings and of Gentlemen, "the hero, the sage, and the saint," of St. Louis, of truly blessed memory. One wreath alone was wanting, and that she acquired—that is, the unremitting, foul and infamous abuse of all that is most unprincipled, base, unmanly and infamous, the *liberaux*.

For these publications funds were amply supplied by the uncircumcised Jews of Paris, they being the natural enemies of Christianity, for true Christianity saves the poor from the rapacity of the rich, and does not suffer the present generation to mortgage posterity, and is therefore an uncompromising enemy to their craft. This gentry, besides holding that no merit ought to be acknowledged, nor any distinction known, but such as usury confers, gladly held their purses open for the furtherance of a measure which was to undermine Christianity, which acknowledges other merits than riches, and admits of other distinctions than those which money bestows.

* The press groaned under innumerable stereotype editions of all that French philosophy and literature had ever devised against morality, social order, and religion. *Le Voltaire des Chaumieres*. and innumerable tracts and pamphlets, in which were condensed

* The number of volumes of obscene anti-social and blasphemous works published from and after M. de Cases Ministry in 1817 (exclusive of countless tracts and pamphlets of the same nature) to the 31st December, 1824, amounts to 2,741,400 vols.—*Memorial Catholique*, May 1825.

all the obscenities, abominations, and blasphemies of the French school, were sold at less than the cost of the paper, and forced *gratis* by the *liberaux* into male and female schools, and into every garret in towns and into every hovel in the country, and the crowned *liberal* for one moment forgot his cook and his favourite, and chuckled at "*le progress de la philosophe, et des idees liberales.*"

On the tomb at St. Helena, neither Marengo, nor Austerlitz, nor even the Code Napoleon, but those only words ought to be engraved, "Here rests the Frenchman who did not suffer the *liberaux* to corrupt the French People." Whilst the tomb at St. Denis's ought to be branded with this sentence, "Here a mass of corruption continues to infect, for here continues to rot the *apres moi le Deluge Philosophe et liberal*, the corrupter of the French People."

You will please to observe that I have never called those *liberaux* Frenchmen, indeed nothing could induce me to inflict such an insult on our gallant neighbours. The Jacobins, the Royalists, and the Bonapartists, notwithstanding their crimes or errors, were Frenchmen, for each in his own way held the advantage and glory of France to be his first object; but they were not *liberaux* or *utilitarians*, self was not their only consideration, nor the *querendo pecunia primum virtus post nummos* the only doctrine they held to be useful, and therefore the only doctrine they held to be true.

There is not even the merit of novelty in those *Apres moi le Deluge*, liberal or utilitarian, all demoralising doctrines of the Palais Royal and Bird-cage-walk school. It is but the *crambe repetita* of those utilitarian Greek sophists who perverted and polluted the youth of Rome, and hastened the downfall of the Republic, dressed in quaint phrase, and dished up as a novelty. Indeed the utter disregard of all human and divine law, the overweening self-sufficiency and contempt for all authority and knowledge but their own, of the sophists of the Bird-cage-walk constantly reminds us of those utilitarian Greek sophists, their predecessors, of whom it was said that if they had lived in the days of AGAMEMNON, they would have persuaded him that without them he could not have known that he was born with two legs.

APPENDIX C.

TO CATHOLIC READERS.

The Right Reverend Doctor Doyle and the Liberal Education Board.

The Right Rev. Doctor Doyle is a determined supporter of his forensic friends (therefore of course zealots for the faith,) Lord Plunkett's, and Mr. Blake's, or Mr. Stanley's liberal Education Bill. Now, as the name of the Right Reverend Prelate carries with it great authority, you might yield to that authority without reflection, and approve of Mr. Stanley's liberal bill, but here I beg leave to submit, whether, before you come to that decision, you ought not to ascertain what objects his Lordship has in view. If you approve of those objects you will agree with him and support the bill, and if you disapprove of them you will disagree with his Lordship and oppose the bill.

In order that you should form a sound judgment on this point I lay before you an extract from a letter written by the Right Rev. the Bishop of Leighlin and Kildare, dated Carlow, May 13th, 1824, (*D. E. Post, Morning Chronicle, &c.*) and addressed to — Robinson, Esq., M.P., and also a letter which appeared in the *Morning Chronicle*, July 22, 1828, and Dublin and other papers:—

To — Robinson, Esq., M. P.

“I agree in opinion with you, that the best if not the only effectual mode of pacifying Ireland, improving the condition of her People, and consolidating the interests of the empire, would be found in an union of the Churches which distract and divide us. An expression of my views, who am a Catholic Bishop, may not be unacceptable to you.

“In such a state of things, it behoves Parliament to apply to itself what the Roman Senate used to say to the Consul or Dictator, *Curet ne quid respublica detrimentas partiat*, and I have little or no doubt if your sentiments were adopted by it but that Ireland could be tranquillised, and the union of the two countries cemented, &c.

“The union of the Churches, however, which you have had the singular merit of suggesting to the Commons of Great Britain, would together and at once effect a total change in the dispositions of men.

“The union, on which so much depends, is not, as you have justly observed, so difficult as it appears to many, and the present time is peculiarly well calculated for attempting at least to carry it into effect.

“The time is favourable, for the Government is powerful, and the Pope is powerless.

“In Ireland I am confident that, notwithstanding the ferment which now prevails a proposition such as you have made, if adopted by Government, would be heartily embraced.

“The Catholic laity, as I before mentioned, are tired of their degradation; they are wearied in pursuit of freedom, and are anxious for repose. Their Clergy, without I believe one exception, would make every possible sacrifice to effect an union: I myself would most cheerfully, and without fee, pension, emolument or hope, resign the office which I hold, if, by doing so, would contribute to the union of my brethren and the happiness of my country.

“It may not become so humble an individual as I am to hint even at a plan for effecting so great a purpose as the union of Catholics and Protestants in one great family of Christians. I would presume to state that if Catholic and Protestant Divines, of learning and a conciliatory character, were summoned by the Crown to ascertain the points of agreement and difference between the Churches, and that the result of their conferences were made the basis of a project to be treated of by the Heads of the Churches of Rome and of England, the result might be more favourable than at present anticipated.

“The chief points to be discussed are the Canons of the Sacred Scriptures, Faith, Justification, the Mass, the Sacraments, the authority of Tradition, of the Councils, of the Pope, the Celibacy of the Clergy, Language of the Liturgy, Invocation of Saints, Respect for Images, Prayers for the Dead.

“On most of these it appears to me that there is no essential difference between Catholics and Protestants, the existing diversity of opinion arises, in most cases, from a certain form of words which admit of satisfactory explanation.

“It should be the duty, as it is obviously the interest, of the ruling powers to provide for the happiness of the people by enlightening their minds, and if through the wisdom of Parliament, and the efforts of Government, the Churches of these countries could be united, a new æra of happiness would commence in our history. The laws of this country could be equalised, the most perfect confidence would prevail between government and the subject, &c. &c. &c. Hoping that you will again call the attention of Parliament to the consideration of this important subject—I have the honor, &c.

“✠ J. DOYLE.

“Carlow, May 13, 1824.”

No sooner had I read the above letter than I was instantly convinced of the extreme folly and the profound ignorance of that host of Laymen, Bishops, Priests, Monks,

Friars and Jesuits, from that ignoramus idiot, Sir Thomas More, downwards, whom we have had the simplicity to venerate as blessed martyrs, and who in England and Ireland suffered themselves to be beheaded, shot, tortured, hanged, drawn and quartered, and of that other host of English and Irish noblemen and gentlemen who lost their lives and their properties, and all this, forsooth, because those thorough-paced lay and clerical *omadauns* had not the *gumpshion* to discover that which the Right Reverend Bishop of Kildare and Leighlin at once makes as clear as mud, viz.,—"That there is no essential difference between Catholics and Protestants, but that the diversity of opinion arises, in most cases, from certain form of words which admit of a satisfactory explanation."

The Right Rev. Doctor Doyle, Catholic Bishop of Leighlin and Kildare, Doctor of Divinity, &c., says that there is no essential difference between Catholic and Protestant; I will leave it to his Right Rev. Brethren to argue that point with him theologically, and I will show him how a Mathematical Professor, in contradiction to the Prelate's assertion, proves mathematically that there is an essential difference between Catholic and Protestant.

"The late celebrated Professor of Mathematics in the University of Edinburgh, Mr. Professor Playfair, who died a few years ago, being on his death bed, in reply to the pressing solicitations of some religious friends, who entreated him in that awful moment to adopt some religion, answered, that if he was to adopt a religion it must be the antient Catholic Religion, for there he saw premises and a conclusion, but that though the sundry denominations of Protestants set forth premises, they never came to a conclusion. He had devoted his life to mathematics, that science abhorred inconsistency. That which was inconsistent could not be true, and Protestantism was inconsistent, therefore Protestantism could not be true. Now Catholicism was consistent and so was Deism, therefore either might be true; and as he could not in conscience adopt a religion that must be false, if he is to adopt a religion it must be one that may be true; therefore he was ready to adopt either Catholicism or Deism, and his good friends might name which he was to choose. Those worthy disciples of John Knox would not name Deism, and still less would they recommend it to Mr. Playfair to take up with the *Scarlet Impure*—so they departed

re infecta, leaving the learned Professor precisely where they found him."

One word with you, my Reverend Protestant, Presbyterian and Methodist Friends as to the said *Scarlet Impure*. Some Reverend Gentlemen amongst you, who, of late, without any sort of provocation, have dealt such virulent abuse against us, have, particularly within these thirty years, suffered their imaginations to run away with their judgment, and waxed poetical in the pulpit, there announcing, as authentic news which they had received either directly from above, or through the post-office, that the aforementioned *Scarlet Impure* was on her last legs, whereas nothing can be more unfounded than that news, for the Old Lady is as brisk as ever she was, ready any day to heel and toe, cover the buckle, or shovel the dust with the best man among you, and see you all down. Indeed so little does she manifest any symptom of decay, that it is my firm belief that this ancient dame will bury all you youngsters yet.

(From the *Morning Chronicle*, July 29, 1828.)

SIR—I have just read, in the *Dublin Evening Post* of Tuesday last, the letter addressed by the Right Reverend Dr. Doyle, Catholic Bishop of Leighlin and Kildare, to his Grace the Duke of Wellington, of which you have given extracts in your paper of this day. As the whole tendency of this is more or less to separate or disconnect the Catholics of Ireland from the See of Rome, it cannot but be received with great favour by Protestants of every denomination, as the one vital principle is common to all the varieties of Protestant belief—that of a denial of the authority of the Pope. This letter may even give satisfaction to the *Cisalpine* Catholicism of some few persons here who are not Protestants. But the question is not what Protestant or what *quasi* Catholic this letter may please, but will the measures it proposes be approved of by the Catholics of Ireland, and if not, are the Right Reverend Prelate's arguments such as to induce the Minister to force those measures down their throats?

To the Right Reverend Bishop's proposal of rendering the Catholic Church in Ireland "*National*," (Catholic and National!!) the very denomination involves a contradiction. I believe few Catholics will agree, this nationalizing of Churches being an essentially Protestant device, unknown before the Reformation; for before and since, Catholics acknowledge but one Faith, one Baptism, and one Holy Catholic, Apostolic and Roman Church. The Prelate seems to rest his *project* on the vague

doctrines of the pretended *Gallican* liberties; and, it would seem, means to gratify us with the pretended liberties of a new-fangled *Hibernian* Church. Now, as we are fully aware of the evils which those pretended church liberties produced in France and elsewhere, we would rather decline the honour of adopting them, however elevated the quarter from whence they come recommended.

Henry VIII. first commenced this nationalizing of Churches, and established the pretended liberties of the *Anglican* Church, which proved not merely the subjugation of that church, but the sacrifice of the rights and interests and well-being of the people which the Church, whilst independent, protected to this Protestant despot; as the establishment of the pretended liberties of the *Gallican* Church effectuated the prostration of the interests of the people of France, which the Church could no longer cherish and defend, by the subjugation of that church to the Catholic despot Louis XIV.; for then, having no longer any power in the state to control him (Richelieu had broken down the Aristocracy), and not till then—that is, until he had established those pretended *Gallican* liberties—could he, or did he, utter the well-known sentence, “*La Nation c’est moi?*” This omnipotence over the Church thus acquired by Louis XIV. is now re-asserted and exercised by the Liberal faction, who lord it over France with much more insolence and a more reckless despotism than ever did the Grand Monarque; and they proclaim all their manœuvres, which tend ultimately not only to the absolute subjugation of the people to their faction, but to the extirpation of Christianity; so that, as was happily expressed by the Viscount de Conny, “every man in France will have every facility to become an Atheist, but no man in France is to be suffered to become a Priest”—to be no more than a vindication of the said *Libertés de l’Eglise Gallicane*. That those pretended *libertés* did not want for eloquent advocates I admit, for Voltaire and d’Alembert, and their whole gang of *Philosophes*, the constant execrators of the name of Christ, were the most loud and incessant declaimers for *les Libertés de l’Eglise Gallicane*, behind which they worked those batteries which were to destroy Christianity and Monarchy, and deluge their country with blood. But after all this bloodshed in the name of liberty, this gang of liberal *Philosophes*, by their nefarious dominion, their profligacy and corruption, so disgusted the people of France with that name, that they hailed the arbitrary rule of Bonaparte as a blessing.

How would those *Philosophes*, in their hatred to the Catholic Religion and the Holy See, have been delighted at these proposed measures, calculated to alter the constitution and relations with Rome of the Hierarchy of Ireland, and by which, according to the Right Reverend Prelate’s own words, “*the intercourse with Rome*

would be diminished and almost cease." That is, by which that would "almost cease" in Ireland, which it has been one of the objects of all their writings to show ought everywhere to cease; and with the same feeling of satisfaction would they greet the desire expressed by the Right Reverend Prelate, "That the Duke of Wellington should propose to the Pope that an arrangement should be made, having for its object to render the Catholic church in Ireland more national;" for thus indeed might the connexion of the Catholics of Ireland with the successors of the Apostle St. Peter be soon made effectually "to cease."

We have seen what those pretended Church liberties have produced and are producing; we have seen what were the opinions and wishes of the most inveterate enemies to the Christian name; yet with those things before our eyes, we are called upon to undergo an experimental course of National Catholic!! *Hibernican* church liberties!!

Those exalted characters who deal in the confection of National Churches and pretended Church Liberties, seem to have one common characteristic which distinguishes them from the vulgar herd of *operatives*. Thus the productions of the latter are not undertaken until it is ascertained that there is a demand for them. But the works of those artisans of pretended Church liberties are totally uncalled for, and they must depend on their friends and an indulgent public to bring them in vogue.

Thus, Henry and Louis, devising their pretended *Anglican* and *Gallican* liberties was due to mere accident, and those new creations were as unrequired as I will by-and-by show the new pretended *Hibernican* Church Liberties to be uncalled for. Nothing on the part of the Holy See gave countenance to those measures; no encroachment of the Papal power had taken place or was apprehended; our Catholic ancestors had fully guarded against any such encroachment. At no time was Rome in more perfect harmony with the governments of England and France than when those new and disastrous measures were broached. The Pope had just then conferred on one sovereign the title of Defender of the Faith, and another Pope had just then sent an extraordinary legation to compliment the other sovereign. Those new devices have, in fact, no more honorable, no more honest, no more sacred origin, than the private personal pique of Henry and Louis against their cotemporaneous Popes.

Henry was incensed against Clement, because he would not give him leave to commit adultery; and Louis, who daily committed adultery without leave, waxed apostolic; and in the effervescence of his holy zeal, concocted the pretended *Gallican* liberties to satisfy his resentment and to spite Innocent, who forsooth would not suffer the insolence of the Grand Monarque's ambassador at Rome to pass unnoticed. The pliant Wolsey made out as bad a

case in support of the one, as did the courtly and servile Bossuet in support of the other; but of course all Bossuet has said adverse to the Court of Rome has been, and must be, lauded to the skies by every true Protestant. However, the special pleading and astute volumes written by Frenchmen and others in support of these pretended *Gallican* liberties, with which our Right Rev. Prelate seems so smitten, obtained at the time a momentary vogue from the ridiculous pretensions of *Avocats*, the over-weening pride and self-sufficiency of Jansenists, and the deep design of *Philosophes*. But they must now appear as deserving, at best, no better denomination than that of an ingenious *skiomachia*, or fight with shadows. Yet at this day, it is from a fear of those shadows that those pretended *Hibernican* Church liberties are to be imposed upon us!!

I have shown that no encroachment of the Papal power had taken place, and that none was apprehended, and that consequently the new devices of Henry and Louis were unsought and uncalled for. I will now prove that those new-fangled pretended *Hibernican* Church liberties are equally unsought, uncalled-for, and unnecessary; and this I will prove by the authority of the Catholic Bishop of Leighlin and Kildare himself; for what does the Right Reverend Prelate say? Why that “*The state is already perfectly secure against Papal encroachment, but I would be anxious to see the Catholics of Ireland equally secure. At present and for the whole of the last century, they have not been molested, but they are liable to inconvenience, and even to be vexed and troubled by the Pope, whilst he holds in his hands the right of appointing Bishops.*”

To the worthy Prelate who thus, in the 19th century, dreads Papal molestation, might be repeated what was said by Doctor Samuel Johnson sixty years ago—“That a man who would then feel a dread of the power of the Pope, would have cried out fire at the time of the deluge.” But though at present, and for a century and a half past, the Catholics have experienced no vexation or molestation; though the present mode of nomination has for a century and a half conferred on Ireland the inestimable blessing of a body of Prelates not to be surpassed in apostolical virtues, and that no reason whatever is assigned upon which a suspicion can rest, that, at any future day, any trouble or molestation will be felt; still, upon this most remote possibility, this *mera possibilitas*, that some one, God knows who, or where, or when, may be “*inconvenienced*” by the Pope, are we called upon to alter those relations, which it appears by the Prelate’s own showing, have for a century and a half maintained uniform concord and harmony between our Hierarchy and the Holy See! This uncalled for scheme—which, among the other evils it would produce, could not but tend to divide us, is now brought before the public, and addressed to a Prime Minister—but will however, I apprehend, not prove likely

to captivate our exemplary, enlightened, and vigilant Prelates. They have little poetry about them, and will probably conceive that *well* may be let alone; for though they know their path they cannot guess where new roads may lead. Indeed, the mere fact of calling in a perfect stranger, to interfere in what may be termed family matters, cannot appear calculated to excite any strong feeling of assent on their part.

As for the Duke of Wellington himself, the first sentence in the above paragraph will probably determine the part his Grace will take in this affair; for that says, "*The State is already perfectly secure against Papal encroachment.*" Now this, I apprehend, is all that relates to his Grace's Orderly Book, and with this he will probably rest satisfied. To be sure, the Duke having so much idle time on his hands, may require varied amusements. But then the question may be, whether his Grace would seek his recreations in the analysing of certain Right Reverend dreaming lucubrations of undefined "*vexations*" and "*inconveniences*" which the Pope may or may not, in the present or the next century inflict on some as yet undiscovered patient.

The evils which the Catholic religion might apprehend, will not come from Rome, they are more likely to arise from a relaxation of discipline, which might, more or less, encourage the experimental feats of theorists and innovators, who, by the division they might thus create amongst us, would greatly cheer the efforts of our spiritual adversaries, and of our temporal opponents. Now these evils can only be securely guarded against by maintaining that intimate connection, that strict union with the center of Christian truth and Catholic unity, the Holy See, which has distinguished the Catholic Church in Ireland, and which at this day, notwithstanding the constant insult and wrongs endured for three centuries, remains unshaken.

It would appear by the Right Rev. Writer's partiality for those misnamed *Gallican* liberties, and by the whole context of his letter, that he may have retained some early prejudices imbibed at a certain Portuguese University, remarkable for supporting those tenets of pretended church liberties; doctrines, whose inevitable tendency is to bring about this "*nationalising*" of churches after the Utrecht or sundry Protestant fashions. In fact to solve the connection of the Catholic people with that eternal strong hold of Christian faith, the Rock of the Apostle St. Peter, against which neither the assaults of Infidels nor Theorists, nor "the gates of Hell" are to prevail.

I lament to say, that throughout the Prelate's letter, this bearing, adverse to the Holy See, is manifest. Indeed, as the absence of the statues of Brutus and Cassius reminded the people the more of those persons, it is scarcely possible, in taking the whole context of that letter into consideration, not to be struck with the

omission (accidental no doubt) of the word *patriarch*, and not to be induced to believe, that if the Duke of Wellington's exertions in procuring from the Pope the nomination of a patriarch for Ireland, all things would be arranged to the satisfaction of all parties. I, however, apprehend that his Grace will be much better employed than in aiding such useless schemes; for in my humble opinion (and I think I know something of them), neither the Irish Catholic Clergy or Laity would ever submit to the appointment of a functionary named for the purpose of dissevering them from the Holy See, and subjecting their religion to the Civil Power, and who, created by the influence of the Protestant Minister of a Protestant King, could not be expected to forget the interests of his creator.

The Right Rev. Prelate quotes, with seeming complacency, the Belgian and other Concordats, and mentions Bonaparte's "*Loix Organiques*" for drilling Priests; but this, to be sure, is only "*by way of illustration.*" I presume to say that had the Prelate been better informed, those Concordats would have excited in him no other feelings than those of indignation. Notwithstanding those declarations and protestations of Protestant liberality and Protestant toleration, and an appeal to the lights of the age and the march of intellect, and so forth, to persuade the Catholic Belgian that his religion would be fairly dealt by, by the Dutch Government, yet no sooner were the ill-fated Belgians subjected to a Dutch King, than all pledges were violated, and, as is notorious, an uninterrupted, vexatious persecution was carried on in Belgium against the Catholic religion and its Ministers. One mode has been pursued most injurious to religion, and insulting to the feelings of the Catholic population—that is, the encouragement given, and the promotion bestowed, by the Dutch Government to *liberal* Priests—that is, to persons not Catholics, and who could be scarcely denominated Christians, who were everywhere preferred to pious and moral clergy in the appointment to parishes, unless, indeed, in some very rare instances, where, by dint of powerful interests, the *liberal* or anti-Christian disposition of Government was neutralized. But now what has happened under the *Concordat*, of which the Right Rev. Bishop of Leighlin and Kildare speaks with complacency? Why, whereas before the *Concordat* the Dutch could only name *liberal* Priests to parishes, the Dutch King now finds himself authorised by virtue of the *Concordat* to name his *liberal* Priests to Bishoprics, and this he has actually done. But, fortunately for the Church there is at its head a Pontiff, who has no political *Gonsalvi* to prompt him, and who, devoted to his great duties, has rejected the whole corps of *liberal* Priests named for Bishoprics by his Dutch Majesty, with one exception; for, as if to qualify the rest, there was among them one pious, good priest, and him the Pope

has named to the Bishopric of *Namur*. But all the other Sees remain vacant, and will so remain, until others than wolves in sheep's clothing are recommended to occupy them. Again—Whereas before the Concordat, though the Catholics experienced great molestation in their Schools or Colleges, still they were not prohibited giving their children early Catholic instruction. Now what has taken place since the *Concordat*! Why the Dutch Monarch has considered himself authorised to deprive the Catholic poor of a Catholic education. Without enumerating the many other instances, the other day the Dutch Government broke up the admirable charity school of *Byloke*, near *Ghent*, where six hundred poor Catholic children were educated gratis by those pious and universally respected men—the Brethren of the Christian Doctrine. That the Dutch should thus expel pious men, who teach the doctrines of a crucified Saviour may not be surprising, as we know that the Dutchman daily tramples under foot the cross and the image of that crucified Saviour, where ducats are to be gained by the performance for *Mynheer* is essentially an *Utilitarian*, and perhaps this *Utilitarian* is of the opinion of a Learned Member of the British Parliament—that “all is bad in the Catholic System.”* However that may be, he seems, under the authority of the *Concordat*, to be taking the best means for securing the future extinction of the Catholic religion, by preventing the rising generation from receiving that early religious instruction in the primary schools, ministered to them by the Brethren of the Christian Doctrine. Indeed the Dutch Government seems, throughout Belgium, to be now sedulously following the example of the Liberal faction now omnipotent in France, who every where throughout the kingdom are at present driving the Brethren of the Christian Doctrine out of the primary schools, and replacing them by liberal school-masters—*philosophes*, who would consider a suspicion that they believed in God as a mortal offence! So much for the advantage obtained for the Catholic

* Mr. Brougham has been pleased to say in Parliament that “all was bad in the Catholic system.” Now I perfectly agree with that gentleman, that if the passing doctrine of the sophists of the day, which the Learned Gentleman patronises, that is, *Utilitarianism*, is good, all must be bad in the Catholic system, for light and darkness, the good and the evil principle, are not more opposed than are the principles of Catholicism to those of *Utilitarianism*.—The question here is, which is the good and which is the bad? But neither the Catholic nor the *Utilitarian* can be judges in their own cause. Let the question then be submitted to an impartial tribunal; for example, to the schools of Plato and Zeno, to whose sublime doctrine mankind, by one common consent, bow down; and it will be found that the disciple of those schools will unhesitatingly join the Catholic in the conclusion, which every unprejudiced person of sound mind must adopt—that UTILITARIANISM, in the last analysis, proves to be the essence of all SCOUNDRELISM.

Religion and a Catholic population, from a Concordat entered into with a Protestant Sovereign!!

There is an effect which a Concordat would produce, which seems to have totally escaped the Right Reverend Letter-writer—that is, the consequences of that measure to our regular Clergy. In the Concordats made by Protestant Sovereigns, those Sovereigns always have required the acquiescence of the Holy See to their determination to exclude the regular Clergy from their dominions—can it be believed that our Government, in its negotiations for a Concordat, would not insist that the spiritual authority of Rome should be exerted in aid of their endeavours to obtain an object so injurious to the interests of our Church, and so desirable to Protestant prejudice, as the annihilation of religious orders in Ireland? That it has been long the intention of government to do away with our religious order in Ireland, and that matters of that nature were in agitation in 1825, is notorious. Indeed the examination on this point before the House of Lords of Mr. Richard Anthony Blake, renders this unquestionable. (This examination was first brought into public notice by the Resolutions of the Catholics of the county of Wexford, 5th December, 1825, published in your Paper, Mr. Editor, in the same month.) In his examination, the Learned Gentleman, having been grossly misinformed, gave a most unfavourable account of the Regular Clergy of Ireland; that the Learned Gentleman was so grossly misinformed is evident, for the Right Reverend Bishop of Leighlin and Kildare, who may be presumed to be somewhat better authority in Ecclesiastical matters than any Gentleman in the Four Courts, in his Examination, also before the Lords, pronounced a splendid eulogium on the Regular Clergy of Ireland, who had just then been so severely stigmatised by the Learned Gentleman. But Mr. Blake's examination still remains on record; and when either negotiations are entered into with the Holy See, or measures are proposed in Parliament for the gradual extinction of the Regular Clergy of Ireland, Mr. Blake's examination will be (as no doubt it was meant to be) a ready argument for the supporters of that measure, for no argument could be presented either to the Court of Rome or to Parliament more to their purpose than the testimony of a Catholic gentleman of high respectability, who declares that the religious orders of our Church in Ireland are oppressive to the people, or indeed worse than useless, or words most fully to that effect. Now, it behoves the heads of those religious houses, to take timely warning, and to consider whether on the day on which a Concordat may be signed, their doom may not be sealed.

There is another matter not precisely mentioned in the letter, but perfectly relevant, which I cannot pass unnoticed, that is a decision freely pronounced by certain liberal gentlemen here,

some of them patriots of the first water, whose every sentence is interlarded with the words Liberty and Constitution. The decision is, "that Government ought to legislate for the Catholics of Ireland without consulting or hearing them." That is to say, these gentlemen would thus deal by seven millions of Irishmen, in a manner in which not one of them would dare to propose to deal by a knot of English cobblers. Such maxims might sound very well on the shores of the Neva, or of the Bosphorus, but those Gentlemen ought to recollect that they are in England. If, however, they must avow such tenets, it is to be hoped that some sense of common decency may prevent them in future from prophaning the words Liberty and Constitution, by giving them utterance.

There are some other matters in the Prelate's letter which I consider highly objectionable, but which want of space prevents my noticing.

J. E. DEVEREUX,

One of the Five Deputies who, on the 7th of January, 1793, presented the Petition of the Catholics of Ireland to their Royal Benefactor, his late Majesty George the Third.

Brookes's, St. James's-street, Saturday, June 23d, 1828.

P. S. As I was convinced that, sanctioned by such a name as that of the Right Rev. the Catholic Bishop of Leighlin and Kildare, the letter addressed to his Grace the Duke of Wellington might do much injury, notwithstanding the good intentions in which, I am confident, it was written, I have presumed to answer that letter, however grievously painful it has been to me to differ in opinion with a Prelate whose unaffected piety, boundless charity, and truly apostolic zeal, no one can more profoundly reverence than myself, as no one can feel a more respectful and sincere affection for the person of that most kind and amiable Gentleman, than I presume to say I honor myself by entertaining.

Upon the above letters I shall not make one word of comment, they are before you, and you will see the objects the Right Rev. Prelate has in view, who is perfectly consistent in supporting Mr. Stanley's *Liberal* Schools Education Bill, as most undoubtedly nothing could with more certitude enable the Prelate to attain his objects, than the establishment of Mr. Stanley's liberal schools.

Having by a perusal of the above documents ascertained the Bishop's objects, the question with you will then be simply this, do you approve of those objects; if so, you unite with the Prelate in supporting Mr. Stanley's liberal schools; if, on the contrary, you disapprove of the Right

Rev. Prelate's objects, then you will with all might and main oppose Mr. Stanley's Liberal Education Bill.

Before we have done with this Board of liberal Education, I shall beg leave to request that my Christian readers will bear in mind the following facts: first, that the Reverend Doctor Sadleir, a member of that board, has declared that in Mr. Stanley's liberal schools the schoolmaster may be an Unitarian, that is of the religion of the Whig Prelate of Winchester, Doctor Hoadley; that is, the schoolmaster in Mr. Stanley's liberal schools may be less a Christian than is a follower of Mahomet; for the Unitarian believes our Divine Saviour and Redeemer to have been a mere Man, whereas the follower of Mahomet believes him to have been a divinely inspired Person. But at the same time it must be a consolation to all Christians to be informed, that there is a Whig member of the board who has dedicated a book to that stanch believer in God and the Trinity, the Reverend Blanco White.*

Catholics who follow the advice of Edmund Burke cannot go wrong, and he advised us Catholics in matters of religion neither to put our trust in Whigs nor Tories, Tories nor Whigs. The Whigs we see by means of this £40,000, would, by their liberal schools, uncatholicise by liberalising or unchristianising us, whilst the Tories would by the £25,000 sent to Kildare-place have uncatholicised by proselytising us, but proselytising us to what? Is it to Church of Englandism, Presbyterianism, Methodism, Quakerism, Soutcotianism, Muggletonianism, &c., &c., no, no, no, and a hundred times no, but to proselytise us to either any one of the thousand and one *isms* known, or to any one of the tens of thousands of *isms* which any one sober or drunken

* This stanch believer in God and the Holy Trinity, the Reverend Blanco White, it is said, first attracted the notice of certain *dilletanti* fellows at Oxford, by the Andalusian *Salero* with which he described the writhings of the Beautiful Saints, in his capital stories about his ravishing the Nuns at Seville, whilst he was their confessor. This reminding said *dilletanti* fellows of those classical exhibitions, where the handsomest boys in Westminster school were selected, curled, rouged, patched, and dressed in women's clothes, and taught to show off to the life the *motus Ionicos* of Roman courtezans, according to the theatrical Romanism of Terence; these *motus Ionicos* being near akin to the Reverend Blanco White's Andalusian *Salero*. These performances were so classically got up, that no errors could be discovered in the Romanism of the curls, rouging, patches or the *motus Ionicos* of the boys, by those classical critics, the Reverend Fellows of colleges, or other Reverend gentlemen who never fail to assist at the performance of the Westminster Latin plays, in order to gratify their exquisite relish for Latin purity.

cobbler, or other sober or drunken citizen, may discover in any verse of the Bible between the first line in Genesis and the last in Revelations.

The Kildare-place gentlemen, in order to bring customers to their *Restaurant*, having, as to the matter of religions, taken pattern from the Paris *Restaurateurs*, thus, as the latter in their bill of fare announce, that in their house every man may help himself to "*Pain a discretion*," the Kildare-place gentlemen in their spiritual bill of fare announce that in their Bible every man may help himself to *Religions a discretion*.

It must be admitted that both the Tory and the Whig humbugs are tolerably modest, but in justice to Mr. Stanley, Lord Plunkett, Mr. Blake, the Most Reverend Doctor Whately, and the Right Reverend Doctor Doyle, it must likewise be admitted that the Whig humbug, though equally modest, still is less silly than the Tory humbug.

APPENDIX D.

Poor Laws.

One word upon the Poor Laws. I consider that the line of conduct which Mr. O'Connell is pursuing, and has pursued for some time back, mystifying the populace and the steady independence of the Solons of the shop and counter with moonshine or the repeal of the Union, has been and is of the greatest injury to Ireland. But some allowance is to made for the learned gentleman's conduct, however injurious to the public, in keeping alive this repeal question; for 1st, he *bona fide* believes that he will carry it in two years, and 2dly, if the learned gentleman could bring himself to look to such dirt as matters of finance, he would at once be aware how injurious it would be to his family to drop this question of repeal, to which the worthy contributors to the O'Connell tribute are so much attached; and this devoted attachment and pure patriotism of theirs surely every candid person must say deserves every indulgence. However, I hold that there is not one man in the united kingdom to whom it is of so much importance that this absurd question of a repeal of the Union should be for ever set at rest and no more heard of, than is Mr. O'Connell himself; for then at once, instead of being the mere head of the *Plebs*, he would be the head of the *Populus*, and would wield the People of Ireland, and might then be for matters of benefit to the commonwealth the most powerful man in the realm; for in a righteous straight forward cause what might not his commanding influence and his transcendent talents accomplish!

But no Irishman or Catholic can forget the essential services which Mr. O'Connell has heretofore rendered to his country and to his fellow Catholics, and far be it from me to disparage those services, yet I will say, that if Mr. O'Connell does, by his superior talent in Parliament and his transcendent influence out of doors, succeed in preventing the imposition of poor laws in Ireland, that he will have performed a service almost if not fully equal in importance to any of those eminent services he has heretofore rendered to his country; and I beg leave to express my entire agreement with that maxim of the learned gentleman, a maxim which ought never to be lost sight of, viz., that the establishment of poor laws would be the greatest curse that could be inflicted on Ireland, and that that class of Irishmen to whom it would be the greatest curse, would be the poor themselves. By this I am not to be understood to object to mendicity houses or hospitals for the destitute in towns, for they are manageable; as the admission of the poor there, though a matter of

Christian charity and duty on the part of the rich, is not a matter of right on the part of the poor. What I admit is Catholic practice, therefore conservatory and wise; the poor laws are not Catholic practice but grounded on a principle subversive of society, and are therefore otherwise; that is, the poor laws, I maintain would transfer the property of one class to another, without ultimate benefit to that other class, as the whole community would after a time be reduced to an equality of pauperism.

It is devoutly to be prayed, that Providence may by its special intervention retain the honorable member for Kerry in his present opinion on the poor laws; for without such special intervention, we shall, I fear, always have to dread the effects of that amiable ductility, with which the learned gentleman ever yields either to the thunders of applause and tremendous cheering of enlightened citizens, or to the winning smiles of the *ci-devant* objects of his most tender affections, Mr. Blake and Lord Plunkett, or to the delicate flummery of a Right Reverend Person, though heaped on the barrister with a shovel, as if he were a prime minister, or to "*multis aliis quos enumerare longum est,*" for,

Quid vento levius? Pulvis,

Quid pulvere? Pluma,

Quid pluma? Daniel,

Quid Daniele? Nihil.

It is then the duty of every gentleman who has any influence on Mr. O'Connell to exercise that influence to retain him in his present mood, for this is not a question like the repeal of the Union, which the learned gentleman may lay down and take up, and lay down again, according to his convenience; as when he lays it down all those legislators in every part of the kingdom who, to the public annoyance, have been mouthing that foolish question, at once drop it; for here, if Mr. O'Connell should be induced to give any support, or even not to oppose that measure, I am confident that it would pass, therefore on him alone rests our hope, for he alone can save the country from this infliction.

As inconsistency has been so much talked of, I must be permitted to say that in opposing the poor laws no reproach of inconsistency lies against me, as I have always maintained the same opinion on that subject; but at the same time I may be permitted to observe, that an accusation of inconsistency is no answer to an argument. When first the letter to the Right Honorable Spring Rice appeared I answered it, but did not publish my answer, because I before had the misfortune of differing with the Right Reverend Doctor Doyle on his letter to the Duke of Wellington, and it pained me again to oppose him when no urgent necessity required it, such as the urgent necessity which I consider required opposition to be given by any and every Catholic to his Lordship on the present most fatal liberal school bill.

The British press is let loose, and is as incessant and violent in its exertions to introduce poor laws here as it had been time out of mind incessant in exposing the evils of the poor laws in England, excited by the English country gentlemen, who have taken it into their wise heads that poor laws would prevent Irish labourers going to England, that is, that poor laws established in Ireland would prevent the Irish labourer from carrying his labour to the best market, instead of giving greater facilities to the labourer to carry the same to the best market; this I admit would be a good effect produced by the poor laws, because in a well ordered government every facility ought to be given to every citizen to bring the article he has to dispose of to the best market. But though I maintain that the poor laws might give greater facilities than he at present enjoys to the Irish labourer to carry his labour to the English market, yet such an advantage is so balanced by numerous fatal evils which would follow from the establishment of the poor laws, that in my humble opinion every friend to his country ought to oppose them.

This is the true cause of all this stir, for I am confident that government is averse to this measure, which they are forced to support by English country gentlemen, who have got fast hold of one of the most absurd of all absurdities, viz., that the poor laws, by making the Irish labourer more happy, would prevent his migrating; now you will observe that this is mere assumption, for neither they nor their advocates can adduce a single fact in its support, whereas all history and all facts prove the contrary of their proposition, which is, that if the peasantry, where there is a dense population and consequently the wages are low, are made more comfortable, they will not migrate to where they can get higher wages.

Do those country gentlemen pretend to say that any poor laws will make the Connaught or Munster miserable cottier more comfortable than are the peasantry of the Asturias and Galicia, and yet yearly do the Galliegos migrate southwards as the Irish do to England, to get higher wages.

Again, all the hard labour about Bordeaux and in the line of the Garonne, is done by Catalans, who annually cross the Pyrennees for higher wages, and return with those wages, just as the Connaught and Munster labourer annually crosses the Channel for higher wages, and returns to his family with those higher wages; the Scotch traveller, Mr. Inglis, describes the happiness and comforts of the Catalan peasantry, which are certainly such as no poor laws will ever bestow on the cottiers of Munster and Connaught. Here I may remark that these Gallicigos and Catalans are all Priest ridden Papists, and therefore firmly believed by every sound Protestant to be a most scandalously unindustrious and lazy race.

Next draw a line from Lyons to La Rochelle, it will go through the hill ground of the ancient provinces of Auvergne and La Marche; well, the labourers of this hill country annually migrate to the North, to Paris and the environs for higher wages, and they have each chests of drawers filled with bed, body and table linen, shirts, chemises, table cloths and towels, of which, though coarse, they have abundance, spun by their women and wove by their neighbours; and they mostly have silver spoons and silver forks. Now, will the poor laws ever give half such comforts to the Connaught and Munster or other cottiers as those labourers enjoy? why then should it be expected by English country gentlemen, that the very moderate relief which, admitting at best the poor laws will afford to them, would prevent those cottiers from annually seeking better wages in England, since we see that notwithstanding the comforts which the Gallicigos, Catalans, and Auvergnats, &c. have at home, that they do annually migrate to where they have higher wages.

Do I wish here to save Irish landlords? by no means; for I consider that no scourge could be sufficiently severe for those Connaught and Munster or other landlords, whose listlessness, ambition, or avarice has made them convert their estates into pauper warrens, suffering those curses of Ireland (middlemen) to exist, and that monstrous system of sub-letting, unknown to any part of the world but Ireland, to cover the country with wretchedness and misery.

A proof of the evils of the sub-letting system is this, that misery in Ireland may be said to be graduated, according as the sub-letting system more or less takes place. In this Irish landlords have however been in some instances more sinned against than sinning, by the trick and quirk of Juries and Judges, allowing a contract entered into for a valuable consideration to be avoided by one of the parties at his pleasure. Every friend to fair play, honor, and truth must feel thankful to Lord Wicklow for the manly and able speech he made on that subject, in answer to all the ribaldry of the advocates of the greatest evil, indeed it might be called the only evil, under which Ireland groans, that is, the sub-letting system. This is so true, that I hold that if the sub-letting act had passed forty years ago, Ireland would at this day be the most prosperous country in Europe.

But to return. I think I have above made it clear and plain to the understanding of English country gentlemen, that the infliction of the poor laws, though it will do us infinite injury, will in no manner answer the purpose for which they intend that measure; therefore I would submit it to their candor and sense of justice, whether they ought to persevere in urging government on to carry a measure which can do them no good, though it must do us infinite mischief.

Two motives urge government to impose poor laws upon Ireland.

1st. That landlords having by their listlessness, ambition, or avarice created a cottier or pauper population on their estates, these poor are reduced to extreme misery and often expire for want of food, though often relieved by the generosity and humanity of the people of Britain.

2dly. That in consequence of this over population the poor flock over to England, and undersell the English labourer in the labour market.

It must be admitted that if neither of those evils existed, that England would not think of establishing poor laws in Ireland, as it would be inflicting a wanton injury on the Irish people. But if there was a part of Ireland where those evils do not exist, would it not be the extreme of wanton oppression to inflict those laws on that part of Ireland where the evils do not exist which the poor laws are to obviate; therefore I cannot conceive if there be a part of Ireland so happily circumstanced, that you would inflict those poor laws on that part of Ireland.

Now I do say, that the County of Wexford is so circumstanced, for 1st, we have always provided for our own poor, no people with us die of starvation, and we have never required nor received subscriptions from England to relieve our poor.

2dly, The Wexford labourers do not interfere with English labourers, for they either have employment at home or migrate to America or Canada. I have known London near forty years, and I have been in the habit of chatting with my countrymen, the Irish labourers, from Paddington to Whitechapel, and Tottenham Court Road to St. George's Fields, and in all my enquiries during that time I could never discover or hear of but one Wexford man a day labourer. Now this is a state of things easily ascertained.

As I have shown that those evils which government considers as the sole reason which could authorise them to inflict the poor laws do not exist in the County of Wexford, therefore the government ought not to inflict the poor laws on the County of Wexford. I hope the gentlemen of the County of Wexford will take this into their consideration, and that if Ireland is threatened with the poor laws, that they will not fail to petition for an exemption from that infliction upon the above incontrovertible grounds of right and justice.

The system recommended by Doctor Doyle in his letter to Mr. Spring Rice I consider impracticable, and if practicable injurious. I should *prima facie* object to it as being a Protestant system, that is, placing the poor under the most grievous of tyrannies, the tyranny of their equals, and thus training them to hate the dispensers of charity and the rich, as cordially as the dispensers of charity and the rich are hated by the poor in England. That charity ministered by the Catholic Priest is alone received with gratitude,

because the Catholic Priest alone can minister charity to the poor without insult. Far be it from me, however, from accusing the Right Reverend Prelate of intending the end to which his system inevitably leads, that is, the degradation of the Catholic Priesthood; for if the Catholic Priest was, as in every Catholic parish from the time of the Apostles he has been, the distributor of charities, it would uphold his consequence; and it is notorious that his Lordship's favorite project of an union of the churches can never be accomplished without the degradation of the Catholic Priesthood, which I am convinced that his Lordship, who is an honor to that Priesthood, could never intend; though nothing would contribute more to that purpose than his Lordship's scheme, as we have in evidence by what has taken place in England, where the establishment of this lay body of churchwardens and committee-men, who are there viceroys over the parson, have gradually destroyed his influence over the people, and therefore, as we must expect that the same cause would produce the same effect here, we must hold that his Lordship's scheme would gradually destroy the influence and degrade the Catholic Priesthood. The Catholic Priest is the only person who at all times and in all places has been the honest trustee to the poor, and the only dispenser of alms who could minister to the necessities of the poor, without insulting them. In their distribution of alms, they, on the contrary, endear the rich to the poor, showing them to the latter as their benefactors, and this creates in return affection from the rich, as is seen in *unliberalised* Catholic countries. Whereas there is no country in Europe where the rich are more hated by the poor than in England, and no where are more thefts, and robberies, and arson committed than in England, where this lay churchwarden and committee system exists. If then the rich of Ireland wish to become as much hated by the poor as are the rich in England, let them adopt the scheme proposed by the Right Reverend Bishop; if not, let such as have any prejudices dismiss them, and adopt the old scheme; and if there are to be poor laws, leave the thing as to Catholics to the Priest. This will be the wisest thing they can do for their interest and happiness, and above all the most conducive to the peace of the country, and to the true interests of government. If landlords and government from their absurd prejudices will not employ those means, then they must take the consequences, and they will soon enjoy as demoralised a peasantry in Ireland as that which by those Protestant poor laws means has been created in England.

I shall beg to make a few observations on the Right Reverend Doctor Doyle's poor law scheme, as set forth in pages 42, 43, 44 of his Lordship's letter to Mr. Spring Rice.

His Lordship proposes that in each Parish there shall be popu-

lar elections at short intervals, to choose out of the traffickers or farmers in the Parish, a Committee, who are to assess the Parish and expend the fund for the relief of the poor. My objections are :

1st—That by these ever recurring popular elections, a permanent focus of discontent, sedition, and faction would be established in each Parish, and thus would each Parish stand ready organised at the disposal of the turbulent and designing ; a state of things as hostile to the security of private property, as incompatible with the peace of the country.

2d—I object to the caste of People to be chosen, on the principle that the free Negro is the worst master to the slaves from whose ranks he has just emerged—so would be this class of persons the most tyrannical that could be placed over the Poor, as the experience of all England has proved. The Prelate's project is grounded on his own unsupported opinion, whereas I have the experience of England to show the severity and general misconduct towards the Poor, of Churchwardens and Overseers precisely chosen out of that class of persons his Lordship has pointed out. In proof of what the Poor in England suffer from those Parish-officers, I request the reader will peruse the annexed Memorial on Lord Leveson Gower's Bastardy Bill.

I shall further observe, that though in England respectable shopkeepers are sometimes appointed, yet they, particularly in country Parishes, are soon disgusted with the duties, and the duty falls to all housekeepers, bankrupts or other intriguers, and the Prelate does not show that it would be better with us.

But the Right Reverend Doctor has indicated a certain means by which if anything went wrong, it might be set right ; that is, “ let him be assisted by the Established Clergy, and such persons “ of rank as reside within the district.”

This again is unsupported advice, and here I again beg leave to differ with the Prelate, and I conceive that I again here have the experience of England at my back. I know no more humane Gentlemen than the Clergy of the Church of England and English Country Gentlemen in general, it has always been their desire to give their assistance in the administration of the poor laws, but in how few instances do they succeed, and in how many have not both the Parson and the Squire been so disgusted with those popular authorities, selected precisely out of that class of persons from which the Prelate declares such functionaries should be chosen as aforesaid ; that they have in numberless Parishes ceased to take a part in the affairs of the Poor. Here again the Prelate does not show, or pretend to show, that the thing would be otherwise here. Now, on the contrary, if I were to give an opinion, it would be that the Poor under this system, being still more unmanageable than in England, and the Committee-men clothed in brief

authority, still more overbearing and difficult to be dealt with, that the Parson and Squire would be more disgusted here than even they are in England. Indeed if this system was adopted, my belief is, that the country would be rendered uninhabitable.

The Prelate says, "But the truth is, that if any system of relieving the poor were established, which would be based on popular election, on a short duration of power, and on unqualified publicity, it would be morally impossible that such a system could be infected with any great abuse; there never has been peculation, oppression, or waste committed in any establishment founded on the above basis."

"Would it not be contrary to all reason to suppose that men elected by the people for a short time, and acting in the presence of the multitude, with a tribunal always sitting to reward or condemn them—would it not, I say, be contrary to all reason to suppose, that men so circumstanced would assess their neighbours and themselves with any other view than that of promoting the public good, I cannot believe it, I think it impossible."

I beg leave to differ with his Lordship; I do believe it, and instead of thinking it impossible, it is what I would expect from persons so constituted; for that is what we have constantly seen in democratic bodies—witness Athens where all was tribunal and all was public, and how did that public assess themselves and their neighbours, not for the public good, and how much was there not of abuse, peculation, and oppression?

Again, in contradiction to the Prelate's hypothesis, I will say that it is morally possible that such a system should be infected with abuse, peculation, oppression, and waste; for I say that the system here laid down is very nearly that of the Republic of Geneva during the eighteenth century, and that the interests of that Republic were constantly sold to France, that there was constant abuse, and peculation, and oppression of the best citizens of the Republic, who were repeatedly persecuted and banished by a lawless and corrupt faction, just as the best men in each parish would be persecuted by the faction which soon would have established itself by the defeat of others in each of our parishes.

If the facts I have adduced have, as I conceive, demolished the Right Reverend Doctor's hypothesis, all arguments he therefrom derives go for nothing.

I must say that the Prelate here outdemocratises any thing at present to be seen, for even in democratic France, when the *centimes additionels* are to be imposed for the poor, they are voted by the Prefect and the *Conseil de Prefecture*, and distributed by the *Mayors of the Communes* and their *adjoint* and *notables*—and if I recollect right even in the most democratic cantons of Switzerland, when the poor are to be relieved, it is not the poor or their compeers that assessed and distributed the money, but the authori-

ties that did both, so that his Lordship's scheme has certainly one undisputed merit, that of novelty; for, as far as I am informed, I do not know any country where the assessment for the poor and the distribution of the money arising from that assessment was not the attribution of some constituted authority; I therefore must totally disagree with his Lordship, that such a body of persons in one parish "would fulfil the trust committed to them "with as much zeal, talent, and integrity as can be found in any "body of men existing within the empire." My decided opinion being, that hardly any body of men existing within the empire would perform those functions so injuriously to the public as would that body constituted by the Right Reverend Bishop's newly devised system.

I repeat that whatever means may be used to relieve the poor, it is at least to be hoped, that government will not legislate on mere assertions, however highly respectable may be the author of them.

My humble opinion is this, that in any succour to be afforded, the mode the most advantageous to the poor themselves and to the public would be, according to immemorial usage, to entrust the ministering of that succour to the Protestant Clergyman and to the Catholic Priest of each parish, and that the less laymen are allowed to interfere the better.

I must over again repeat that the Bishop's scheme would soon render both Parson and Priest nonentities in the parish; and as to the proprietor, of the soil he it seems is to have no opinion. But if those petty traffickers and farmers elected by the multitude of the parish are competent to assess the parish to the amount which they themselves consider to be requisite, might they not, (however foreign from the Right Reverend Doctor's intention) being thus organised in every parish throughout the kingdom, and as the Prelate states, "*who would evince a skill and ability beyond their sphere in applotting the value of property,*" might they not, I say, consider themselves to be very proper persons to applot the value of land and the amount of rent which the tenant might, in doing justice to himself, pay to the landlord?

If when the Peasantry are, as in England, comparatively steady and docile, this system of parochial election and committees, though infinitely less democratic than the one proposed, is attended with such bad effects, what could not be apprehended from such a system established amongst our so easily excited mercurial Peasantry?

I shall here show for the information of the Public how mendicity has been almost extinguished in Spain. The most perfect Statistical Census that has yet appeared, was one made in 1767, in Spain by Count d'Aranda. Compared to the unequalled perfection of this Statistical Census, all that has been since attempted

in France and England is mere drivelling, so admitted to be by all who have seen the Spanish Census.

By that Census it appeared that in 1767, there were in Spain 7,250 beggars; severe laws were enacted against them, but the hungry in spite of those laws still continued to beg, and the charitable to administer to their wants. This Statistical Survey was renewed by Count *Florida Blanco*, in 1787, and the number of beggars was then found to be 7,030. When Government instead of continuing those severe measures which had proved unavailing, adopted Catholic ones: the Brethren of *Juan de Dios*, an order of Hospitallers, and other orders were charged with opening Hospitals and Hospices for the beggars, and ten years after, when the new Census was made by the Prince of Peace, in 1797, the number of beggars all over Spain, was reduced to 3,563. The two richest Provinces of Spain, Catalonia and Valentia, had between them 1,500 beggars, whilst with the same number of inhabitants, the poor Provinces had but 200. The paupers directing their steps towards the rich, as the best able to relieve them, and those Provinces being Catholic, they knew no distinction between strangers and their own poor, the anti-Christian *law removal* measures being unknown there.

If the well being of the paupers themselves, or if economy, or if the tranquillity of the country, be matters of any importance to Government, I would say establish Hospices for males and females in each County, under the direction of the religious of each sex; you will then see what another order of beings will those paupers become under that rule, from what are the inmates of an English workhouse, or a liberal Paris depot.

As to economy, I would say that under those religious persons, at least fifty per cent. would be saved; for peculation and plunder of the funds of the Poor, are matters unknown to our Church.

See what is done with £9,000, at Maynooth, and the astonishment of Mr. Frankland Lewis, &c. &c. and all who have heard those Commissioners or seen their report, at the miracles performed at Maynooth by Catholic principle, Catholic honor, and Catholic disinterestedness.

It is to be remarked, that in those Spanish Hospices, under the different orders of Hospitallers, though forcible means are almost unknown, and therefore the Poor are encouraged to perform their work by mild means, by their pious, amiable, and beloved friends and guardians; yet that the sums realised by the produce of the easy labour of these priest-ridden Catholics, and therefore, according to the Protestant creed, lazy People, is greater in amount according to numbers, and goes further towards their support, than what the whips and treadmills of England, or the ferocious severity of liberal gaolers in France, have been able to realise out of the labours of their respective Poor.

TO J— S—, ESQ., BLACKROCK.

London, Sept. 28, 1830.

MY DEAR SIR,

As I find that Mr. DEVEREUX's excellent and effectual Letter* on Lord LEVESON GOWER's so well named *Prostitute Protecting Bill* has not appeared in any of the Dublin Papers, I send you a copy of the same, as I conceive that the publication of that Letter would be interesting to your countrymen of all denominations. The history of this Letter is as follows:—The Editor of a London Paper having failed in his promise to publish the following Letter on Saturday, the 24th of April, it was printed on the morning of Monday, the 26th of April, on which day, before the Speaker took the Chair, it was placed in the hands of the Right Hon. Sir ROBERT PEEL, and of the Right Honorable Lord LEVESON GOWER, and distributed to several Members of Parliament; and on Monday night Lord LEVESON GOWER got up, and, though the Bill had been read a first time on the 2d of March, and printed, and, therefore, was in the hands of all the Members—his Lordship, without any debate, virtually gave up the Bill, which has not since been heard of; thereby, as it were, granting the request of Mr. DEVEREUX, that this execrable measure should be adjourned, *sine die*.

* First published, London, April 26th, 1830; republished, Dublin, October 28th, 1830.

PROSTITUTE PROTECTING BILL.

"It is sufficiently notorious that promiscuous intercourse is become common from early age, that marriage is seldom contracted with honor, and that illegitimacy has greatly increased since the introduction of the existing Laws of Bastardy."

Observation on the Poor Laws in Agricultural Districts, by the Rev. J. D. BRERETON, A. M., Rector of Little Messingham, Norfolk.—*Hatchard, Piccadilly.*

MR. EDITOR,

A BILL for the Protection and Comfort of Prostitutes, and for the Propagation of Bastards in Ireland, has, under another denomination,* been introduced by the Noble Secretary for Ireland, the Lord Leveson Gower, into the House of Commons, read a first time, and ordered to be printed and read a second time on the 19th March, when the second reading was put off to the 26th of April. It is to be hoped that every Irishman in the House, who has the honor of his fair countrywomen, of every degree, and the morality of his countrymen, at heart, will use all his efforts to defeat this insulting and demoralizing measure, calculated to reduce the most chaste and moral peasantry in Europe, to the degraded level of that peasantry once so famed for religion and morality, but, as it appears on the authority of a highly respectable Clergyman of the Church of England, now the most immoral and depraved peasantry in this quarter of the globe, there being no part of Europe, not excepting certain Protestant parts of Germany, and Protestant parts of Switzerland, or even excepting those parts of France infected with *liberalism*, where "it is notorious that promiscuous intercourse is common from early age, marriage seldom contracted with honor, and where five-sevenths of the births are illegitimate," a state of things which the Reverend

* "A Bill for making Provision for the Relief and Maintenance of Deserted and Illegitimate Children in Ireland."

Mr. Brereton, above-quoted, shows, pp. 50 and 54, to exist in the agricultural districts around him; and this being the state of things in the county of Norfolk, which, above all others, is famed for its agricultural prosperity, may, I presume, be taken as no unfair average for the other agricultural parts of the kingdom. The first objection to this Prostitute Protecting Bill is, that it is not wanted—the proof of which is, that it has not been called for; for neither Grand Juries, counties, parishes, or any other meetings, have applied to Government, or manifested any desire for such a measure. This Bill then seems to be a sort of voluntary,—an *improvisation* on the part of Ministers, who, with the best intentions, have, as it would seem, consulted persons wilfully concealing, or totally unacquainted with, the moral interests and feelings of our people.

The only argument which the supporters of this Bill put forward is this: that the laws of bastardy are necessary for Ireland, because a child may sometimes be found deserted, and that the parish must then be at the expense of maintaining that child; whereas, if the bastardy laws were established, the person to whom the mother had sworn the child would be bound to maintain it, and the parish money would be saved. So that this question, which has such appalling moral bearings, is thus to be considered merely in a pecuniary point of view, and the morality of the present and future generations of Irishmen is to be sacrificed to save a few pounds to the parish!!

But taking these gentlemen on their own ground,—that is, the pecuniary interest of the parish, I will show their position is untenable, for I will make it evident that the system they propose—that is, the laws of bastardy—would soon enormously increase the expenses of the parish, and place them far above any expenses the parish might possibly incur by suffering things to remain as they are at present.

What is the present state of things? Why a poor girl may be sometimes seduced (but this is no common occurrence), and she deserts her child, which the parish then provides for. This, I admit, is a burden on the parish, but it is generally a small one; but what becomes of the girl? Why, dreading the just reproaches of her family—unable to bear the looks of her friends and companions, she abandons her child, and, to hide her shame, flees to strangers for refuge; but usually overcome by those feelings which none but mothers can comprehend, she steals back, and mostly one way or other, either as a nurse, or otherwise, gets possession of her child, and is allowed something by the parish, or “makes it out,” as we say, “among the neighbours,” whose charities, without abating their detestation of the crime, whatever their poverty may be, still find a mite for the wretched and forlorn, there being no word in the Irish language for *utilitarianism*,

as there is no word in that language for another equally odious and equally unnatural practice.

However, nine times out of ten, this girl sins no more; but by repentance seeks mercy, and not unfrequently by a life of humility, piety and virtue, in some measure atones for the scandal she has given. Here then, generally speaking, the parish is burdened if burden there is, but with one child by one woman.

Now, what would have become of this girl, and how would the interests of the parish have been affected, if the Prostitute Protecting Act had been in force? Why the girl would have been dragged forth to swear the child, and from that moment would she cast away all shame; and, besides the chance of getting a husband compelled to marry her, the comforts with which she would be surrounded in her *accouchement*, either at the expense of the reputed father or of the parish, and her being paid by the public, and consequently in some sort recognised as a public functionary, would, most likely, soon persuade her that there was some "UTILITY" in her guilt, and instead of bringing forth but one illegitimate child, she would seek her "*greatest happiness, principle*,"* in the repetition of her crime, and for successive years would burden the parish with her spurious progeny. Let us now see what would be the effect produced on the morality of her companions by the different fate of this girl, considered as under the present state of things, and as under the operation of the Prostitute Protecting Act.

In the first case, the girl's shame, the reproaches of her friends and kindred, the contempt she endured, the misery and woe she suffered, would be a salutary warning to her companions to shun that course which led to all her afflictions, whilst, in the other case, they would behold vice as it were triumphant, the prostitute probably with a husband, and see, to use the words of the Rev. Mr. Brereton, "that profligacy was not only shielded from punishment, but that bounty was afforded to it." Thus, under Lord Leveson Gower's Prostitute Protecting Bill, the whole moral tone of the parish would be deteriorated, and the same corruption and depravity would be witnessed in Ireland, which, under the Bastardy Laws, according to the Rev. Mr. Brereton, takes place in England. Instead of the accidental misconduct of one or two poor deluded girls (for in numberless parishes in Ireland hardly such a one appears) we should soon behold dozens of the Noble Secretary's bastard-bearing functionaries regularly paid and stationed in each parish, there zealously pursuing their vocation, and punctually yielding their annual contribution of bastards to the notable increase of the species, but, at the same time, to the notable decrease of the parish funds.

Ministers, with singular inconsistency, while they daily lament the excess of population in Ireland, here, unasked, unsolicited

* An expression of the Utilitarian School.

mero motu, apply a most powerful stimulant, hitherto unknown in Ireland, to provoke the increase of that population.

But I shall be told that the fathers would pay all, so that the parish would be at no expense; for this is the argument (and a solitary one) which the suggesters, framers and supporters of this Bill employ; but I will beg leave to tell these gentlemen, that the fathers would do no such thing, as most certainly in Ireland the nine-tenths of them (for then our poor girls would have been rendered as dissolute as elsewhere) would run away, and the other tenth would more likely turn out to be paupers. To prove that I am not here stating a case unlikely to take place, I will show that such things do take place, and for that purpose I will again quote the Rev. Mr. Brereton, who writes, page 54, "There is a woman in this parish who has had four illegitimate children, and is now pregnant of the fifth. During the last years her children have been supported almost entirely by the parish, through the running away of the fathers, and partly through the negligence of the overseers. This woman, I believe, received during this time more than a widow's allowance, and thus not only is profligacy shielded from punishment but a bounty afforded to it."

I apprehend that after what has been adduced in this letter, whatever may be the other unknown merits of the Noble Secretary's scheme, that at least we shall no more hear of this scheme as a measure by which the finances of the parish would be greatly benefitted.

As to the nefarious usage attributed by the newspapers to English Justices, and the parish officers under their control, churchwardens and overseers, which would appear to manifest great contempt for their poor countrymen, I must say that words are wanting to express the abhorrence in which it must be held by every man of common feeling and honor; I allude to that infamous practice of forcing poor men, under pain of incarceration, to marry girls or women who have prostituted themselves either to them or to others, thus making marriage, which in all Christian countries, and in none more religiously than in that of Old England—not less renowned for the virtue of her daughters than for the valor of her sons—was held up as the reward of female virtue, to be now a premium awarded to female vice. Who, after this, can be surprised at the Rev. Mr. Brereton's picture of the gross depravity of the peasantry of England, "Its being sufficiently notorious that promiscuous intercourse is become common from early age, and that marriage is seldom contracted with honor," when we see that simple country girls, who, if let alone, might have remained in that state of innate innocence and purity, which not unfrequently the candid loveliness of their countenance so well bespeaks, are thus not suffered to remain unpolluted, but must be driven into "promiscuous intercourse from early age," propelled "*de tenero ungui*" into the "*motus Ionicos*," in order that by their infamy they may

establish a claim to that premium which Justices, Churchwardens and Overseers so sedulously keep before their eyes. Their Worships, by thus provoking the debauchery of these poor girls, are pleased to perform a part which would not ill become certain matrons trading in female frailties!! There is another, and perhaps a still more heinous branch of those heinous practices of the said Justices, Churchwardens and Overseers, almost daily brought before the public, in the reports of trials between parish and parish. That practice of procuring an abandoned woman to swear the child of which she is pregnant to a man living in another parish, and forcing that man by threats of imprisonment either to provide for the child or marry the prostitute, in order to exonerate her parish, and throw the maintenance of the child upon the parish of the bridegroom.* Even though said Justices, Churchwardens and Overseers do not look upon matrimony as a sacrament, they surely in all their doings do treat that institution somewhat

* The following case in point, from the *Morning Chronicle*, of this very day 26th April, will show what the poor people of Ireland have to expect if Lord Leveson Gower's Bastardy Bill is imposed on them:—

“The following curious case of match-making, by Parish Officers, was tried on Wednesday, at the Derby Quarter Sessions. It affords a fair specimen of the disgraceful practice too often resorted to for the purpose of shifting the maintenance of a pauper from one Parish to another.

“Philip Bateman and David Walker were charged with conspiring, in their situation of Parish Officers of Middleton, to effect a marriage between two paupers named W. Saxton and Lydia Brooks. W. Saxton is 25 years of age, and was in the poor-house on the 2d of August, when he saw Lydia Brooks for the first time. On the 13th he was arrested by the defendants on the charge that Lydia Brooks was with child by him. They asked him if he would marry Lydia; he said he would not, and they threatened him with twelve months imprisonment in Derby jail. They promised him three or four pounds if he would marry Lydia. They took him to Chesterfield in a gig hand-cuffed.—He staid that night at Chesterfield, and was next day taken in the same manner to Wirksworth. They then took him before the Magistrate, and Bateman told the Magistrate that he (Saxton) was father of Lydia's child; the Magistrate ordered him to jail, and he was taken there hand-cuffed. Both defendants continued to urge him to marry, and offered him three or four pounds if he would comply. After being three days in jail they conveyed him before the Rev. Mr. Ward, the Surrogate, and Saxton supposed when they were asking his place of residence that they were questioning him relative to his examination at Wirksworth. The Rev. Gentleman, it appeared, had been applied to for a license—Walker gave the necessary information, and two sovereigns and a half for the license, which was then obtained. They then returned to Wirksworth jail, Saxton being hand-cuffed all the way. The next day both defendants came to the jail, between eight and nine o'clock, and asked Saxton if he was ready to go to Church; he said he would as lief stop where he was.—Lydia was in attendance, the ring was purchased by the defendants, and they also paid the other expenses. The marriage ceremony was then performed, and Lydia and Saxton signed their names to the register. Lydia has a wooden leg. The defendants then treated them to pork chops and ale, and bought Saxton a new hat. They then went to Walker's house, a public-house at Middleton, where they were treated and staid all night. Two days after Saxton quitted Lydia.”—*Morning Chronicle*, April 26th, 1830.

too cavalierly. We have before seen how little they regard the honor and morality of their poor neighbours, and we here see, that when for their own purposes, they wish that a female in their parish should be married, that they send to the next parish for a male with as much unconcern as they would send to the next parish for a bull or a boar for the service of the females in their stalls or styes. Now, though it may have been found convenient not to consider marriage as a sacrament, still I may be permitted to observe, that the legal union of a Christian man and a Christian woman, however poor they may be, ought not in a Christian country to be dealt with altogether as would be the intercourse between brutes. I need not say with what horror all these proceedings would be contemplated in Ireland, where the utmost reverence and veneration is paid to the holy sacrament of marriage by the Catholic, and to the conjugal union by the Protestant. Indeed, if even Lord Leveson Gower's Prostitute Protecting Bill did pass, I cannot well see how he could ever carry it into effect in Ireland, so revolting would it be found to the prejudices of all classes.

This system of forced marriages, which may in fact be considered as part and parcel of those Bastardy Laws which the Noble Secretary means to inflict upon us, as they almost uniformly accompany them, is one which the high sense of honor of the Irish peasant would never suffer him to brook, which he would avoid by flight, or to which he would prefer incarceration; for, generally speaking, it is with the greatest reluctance (except under very peculiar circumstances) that he ever can be brought to marry and introduce into his family a w—e, even of his own making, and he would consider himself a degraded being, and his family for ever disgraced, if he married one of another man's manufacture. How absurd then must be the attempt to apply the same legislation to the Irish which is now in use with the modern degraded English peasant, when their dispositions are so dissimilar. The first feelingly alive to the reputation of the woman he is to marry, whilst the latter is regardless whether his spouse be virtuous or not.* In this I am fully borne out by the Rev. Mr. Brereton, who gives us to understand, that the woman the English peasant marries is seldom virtuous, or, in his own words, that "marriage is seldom contracted with honor;" whilst it is notorious that the Irish

* "The Reverend John Monkhouse, Rector of Broomshot, near Southampton, who died in the year 1828, had tacked an unceremonious epithet in the Parish Register, page after page, to the names of females: out of 72 married women, it has declared that 69 had misconducted themselves before marriage, and that the other three were more fortunate, but not more virtuous."—*London Gazette of Literature*, No. 8, Saturday, July 24, 1830.

STATE OF MORALS IN ENGLAND.—"The *Leeds Intelligencer* of Thursday, 23d September, contains an Advertisement offering a Reward of Ten Shillings a head for no less than sixty-one Persons, who are each and all fugitives for "Bastardy."—*Dublin Evening Post*, Sept. 28, 1830.

peasant may be said hardly ever to contract marriage with dishonor.

This measure would not only be repudiated by the lower, but would give no less disgust to the higher orders of his Majesty's Irish subjects; for I do not believe that the Lord Leveson Gower, notwithstanding all the power and influence he commands as Secretary for Ireland, could procure any Irish gentlemen, orange or green, green or orange, (if such colours he still remembered) who entertain such listless disregard or stern contempt for the well-being of the people, as basely to pander to a system which was to demoralize the whole peasantry of their country: that is to say, which was to reduce the peasantry of Ireland to that state of demoralization and depravity, in which, according to the Rev. Rector of Little Massingham, the peasantry of England now wallow; and which state of demoralization that enlightened and sincere friend to the poor and truly patriotic Clergyman shows to be the effect of certain laws. Now, I pray you particularly to denote, that these laws which have caused the demoralization of the peasantry of England are precisely the same laws which the Noble Secretary, the Lord Leveson Gower, intends to impose on the people of Ireland!!!

English country gentlemen, who, as it would appear by the Rev. Mr. Brereton's pamphlet, live in the midst of a population, the five sevenths of which is composed of w—s and bastards, (we shall say five-sevenths more or less, as the case stated by the Rev. Gentleman may be, though nothing appears to show that it is an extreme case,)—these gentlemen, being used to such a state of things, naturally consider that state as the most advantageous mode of being the peasantry of any country can enjoy, and, in their kind anxieties to extend those beatitudes to the peasantry of Ireland, are (if I am rightly informed) determined to give their most strenuous support to the Noble Secretary's said Prostitute Protecting Bill, considering this Bill as a preliminary step towards the establishment of the Poor Laws in Ireland. Thus there can be no doubt, if Government be so determined, that this most effectual means of demoralizing a whole people will be carried by a triumphant majority. However, I cannot conceive that, after the great benefits which the present Ministry has conferred on the people of Ireland, their intention can be to hurry through the House a measure in which the well-being and happiness of that people are so deeply involved, without allowing the parties aggrieved to be heard against the measure. On the contrary, I can have no doubt, from the straight forward frankness of the Noble Secretary's public and private character, that, on reflection, the further consideration of this execrable measure may be adjourned, if not *sine die*, at least to a more advanced period of the session, so that the people of Ireland, both clergy and laity, may have an opportunity of submitting to Parliament their humble remonstrance against a measure which would effectually bring all morality into

contempt, and doom us to behold in Ireland what is to be seen elsewhere—"promiscuous intercourse notoriously become common from early age, marriage seldom contracted with honor, illegitimacy increasing in such a ratio, that out of 77 children born within a certain period, 54 shall be bastards, and only 23 legitimate."— (Rev. Mr. Brereton's pamphlet, pp. 50 and 54.)

This Bill smells of the shop from whence issued the "*Easement of Burial Bill*," which was calculated to place the Priest under the heel of the Parson, as this Bill is calculated to place him under the hoof of the Churchwarden and Overseer. Former ill-blood and irritation were fast subsiding, the Parson and Churchwarden were cordially shaking hands with the Priest, a mutual feeling of Christian charity pervaded all parties; but it was too much to expect that Ireland should be long suffered to remain in so united and so happy a state; a new brand of discord must be devised and cast into every parish in Ireland. Whilst the Priest, as in duty bound, and according to his immemorial usage, is exercising all his private influence, exerting all the authority of his holy ministry, to expel irreclaimable loose women from his parish, protection is afforded and allurements are held out to make those women spurn the Priest's authority and remain in the parish. Churchwardens and Overseers either procure husbands by compulsion for the prostitutes, or diligently prepare caudles and possets, child-bed linen and baby clothes, in order that these strumpets may see the enjoyment of a comfortable *accouchement* at all times prepared for their sisterhood; so that, in spite of Priest and priestcraft, Pope and Popery, they may the more readily be induced to gratify the parish with uninterrupted repetitions of those performances, in conformity with the Lord Leveson Gower's said Bill for the protection and comfort of Prostitutes and for the propagation of Bastards in Ireland,

J. E. DEVEREUX,

One of the Five Deputies who, on the 2d of January, 1793, at St. James's, presented the Petition of the Catholics of Ireland to their late Royal Benefactor, his Majesty George III.

April 26, 1830.

P. S.—It would appear that the doctrines of the *Philosophes* of France have not been less effectual there than the Bastardy Law has been here in increasing the number of illegitimate births: for *Monsieur le Baron Charles Dupin* (himself a *liberal* of the first water) in his late work on statistics, as if to manifest his satisfaction at the triumph of *les idees liberales* and *les lumieres du Siecle*, joyously informs his reader that, when he meets with three Parisians, he may be almost certain that two of them are sons of w—s.

Houses of the Oireachtas