

ry of her soldiers and sailors, a loud expression of shame, on her statesmen, of horror for her Church, and of contempt of her military leaders has rung through every capital in the world, has lowered the prestige of Great Britain, has, by her depression, advanced proportionately, the causes of reform, liberty and religion in several neighboring nations, and ultimately will rid Ireland of a bigotry which is the fruitful source of national discord and the fatal obstacle to our national progress.

Even the heartfelt news which this day has been received of the fall of Delhi, so far from overthrowing, palpably confirms the statements here put forward. In the loud shout of triumph in which every Irish heart will join over an enemy whose brutal atrocities and fiendish perfidies have no parallel in the cruelties of all ancient warfare; even in the midst of the joy which our victory at Delhi will call up from the inmost soul of this country, there can also be read the universal impression at home and abroad that it was the bungling, the stupidity, the inefficiency, the arrogance, the ignorance and the flagrant bigotry of the supreme authorities and of the chief commanders in India, to which, at least in one half, may be ascribed the cause of this melancholy, pitiful and sanguinary revolt. I now repeat what I have often said before, namely, that if the supreme officers responsible for the peace of India were tried by the laws of a French military discipline, every man of them would forfeit his life by the unflinching verdict of a French court martial. And also, in the midst of our universal acclamation, let it never be forgotten that the Fusiliers, who have fought ten battles under Havelock, and who have entered Delhi through the volcanic breach in the walls, are the very same regiment which was lately punished for not sending their children to a Protestant school.—The pension allowed to the children of soldiers, namely, five shillings a week for each child, was withdrawn, and the sum of £276 for ninety-two children was glibly taken by a Scotch colonel and commandant from these very men, the brave poor Irish fellows who, through fatigue, famine, sickness, plague, have faced the cannon's mouth for England, and have had their glorious share in the most deadly fight recorded in the bloodiest past struggles of Indian warfare. The conduct, the shameful conduct, practised towards those brave Fusiliers, is part of the disgraceful discipline which eventuated in the late lamentable mutiny; and this, and similar outrages on liberty of conscience, should be the very first abuse of military bigotry which the English Cabinet should utterly and entirely and for ever crush out, along with the other numerous faults and crimes, from our Indian legislation. It is not intended in these remarks to cast odium on England in reference to her policy in the East; far from it; the object of the writer is to call attention to a crying injustice and odious bigotry, a fiendish biblical persecution in the army; to seek its removal by public exposure; to extend to our brave, invincible soldiers of every creed and denomination a toleration which is their right by the laws of their country, and to expunge from their military code a foul stigma which is unknown in other countries, and is a lasting disgrace to the otherwise untarnished honor of our gallant armies. The best surgeon is the man who inflicts no new, unnecessary wounds on his patient, but who uses his skillful lancet to cut out old cancers; and the man who exposes political and religious mistakes in a nation, with a view to their correction, is decidedly not an enemy but a true friend of the State. And the changes in our laws and customs, which individuals can make at home, are often effected by the criticism and the animadversion of foreign nations, as they copy our complaints and point out the redress of our grievances. I shall, therefore, copy from a widely circulated and a most moderate French journal, the *Debats*, some remarks on England, from which it will appear that her braggadocio is now received on the Continent with a full measure of merited contempt; and from which it may be gathered that the days of the pride and pomp of England are at an end amongst the surrounding kingdoms; that she must be content in future to take her place in foreign courts with an unobtrusive propriety, and learn to improve her own clearly imperfect institutions before she can again find fault with the laws, the customs, and the civilization of others. The public unfavorable criticism which is now freely made on England by almost the universal press of Southern Europe will in due time have the effect of giving a more tolerant interpretation to her laws in reference to Irish Catholic feeling and Irish Catholic interests throughout her empire.

(From the *Debats*.)

The *Times* gives vent to a bitter complaint against the French press, which it reproaches with not endeavoring to conceal the selfish pleasure it derives from the embarrassments and misfortunes of India. The sanguinary and, hitherto, unsuccessful struggle (*la lutte malheureuse*) which our neighbors have maintained for the last six months against their revolted subjects of Bengal, offers a and spectacle to the world great enough and novel enough to explain the difference of opinion and sentiments which it has called forth in Europe, and especially in France. As far as we ourselves are concerned, without our ever having shared in the language of the systematic and passionate abusers which England has met with in the French press, we thought we were fulfilling a duty in stating a truth which, according to all appearance, had long since crossed the Channel; and we acknowledged that the movement caused in public opinion by the state of affairs in India was not favorable to England. We stated that movement of public opinion, and we have considered it according to our particular impressions; we have done more than that, we thought it just and necessary to associate ourselves thereto to a certain extent. We never submitted passively either on this occasion or on any other to the yoke of public opinion; we flatter ourselves that we have established our independence otherwise than by words and high-sounding professions (*professions de foi*) in this respect we are not open to any censures from English journals in general, nor from the *Times* in particular. We can make this reply as far as we are personally concerned in the accusations brought by the *Times* against the French press.

We believe we may say that the *Times* is mistaken as to the real state of the question, and that it considers too exclusively in its own particular point of view the sentiment which has manifested itself in public opinion towards England. First, the *Times* is wrong in supposing that there are French journals which rejoice at hearing that English officers, Eng-

lish women, and children are massacred by Sepoys. In saying so the *Times* is unjust towards those journals which have shown themselves the most violent and passionate enemies of England; and our impartiality compels us to protest even in the name of the *Univers* and of the *Gazette de France*. In France, as in England, there are not two sentiments, not two opinions, on the atrocities of which India has been the theatre; and it is certain that the horrible narratives brought by every mail have stirred up every heart and mind. The *Times* confounds two things which the public conscience has clearly distinguished and separated one from the other—it confounds the cause of English policy, which has been blamed and censured elsewhere than in France, and which, at all events, cannot pretend to be above criticism.

The English journal is deceived, and is under a still greater illusion when it attributes to envy the sort of unpopularity which at present exists among us regards England. The *Times* might have found the cause of that unpopularity in certain well known incidents which have so unfortunately compromised and disturbed the amicable relations of France and England. It ought to have taken into account, and into every great account, the irritation which the selfish and egoistic policy of Lord Palmerston has caused not only in France, but on the whole of the continent. It should have asked itself whether the English press had always sufficiently spared the just and honorable susceptibilities of France, and if it did not hurt them violently on that recent occasion when, to justify the opposition of Lord Palmerston, the confidential organ of the premier declared "that the French Government might any day send from its ports through the Suez Canal a numerous fleet to attack and divide the English Empire of India." Instead of examining that important question, the English journal found it more simple to ascend the Capitol by writing this sentence, which is so naively replete with British pomp and pride:—"It is impossible that an island like ours should bring up an empire which extends over the five great portions of the globe and contains 22,000,000 souls, without drawing upon itself the envy and the hatred of its neighbors."

A most admirable and handy system, for it serves to lower its neighbors from the very height to which it strives to raise itself up! The *Times* quotes the clever expression of a French writer on the question before us:—"Let England be well advised of it, she is not loved; she is too selfish for her misfortunes to be considered as family misfortunes by the other nations, and she has been too successful not to be greatly envied." The English journal extracts from the above opinion all that which flatters its national vanity, and it contemptuously rejects the truth:—"Selfish or not," says that journal, "it is no less true that it is to her success and her prosperity that England must attribute the injuries launched against her." Thus all the blame is for those who do not admire England exclusively, and not a word is to be said against the wisdom, grandeur, nobility, magnanimity, and disinterestedness which our neighbors have displayed in the government of India and elsewhere!!! Once more, we speak without bitterness, without passion, with all that impartiality of which we have so often given proof; but we think the proud (*orgueilleux*) language of the English journal will not be favorably received in France, and that it will not contribute to bring back public opinion from the feeling of ill will (*preventions*) which has latterly conceived towards England.

Without any doubt, there is throughout the entire Southern Continent of Europe, a bitter feeling towards England. Perhaps this feeling will die out harmless when Lord Palmerston and his clique die out; and perhaps it will live after their death, ready to burst forth in active retaliation when a favorable occasion shall be presented. Whatever be the result, it is clear that English Statesmen ought to be on their guard, and do nothing unjust or impolitic, like the Indian Incapables and Bigots to encourage an enemy, or to weaken a friend. All Ireland may be wanted in some unforeseen emergency to unite their hearts and hands in the defence of the State; and it is certainly neither just nor politic in the Government itself to supply, themselves, not only the materials for national conflagration at home, but even to procure the very fire to ignite the combustible heap. Now, I am not one of those grumblers, who say that England could not exist without Ireland: on the contrary, I think she could; and that in a state emergency every man, young and old in that country, would volunteer his life and property for her service and protection. But, decidedly, Ireland has great power both of mind and body; and, no doubt, it would be wiser to employ both these powers to the advantage rather than the injury of the sister country. Now, independently of our want of commerce, our annihilated trade and other national items of partiality evinced by England in her own favor to our disadvantage, there are two standing evils in Ireland, which evils I believe are such an impediment to national peace, and to national progress, that until they are entirely abated and removed, the heart and the mind of our nation can never be cordially enlisted in the full service of the State. The two evils alluded to are, firstly, the social persecution by the Protestant church; and secondly, the legal extermination of the Irish farmer by a *bad landlord*. Let the clergy of the Protestant church, by all means profess and teach their own creed, without the insult of the tract distributor, or the persecution of the local magistrate or the local landlord; and let the government itself, without prepared bills from Tenant Leaguers, grant a just tenant-right to the Irish people; and the reign of a lasting prosperity will commence the hour when these two questions of discord, and the universal expulsion of the poor, shall have been finally and definitely settled.

Wexford, Oct. 28.

D. W. C.

IRISH INTELLIGENCE.

On Sunday, October 25th, the Right Rev. Dr. Walshe conferred the Holy Order of Priesthood on the Rev. Thomas Tynan, at the College in Carlow. His Lordship has been pleased to give him the Humanity Chair in the College.

CONVENTS IN KERRY.—The late lamented Bishop of Kerry left six convents completed and tenanted by their devoted inmates at his death. A seventh is about being constructed in Kenmare. The side for the purpose has been liberally granted by the noble Marquis of Lansdowne, by whom four acres of land were granted. The fund for the building is due to the munificence of a private gentleman, Mr. Hartnett, of Liverpool, brother to Edward Hartnett, Esq., of Castleland, and to the amiable, indefatigable, and pious Superioress of the convent of that town. For the convent of Kenmare Mr. Hartnett has given the sum of 3,000*l.*, one-half for the cost of the building, the other half for the maintenance of the convent. He had previously given 1,500*l.* for the convent of Castleland, and 1,500*l.* for a similar purpose in Liverpool, so that this gentleman of Kerry has appropriated 6,000*l.* to those abodes of edifying piety, religious teaching, and moral and industrial instruction, from which the young female poor derive so many and such incalculable benefits.—*Munster News*.

We announced a day or two since that the first act of Lord Powerscourt's majority was the granting of a site for a Catholic church on his property at Bannickerry; we are gratified at being now able to state that Lord Monck, in a spirit of liberality worthy of the highest praise, has contributed the munificent sum of £100 towards the erection of the sacred edifice, and that Col. La Touche has signified his intention of contributing towards the same object. We hope to have soon the pleasure of announcing that many have followed the example thus set them.—*Freeman*.

The Bishop of Leighlin and Ferns (Dr. Walshe) sends the following reply to an invitation to attend the Carlow meeting to assist the sufferers in India:—

"Braganza-house, Carlow, Oct. 24.

"Sir, I regret that I cannot attend at the meeting to be held at Carlow on Monday, to take into consideration the propriety of contributing to the relief of the sufferers from the mutiny in India. I will be engaged on Monday with other duties at a distance from home. We all, of course, abhor the atrocities which have been perpetrated in India, and sympathize deeply with the victims of these appalling disasters. To inquire into the causes of these calamities is not now our purpose. Such inquiry will, I presume, occupy the attention of the rulers of India, and the result, we may hope, will be instructive and useful. The object of my meeting is of a more simple and consoling character—to testify our condolence with the sufferers, and to relieve their distress. How painful it is to reflect on the number of families, lately so happy, that have been suddenly plunged into dark and deep affliction by the desolating havoc we all deplore. I will not suppose that there is any discrepancy of opinion about the propriety of relieving the sufferers; all, I trust, are ready to give—they who have little, to give their mites, and they whom Providence hath blessed with abundance to give abundantly to supply the wants of the distressed. But there is yet a difficulty about the mode of discharging this duty. 'I have heard,' to use the words of Sir John Pakington, in his letter to the Lord Mayor on the 18th inst., 'that there exist on the public mind, in combination with a desire to subscribe, a feeling that no adequate security has yet been offered with respect either to the responsibility under which the fund is to be administered, or the principles, regulations, or conditions under which it is to be applied.' The feeling of mistrust to which the right hon. baronet refers has, I believe, arisen from the manner of the distribution of the Patriotic Fund, and from the treatment of the children and orphans of soldiers with regard to schools and orphanages. With every disposition to co-operate in the present praiseworthy undertaking, many, I apprehend, will be withheld from doing so by the fear that what is given with enlightened and comprehensive views may be disbursed in a different spirit. It would, in my opinion, be easy to dispel this fear, and secure the confidence of all. It is obviously most desirable that some provision be made to attain this laudable object, and to enable us all to labor together—as we desire to do—in this work of benevolence. It is lamentable that there are any grounds for difference in this matter, particularly at a period when the hearty union of all is peculiarly useful to the common weal; such union cannot be firmly and abidingly maintained unless we observe a due and becoming regard for the just rights and feelings of each other. Your meeting has, no doubt, been convened in this spirit, and will, I am sure, so far as it is within the power of the meeting, endeavor to remove the mistrust and to provide that the Christian benevolence which creates this fund will preside over its administration and protect it from being soiled by anything unworthy of the noble charity for which it is designed. I pray you to excuse the length of this letter, and to accept the assurance of the sentiments of profound respect with which I have the honor to be, Sir, your faithful servant in Christ,

"J. JAMES WALSH.

"The High Sheriff, County Carlow."

THE ARCHBISHOP OF DUBLIN AND THE SOUPER FUND.—Nothing can surpass the bitterness of the Orange organs against the Most Rev. Dr. Cullen, for his well-timed and most necessary letter, with regard to the Souperism of the British Barracks. In all corners of the country the spirit is up that Catholics have nothing to expect from the British government, whether in court or camp, but insult and injustice, and that they in return will have nothing to do with funds which are ostensible collected for the relief of Anglo-Indian sufferers, but which would be ultimately used, as they were before, for the perversion of Catholic orphans. There never was a greater wrong than that to which Catholic soldiers are subjected, and we hope that the letter of his Grace will have the effect of getting this grievance redressed. Already we find the subject agitated by the Catholics of England, showing that here in Ireland the apathy of defeat and treachery has sunk deep into the national heart, and that the people who have hitherto always followed us in agitation are now about to take the lead in this new movement. It is too bad that Catholic sailors are allowed to die the death of dogs, if they do not accept the ministrations of a Souper-purson. It is too bad that Catholic soldiers in India are too often denied the solaces of religion while exposed to fever and sunstroke. It is too bad that the orphans of Catholic soldiers are invariably perverted from their fathers' faith, and that it is not sufficient for these British Ghouls that the body of the parent should be sacrificed, but even the soul of the surviving orphan. It is too bad that Catholic soldiers in India are deprived of five shillings a month if they do not send their children to Protestant schools. It is too bad that Protestant officers should be allowed to insult the faith and feeling of Catholics, as some of them did a few days ago in Ferozy, while accompanying their men to Mass. It is too bad that our bishops and priests in India are not recognised as Ecclesiastics, but as 'civil servants' of the 'Honorable East India Company.' It is too bad that Catholic chaplains, who go through more fatigue and pay more attention to those under their charge than all the others put together—it is too bad, we say, that they should not receive equal pay to those of other denominations. Would our readers like to know how Catholic chaplains are treated? Here is a specimen: the Rev. T. A. Crowther, one of the Catholic chaplains now on his way to India on board the *Colombo*, writes a letter from Malta descriptive of the voyage, in which he gives the following fact:—"Just opposite me sits a Presbyterian, who is also going out as chaplain, but his appointments are at the rate of £80 a month, while ours are only ten; he drew his three months pay before starting, at £240, whilst ours was only £30; he has received more than the whole corps of Catholic chaplains put together: herein is that saying fulfilled, 'The world will love its own.'—Really if these be not grievances requiring redress, we are the veriest slaves in creation. The Most Rev. Doctor Cullen's letter has given heart and hope to the country, and we are of opinion that its effect must ultimately be the remodelling of the relations existing between the Catholic soldiers and the British government. This is a subject which cannot be too much agitated at present. It is only by agitation we can get this or any other grievance removed. It is anything but creditable to the Catholics of the empire, that they have not protested before now against this great grievance to which poor Catholics in the army have been subjected. It is well even if redress come now, at the eleventh hour, and if it do, the country will have to thank the Archbishop of Dublin for such a consummation, by his bold and dignified letter against the Souper Relief Fund of the British army.—*Xilkenny Journal*.

William Smith O'Brien, Esq., has, at the unanimous call of the Congregated Trades of Limerick, consented to deliver the opening address of the session in the Mechanics' Institute during the ensuing month.

It appears that the Grand Orange Lodge of All Ireland has been sitting in close conclave during the past week, debating, it is said, with considerable acrimony the momentous question, "to be or not to be." The Grand Lodge appears to be composed of some thirty noblemen and country gentlemen, whose names are given in another column. With hardly an exception, they are known to be men of very moderate talents—in fact, the bigots and blockheads of the Irish peerage and squirearchy. Outside their own immediate circles their names are as little known to fame as those of the members of any Ribbon or Orange lodge in the country. It is wonderful to see how dull a set of people can be at the bottom of so much evil as the villainous system of Orangism has created in Ireland. These men, however, have only been the puppets in the hands of others, and as those who condescended to pull their strings have now shown an unmistakable resolve to cut the connexion and let the blockheads work for themselves, it seems probable that at length the system will be allowed to collapse and die out. Of course, there will be much dull ranting and sonorous shouts of "No surrender," loudly echoed by the Orange rabble; but as, "when the brains are out the man will die," the desertion of the Napier-Whiteside set has settled Orangism as effectively as over the "traitor Peel" and his Ministry settled Protection. We congratulate the country on the prospect of being speedily and finally rid of this most vile system, the greatest social pest and nuisance that ever afflicted any civilised community. We trust the decline and fall of Orangism will be quickly followed by the entire extinction of the last vestiges of Ribbonism in every part of the country.—*Tablet*.

Lord Dunnington has been fulminating his ire against the Lord Chancellor of Ireland at an Orange meeting in Antrim. A meeting of delegates from all the lodges in Ireland was held on Tuesday in Dublin the Earl of Enniskillen in the chair, to instruct a committee to prepare a manifesto of the principles, purposes, and constitutional conduct of the order.

STREET FENCING IN BELFAST.—On Sunday the Rev. George Shaw preached in Eliza street, and at four o'clock the Rev. William Johnston preached at Cullinstree street. Mr. Mater preached at nine o'clock in Stanley street (opposite the Pound Mill-gate). He also preached at one o'clock, in Roilly's place. At three o'clock he preached again at Donegal-quay. At half-past four o'clock he preached a fifth sermon in Sandy-row, and at seven he preached again in the National School-room, Durham street.

RAISING RENTS.—We regret to hear that some landlords have been putting the screw on tenants where the rents had been high before. This all comes from the system of not granting leases. Some cases of Incumbered Estates' purchasers have been mentioned to us, where the rents have been increased to a figure far and away beyond anything they ever paid at any period. We hear in other places of the most unaccountable and extraordinary antics on the part of agents. Altogether the land system in Ireland is truly a blighting evil, and demands immediate reform.—*Limerick Reporter*.

A reconstruction of the Irish Poor Law Commission is at present under consideration, and the Chief Commissioner, Mr. Alfred Power, is engaged rearranging the classes of clerks, with a view to increased efficiency combined with economy. We believe we are justified in anticipating, from the intimate practical knowledge of the Chief Commissioner, aided by the chief clerk, Mr. Benjamin Banks, such a re-organisation as will give every satisfaction to the public, at the same time that it will do justice to the merits and services of individuals.—*Civil Service Gazette*.

The Northern *Whig* seems to be familiar with the story which attributes the death of Mr. Ellis to other causes than those of disputes connected with the possession of land.—"We have reasons for supposing (says the *Whig*) in regard to the case of the unfortunate Mr. Ellis that land, and in its traditional disputes, may have had nothing to do with the horrible murder. It may be as reasonably referred to other causes. Why is it supposed in this country, when a murder takes place, and the unfortunate victim is a landed proprietor, that revenge for harsh acts as a landlord has been the inducement? We have heard of landlords shot by outraged husbands; and there certainly are immoral men who are not bad landlords. In the neighborhood where this last atrocity was committed public opinion does not altogether pronounce in favor of the theory of agrarian outrage." The Lords Justices have offered a reward of £100 for the discovery of the murderer or murderers.

ANOTHER AGRARIAN MURDER.—Another murder has just been reported to us. The victim is, or rather was, a farmer of the name of McDonnell, near Kells, and the ruffians are six in number. The particulars are few, and the case is a mystery. All we have learned is, that as McDonnell was going home from the first Mass on Sunday last he was waylaid by six fellows, who beat him to such a degree that he has since died. The dark deed occurred in the open day, and every hope is expressed that the villains cannot escape. Mr. McDonnell was driving his own car at the time, and having met an acquaintance on the road, with whom he chatted a while, he was waylaid soon after the parting. It is thought that this third party can give very important information in identifying the perpetrators.—*Nevry Examiner*. [Another account gives the man's name as McConnell and states that the man still survives.]

A fire, attended with very destructive results, broke out about nine o'clock on Monday morning last, at Ballymunn, near the chapel of Pitt, whereby a range of newly erected offices, measuring upwards of 70 feet in length, the property of Widow Hely, was totally consumed, together with a large rick of upwards of 40 tons of prime hay, and an extensive rick of corn. But for the providential circumstance of the wind blowing in a direction from the premises, and the fact of a great number of people being collected in the neighborhood, owing to a "Station" being held in the chapel, a much greater amount of property would have been destroyed, there being no fewer than seven other large ricks of corn in close proximity to those on fire. By daring and well directed efforts, however, the country people succeeded in overturning the latter, and precipitating them beyond the range of the haggard wall, by which means the communication to a certain extent was cut off.

THE BELFAST TEA FRAMES.—According to the *Belfast Mercury* Mr. Moore, the fraudulent tea dealer, has avowedly evaded all pursuit, and was, by the last American accounts, among the arrivals in New York by the Asia.—"His management was very adroit, and his keenness may be judged by its success. He appears to have got clean away, notwithstanding the steamboats, with Admiralty warrants and without them, which were despatched from this port and from Queenstown. Last evening, in the commercial news-room, everybody looked at the arrivals, as announced by the *New York Journal of Commerce*, per the Asia. The interest attached to them lay in the fact that, far down in the list, the name of 'Mr. Moore' was mentioned. The person indicated might be John James Moore, or Smith, or Brown, or Jones, or Robinson. But the idea appeared to be indelibly fixed on the minds of some gentlemen that the 'Mr. Moore' mentioned as among the passengers by the Asia, who arrived at New York on the 17th of October, was the John James Moore who practised frauds on the Customs in Belfast, and who was in his own person very fraudulently dealt with."

THE PATRIOTIC FUND.—THE QUESTION OF PARTIALITY.—It is clear that, if public opinion have any weight in Great Britain, the executive of the Patriotic Commission cannot ride off upon a shaggy anonymous statement that they are the very purveyors of impartiality—the exact models of blind justice. When the venerated Catholic Archbishop of this ancient diocese warned the public of the probable existence of partiality in the distribution of a charitable fund,

which was raised clearly with the view of strictly impartial distribution, Lord St. Leonards came out with an unsubstantiated denial of partiality in any shape. The Duke of Norfolk hinted at a Parliamentary inquiry, as the best mode of settling the question, but this seems to have terrified the Executive Committee, who at once, through their Chairman, promised an explanation without the aid of Parliament. Well, the explanation appeared, promptly enough.—But such an explanation! It did not bear the signature of even a clerk of the Committee, much less of a Secretary or the Chairman! There was not found amongst all the officials of the Commissioners one with sufficient brass in his face to adopt the offspring of the mountain in labour. To their credit be it said, not one of them confirmed with his signature statements which they all knew full well were a sham; yet all of them, after some kind of "round-robin" fashion, took upon themselves, under the shelter of the *Daily News*, the responsibility of the consumptive explanation. We have published a letter on this subject from Mr. W. Acton to the *Worcestershire Chronicle*. Mr. Acton, who is a magistrate and resident gentleman in Worcestershire, not only puts the insinuations of Dr. Cullen into a specific shape, but states that the exclusive dealing of the Executive Committee was carried on to a far greater extent than was hinted at by His Grace the Archbishop. Portion of the fund, amounting in the aggregate to the enormous total of £231,000 or about a sixth of the entire amount, have been allocated to the founding, endowing, and otherwise assisting of exclusive institutions, not one of which is Catholic! In none of them could a Catholic find shelter or help, and continue to remain a Catholic! Mr. Acton, it will be seen, names the institutions that have been founded and subsidised out of the fund. They are, he says, "purely Protestant institutions, under purely Protestant principles." And he adds, "some attempt was made to obtain a separate allotment to be managed by a Committee of Catholic gentlemen for the relief of Catholic objects in Ireland; and it was resisted." It was resisted, of course. What right have Catholics to be objects, or when they are such, to claim a share of such a fund as this? Dull, ungrateful beings that they are, is it not enough for them that they have been made objects of charity in the service of England? Is not the boast of the Irish Catholic widow or orphan, that the husband or father died under the English flag in the Crimea, a sufficient recompense for the loss either has sustained? Sufficient for such people is the honour? Pater Pindar would scarcely say, were he criticising the generous gratuitous and the classic justice with which the Patriotic Fund has been administered, and the executive of the Fund have managed it—without intending any sarcasm, but as if the Irish and Catholic claimants really unworthy of any consideration whatever—on this very principle. What matters it that the Irish soldier's widow starves, or that his child is reared up in ignorance or crime, if the widow refuses to place him in a proselytising institution? Did not the husband and father enjoy the great glory of dying under the English banner? Should not the widow flourish and thrive and prosper upon the very idea of such an honour? Why should Protestant and English widows and orphans be deprived of a single farthing of the million and a half, raised in the name of patriotism and humanity, for the general benefit of the widows and orphans of all our fallen soldiers, so long as the moiety of them who are "Papists" can starve in uncomplaining quiet, or tread through misery and ignorance the highway to crime and degradation?—

Either this is the spirit in which the Fund has been administered, or it has been administered fairly. If it has been impartially allocated, Catholic institutions have received—we will not say half the amount applied, though that would not be a fair proportion but a third or even a fourth. If they have received even a fourth—if even a sixth, or yet a tenth, has been devoted to the maintenance and education of Catholic widows and orphans, in the only way in which Catholics can receive instruction, Dr. Cullen is wrong, Mr. Acton is wrong; and Lord St. Leonards and his anonymous benchman are quite right. There are some 700 orphans receiving education at the expense of the Fund. If fair play were the guiding rule of the managers, 300 of these—to be far under the mark—would be Catholics. Are they? Are 200, 100, or even 50 of them of the Catholic religion, receiving their education in Catholic schools? Mr. Acton, who has given the subject a good deal of attention, can only hear of seven—three boys and four girls! If there be many more, the managers of the Fund can point them out; and they cannot learn a moment too soon that it will not do to meet specific and distinct charges of this character with the unworthy quibble that they never inquire particularly into the religious convictions of claimants for relief. An open admission of partiality, and a brazen defence of it, would be more manly and creditable than shabby expedients of this nature. The truth must come out sooner or later. We fancy we have already a pretty clear notion of it; but we certainly have not obtained our impression from the Executive Committee, or their apologists. A Parliamentary inquiry will lay bare the entire state of this vexed question to the gaze of the public, and to the indignation, we believe, of the great majority of the British people. The Committee have only postponed for a short period the day of reckoning. It will shortly be seen if they have or have not allowed persons under their control to pervert charity, and convert the generous benevolence of the British and Irish people into a sectarian machine. There are runkeys at the Tory press and elsewhere who affect to believe in the immaculate character which they love to assume, and who do a great deal of mischief by propping them up in their foolishly assumed impartial reputation. Such toadies will not blush when the truth is brought into full view; but, surely, the parties immediately interested cannot remain indifferent to an exposure of one-sidedness unworthy the character of civilised and Christian manhood, and of the important and sacred duties which the Committee undertook to perform. In any event, the discussion that has been thrown upon the long-existing evils in the partial administration of Relief Funds must have the effect of completely checking such practices in future.—*Dublin Evening Post*.

GREAT BRITAIN.

We (*Weekly Register*) are enabled to announce that on Saturday the 31st ult., the Reverend Henry Nutcombe Oxenham, M.A., of Balliol College, Oxford, and late Curate at St. Bartholomew's Gripple-gate, was received into the Catholic Church, by the Very Reverend Provost Manning, D.D., at his Church at Bayswater. Mr. Oxenham had the honor of carrying the Archbishop's Episcopal Cross before His Eminence the Cardinal Archbishop, at the function at Bayswater on St. Charles's Day.

THE REINFORCEMENTS FOR INDIA.—Since our last issue six more vessels have sailed, conveying 2,470 troops, making a total of eighty-four ships, having on board a force of 32,604, which have left for India since the news of the Indian mutinies reached home; and if to those be added the 804 which have been despatched by the Suez route, the total amounts to a force of 33,568 officers and men. The four vessels now preparing to sail with an additional 2,163 will make up the total to 35,729; to which if we add 1,000 men now ready for embarkation at the provisional battalion at Chatham, and the three regiments of infantry and one of cavalry under orders for India, will make up the force despatched by the home government to upwards of 40,000 officers and men, of infantry, cavalry, artillery, and engineers.—*Traveller's Overland Mail*.

Returns made up to Saturday show that the subscriptions to the Indian relief fund already amount to above £200,000. The great loss of life which attended the capture of Delhi will create many additional claims upon the fund, for it must be borne in mind that we are as yet ignorant of the loss which our forces sustained during the latter portion of the six days over which the struggle extended.