

ous; and beyond question, a single company of infantry, with their fire-arms, would have transformed it, so far as the rioters were concerned, into an impregnable fortress. But it was in vain that the chief citizens, joined with the court of Aldermen, had all this day urged the Lord Mayor to take some measures for the defence of the public buildings in the metropolis. Even when the resolution of the rioters to take and burn Newgate was conveyed to him, it seemed only to increase his irresolution and unwillingness to act, and to such a degree, that they who did not exasperate him as a traitor reviled him to his face as a pitiable coward. All that could be obtained after much entreaty, was the promise of a small body of constables; and this to repel the onslaught of infuriated thousands, who already had stood their ground in the presence of the regular troops, and whom success and impunity had raised to a pitch of indescribable madness.

(To be Continued.)

GREAT CATHOLIC MEETING IN LONDON TO EXPRESS SYMPATHY WITH GERMAN CATHOLICS.

A great counter demonstration by the Catholics was made on Friday at St. James's-hall to the Protestant "sympathy with Germany" meeting held in the same place and in Exeter-hall ten days since.—As a demonstration of numbers and feeling the whole proceedings were completely successful, for not only was the large hall filled to overflowing with a most enthusiastic audience, all of whom were admitted by tickets, but two other places were filled with the throngs who could not gain admittance to the central gathering. The Duke of Norfolk presided, and among those present were the Earl of Gainsborough, Lord Howard of Glossop, the Earl of Denbigh, Lord Walter Kerr, Lord Stafford, Sir Charles Douglas, Lady Noel, the Earl and Countess of Kenmare, the Dowager Marchioness of Londonderry, the Dowager Marchioness of Lothian, the Countess of Denbigh, the Ladies Howard, and a large number of other Catholic families.

Telegrams were read from various parts of the Continent, England, Scotland, and Ireland expressing sympathy with the meeting, and there were others from different parts of Germany thanking the Catholic Union which had organized the demonstration.

The Duke of Norfolk, who was loudly cheered on rising, said his first duty would be to read a letter from his Grace the Archbishop of Westminster.—The letter was as follows:—

"Archbishop's-house, Westminster, }
Feb. 5, 1874.

"My dear Lord Duke,—I write to thank your Grace and all those who, with you, have assembled to protest not only against the religious persecution in Germany, but also against the attempt made in St. James's-hall on the 27th of last month to revive the religious conflicts now happily at rest in this country. (Cheers.) When I saw the failure of these meetings both in quantity and quality (laughter and cheers), I doubted whether the meeting of to-morrow would be any longer needed. (A Voice.—"Down with Bismarck," and laughter.) But it is well for the Catholicity of Great Britain to enter a protest against the violation of conscience in matters of religion, and to convey to the Catholics in Germany, and to those who are suffering with them for conscience sake, the encouragement of their heartfelt sympathy and the promise to pray that strength and firmness may be given to them in their conflict.

"Believe me, my dear Lord Duke, your Grace's affectionate servant,
HENRY EDWARD,
"Archbishop of Westminster."

The Duke then went on to say that the Catholics of Great Britain had met primarily to express their deep feeling of indignation at seeing what was being done by the German Government against its Catholic subjects, their sympathy with those who were suffering under the cruelty of the new Penal Laws of the Empire, and their admiration of the way in which the victims were bearing their suffering (cheers). There was also, he was obliged to confess—though he would rather not have alluded to it, and he should not have done so if it had not been thought ingenious to have passed it by—another great reason why they had been called, and it was the announcement made about six weeks ago, of a meeting to express sympathy with the oppressors of the Church in Germany. They would mark him that he said the "announcement," for it was that, and not the meeting itself, which had called this together (cheers and laughter). It was announced to be held under auspices which would have given it an importance and a character it would not otherwise have had, and it was this which aroused the indignation of all Catholics in England, and made them feel it was their duty to come forward and declare their views on the issue (cheers). But it was not until the means had been taken to hold this gathering, and not until all the preparations had been made, that it was discovered the forces had been drawn and the Catholics had come forth to fight a shadow (cheers). He should not have alluded to this, but he felt to such a vast meeting as this, where were gathered representatives of every Catholic name in England, Scotland and Ireland, it was due to apologize for having based upon that gathering he had alluded to the proceedings of the night (cheers). But going to those deeper feelings which animated them, he felt there was no apology due from himself or the Union for having called the Catholics of Great Britain to express their views upon the question of Germany and the Church. (A Voice.—"And Ireland.") Yes, and Ireland had come too, and he hoped that Lord Grand and the Irish Union would allow the Irish people the opportunity of expressing their opinion also (cheers). The Catholics, then, of Great Britain had felt it incumbent upon them to express their opinion upon what the Empire of Germany was doing. In this country in bygone times the Catholics suffered persecution, and it might be said that the persecution abroad now was very different from what it was here 300 years ago; but still there was the same sting in the persecutions of to-day which was in those ages ago. The sting of the English persecution was not all in the cruelty, the tortures, and the horrible butcheries which then prevailed; for the greater pain was inflicted in the injuries done to the faith and the heresies brought into it (hear). Englishmen in those days felt that the cruelties practised were not the worst evils, for they constantly returned from exile to battle in face of these, and courted them in their struggle to keep alive the faith (cheers). So in Germany now fine and imprisonment followed the faith, and it becomed the English Catholics to come forward, and while expressing sympathy with the sufferers in Germany it became those assembled also to say they felt most grateful to their own fellow-countrymen for the change which had come over the treatment of Catholics in this country (loud cheers). England had done her duty in that respect, and had only given what justice demanded; but he would add there were many things which Catholics would in justice ask England to do, and which they should soon hope to attain (hear). It was, however, greatly to the honor of this country, that after generations of prejudice, vilification, and falsehood, England should have had the generosity to grant Catholics their rights, and English Catholics could not now look abroad at Germany and what was being done there without expressing their feelings of gra-

atitude to this nation (cheers). These remarks might, however, appear to be more of the Church in England than in Germany; but the point he would give to them was that the German Catholics would see that the English had a right to sympathize with them, and they would hope and join with the English Catholics' earnest prayer that the Church in Germany might be as free as it was now in England (cheers). The Duke then went on to speak generally of what he termed the general character of the laws which now exercise the most baneful effects in Germany. In the first place he said the laws were cruel in themselves, and though many of the old weapons of persecution were gone, fine and imprisonment remained, and were carried out with rigor. There was, too, something peculiarly hard in connexion with this persecution, and that was that the punishments were inflicted under the pretence that those who were suffering them had committed crimes (hisses). It was a fact that the Archbishop of Posen was in prison because he would not submit to laws which his conscience told him he could not submit to, and when he added that the charges made against him should be proved they were not proved. (A Voice, "God bless the Archbishop of Posen.") People might speculate as to what would be the end of these conflicts, but no one could doubt as to that end. It might seem strange that the powers of the world did not see that any attack upon the Church must be futile—that they were attacking what no human power could overcome and no human wisdom overreach (loud cheers). But, while Catholics felt that the end was certain, they knew that while these persecutions lasted great harm would be done to religion and many led from truth. Let the meeting here take the Archbishop of Westminster's advice, and in all humility pray that those suffering in Germany might have that strength which they needed, that these evil days might pass away from them. While the English Catholics met to mourn that members of the Church were suffering in Germany and Switzerland, they must also remember that the Holy Father at the head of the Church was suffering also. In these later troubles there might be some ground for hoping that the end might be near at hand, and while offering their prayers Catholics might take heart at the thought that these sufferings would hasten the day for the liberation of Christ's Vicar, and the peace and triumph of His Church (loud cheers).

The Earl of Gainsborough then moved the following resolution:—

"That this meeting desires to express its deepest sympathy with its fellow Catholics in Germany, who are suffering under the rigors of the new penal laws."

His Lordship, who spoke throughout in a very low and indistinct tone, said Englishmen happily lived in times when the penal laws of their country had been repealed; but they had seen them re-imposed in countries which boasted of being more civilized and more enlightened. The persecution in Germany involved a great principle, for it was charged against the Catholics of Germany that they had entered into a political conspiracy against their own country for the odious purpose of overturning her institutions. The charge was out of all reason, but the laws had been made for the purpose of raising this opposition, and now the Catholics had the glorious spectacle of an Archbishop having chosen to go to prison in defence of the faith (cheers). The State had the right to make laws relating to temporal matters, and the Church to make those relating to spiritual matters, and if the State took upon itself to enact laws which affected the conscience of the subject, then the subject was not bound to obey them, and was not guilty of treason in refusing to accept them (cheers). What had occurred in Germany was that the State had made laws affecting the Church, and thus placed her subjects in the position of being in conflict either with the temporal power or in regard to their duty to Almighty God. It was with the greatest surprise he found people in this country who were advocates of religious liberty sympathizing with what was going on in Germany and with men who looked upon the Church as a power which could be regulated according to their views. He declared that those who forced on these laws were opposed to Christian doctrine altogether, and he warned those who came prepared to express sympathy with these acts that they were expressing sympathy with infidelity. Some of those who came forward to express sympathy with the German Government did so because they were against all religion and against the Catholic especially, because they knew that every form of religion must stand or fall with the Catholic (loud cheers).—The Catholic religion was the only one which could resist the tide of infidelity, which was rapidly sweeping over the world, and that same Catholic faith which during the first 300 years of the Christian era survived the most terrible persecutions, and caused trouble in the heart of Herod and Roman Emperors—that same faith was causing trouble in the heart of Prince Bismarck. (There were loud shoutings and howlings at the mention of the name.) Bismarck was trying to meet that trouble by these penal laws, and when the men who helped to repeal the penal laws in this country came forward to express sympathy with the passing of them in Germany, then it was the English Catholics felt they should speak, and express sympathy with those suffering persecution in another land (cheers).

Colonel Vaughan seconded the motion in an exceedingly long and able speech. He said that Catholics were alike all over the world and animated by the same principles, and when one portion was oppressed a thrill ran through them all. He expressed his indignation at the sufferings inflicted on the Catholics of Germany, and as for the late meetings he said he never would believe that the English people would rejoice at or sympathize with religious persecution, or exult in the spectacle of a Government sending to prison those who had fought for her on many a gallant field. For one he stood between his countrymen and this foul imputation (cheers). If he knew anything of Englishmen it was that they wished there should be fair play—and the typical Englishman said that while he served God in his own way and had freedom himself he desired that every man should have the same. He then proceeded to speak in terms of great disparagement of the conduct of the German Government as to the meanness and insincerity upon which this persecution was founded. Tyranny, he said, was always at its worst when it put on the garb of fear, and declared that it made its penal laws for the public safety. This was the way in Pagan Rome. It was the way in Ireland (loud cheers), and it was the way in modern Germany. It was the way from Nero to Cromwell, and from Cromwell to Bismarck. He ridiculed the action of Earl Russell, at whose name raised a host of howls; and in response to those noises, he reminded them that the Earl had done them good if he had done them wrong of late, and said they should remember the one with the other. He concluded by expressing his confidence in the ultimate triumph of the Church over all her enemies.

The motion was then put and carried amid acclamation.

Lord Howard of Glossop, who was received with cheering, proposed the following resolution:—
"That the new ecclesiastical laws in Germany make it impossible for the Church to exercise in freedom her spiritual functions, and are contrary to the rights of conscience."
At first he said he had some doubt as to the good which might attend this meeting, or rather meetings, for he feared that any indiscreet remarks might cause harsher measures to be used towards those persecuted, especially when it was considered that the Continental Press might turn appearances against these meetings. There was the more reason to suppose this because the English newspapers were so full about the elections, and the reporters so over-

worked, that there was fear they would not be able to give reports at the length which the importance of the assemblage demanded. The meetings to which they referred were failures, and so the good sense of the English people had judged them.—(cheers). Earl Russell's name had been mentioned, and he regretted the course the noble Earl had taken on the occasion; and it would seem as if the Earl shared the feeling which a good many English people shared about Catholics. Catholics must not deceive themselves as to the feeling of Protestant Englishmen; for while the Protestants in England showed respect for Catholics they had a great dislike to the Catholic religion. There was no mistaking this, and they could not help it. The English fixed peculiar ideas to particular words, and they had fixed a different meaning to the word Ultramontane to what it really meant, and it was picked up to throw in the way that there was always a stone at hand to throw at a dog, and when they wanted a word they always had that of Ultramontane to throw at Catholics. He touched upon the dispute about the conclusion the Gallicists had come to respecting the infallibility of the Pope, and then went on to say that much prejudice had been raised against the Catholics in days gone by, by the charge that they were disloyal and had a double allegiance, and that their allegiance to the head of the Church prevented them from giving allegiance to the Sovereign of their country. But, he maintained, this prejudice was unfounded, and that a person could be an excellent Catholic and a subject as well, and indeed, that there was no person who was a good Catholic but was a good subject. He then went over the situation of Prussia from 1815, and touched upon the events of that period and of 1848, 1850, and 1859, when, he said, pledges were given to the Catholics that they should be protected in their faith, and that when it was proposed to stop some meetings at schools, the ecclesiastical minister made the meetings free, saying it would be tyranny to stop them (cheers). Then, in 1866, when the difficulties of the war were just over, religious toleration was fully supported, and the Catholics enabled Germany to become the great Power she had become. But after the war the spirit changed, and there was a sort of meddling and muddling the result of which was that there was a spirit of prejudice raised against those who had done their duty to the State and fought her battles. On his visit some years ago he found that the people were full of the great question of the day—the unity of the Fatherland; but now the people were dissatisfied and murmuring, saying, "Our fathers and brothers fought against the common enemy, who, however, were our brethren in religion; and when the consummation of our wishes is complete, the Government turns round and persecutes us through our priests." Whether this was the correct way to look at the question was not what he wished to discuss, but he could not help thinking that Prince Bismarck and Dr. Falk were rendering the Government of the country very unpopular by the arbitrary measures they were putting into force (cheers). The way the laws operated was that one of the Orders which did service in the field in caring for the sick and wounded, and among whom there were 80 decorated members, was, as a reward for its services, bodily kicked out of the country (shame). As to the prejudice against Catholics he said, "It stands to reason that there is nothing in our religious creed to hinder us from judging of our duty to our country according to our own political sympathies, nor has there been the shadow of an attempt made in Rome to fetter our political action in the slightest degree." In the concluding part of his speech he said there was a great debt of gratitude due to the English public for the way they felt upon this question, and also to the great British Press. As an Englishman, he expressed himself proud of the Press of this country; which, he said, could not be coerced or influenced beyond its duty, and he proceeded to remind them of the complaints made through the English Press a few years ago as to the overbearing conduct of the Prussian officials. The religious prejudice he said would spread against Germany, for all shades of religious faith could see that they were likely to be attacked, and English sympathy would awaken on the side of religious liberty. He concluded by giving Germany an earnest warning that she might be led on to destruction through her injustice and wrong-doing.

Mr. Allies seconded the motion in a very long speech, and it was carried with the like enthusiasm which had greeted the other.

The other resolutions were:—
"That the suppression and expulsion of religious communities, against whom no evidence of crime or disloyalty has been adduced, is a tyrannical abuse of power by the German Legislature and Government."

This was proposed by the Earl of Denbigh and seconded by the Master of Herries.

"That the chairman be requested to communicate to the Archbishop of Cologne and to the Archbishop of Guessen and Posen the foregoing resolutions."

This was proposed by the Master of Lovat and seconded by Mr. Langdale.

The meeting did not close until a very late hour.

IRISH INTELLIGENCE.

The London newspapers, the Times included, announced a short time ago the illness of Cardinal Antonelli. The Pope himself had administered the rite of extreme unction, and the Cardinal lay upon his death bed. It is pleasant to think that this intelligence was totally without foundation. Cardinal Antonelli is not only at present in tolerably good health, and able to assist at all the functions in the Vatican, but for some time past has possessed the full enjoyment of his mental faculties. He was sufficiently well this winter to receive a visit from a member of her Majesty's Legation at Rome, who came to him upon a somewhat curious errand. The Home Rule agitation in Ireland has, it would seem, anxiously engaged the attention of her Majesty's Ministers. The speeches and pastorals of some Catholic prelates in Ireland have proved that the Catholic clergy in that part of the United Kingdom have, to a considerable extent, sympathized with the popular movement. And as the Pope is supposed to have the Irish hierarchy completely under his power in all matters, civil or ecclesiastical, application was made to the Vatican Court to obtain a Papal admission to the Irish prelates, asking them to refrain from advocating Home Rule. It is needless to say that this application met with little success. The Home Rule movement did not originate with the Irish Catholic clergy. It is essentially a popular, not a clerical, question. The Catholic clergy are not deluged by their priestly character from exercising within due limits, their privileges as citizens, and it does not seem very consistent with the principles of the Liberal creed to try and repress the free utterance of thought among ecclesiastics. It is another question whether it be good for the Catholic Church that its clergy should become political agitators, but this is a matter for the Church herself to determine when necessity arises. The Catholic clergy in Ireland do not deserve to be considered mere political partisans, nor have they shown any disposition of late years to weaken the connexion between Ireland and Great Britain. On the contrary, they opposed and discontinued the several associations—which aimed at a separation between the countries. The Home Rule movement is one which seeks to unite England and Ireland more closely together by removing certain disadvantages which are supposed to arise from the present arrangement by which the affairs of Ireland are settled in a Parliament which has never succeeded in gaining the confidence of the Irish nation. Now that Mr. Gladstone finds a new and widespread agitation for Home Rule gaining ground in Ireland, he

turns in his distress towards the Catholic clergy, and seeks through the intervention of Pius IX. to obtain their help, or at least such help as their silence would afford. The response given by Cardinal Antonelli to the British diplomatist who waited on him was not very encouraging. He expressed his wonder that his interference should have been solicited after the famous speech of Sir Augustus Paget at Turin, a speech which has never yet been censured by the British Cabinet, and for which the British Ministers must remain responsible until they repudiate the sentiments and deny the assertions which it contains. The conduct of Earl Russell, in undertaking to preside at a meeting called for the purpose of exhibiting British approbation of the persecution of the Church in Germany, has created in Italy a profound sensation. Lord Russell, although not a member of Mr. Gladstone's Ministry, is supposed to share the opinions of many members of the Cabinet and of the Parliament. Now that Earl Russell has been compelled by ill-health to relinquish the chair at that meeting, the Italian newspapers consider the meeting itself to have lost all political significance, and to have become merely one of the usual anti-Papal assemblies which take delight in reviling the Pope and denouncing "Ultramontanism." But after all, why should Mr. Gladstone expect the Irish Catholic people to rest content with the abolition of the State Church in Ireland, and the Land Act? The Church Act was to a certain extent a great boon to Ireland, but it was an imperfect measure in itself, and in the mode in which its provisions were carried out it has proved very unsatisfactory to the Irish Catholics. In the matter of University Education, the Irish Catholics have been also treated by the English Government in a mode to make them feel poignantly the need of a domestic legislature. Under these circumstances it is surprising that Irish Catholics should seek, by moral and legal means, to obtain a remedy for their difficulties? And is there any way by which they could hope for the gratification of their legitimate desires, other than that of a Parliament of their own under the sovereignty of the Queen? Cardinal Antonelli, when asked by the British diplomatist to urge the Pope to put a bridge on the Irish Catholic bishops, must have felt an inclination to smile. Pius IX. was a legitimate Sovereign, and his territories were taken from him by men who pledged themselves to use none but moral means to dethrone him. The British Government looked on complacently while these moral means developed themselves into sword and bayonet, cannonading and bombardment. According to Sir Augustus Paget, the complacency of her Majesty's Government was downright complicity. And yet her Majesty's Ministers, who cared not to interpose a single remonstrance—nay, who have not even protected the pecuniary interests of British Catholics in the Roman States—hesitate not to seek the intervention of the despoiled and imprisoned Pontiff to oppose a movement which, so far as the Irish clergy are concerned, is perfectly legal, and aims, not at the disruption, but at the consolidation of the British dominions.—London Tablet.

Will it be believed that the Catholics of England if we take the tone and declamations of their press, with some few exceptions, will be the most avowed opponents of Home Rule for Ireland? We find by extract from an English publication, *Catholic Progress*, that it is in this way they will put their grounds of hostility: "There is perhaps no section of the population of this empire which has a more practical interest in averting the calamity of a real disunion of England and Ireland than the English Catholics. Apart from Ireland, we are a small and insignificant minority of the population, without a single representative in the House of Commons, and without any outlet for the Parliamentary ability which is the frequent accompaniment of, as well as the stepping-stone to, forensic eminence. We should forego the benefit of the thirty-six Catholic representatives in the House, some of whom are Englishmen and represent the wants of English Catholics. In short, the change is one by which we should be losers in every point of view. It would consequently, be a suicidal policy in us, as English Catholics, to become the advocates for a dissolution of the legislative union." If this is not a statement of the most selfish political injustice ever made, we are at a loss to characterize it by terms. The English Catholics gained their religious liberties by the exertions of the Irish people. They gave the enthusiasm, the energy, the sacrifice, and the champion to that cause. It was not the Shrewsburies, or the Norfolks, or the Camoys, Barons, belted Earls and coroneted Dukes as they were, that struck the shackles from the limbs of the Church and bade her arise free and in her majesty. It was O'Connell, whose inheritance was a diminished patrimony, plundered by the Catholic ancestors and Catholic countrymen of these same nobles, and the hardy peasant people of Ireland. The daring mountaineers of Clare and Kerry, Wicklow and Donegal, the sturdy farmers of Munster and Midland counties, the artisans of Leinster and the cities of the Pale, were behind him, and pressed on with the honest tillers of the soil of the Connaught province to drag that unwilling concession from the hands of a haughty and stubborn government. The English people repeatedly, by their influential Catholic representatives, clogged the wheels of the advance, and gave nearly as much trouble as the foes of the liberty of the Church to the Master mind of the Liberator. They were unfit almost for the full measure of religious freedom which the Irish gained for them, if we are to judge them by their conduct. They were unwilling to be emancipated. They lugged their chains with complacency out of the veriest caution, and only for the high and bold resolve of the gifted Irish Tribune they would have clung to half measures of freedom, and afforded the spectacle of a decorous dance in chains ever since. They are glad now of the victory, little as they did to achieve it, little as they showed then of the bold enthusiasm that lit the men of emancipation to success, but the way in which they would reward Ireland is to keep her still in the rags of political dependence, and almost in the condition of political annihilation of her national instincts. But they are willing to do this, of course, for "Catholic interests." The Irish people who hear this will scoff at it. They will not believe it. It has the odor of selfishness and not the aroma of charity around it. Religion or its spirit has nothing in common with it. It is the shadow of the cloven foot obtruded through the garb of the astute politician, and shows that the English Catholic can be an Englishman in policy, as far as Ireland is concerned, just as much now as when the Plantagenets and Tudors fixed the same value on the head of an Irishman as on the head of a wolf, if history be true. It is an unmistakable fact that they would give their influence to still keep this Andromeda of the nations chained to the rock, looking in vain for a deliverer nor yield to the prayer of her great advocate and patriot, Henry Grattan, that she might be yet "risen from her bed and draw nearer to the sun." Is it fair?—Catholic Mirror.

To-day we chronicle some Irish election news of importance. The contest at Limerick County, in which so much interest was felt, has terminated in the return of Mr. O'Sullivan at the head of the poll. Mr. Synan, the useful and patriotic representative of the county was re-elected, while Mr. Kelly was "a bad third," polling little more than a fourth of the votes given to his rival. All three candidates were supporters of the platform of Home Rule, Denominational Education, Fixity of Tenure, and Amnesty. In Longford, the candidates who stood in the popular programme set forth above, were chosen by an overwhelming majority. Major O'Bailey was for a fourth time in succession elected to represent the County, and came in at the head of the poll, closely

followed by his new colleague, Mr. George Errington. Mr. Errington, who enters Parliament for the first time, is, though a young man, well and favourably known to the Catholics of Dublin for the services he has rendered to the cause of Catholic Progress and Catholic Education. In Donegal the Conservative members, the Marquis of Hamilton and Mr. Tom Conolly, have been selected after one of the closest fights of the General Election. Mr. Tristram Kennedy and his brother, Dr. Evory Kennedy, who carried the Liberal banner in the County Donegal, made a most gallant stand, and were defeated by a very narrow majority. Turning to Great Britain, yesterday's election news continues to be an untrodden catalogue of Liberal disasters. In the West Riding of Yorkshire, once a great stronghold of rural Liberalism, the Southern Division, represented in the last Parliament by two Liberals, has been carried by two Conservative gentlemen. In both East Derbyshire and Hertfordshire the Liberals have lost a seat, and from the latter constituency, Mr. Brand, the son of the Speaker, has been ejected. In Liberal Scotland, also, the seat for Berwickshire has been carried by a Conservative. By last night the results had been ascertained of elections in which nearly six hundred members had been returned to Parliament. It is then, perfectly possible to calculate with some accuracy what the conditions of the new House of Commons will be. Making all possible deductions, and counting all Home Rulers in the Liberal ranks, the Conservatives will have in the new House a clear majority of, at least, forty votes. Such a majority, though not to be compared with the overwhelming one which supported Mr. Gladstone after the General Election of 1868, is amply sufficient for the purposes of Government. It is notorious that the Conservative party, not suffering from "the disease of thought," is admirable in the thoroughness of its discipline, and either in office or in opposition follows its leader with the most child-like docility. Under such circumstances, unless Mr. Disraeli commits some blunder of the first magnitude, he appears to have a long reign before him. There is every possibility that the General Election of 1874 has placed the government of the country in Conservative hands for four or five years to come. We cannot conceal from ourselves the fact that the great Conservative triumph has been most injurious to the interests of Ireland. In an evenly divided House the Irish popular party would have been omnipotent as the holders of the balance of power.—Under the actual circumstances of the case Mr. Disraeli has a large majority of pure Conservatives, and hence he can, for the present at least, afford to talk of Home Rule in the tone of airy defiance which he adopted at Buckingham. However, Ireland has the pleasing consciousness of having done her duty.—Events may postpone, they cannot avert, the ultimate triumph of her cause, and for the nonce she has only to "possess her soul in patience, and await what may betide."—Dulinn Freeman's Journal, Feb. 12.

MR. DISRAELI ON IRELAND.—The Standard says:—A most important part of Mr. Disraeli's speech—most important chiefly for its declaration as to Home Rule—is that wherein he referred to Ireland. Home Rule he properly described as the legitimate product of Liberal legislation—the natural fruit of the policy of spoliation and violence, alternating with submission and treachery. Mr. Gladstone himself is charged with having made a declaration in his election address, so studiously equivocal that the Home Rulers might, if they pleased, read it to mean that the Liberal Government would grant them at least a portion of their desire if only they agitated enough. For himself and the Conservative party, Mr. Disraeli emphatically repudiates all notion of pandering to the Irish Nationalist demand, averring that it is the first duty of Conservatives to regard the conservation of the Empire.

THE MENDICANT ORDERS.—A lecture on "The Mendicant Orders" was delivered on the 11th ult., in the Molesworth Hall, by the Protestant Archbishop of Dublin (Rev. Dr. Trevelyan). The chair was occupied by the Dean of the Chapel Royal. There was a very large attendance. The Archbishop pointed out that the three subjects pre-eminently instructive in connection with the middle ages were the Crusades, the Scholastic Philosophy, and the Rise and Fall of the Mendicant Orders—and it was to the latter of these he intended to direct their attention. In the thirteenth century Innocent III., the greatest of all the Popes, wore the triple crown. In the previous three centuries the number of religious orders had multiplied so greatly that in the fourth Lateran Council, in 1215, a decree went forth prohibiting a further multiplication of them, and requiring that any who might wish to undertake the religious life should make his choice among the orders already existing. Circumstances, however, were stronger than men and the resolves of men; and Innocent III., who was the author of this decree, himself sanctioned the foundation of two new orders, which presently rose to such importance as to cast in the shade all the earlier ones. A new idea found its utterance in the mendicant orders, and herein their strength lay. Hitherto, the monk was one who, withdrawing from the world, had sought in prayer, penitence, and self-mortification to set forward the salvation of his own soul. Now he should be one who, in labor and self-denying love, in carrying the Word of Life to others, should seek the salvation of others. Dominic (born 1170, died 1221), a Spanish priest of a noble Castilian family, convinced of the imminent danger which threatened the Church from the revolt against the Roman system, hastened to Rome and laid before Pope Innocent III. his scheme for an order of preaching brethren—*fratres predicatores*—who should devote themselves to the preaching of the Word, and the repression and extirpation of all heresies. After some little hesitation the Papal allowance was given (A.D. 1216). Dominic died in 1221, uttering from his death bed an anathema on any who should seek to corrupt with the fatal gift of riches the order which he had founded, planting in it, as they thus would do, the certain seeds of dissolution: "He was a man of mighty will, devoted with absolute singleness of aim to the interests of the Church, beside which he could not conceive any other; as Dante said—"Good to his friends and dreadful to his foes. Francis (born 1172, died 1226), the son of a rich merchant in Central Italy, one day hearing the Gospel read and expounded, of the Twelve Apostles sent forth without scrip or shoes, exclaimed this was what he needed, and vowed that such a life should henceforward be his. He changed his fine garments, for he had loved such, for the rags of the first beggar whom he met. He found his way to Rome in 1215. Innocent III. was indisposed at first to extend any countenance to the begging suppliant, but on second thoughts gave allowance to him and his rule, being, as he was, too sagacious a prelate to commit the fault which the heads of the English Church committed when they repelled Wesley, and refused to utilize for its enthusiasm and that of his fellows (applause). The rapidity with which this order spread was marvellous. Two and twenty years after Francis's death his order numbered 8,000 religious houses. The mendicant orders were endowed by the Pope with peculiar privileges and immunities, as he recognised in them his most faithful militia. Having traced the history of the orders, and remarked that in after years the disciples of St. Francis—for he regarded him as the founder of both orders so far as they were mendicant—did not practice the lesson of humility taught by their founder, and evaded the rule of poverty by acquiring lands, he said, with regard to Francis himself, let him have fallen into what mistakes he may, he must ever remain one of the most wonderful figures which the wonderful history of the Church presented. "Who could doubt that he did well?" When bidden by an inward voice to leave all for the sake of Christ and Christ's poor, he was not disobedient to that heavenly voice.