

together. It was remarked by Father Cremins that Mr. Redmond would not be long out of gaol, at least he heard so.

Westmeath.—The 33rd anniversary of the Christian Brothers school was recently celebrated. The great benefits conferred on the people of Mullingar during the past 33 years are fully recognised by them. Rev. E. V. Casey is the present superior, and is much esteemed by the people. Father Kelly presided at last Rathowen League meeting and the following amongst other resolutions were passed:—That we tender Most Rev. Dr. Nulty our warmest congratulations on the attainment of this the 25th year of his Episcopacy, and pray that he may be long spared to his people, for whom he has laboured so zealously both for their spiritual and temporal welfare.

Wexford.—J. E. Redmond, M.P., accompanied by Rev. W. O'Neill, Kulanerin; Rev. J. Dunphy, Arklow, and Rev. H. O'Donnell, Johnstown, recently drove round the Col. Greaney estate and visited the houses of the evicted tenants. On Croghan Mountain, the scene of the murder of John Kinsella, about a score of evicted families are comfortably housed. They still retain the grazing of the mountain and they have a large number of sheep and cattle. Recently two planters arrived in their midst to take up their residence on two of the evicted farms, but both of them suddenly left the district, which during their stay was in a state of great excitement and was thronged with police. The people regard their departure as a great triumph. About 5,000 acres have been evicted on their estate, and this vast tract is only stocked by the landlord to the extent of 95 cattle, and a dozen emergency men are constantly employed in protecting them. Recently Captain Hamilton, the agent of the estate, visited Croghan Mountain unexpectedly, but his presence rapidly becoming known a large crowd, chiefly composed of women, assembled and hooted freely till he passed off the lands. Mr. Redmond, after visiting all the evicted families, addressed an enthusiastic meeting of the tenants and succeeded in ending the police, who in large numbers were scouring the country looking for him.

THE IRISH UNIVERSITY QUESTION.

The following is a speech recently made by Archbishop Walsh at the Catholic University Medical School in Dublin:—

His Grace, who was received with applause, said: "I have had occasion, gentlemen more than once within the past few weeks to speak in public on some one or other of the grievances from which Catholics still have to suffer for conscience sake. Your address reminds me, but, indeed, there was little danger of my overlooking it, that my visit to this medical school of our Catholic University brings me into contact with another of these—the grievance resulting from the arrangements maintained up to the present by the State in this country in the matter of University Education (applause). I speak of this as a grievance which Irish Catholics have to suffer for conscience sake. I know, of course, that it will be denied that this is so. It is likely to be denied, at least by those who are responsible for the continued maintenance of the grievance. In these days of so-called universal toleration, British statesmen are very naturally unwilling to face so unpleasant a fact, very naturally unwilling to have it recognised that the policy they pursue is one that trenches in any way upon the sacred rights of conscience. But no unwillingness to face the facts of a case, no denial of them, can change those facts. What I have said as to this university grievance is true, and, indeed, so manifestly true that I cannot see what room there is for denial of it, or even for calling it in question. For, when we say of any grievance, imposed upon a Catholic that it is to be endured by him for conscience sake, what do we imply? Surely nothing else than this, that it is a grievance which presses upon him because of his Catholicity and because of his fidelity to Catholic principle, the result of some oppressive law which shuts him out from the chance of sharing in some advantage that is placed by the State within the reach of others, an advantage which, in this way, is open to others and not to him—that is to say, which is not open to him so long as he continues conscientiously to follow the teaching of his Church, and, from which, moreover, there is nothing to exclude him save only the fidelity with which he adheres, and his conscience tells him it is his duty to adhere, to that teaching (applause). With grievances such as I have now described we in Ireland are but too familiar from a sad experience. We are face to face undoubtedly with one of them here to-day. Not, indeed, that in this matter of University Education there are now any advantages of a public character from which Catholics, as such, are formally excluded by the letter of the law. In at least one other department of the public administration of our country examples even of such unlooked intolerant exclusion of Catholics are still to be found. But in this matter of University Education, the policy, unfortunately, still dominant in Ireland is more guarded in the form of its operations. Apparently it has not the courage, or it is ashamed, openly to declare itself for what it is. Even then, whilst it distinctly puts under a ban fidelity to the teachings and principles of the Catholic Church, it wishes to keep up the false pretence that it does nothing of the kind. So far as regards the displaying of an outward show of toleration it has improved, no doubt, upon its old practice. Not yet twenty years ago—let me be quite accurate, only sixteen years ago, down to the August of 1873—it was not ashamed to take a much bolder and more defiant course. Down to that quite recent date it made no scruple whatever in insisting that if we, the Catholics of Ireland, were so presumptuous as to wish to stand upon a level with our Protestant friends and neighbours in the matter of University education, we should qualify ourselves for the privilege by first becoming Protestants ourselves; we should make an oath of abjuration; or take the Protestant sacrament; or stand up in some Protestant church or other and there read our recantation of Popery and all its evil ways (applause). This is the matter of University education, is literally true, not merely in that far-off time that is known as the time of the Penal Laws, but down to our day. It was true, literally true, here, in this Catholic city of Dublin, down, as I have said, to sixteen years ago. The

scandal of it was then in some degree hushed up and hidden away out of sight, by the passing of Mr. Fawcett's University Tests Act of 1873, the Act which abolished all religious tests in Trinity College and in the University of Dublin. Since the passing of that Act, Catholics whose ambition may lie in the direction of obtaining even the highest honours of that ancient seat of learning, are, it is true, no longer under the necessity of abjuring their faith as the first step towards the attainment of the object of their ambition. Every honour, every emolument, in that college and university is now thrown open by law to both students and professors of the Catholic religion, as it has also been thrown open to students, if there be any such in Ireland, and to professors, as there unfortunately are, who are of no religion at all. I am aware that many liberal-minded Protestants, and, amongst them, some of the most eminent among the heads of Trinity College itself, welcomed that change. I cannot share their view, but I most heartily sympathise with the feeling that inspired it (applause). It surely must have been a galling thing to any man of spirit in that college to feel that the tenure by which he held some highly-prized academic post of distinction, or of emolument, has its root in a system of intolerant exclusiveness, to feel that his success in the academic struggle in which he had carried off the prize from his college competitors had by anticipation been shorn of more than half its honour from the fact that by the very terms of the competition in which it was won, the contest for it could lie only between a favoured few, that every representative of intellect and genius amongst the millions of his Catholic fellow-countrymen (applause) was rudely barred out from the arena, and that all this was done not because there were provided for the Catholics of Ireland corresponding prizes and distinctions for which they might compete even amongst themselves, but because it was the policy of the day, out of sheer intolerance, to exclude every Irish Catholic who could not be bribed into renouncing his faith from all chance of winning any such prize or distinction in his native land (loud applause). It must, indeed, have been a galling thing for any man of spirit, holding high office in Trinity College, to think of these things. No wonder, then, that by many of those within as by many without the walls of the College, the change that was wrought in 1873 was hailed with satisfaction. There seems to have been in the minds of many—there certainly was in the minds of some—a belief or expectation that the passing of Mr. Fawcett's Act and the removal by it of the legal obstacle that until then had barred against the Catholics of Ireland the path of higher academic promotion, would have effectually opened up, to Catholics as well as Protestants, the competition for the higher prizes and distinctions of the College and University. This was but one of those delusions, of which instances so frequently recur in the history of the attempts of well-meaning English legislators to work out their scientifically-constructed schemes of political, or educational, or religious, or social reform in Ireland (applause). The Protestants of Ireland had not asked for the secularisation of Trinity College. The Catholics of Ireland had not asked for it. As regards University Education, Irish Protestants had no grievance to be removed. Irish Catholics had indeed a grievance. It was their grievance that Mr. Fawcett, in his strange ignorance of what was really wanted, would seem to have sought to remove by the secularisation of Trinity College. Now, not only had the Catholics of Ireland not asked for anything of the kind, but the change then made did not even accord with their wishes. This point perhaps, is worth dwelling upon for a little while. In some Protestant circles there seems just now to be a strange forgetfulness of what occurred when Mr. Fawcett's Bill was being passed in the House of Commons. I have in view especially the blundering of one ecclesiastical dignitary—I am told he is an old man, so I do not wish to speak too severely about him; the fault perhaps, in the circumstances, lies not so much with himself as with the newspapers that publish for him his mischievous lucubrations (laughter). He must at all events be either very ignorant or very malicious (renewed laughter). I trust he may be entitled to the less discrediting plea of the two (applause). His present line is that, although we are now dissatisfied with all that has been done for us, even to the overturning of the old Protestant constitution of Trinity College, there was a time when this was not so, and when in fact we clamoured so loudly for that change that it had to be made to appease us. All this is pure imagination; fiction of the most manifestly baseless type (applause). To see this we need only refer to the volumes of Hansard for 1873. The second reading of Mr. Fawcett's Bill was moved by that gentleman on the 21st of April. Even in the face of the combination of English members of all parties, Conservatives, Whigs, and Radicals, which rendered opposition to it futile, except indeed as a matter of the assertion of the principle, it met with the united opposition of the representatives of Irish Catholic opinion in the House. An amendment, hostile to the second reading, was moved by Mr. Mitchell-Henry, then the representative of one of the largest Catholic constituencies in Ireland, the county of Galway (applause). What did Mr. Henry say of Mr. Fawcett's Bill? He spoke of it as a measure not unworthy of the earlier days of English history, "when either the word of the monarch or that of an oligarchy governing in his name imposed its will upon a reluctant people." He said that Parliament "in a cooler moment would shrink from enacting laws upon a domestic subject, contrary to the advice of the large majority of the Irish members and to the remonstrances of the people." He described the bill as the outcome of the "political pedantry of legislating on abstract theories of right without taking account of what were scurrilously called sentimental grievances, or studying the characters and the prejudices of nations." Again, he said of it that it was "a measure which, whether it was in itself a right or a wrong one, could have no perceptible effect on Catholic grievances and was calculated only to blind and deceive the public" (applause). The amendment was seconded by Mr. Denis Caulfield Heron. Mr. Heron warned the House of the mischief it was about to do. "It was," he said, "a very serious step to take, to force through the House and upon the Roman Catholics of Ireland, a measure with which they were discontented." Then the O'Donoghue spoke. He denounced the bill as "an indirect and unworthy attempt to force upon the people of Ireland a university system, against which they had solemnly