

him from his allegiance. Have you spoken the truth, Reginald?

"I have spoken the simple truth and rejoice that the good baronet yielded, because I regarded the idea of his adherence to William's government as an incentive to induce my beloved Florence to cast away her prejudices."

"You are bold as well as insolent," said Florence, bitterly. "Do you think this a seemly way to win my consent to our union? You do not know me, I think, but understand that yonder sun is about as likely to fall from the heavens as I to unite my fate with that of a devoted adherent of the Dutch king. No, not a word more," she added, wrenching her hand from his grasp, "my heart may break at witnessing the mistaken prejudices, harbored under the name of loyalty, of those I love, but never shall it forswear, whatever be its struggles, its allegiance to the Stuarts."

As she spoke these words she rushed out of the room, and hurrying to her own chamber, wept long and bitterly over the defection of her uncle, and the mistaken line of conduct pursued by Reginald, to whom the whole wealth of her affections had long been devoted; nor did she leave her room till she had seen Sir Reginald and the fanatical Benson gallop down the avenue leading from the Grange. Then, with tears in her eyes, she sought her apartment, the secret of admission to which was known only to herself and Sir Charles de Gray.

(To be Continued.)

A LECTURE ON CHRISTIAN FREE SCHOOLS.

BY THE RIGHT REVEREND BISHOP OF ROCHESTER.

(Continued from our last.)

The Rev. Dr. Anderson, President of the Rochester University, a gentleman whose life has been devoted to the training of young men, who stands high in his profession in this city in which he lives, and whose reputation as an educator is known I might say all over the country—a man who has a wonderful gift, as I understand, of influencing the minds of others; who can draw young men to him, who can fashion and direct their ways of thought, who can mould and form their characters.—Dr. Anderson, one of the first men in the Baptist Church in these United States, addressing the Baptist Educational Convention in the City of New York, says:—

"Happily, I need not say much upon the subject of moral and religious education in colleges. By far the larger part of our colleges have been founded by religious men, and by prayer and faith consecrated to Christ. . . . I would only call attention to that kind of moral and religious influence which may be called spontaneous or incidental."

He speaks now of colleges and universities. Ten times more do we need such teaching in our schools—down where the people are, than in our colleges where the select few of the rich are to be found.—Again he says:—

"With the elements of christian faith in head and heart, it is impossible for an earnest teacher to avoid giving out constantly religious and moral impulses and thoughts. He must of necessity set forth his notions about God, the soul, conscience, sin, the future life and Divine Revelation."

I endorse most heartily these correctly expressed views and sentiments of Dr. Anderson. They show how profound, how deep is his knowledge of the boy-heart, and how well he understands the influence that must of necessity go out from the mind and the heart of every earnest teacher to work upon the plastic and susceptible hearts and minds of his young pupils, fashioning and forming them for their future welfare in the world. The Doctor goes on:—

"If he promises not to do so he will fail to keep his word—these are true words—or his teachings in science or literature, or history will be miserably shallow and inadequate. Our notion of God and the moral order form, in spite of ourselves, the base line which affects all our movements and constructions of science, literature and history. Inductions in physics, classifications in natural history, necessitate a living law, eternal in the thought of God. . . . All instruction unfolding the laws of science, literature and history should be permeated with the warmth and light and glory of the Incarnate Redeemer."

"Incidental instruction." Here is the power of the teacher. The fact is, if you take a number of boys to instruct them, and dose them too largely with set forms of religion, you will do them harm. But if you go to work in Dr. Anderson's way—by incidental instruction—you may be sectarian, but you will make your scholars religious and just what you please:—

"Incidental instruction in morality and religion then," says the Dr., "ought to be the main reliance of the Christian Teacher. The ends of a Christian school while working by its own laws and limitations, ought not to be essentially different from a Christian Church."

Note well these words of the Doctor which I repeat:—

"The ends of a christian school ought not to be essentially different from a christian church."

I would like to ask here what we shall call those schools that are not christian? Can a school be called christian in which all religious exercises are forbidden? The Doctor continues:—

"The principles we have thus indicated are universal in their application. If the christian teacher must make the elements of his religious faith color all his teaching the same must be true of the unchristian teacher. . . . There is no good thinking that is not honest thinking. There is no good literature or art that is not the spontaneous outflow of the deepest elements of the moral and intellectual life. If parents wish their children educated in christian principles, they must seek out honest, christian men to be their teachers."

I thank God that put it in the mind of Dr. Anderson to give such clear testimony in favor of sound Catholic views with regard to the education of the young. There is nothing like the variety.

You have heard the testimony of the thirty presidents and then that of Dr. Gratz Brown, Governor of the State of Missouri, a great politician and statesman. You will notice that these gentlemen are speaking on occasions when loose talking will not answer. Dr. Anderson addressed the Baptist Educational Convention; the thirty presidents of colleges were united at a Teachers' Convention. They are men advanced in years, of serious thought, speaking on serious questions, and their words are not to be taken lightly, like those of the writer in a newspaper who has to throw off his column per day.

Gov. Brown, addressing the seventh National Teachers' Convention in St. Louis in August last, said:—

"It is very customary declaration to pronounce that education is the great safeguard of republics against the decay of virtue and the reign of immorality. Yet the facts can scarcely bear out the proposition. The highest civilizations, both ancient and modern, have sometimes been the most flagitious. Now a-days, certainly, your prime schools have been educated musk."

I know you would be angry if I said this, but I am merely quoting from this gentleman, and if you go to Auburn, Sing Sing and other prisons, and examine some of the criminals confined there, you will find that there is truth in the Governor's words. Again:—

"And it is at least doubtful whether education in itself, as now engineered, and confined merely to the acquisition of knowledge, has any tendency to mitigate the vicious elements of human nature, further than to change the direction and type of crime."

That is, without this education the crime might be of a low, mean and sensual order, but the educated criminal has attained a higher grade of crime. And again:—

"This is not alleged, be it understood, of moral culture or religious instruction, but simply of the education of the intellect as it really obtains. . . . I say, therefore, frankly, that whilst an earnest advocate of education, believing that knowledge is power, confessing that true advancement can only repose upon education, yet it is only a self delusion to mistake the question and blind our eyes to what it does effect, by claiming for it what it does not by any necessity accomplish."

This speaks for itself and I need add nothing. I strayed off from my regular authorities this time in quoting Governor Brown; now we will return home and call before us the Rev. Dr. Peck, President of the Board of Trustees of the Syracuse University, just at your door, and a gentleman well known all through this part of the country. Addressing the East Genesee Conference at the city of Elmira, August, 1870, he says:—

"The hope of our country is the Christian religion, the putting of it where it is not, and the allowing no man to take it away from where it is."

Very plain Anglo Saxon that:—

"I charge not upon the Cornell University that it is infidel; but I state the fact. It has chosen its own ground. It is negative in religion."

And because it is negative it is therefore infidel, according to Dr. Peck. Evidently they are not teaching Dr. Peck's form of Christianity, at Cornell University:—

"Our institution is for positive Christianity, such as comes from the Holy Bible, such as Methodists will approve; that which will influence your children to come to Christ."

I like that plain Anglo Saxon style:—

"If you want anything else don't put me on the Board of Trustees, nor ask me to give anything. These are your principles. God forbid that you should change them or to adjust them to the liberal religion of the day."

And this is the ground upon which the Syracuse University has been established—"opposition to the liberal religion of the day." Yet we American, Irish and German Catholics must send our children to schools negative and infidel in their teaching, or pay double taxes. O, no! Dr. Peck of the Methodist Episcopal Church has given us the right views, and we hold to them.

But he is not alone in his position.

The Rev. Dr. Steele, Vice President of the Syracuse University, in his inaugural address in Syracuse August 31st, 1871, declaring to Syracuse and the country the intent and purposes of that University, and the mode of instruction to be followed there, spoke as follows:—

"A far more important and much discussed question is the relation of University culture to religion."

And we poor people who belong to the crowd are told that we must lay aside religion, which must not enter into our education. Yet young men who have left their mother's apron strings, and are able to do for themselves, need the restraining influences of religion, need direct Christian teaching in order to make them good men; but the poor—let them go to their schools and be infidels if they have a mind to:—

"We are not disposed to evade a question so vital, nor do we wish to assume any equivocal attitude before the public on this subject. Here we do not wish to innovate upon the general usage of American colleges which has prevailed with scarcely an exception from the day that Harvard opened its doors to the sons of the Pilgrims, 235 years ago."

Rev. Dr. Steele here tells us that the prevailing usage of American colleges for the last 235 years—and very few of us wish to go back any further than that—has been to join secular education and religious culture:—

"This mother of our colleges, by the appointment of a chaplain and by his required attendance upon daily prayers and public worship twice upon the Sabbath, reflects the almost uniform practise of the Universities and Colleges of our country. . . . It has been found that those who have been trained under the influence of more mundane motives by the exclusive development of the outward side of their nature to the neglect of the spiritual part, and by the use of ideas devoid of the high spiritual qualities which religion affords, have been destitute of that strength, symmetry, beauty and usefulness which makes the lives of those who have thrown open the sky-light of the soul, the spiritual nature to the transfiguring power of religious truth and spiritual influences, and who have been moulded by a culture vitalized and guided by the spirit of God."

"In the second place it is requisite to true culture by the aid which it affords to the morals of the student. There are systems of religion in which morals are divorced from religion. Such is not christianity. . . . So long as the Bible is the acknowledged foundation of our civilization, our civil and criminal codes of law, and so long as its spirits and teachings are requisite to the existence of self-government and of free institutions, it should have a place in the common school, the high school, the seminary, the university, as an influence necessary to conserve good order and pure morals. . . ."

"In the third, religion is necessary to culture by the aid which it affords."

Now, you will notice that this school question has great difficulties in it, and what is wanted is that we come together, discuss them, and, if possible, find a solution of them. I desire with all my heart the substantial welfare of the people, and the permanence of this form of government. We cannot have any other form of government—no other would do in this land of ours, and my whole soul is in its success and stability, and I feel anxious and uneasy when I see principles laid down and systems taking deep root among us that are derogatory to a republican form of government, and are likely in future to do harm.

I may fatigue you with long readings from others, but I desire this evening to bring out the sentiments of very estimable gentlemen—ministers, college presidents and editors—on the necessity of religious education in schools and colleges.

The Journal of Commerce of New York, thirty years ago, was the strongest and most violent opponent of Catholics in asking for their rights in this matter of school education. The Journal of Commerce of 1870 is quite another paper, although as staunchly Protestant as ever. In an article bearing date May 11, 1870, after saying that Catholics would not be satisfied with the exclusion of the Bible from the common schools, it asks:—

"Would it satisfy Protestants? For ourselves we frankly answer no! Our first and chiefest objection sprang out of the growing intention to the religious culture of the young in their daily lessons in the class."

Yet we hear it said continually that children go into the class room merely to learn reading, arithmetic, geography, &c., and here we have the sentiments of the Journal of Commerce, a most able and influential paper, the writers of which are men of thought and education, who carefully weigh what they say—howing that religion must go into the daily recitations of the class. The article continues:—

"Where the common school system won its chiefest laurels, and achieved its highest success, all scholastic learning was based upon the fundamental truth of religion, and the Gospel teachings were the sanctions of faith and practice. The dissenters were so few in numbers that their rights were never only respected, and the great majority being substantially

of one faith consented to the sectarian intolerance. The system was wrong, because if the support came from the State bound to universal toleration, it ought not to force any religious system upon the child of a single objector; but the method was right, because without the sanction of religion there can be no proper training of the young in any branch of instruction; and the school where this is excluded is a heathen nursery. It is all in vain to say that geography, arithmetic, grammar, history, botany, &c., may be taught as sciences without any necessary connection with religion true or false; and that the baptism of faith can be given to all these requirements by exercises in the family and at the church, having no mutual relations with the school room."

All these gentlemen—Dr. Anderson, Dr. Peck, Dr. Steele, and the thirty presidents—tells us the same story with regard to the rich; and if the rich with all their advantages of books, many intellectual and moral associations, pleasant friends and instructive conversation, the family minister visiting their homes, listening to eloquent discourses in the church, &c., if with all these advantages the children of the rich, even in the study of botany and the sciences, need religious culture, need the "incidental instruction," spoken of by Dr. Anderson, how much more is it needed by the laborer's child, whose mother rises early in the morning and toils for her family while others are still in their beds, who, when the school hour comes, hurries off her child with scarcely time to say "God bless you" who, all day long labors on, busy in many ways to keep things together and eke out a bare subsistence; whose father, in summer's heat and winter's cold, the year in and the year out, for some paltry pittance of a few shillings, in health or failing strength, like a machine that must stop only when it is worn out, works from morning until night, and has, perhaps, neither time, nor strength, nor patience to sit down with his children to supply the deficiencies and shortcomings of the school and church?

It is the children of these poor people, who will make or mar the future of this mighty Republic. They constitute the members, they bring vigor and brightness of intellect, as well as strength and endurance of body to make powerful and energetic, if not virtuous and God fearing, citizens. How, I ask, can these children find in the dingy apartment called their home, from such toil-worn and harassed parents, that amount of religious culture and instruction, which the State says shall not be given in the school, and which these gentlemen, speaking candidly for the members of their own churches, say is essential for the education of the young? The article continues:—

"The mind is not governed by laws which allow for such separations and distinctions. . . . Good men will come to acknowledge this in time and will see that instead of excluding the Bible from the school, the great need of the race is in its systematic daily study in the formation of mind and character. . . . As Protestant from the most earnest convictions, we believe that nothing has contributed so much to the extension of the Roman Catholic organization and influence in this country, as the partial persecutions it has received from those conscientiously opposed to it."

"Give Catholics their full rights; ask nothing from them you would not willingly concede if you were in their place."

Just what we are standing before the whole world to-day asking for:—

"Extend to them even a liberal courtesy, as believing that if they hold to some errors, they are not heathen or infidel."

We are Christians, we believe in Christ, we believe in the Bible as a divinely inspired Revelation, we believe in One God and Three Divine Persons, we believe in an Incarnate Redeemer; that Christ Our Lord gave His blood to save us; we believe in heaven and hell, and a world to come; we believe in sin—and now pray tells us what else the Protestant believes?—

In my anxiety to show that Catholics are not alone in regarding as defective and faulty the education given in the Common Schools, because separated from religion, I must beg your patient attention to another distinguished authority. This time it is no other than Dr. Cox, Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in Western New York. In a book called "Moral Reforms," page 135, he lays down the following positions as the proper ones to be taken by the members of his denomination. With the assistance of Dr. Cox, and the entire Episcopal Church following the lead of their Bishop in favor of Christian schools, our holy cause must necessarily make great headway.

These are the positions to be held by churchmen, according to Dr. Cox:—

"I. Secure to every human being the best education you can provide for him."

Let the very beggar in the streets of your city have the best education you can provide for him, but because he is poor do not tell him to be content with stones when he asks for bread. Let our country be able to say to the world that it is a land in which no one, rich or poor, is left without the very best education that can be provided for him:—

"II. Where you can do no better utilize the common schools, and supplement them by additional means of doing good."

"III. But where you can do better, let us do our full duty to our own children, and to all children, by gathering them into schools and colleges thoroughly Christian."

Many of the Presbyterians agree with Dr. Cox on this question of Christian schools. In 1850, Rev. Mr. Young, pastor of the Presbyterian congregation in Warsaw, N.Y., wrote to Mr. Morgan, superintendent of common schools:—

"The Presbyterian congregation, in this town, regarding the State plan of common school education as incompetent to secure that moral training of their children which is indispensable to a proper direction and use of the intellectual faculties, established some eighteen months since, within the bounds of School District No. 10, a parochial school, to be instructed by such teachers only as profess religion. . . . In the progress of our school we find that evangelical religious truth sanctifies education as well as all other things with which it is connected; and that our children have made more rapid and effective progress in intellectual attainments than formerly—but the 'Free School Law' passed by our last legislature has invaded our sanctuary, and we fear is about to thwart our purposes."

"We might have supposed that these principles of toleration which secure to the religious denominations respectively the privilege of worshipping God according to their respective views, and which excuse them from supporting those of a contrary belief,—that these principles would at least allow them the same toleration in the education of our children. But such toleration is now by legislative enactment denied us; while we are subjected to such onerous taxes for the support of common schools as are equivalent to an actual prohibition from carrying out our views, conscientiously entertained."

(To be continued.)

HOME RULE.—XIII.

THE UNION DEBATES.—(Continued.)

Although it is not our intention to pursue into minute detail the various debates which finally resulted in the overthrow of Ireland's legislative independence, it may be instructive to dwell a little longer on the struggle which took place, and to note down briefly what were the sentiments, on this question of the Union, of some of the best and wisest statesmen of that generation of gifted men. The record will at least serve to show that if England, as she has always done in her proceedings to-

wards Ireland, doggedly maintained, and arbitrarily carried out, in spite of all argument and opposition, the high-handed policy on which she had set her heart, there were not wanting the most ample warnings of that retribution which has since followed her in every transaction of her history, and which may one day—we pray Heaven to ever it long—work her own downfall.

Again and again did Sheridan, with untiring pertinacity, and with an eloquent zeal that was worthy of the cause, and worthy, too, of a better fate, return to the contest against the Minister in the English House of Commons. When Pitt on 31st January, 1799, moved his resolutions embracing the general plan of the Union, after a speech in which he put forth all his oratorical powers, Sheridan at once rose to "warn the House against being led away by the seductive force of the Minister's speech. The fate of the question when it was lately agitated in Ireland might reasonably induce him to desist from the prosecution of the scheme; but as he had solemnly pledged himself for the exertion of his most strenuous efforts to produce an Union of the two kingdoms, it might be apprehended that he would pursue his course in defiance of every obstacle, would make use of artifice to gain his point, flatter and delude the Irish, and by seeming to respect their declared opinion, lull them into inactivity, the more completely to subjugate them to slavery."

He reproached Canning for pleading the cause of bold and bar-faced corruption, and censured as wanton and unnecessary Pitt's pledge for the prosecution of his favourite measure. He admonished on the conduct of the Court in the dispute respecting the Catholics. A Lord-Lieutenant (Earl Fitzwilliam) had been sent to that kingdom to allay animosities and gratify the great bulk of the nation. The emp of concession was presented to their lips, but when they were on the point of tasting, it was dashed in their faces, and the new viceroy was recalled. As regards the adjustment of 1782, he maintained that it was intended to be final as to the Constitution of Ireland but he admitted that some regulations, chiefly commercial, were to have been proposed for the improvement of the connexion between the Kingdoms. He then proposed two resolutions, which speak for themselves:—"That no measures can have a tendency to improve and perpetuate the ties of amity and connexion between Great Britain and Ireland which have not for their basis the manifest, fair, and free consent and approbation of the Parliaments of the two countries; and that whoever shall endeavour to obtain the appearance of such consent and approbation in either country, by employing the influence of Government for the purpose of corruption or intimidation, is an enemy to his Majesty and to the Constitution."

Pitt, of course, protested against the resolutions; but Mr. (afterwards Lord) Grey supported them, maintaining that they would "serve as pledges for the honourable intentions of the British Government, and allay the jealousy of the Irish nation. He considered the question brought forward by the Minister as the most momentous that had ever been submitted to the deliberation of Parliament either in point of constitutional right or of public policy; but, as one of the parties whose consent was necessary had declared against it, he recommended a suspension of the scheme. He was earnestly desirous of the prevalence of the most cordial harmony, of the establishment of an effective Union, not an union of Parliaments, but of hearts, of affections and interests, of vigour, of ardour, of zeal for the general welfare. The scheme then offered seemed to be of a very different tendency. It threatened discontent, jealousy, and distrust."

Read by the light of subsequent events, these sentiments not only deserve the credit due to prophecy fulfilled, but should also be received with peculiar force as warnings for us and for the future. In the same strain, too, Dr. Lawrence "conjured the House to relinquish a discussion which might be productive of serious mischief while so high a degree of irritation pervaded the public mind in Ireland. The members," he said, "was not necessary at the present moment, even if it promised to be more beneficial than he had reason to think it would be. The settlement of 1782, according to the opinion of Mr. Burke, was to every constitutional purpose, final and conclusive, although the mercantile concerns of the two countries might acquire some further arrangements."

Another of the Parliamentary celebrities of that day, Mr. Tierney, raised his voice on behalf of Ireland. "He was surprised," he said, "that Ministers should have proposed an Union to the English Parliament without having been previously assured of the consent of the Irish legislature; but he was still more astonished, and even alarmed at their present perseverance, after the strong disapprobation of the measure in Ireland. He was among those who doubted the competency of the Irish Parliament on this occasion, as a delegated body could not be justified in surrendering the trust reposed in it by the people." All was in vain, however; Pitt's resolutions were carried. But in the course of the following month, the Minister having moved the order of the day for the House going into Committee for the further consideration of his Majesty's Message, Sheridan once more came forward to do battle on behalf of his country in this unequal contest. As a substitute for Union, he recommended the abolition of all disabilities which had been incurred in civil affairs on account of religious distinctions, and which abolition, he was of opinion, would tend more to the improvement of the connexion between Great Britain and Ireland than the measure brought forward. This motion being also rejected, a fresh debate arose when Pitt moved that the Speaker should leave the chair. General Fitzpatrick, a thorough anti-Unionist, who had acted as secretary to the Duke of Portland (when Viceroy) asserted, "from his own knowledge of the views of the Cabinet in 1782, the constitutional finality of the compact which was then adjusted, and completed in the following year. An incorporate Union," he added, "from its tendency to a subversion of that settlement deserved, in his opinion, the severest censure. What security would the Irish have for the continuance of any promised advantages? How would a minority be able to enforce the execution of the terms? In every case of rivalry, British superiority would overwhelm the interests of Ireland."

In another division which subsequently took place, Mr. Hobhouse "strongly opposed the measure; first, because it was obnoxious to a great majority of the people of Ireland; next, he doubted the competency of the Irish Parliament to its adoption; then he urged that a resident legislature would be better qualified than a remote Parliament to remove the internal evils of the country."

That this has been the increasing conviction of all who value the British connection, as well as those who do not, experience has demonstrated with growing accumulation of force from year to year; and, if it were not for the unfortunate religious dissensions which have so long divided the people of Ireland, and which, like the hounds of Acteon, have turned on and devoured herself, there can scarcely be a doubt that an united nation might long since have wrung from England's weakness—which has always been so stimulating to her sense of justice—that recognition of Irish rights which she may ultimately have to concede to her. Even now, if the Presbyterian North would lay aside its bitterness and unite heart and hand with the Catholic South for the weal of their common country, and if the Anglo-Irish of the Pale would turn, as did the Geraldines of old, towards the Celtic tribes of the West, a day of resurrection might soon dawn on old Erin, such as some of her early saints saw in prophetic vision, and her birds have handed down from generation to generation to those plaintive strains which have wrung tears of sympathy and admiration from friend and foe.

But to return. All opposition at this side of the water was fruitless. The English House of Commons servilely followed the Minister, because it gratified the national vanity to bring Ireland into the helpless subjection once more, and because it destroyed, as the commercial interests desired, all prospect of Irish trade ever again interfering with English prosperity.

In Ireland, however, it was hoped that, after the defeat of Lord Castlereagh, the project would be abandoned altogether; and the rejoicings were consequently loud and universal. Public addresses of thanks and congratulation were voted to Mr. Fox, the Speaker, and to several other prominent members who had strenuously opposed the measure. As the Irish Secretary knew full well that, with the nomination of unscrupulously using them to the utmost, time was on his side, he moved on 28th January for an adjournment, in order to receive the report of the proceedings in England. Sir John Parrott opposed the motion with much spirit, as he said there never was a moment in which it was more necessary for the Parliament of Ireland to remain vigilant at its post, Barrington likewise warmly opposed the adjournment, and inveighed against the speech of the British Minister. "There was not a man," he said, "within either nation more zealously attached in loyalty to his king and Government than himself, nor who would sacrifice more cheerfully to the maintenance of both; but if the honour and the dignity of the Irish Parliament were to be again entrapped by an attempt to press upon them the odious measure of an Union, against which that house had already contended with so much spirit, virtue, and honest indignation, he declared that he for one would go every length to oppose it, in every shape and in all its ramifications."

Sir John Erskine, in reply to a member who stated he had been told that the people of the County Cork were in favour of the measure, declared that he had that day received letters from some of the most respectable and best-informed gentlemen in that province, assuring him that, had the vote in the previous debate passed in favour of Union, the whole province would have been next day in open rebellion.

Colonel Bagnall also stated that he had received letters from several of the best-informed gentlemen of Tipperary, and so had his colleague, declaring the whole county to a man decidedly adverse to the measure of an Union. Plunket likewise spoke strongly on this occasion; and Lord Castlereagh deemed it prudent to close the discussion by saying that, with respect to the question of Union, he had already declared his determination explicitly, "that he should never bring it forward so long as it appeared to him repugnant to the sense of Parliament and the country"—a notable specimen of the hypocrisy of the wretch whom Byron stigmatised, with such just indignation, as "Carrot-and-stick-cutting Cate-paw"—a title, in respect to which we may here, *par parenthese*, express an individual sentiment, that the poignancy of our grief at his having deserved such an epithet is only augmented by the regret that he had not earned it more than twenty years before.

When the Parliament adjourned, the Viceroy, with the aid of the Castle, set every engine to work to gain over proselytes. By the aid of a lavish expenditure of money, and a free distribution of patronage, it is little to be wondered at that this "corrupt minister and his corrupt phalanx" demoralised the public mind, and that his bribes converted many whom his arguments failed to convince. Everywhere, however, a strong opposition was experienced, and he soon found that the majority of the nation was hostile to the scheme of Union. As he saw that the national sentiment could not be extinguished by a deceitful show of flimsy arguments, which were repudiated wherever the voice of the people could be heard, it became all the more evident, therefore, that it was necessary to convert the Council-Chamber of the Castle into a market-place for political hucksters; and that a set of scheming adventurers, contrary to all law and constitutional doctrine, should be induced to sell that which no Minister, except a patron of fraud and profligacy, had any right to buy. The title-deeds of the estate were indeed sold; but the vendors were only faithless trustees, who basely bartered what they had no power to part with; and, in all justice and equity, the rightful claims of the true owners—the Irish people—are still in force, and will one day be re-established.

—Catholic Opinion. Hibernicus.

IRISH INTELLIGENCE.

THE BISHOP OF CORK ON THE EDUCATION QUESTION.—What was it, then, they asked? They asked freedom for the exercise of their religion and the observance of the sound principles of their education. During the last 50 years no less than £400,000, had been expended on religious and educational establishments in Ireland. They wanted a fair share in those endowments. They required this freedom in University education. He need not tell them of the giant strides that infidelity and even atheism were making throughout Europe, or that the British Press was teeming with infidelity. Even in the oldest University of England—Oxford—rank infidelity exists. They did not wish to make religion mere task work, or to bring it in at an hour when it would come in as a painful burden on the young mind after the efforts of the day to cultivate secular knowledge.

He continued:—"We propose that the Government of this country shall consult all the inhabitants of the country. We ask them to put it to each party—Don't interfere with your neighbours; mind your own business; don't meddle in the concerns of others. What do you wish for yourselves? What answer would the Protestant give? Give us the Bible and Protestant education for our schools? The Government accedes. The Presbyterian is summoned, and asked what he wants. He wants the same—Then let it be granted to him. 'Take all that you desire for your own interest, but don't meddle with your neighbour.' And so through all the divisions of the inhabitants of the land. We are asked what we want, like our neighbours. Education on our own principles. What is the Government to do if it wishes to hold the balance of justice evenly between all parties? If their petitions, he proceeded, were acceded to, all would be right. If not, they would not abandon the course they had been pursuing. They would extend the monks' and nuns' schools, and the result would be that they would be training the intellect in all the towns of Ireland, and education would be in the hands of religious teachers, no matter what the English Government might determine.—Times Cor.

There are, two foes to the spread of National sentiments which must be annihilated before success can dawn upon our labours. We allude to the evils of intoxication and partyism. The first destroys mental energy—does among honest men what a plague does in a military camp; both destroy hope, even in the blossom. Let all who call themselves Nationalists avoid intoxication as a demon. It is the oppressor's friend, the slave's master, and the patriot's foe. The stupid drunkard can form no idea of the pure feelings by which the heart of the patriot is swayed. No, he is a disgrace to his country, to himself, and humanity. The fanatical dupe of party, prejudice is even worse than the blotted victim of ardent spirits. He is the tool of Landlordism, and the hapless slave of a state of mental depravity that nothing short of a miracle can remove. In Ireland this thing of partyism has done more evil than all the other instruments of foreign domination could possibly effect. It divided the sufferers, and presented the sad spectacle of slaves destroying one another for the profit and amusement of their drivers. We are delighted to see partyism hunted down in every quarter where intelligence holds sway. Were it