

"Miss Lanigan, listen to me. There is one step, which if taken, would prevent all the misery that may otherwise happen; and you can, if you like, be mainly instrumental in causing that step to be taken."

"Goodness gracious, now! What step?—What do you mean, my dear?"

"This—I mean this. You can persuade Helen to consent to a private marriage with me."

Miss Lanigan half screamed at the notion. "A clandestine engagement! And such an engagement!" No, no; the thing was impossible; it would be very sinful, and very wicked, and by no means respectable for her to have anything to do with such a matter. It would injure her character among her very numerous circle of friends, who were vieing with each other, every day in the year, to see which of them should have her oftenest among them.

At the end of the little street he encountered Tom Naddy. "Have you a letter for me?" asked Edmund.

Tom handed him one. He tore it open, and ran his eye over it.

"'Tis all as I feared," he continued, "she refuses to entertain, for an instant, my proposal—Helen, I knew you would, though I am sure you love me."

"What luck with the little elderly lady in this street, Master Edmund?"

"No luck."

"Well, love her to me. I'll make an offer at her, over again for you. I'll be looking after you in an hour or so, sir, with better news for you than you have for me, my dear."

And thrusting his right hand into the left sleeve of his jacket, and his left hand into his right sleeve, he shouldered onward very leisurely to Miss Lanigan's little green hall-door, whistling at every step he took—but indeed, not for want of thought.

(To be Continued.)

HOME RULE.

No. II.

BEFORE THE UNION ACT.

The Union between England and Ireland, although a mere parchment Act, is still binding as long as it remains unrepudiated on the Statute Book. Saurin, who was afterwards Attorney-General of Ireland for more than twenty years, and who refused the office of Lord Chief Justice, declared in the Irish House of Commons, "You may make the Union binding as a law, but you cannot make it obligatory on conscience." But, if the good sense, and honourable spirit, and mainly independence of the people of England were once roused to a full knowledge of the circumstances under which, and the iniquitous means by which, that act was carried, we feel assured that they would find not all selfish prejudices, and take the earliest opportunity of undoing a great national wrong by restoring to the people of Ireland that Domestic Parliament of which they were so unjustly deprived, and without which, we are firmly convinced, there can never be a peaceful solution of the Irish Difficulty.

Full seventy years of hopeless, helpless, driftless legislation on one side, and intermittent disaffection and distrust on the other, occasional and fitful gleams of sunshine, invariably broken by stormy outbursts and dangerous mutterings of ill-suppressed hate, have passed away; and still the halcyon days of peace are as far off as ever. The blessings promised in 1800 have not come in all those halcyon years up to 1871. Why is it so? If an English Prime Minister were ever to divest himself of the narrow insular prejudices of his position, and the pressing claims of his party, and if he were determined to work out the destinies of the empire from a truly Imperial standpoint, we honestly believe he would be the first to acknowledge, in reply to that question, that the Act of Union is the perennial spring of disunion between the two countries; and that to win the affections of the warm-hearted, generous people of Ireland would be an accomplishment of the highest statesmanship, and would place England on a pinnacle of strength and security, from which she might look down, calmly and without trepidation, on the turmoil and disorders, which now agitate the political world, and shake the foundations of the oldest kingdoms.

The history of the Union carries with it its own condemnation. To enlighten those who are ignorant of its origin, and who cannot, therefore, fairly estimate its natural results, nor understand the undying hatred of the Irish people towards it, we shall trace it to its source, and follow it out through its consequences, in a brief, but we hope not uninteresting, narrative of the facts; to do so, we shall have to go back a little.

The Revolution of 1688, whatever political benefits it may have brought to England, was fraught with nothing but disasters for Ireland. At the termination of the civil war by the surrender of Limerick on 3rd October, 1691, the Protestant ascendancy, which had been rudely shaken by the events of the brief but unfortunate reign of James II., was completely re-established, and the Irish Catholics, that is, the Irish people, were laid prostrate in the dust. The terrible horrors of the penal laws—that "unparalleled code of oppression"—were enacted. "The declared object," says Burke, "was to reduce the Catholics of Ireland to a miserable populace, without property, without estimation, without education. They divided the nation into two distinct bodies, without common interest, sympathy, or connection. One of these bodies was to possess all the franchises, all the property, all the education; the other was to be composed of drawers of water and outers of turf for them."

The Protestants, therefore, considered themselves, and were considered in England likewise, as exclusively constituting the Irish nation; whilst the Catholic population was looked upon merely as an unavoidable evil in the land, stripped of all political privileges, and objects of the most unmitigated hatred and contempt. But, notwithstanding the complete establishment of the Protestant power, and the English interest, England had not the slightest idea of treating Ireland as an integral part of the empire. The policy of England towards Ireland was invariably selfish, intolerant, and tyrannical. The principal upon which Irish affairs were conducted was, not to consider what would be beneficial to Ireland, but what would be profitable to English commerce, and advantageous to English interests alone; whilst successive confiscations placed the proprietorship of the greater part of the soil of Ireland in the hands of English adventurers and

hungry Dutchmen. In his celebrated speech on the Union, Lord Clare, referring to this period, stated: "The Parliament of England seems to have considered the permanent debility of Ireland as their best security for her connection with the British Crown; and the Irish Parliament to have rested the security of the colony upon maintaining a perpetual and impassable barrier against the ancient inhabitants of the country."

But, with the utter prostration of the native Catholic Irish, there was a corresponding elevation of the English colony, who retained much of the sturdy independence of the mother country; and, although England had been accustomed to treat Ireland as a conquered and dependent province, and for a long period asserted the supremacy of the English over the Irish Parliament, there was a strong feeling gradually gaining ground in the Irish House of Commons that this supremacy was an usurpation, and an encroachment on the liberties of the Irish Parliament, which should have, sooner or later, to be resisted and overturned.

It is true, that by the statute passed at Drogheda in 1494 by Sir Edward Poyning's, the Lord Deputy of Henry VII., and called after him Poyning's Act, it was enacted that no Parliament should be held in Ireland until the Chief Governor and Council had first certified to the king, under the Great Seal, the causes and considerations, as well as the Acts they designed to pass; that the same should be affirmed by the king and council in England, and his license to summon a Parliament be obtained under the Great Seal of England. By this Act the English Privy Council got the power to alter or suppress anything emanating from the Irish Parliament, which was thus deprived of the power to originate, alter, or amend.

But the jealousy of Irish trade, on the part of English manufacturers, and the prohibition to export wool and woollen fabrics from Ireland, created a feeling of hostility in that country, which soon led to something like an open rupture between the two legislatures, and ultimately terminated in the complete overthrow and abeyance of Irish legislative independence for a long time.

In 1698, however, William Molyneux, member for the University of Dublin, the friend of Locke, whose principles of Government he cordially embraced, seeing that the woolen trade was in danger of extinction—unhappily too prophetic—from the oppressive regulations adopted by the English Government, boldly raised the question of independence in his famous "Case of Ireland's being bound by Acts of Parliament in England stated." This celebrated tract, although dedicated to the king—William III.—with the strongest expressions of the most devoted loyalty in discussing the question "How far the Parliament of England may think it reasonable to intermeddle with the affairs of Ireland, and bind us up by laws made in their House"—reputed in toto the right of England to legislate for Ireland, and maintained the independence of the latter in this respect with such a powerful display of legal argument and historical research, that it was hailed in Ireland with unbounded applause; whilst it was received in England, as might be expected, with vehement indignation. Indeed, so enraged and exasperated was the English House of Commons, that they passed a resolution condemning the book to be burned by the common hangman, the usual resource of defeated tyranny. In an address to the king they besought him to restrain the Irish Parliament, and on their part pledged themselves to assist him in unsustaining the dependence and subordination of Ireland to the imperial crown of England.

The short-lived reign of Anne, which lasted only from 1702 till 1714, was too much occupied in general with framing and enforcing the worst portions of the atrocious penal code—such as the savage Act, for preventing the further growth of Popery—to pay much attention to political rights; and too deeply engaged with the French war and Continental politics, to care much about Irish affairs. Even the idea of a Union, which was then suggested for the first time by certain friends of the Crown, was treated with something like contempt. A Committee of the Irish peers, reporting on the state of the nation in 1703, resolved "that a representation should be laid before the Queen to induce her to promote such a union with England as might qualify the states of that kingdom (Ireland) to be represented in the Parliament there." From the coldness with which the Queen received the proposal, however, it is plain, says Lord Clare, that her ministers would not listen to the proposition of a union with England.

It would seem to be the fatal destiny of England never to know the right time to catch the breeze of popular sentiment in Ireland, or to be able to avail of the golden opportunity which has often presented itself, in the long period of their connection, for winning the good will, if not the affections, of her people. The Education question, which is now coming to the front, is another of those rare chances of conciliating Irish opinion, and meeting the wants and wishes of the time. Will it be met boldly and generously? We fear not. There will be the same struggle to make Irish demands, however just, chime in with English prejudices, however irrational; and then the usual results will follow. And when some compromise has taken place, the time for gratitude will have passed—Ireland is not satisfied, because she has been made to feel that the boon was granted to fear, and not to favour; whilst England has again missed her chance, and is disappointed accordingly.

But to return. Early in the reign of George I. there arose an altercation, in a question of privilege arising out of a point of appellate jurisdiction, which brought to the test once more the subject of the relations between the two countries. A decree of the Court of Exchequer in Ireland, the functionaries of which were English, both in their origin and in their sympathies, having been reversed by the Irish House of Lords, whose judgment was in turn reversed by the House of Lords in England on appeal, the Irish peers denied the legality of the appeal to England at all, alleging that an appeal to the King in his Irish Parliament was definitive and final in any cause in Ireland. But the English Legislature, in the most peremptory and high handed fashion, passed the arbitrary act known as the 6th of George I., which recites: "That whereas attempts have been lately made to shake off the subjection unto, and dependence upon, the Imperial Crown of Great Britain, &c. &c. It is declared and enacted that the said Kingdom of Ireland hath been, is, and of right ought to be, subordinate unto, and dependent upon, the Imperial Crown of Great Britain; and that the King's Majesty, by and with the consent of the Lords spiritual and temporal, and Commons of Great Britain in Parliament assembled, had, hath, and of right ought to have full power and authority to make laws and statutes of sufficient force and validity to bind the people of the Kingdom of Ireland."

Thus was Ireland despoiled of her natural, just, hereditary rights by a stroke of the pen, and the Irish Parliament degraded to the rank of a provincial debating society, by an Act of national robbery and spoliation.

A day of reckoning, however, was approaching, although slowly, and without bringing its full results for many a long, sad year afterwards. It came, however, as we shall see. But it was not till Irishmen had learnt from adversity the grand political lesson that it is only by a true and cordial union amongst the people themselves that any nation can ever hope to be great, prosperous, and free.

HIBERNICUS.

—Catholic Opinion.

The baronies of Upper and Lower Kells, and parts of the barony of Lower Navan, in County Meath, have been placed under the Protection of Life and Property Act.

THE OPPONENTS OF HOME RULE.

(From the Dundalk Democrat.)

The Home Government question continues to attract universal attention. Both the wise and the foolish are discussing it—the former giving it their approval; the latter stating that it will prove the ruin of Ireland! Some days since Lord Lifford, whilst speaking on the subject of the Fin Valley railway, said that an Englishman who had invested capital in the line, would never dream of bringing his money into an Irish undertaking, if Home Government were won for the country. His Lordship must be a very silly being when he permitted such an idea into his head. The truth is, that Ireland requires no English capital. She has plenty of her own, if she could retain it; and it is chiefly that she may be enabled to keep her own money from being swept off to England that she seeks for Home Rule.

Lord Bandon is another enemy of Irish native government. Speaking the other day at an agricultural dinner in Cork, he said "he was opposed to Home Rule, as he believed it meant separation. It was, he declared, a dishonest movement, and would ruin both countries. Our great trade was the cattle trade, and the only security for that was our connection with England." It is evident, from these remarks of Lord Bandon, that a man may have a grand title, and a great deal of wealth; and at the same time a very small store of common-sense. Home Rule does not, however, mean separation, but a cordial union with England. Properly speaking, there is a deep gulf between both nations at present, and native government alone can bring about a real union between them.

How the movement is "dishonest" we cannot pretend to say; and if Lord Bandon were asked to explain himself, it is likely he could not tell what he meant. All we can say on the question he has raised is, that the noble lord has spoken what is not true, as the Irish people seek nothing but a Federal Parliament. They demand power to make their own laws and nothing more. Surely that is nothing extraordinary. Canada made a similar demand, and she has obtained it. Australia asked for native rule and it was conceded. Did either of them, when they received what they desired, exhibit any disposition to separate from England? Lord Bandon must say that they did not. They are now perfectly loyal; and when Ireland is treated in a similar way, she will exhibit similar loyalty and good faith.

There was a small meeting of Orangemen at Poyntzpass last Saturday to open one of those ridiculous and insulting buildings found in Ulster, called "Orange Halls." The "brethren" did not muster in large numbers, but few though they were, they resolved to display their folly by saying something in opposition to the Home Rule movement; thus acknowledging that they are willing slaves. A busy-body called T. G. Peel, who hails from Armagh, occupied the chair, and in addressing the few people before him, in an ill-conceived speech, he had the effrontery to say—

"During the last century, or within the last eighty or ninety years, they had no fewer than seven open rebellions in this country. Therefore, he said, this agitation, which was called Home Rule, was not new, but simply a change of front by a certain class of the Irish people. Now, during these seven open rebellions they, the loyal (?) Orangemen of Ireland, had not allowed them to throw dust in their eyes, or to mislead them or draw them astray—(cheers)—but, having established their standards, their principles, their constitution, and laws, they had stood to them; and what they (the Orangemen) were to-day they were many years ago—(cheers)—and what they were to-day they intended by the blessing of God, to remain (cheers). It was their interest to maintain their connection with British rule."

All this, we suppose, was spoken as if it were the true history of the past. When, however, were the eight rebellions waged against English connection? We can count but one rebellion, and two feeble attempts at raising the banner of revolt. The rebellion took place in 1798, and nearly all the leaders were Protestants. The rank and file consisted in a great measure of Orangemen. The Jacksons, the Emmets, the Tones, the Russels, the Fitzgualds, and scores of other Protestants were the inciters, and if Catholics were engaged in it, it was because they found their homes set on fire, and their relatives slaughtered in cold blood by the sanguinary fiends who marched with fire and sword through the country. They fled to the hills to escape the swords of cold-blooded murderers.

Mr. Peel went on to say that the Irish Catholics were anxious for Home Rule, in order to banish Orangemen from the country, and seize on the forfeited estates, as they looked upon Protestants as intruders, and that the lands belonged to themselves. Well, many people do look at the question in this way, but we have never heard any one stating that Protestants should be hunted down, or the lands taken from their present possessors. The lands were taken from the native race, and that race was most cruelly treated by what Mr. Peel calls "the intruders." But the natives are a forgiving people; kind and gentle, and they are the last in the world to seek a terrible redress for a terrible wrong. They are willing now to let the past be forgotten, but they will never cease till they achieve a local legislature for Ireland, as they feel degraded in having their laws made in England.

Many of the Orangemen may not join the movement for that great end. They may continue to kick the English band that smites them; but we are certain that Orangemen will be found in the national ranks, and will unite with their Catholic countrymen in making Ireland a nation. Those who may stand off, and continue to resist, will be so small that no one will care about them. But onward the movement will proceed despite the opposition of the Lord Liffords, Lord Bandon, and Mr. Peel of Armagh and his sulky little knot of Orangemen. The whole Irish people are now on an equality. All ascendancy is at an end. Faction and party have nothing to live upon, and all will be forced in a little time and by common sense to unite for the land that supports them. When the day of complete union arrives, when Protestants and Catholics unite, and Papists and Orangemen grasp each other's hands, Ireland will cease to be a paltry, beggarly province—what English misrule has made her—and commence her career on the broad road to national prosperity.

A WORD OF WARNING.

(From the Wexford People.—Catholic.)

"Thou shalt not kill" contains a precept, old as the creation itself. This precept binds strictly all men, and he that violates it incurs the wrath of God, and is liable to the punishment which an offended Deity has in store in another life for those who trample upon His laws. Society has agreed to confirm the Divine law in this matter; and in almost every state the crime of murder—the crime of taking away a fellow-creature's life without a justifying cause—is punished with death. Moralists admit the justice of such a law to punish such a crime. No man who holds the Christian faith calls in question the principle that the greatest wrong we can inflict on a fellow-creature is to take away his life, and that the taking away of human life without a cause sufficient to justify such an act is the greatest crime a man is capable of committing. It seldom happens that prejudice is powerful enough to darken the understanding so much as to cause any doubt about this plain self-evident principle. Nevertheless such is the case. A contemporary in its issue of last Saturday, in a column which it calls "The History of the Week," has the following, in reference to the trial of Kelly for the murder of Talbot:—"Meanwhile we are waiting for

the verdict which shall say whether or not twelve Irishmen can be found who believe that Robert Kelly killed Talbot, or whether it is a moral crime at all to rid the earth of an informer." The first part of the sentence is for the jury unparalled to try Kelly, and we leave it to them to decide: our business is with the second clause. Plainly this writer believes that we have become at last a nation of Thugs. It would be a sad state of things, indeed, if twelve men could not be found in Ireland who believe that it is a crime to rid the earth of an informer. Bloodthirstiness is not one of the characteristics of our race. Thank God, murder is a rare crime in this country. We have our faults as a nation, but a thirst for blood is not one of them. We should be the last to wish the liberty of the press in any way curtailed: we like to see the "Fourth estate" in possession of the fullest freedom, but we regret to see that liberty abused. We must admit that it is a gross abuse of this liberty to preach up the doctrine that it is right to assassinate an informer. The crime of assassination is one that society abhors—that civilization detests. If such crime be not held in the greatest abhorrence no man's life is safe, be his merits what they may. There are certain cases when "killing is no murder." The officers of justice can execute a criminal who has been condemned to death by the laws of his country. Soldiers in a just war can slay the enemy without contracting the guilt of murder, and in self-defence every man is at liberty to protect himself even by taking the life of his assailant when his own life is in danger. Most moralists even allow that a thief who attempts to steal a valuable article of property can be lawfully slain when there is no other means of preventing the robbery. Beyond these cases we think no man is justified in taking the life of a fellow-creature. The Creator has spoken very plainly, and to the point, in the words "Thou shalt not kill;" and moralists and jurists have been as accurate as unanimous in explaining what exceptions this general rule "Thou shalt not kill," admits of. One might guess from beginning to end all the writings of divines or of moralists who enjoy any authority or reputation, without being able to find a single one who will admit that a private individual is ever justified in taking the life of a bad man—whether tyrant or informer, or other evil-doer—for the purpose of ridding the world of such an innumerable. An informer is, no doubt, a degraded wretch whose hands are sometimes stained with blood, and society justly holds such a character in detestation; but no amount of moral turpitude will justify a private individual in slaying the wretch. We do not believe that any man whose moral education extends beyond decent paganism would attempt to justify such summary execution of justice upon an informer. Two things are particularly necessary to the comfort and happiness of civilised life—security of life, and security of property. Where these are wanting there is stagnation, and disorder, and immorality. These two things every executive power that deserves the name must secure. It is useless to expect these two boons to society if private individuals can lawfully take in hand the punishment of the guilty. We must contemplate the results of such a state of things. If ideas of this sort once get into the heads of a people, a state of barbarism would shortly set in. Our country would be soon as degraded as Mexico or Sicily, and life as insecure as in these unhappy states. It is far better to have a swarm of informers hanging about us than a horde of bravos and cut-throats armed with pistol and bowie-knife swaggering under our noses. We protest against openly preaching up the doctrine that it is lawful to shoot an informer. Such hideous doctrine is condemned by the laws of God and man and its practice would lead speedily to the utter demoralisation of the Irish people. We are not ignorant that the English press has sometimes styled the Irish a nation of Thugs. We expect no better treatment from our enemies; but every sincere and patriotic Irishman must regret to see Irish journals playing into the hands of the enemy. If Irishmen preach up the doctrine that it is right and just to kill an informer, and occasionally put his pernicious doctrine into practice, we shall be no longer able to refute the calumnies of our enemies, for facts are stubborn things and not easily ignored.

The Gazette of Tuesday contains a proclamation, signed by the Commander of the Forces and Baron Denys, extending the provisions of part one of the Protection of Life and Property Act to parts of the county of Meath. The present proclamation puts in force to-day, the 8th November, the operations of the Act we have mentioned in the baronies of Lower Kells and Upper Kells, and portions of the barony of Lower Navan.

THE CHRISTIAN BROTHERS ON THEIR TRIAL.—Scarcely a day passes, observes the Weekly Freeman, without a leader or letter appearing in the Times itself, in most of which a very marked hostility is exhibited to the fair and reasonable educational demands of the Irish people. One of these communications to the Times is from a certain Mr. Hawkins, of Oxford. That gentleman adopts the sensational phrase of the Times, and declares the question to be between "education controlled by the State and education controlled by the priesthood." If, the writer continues, the education of youth is handed over to the priesthood, the books used in the schools will be those of the Christian Brothers. Those books Mr. Hawkins assails with that bitterness and ferocity which appear to be inevitable when the Catholic people of Ireland are to be assailed in the columns of the Times. The writer alleges that the lessons of the Christian Brothers' school-books, and notably those contained in the "Fourth Book," are calculated to inculcate "superstition" and "treasonable morality." Now as to the superstition, that charge is dismissed with very great ease. The extracts quoted from the Christian Brothers' Manuals by Mr. Hawkins are simply embodiments of the teaching of the Catholic Church. That teaching may, in Mr. Hawkins's opinion, be superstition, but it is not so regarded by some two hundred millions of human beings. Whether, however, it be superstition or not, surely Mr. Hawkins does not imagine that Catholics, when teaching religion to their children, are to teach any creed but their own. Nothing could be more natural than that in a purely Episcopalian school, children should be taught Episcopalian doctrine; nothing more natural than that in a purely Baptist school children should be taught the peculiar tenets of their creed; but when in purely Catholic schools an attempt is made to teach Catholic children Catholic doctrine, bigots of the Hawkins type are at once up in arms, raising the war-cry of superstition, and declaring, as this sapient person does, that "the priests must be met with steel instead of gold," a sentiment equally Christian and sensible. With regard to the charge of inculcating a "treasonable morality," that is chiefly based on the following passage taken from the Fourth Book of the Christian Brothers:—"They were for the time forced to yield to the just demands of the Irish nation, but their thirst for dominion over this Island and for control over her purse and her resources was by no means quenched. To effect this (i.e., the Union) a policy equally deep and wicked was pursued. A violent persecution, accompanied in several instances with personal torture, was set on foot against the Catholics. Pitt and his Irish agent, Castlereagh, in extinguishing that senate which had lasted six centuries; which had like all other human assemblies often grievously erred, but which had also shown that its existence was essential to the greatness, the dignity, the prosperity, and the happiness of Ireland." Now, this may be not quite a pleasant passage for English ears, but that it is perfectly true no man who has given the most cursory attention to our national record can deny. It is as certain as that the earth moves round the sun that to compass the Union, a policy equally deep and wicked was adopted—that that policy had as handicmaid Slaughter and Torture—that the accused compact which deprived Ireland of her nationality was written in treachery and sealed in blood. These facts are, we repeat, not very pleasant, but they are true, and the question is whether we are to teach our children what is pleasant or what is true. We may indeed meet the difficulty, as the Board of National Education did in their school-books—namely, by coolly ignoring the history, the language, the very existence of Ireland, by never alluding one single line to a land beautiful beyond all nations, to a history chequered but not inglorious, to historic monuments such as the noble pile that crowns the Rock of Cashel, to a folk-lore rich in suggestiveness and beauty, to deeds of heroism, of endurance, and of faith which may well match the brightest exploits recorded in the pages of Matthew Paris or Froissart. All these the National School-books ignore, and the Irish boy or the Irish girl searches through them in vain for what has been, and ever will be the noblest object of the patriot's study, the history of his fatherland. What would be said of a Scotch school system which ignored the deeds of Wallace or Bruce, and which consigned to oblivion the days of Bannockburn and Arden Moor? But when Irishmen care to teach Irish children the salient and unquestioned facts of Irish history, their morality is stigmatised as treasonable, and their conduct as seditious. We tell Mr. Hawkins, whoever he is, that no system of education will ever prosper in Ireland which is not in the highest sense national—is not conceived, as the Christian Brothers' system is, in strict accordance with the history, wants, and ideas of Ireland—is not, in a word, "pure and racy of the soil."

Accident on the Bannock Railway.—An accident productive of injury to three persons occurred on

habit of the devotions and the cherished symbols of their faith being interdicted, by any undue influence, our conventual schools are as free from the official and intrusive visits of board inspectors as those of the Christian Brothers throughout Ireland. Those who can make such pecuniary sacrifices as six hundred pounds yearly, or twelve thousand for the last twenty years, need not, with God's assistance, entertain any fears that any Government will succeed in its threatened attempt to establish a Godless education.

"Whilst the parents thus strive, by a sound Catholic education, to protect the integrity of the faith of their children, they will not be less solicitous, we trust, to discharge the duties of charity. They are kindred virtues, and may be deemed—one the parent and the other the offspring—in relation to each other. Yes, the virtue of charity, in all its fullness, was manifested to the world when the knowledge of His only begotten Son, issuing from the bosom of the eternal Father, was revealed to mankind. Hence the close connection between both virtues of faith and charity; and hence, although there are some records of magnificent instances of benevolence springing from feelings of humanity alone, as a general rule it is only when faith as the source is vigorous and active, the streams of charity are found to flow in greatest abundance. As a striking illustration of this truth we have but to refer to the contrast between the pagan and Christian world—the one so selfish and barren of benevolent works, and the other so self-denying, pouring forth its treasures for the relief of every form of misery under which our fellow creatures may happen to labour."

A police party made search for fire arms in some houses in the vicinity of Westport last week. They failed to discover any. The authorities were no doubt acting on the information of an informer. "The operations of the informer Moran in Westport not very long since should prove a warning to credulous and unwise youths there and elsewhere. Drink leads many persons into the traps of informers and others whose evil plans impose searches, imprisonments, and apprehension upon innocent, industrious men. We have been told, and we have no reason to doubt our informant, that spies are busy at this season, and that among their many deceitful ways may be observed a pretended disregard for life and civil and religious authority. —Juno Examiner.

The Gazette of Tuesday contains a proclamation, signed by the Commander of the Forces and Baron Denys, extending the provisions of part one of the Protection of Life and Property Act to parts of the county of Meath. The present proclamation puts in force to-day, the 8th November, the operations of the Act we have mentioned in the baronies of Lower Kells and Upper Kells, and portions of the barony of Lower Navan.

THE CHRISTIAN BROTHERS ON THEIR TRIAL.—Scarcely a day passes, observes the Weekly Freeman, without a leader or letter appearing in the Times itself, in most of which a very marked hostility is exhibited to the fair and reasonable educational demands of the Irish people. One of these communications to the Times is from a certain Mr. Hawkins, of Oxford. That gentleman adopts the sensational phrase of the Times, and declares the question to be between "education controlled by the State and education controlled by the priesthood." If, the writer continues, the education of youth is handed over to the priesthood, the books used in the schools will be those of the Christian Brothers. Those books Mr. Hawkins assails with that bitterness and ferocity which appear to be inevitable when the Catholic people of Ireland are to be assailed in the columns of the Times. The writer alleges that the lessons of the Christian Brothers' school-books, and notably those contained in the "Fourth Book," are calculated to inculcate "superstition" and "treasonable morality." Now as to the superstition, that charge is dismissed with very great ease. The extracts quoted from the Christian Brothers' Manuals by Mr. Hawkins are simply embodiments of the teaching of the Catholic Church. That teaching may, in Mr. Hawkins's opinion, be superstition, but it is not so regarded by some two hundred millions of human beings. Whether, however, it be superstition or not, surely Mr. Hawkins does not imagine that Catholics, when teaching religion to their children, are to teach any creed but their own. Nothing could be more natural than that in a purely Episcopalian school, children should be taught Episcopalian doctrine; nothing more natural than that in a purely Baptist school children should be taught the peculiar tenets of their creed; but when in purely Catholic schools an attempt is made to teach Catholic children Catholic doctrine, bigots of the Hawkins type are at once up in arms, raising the war-cry of superstition, and declaring, as this sapient person does, that "the priests must be met with steel instead of gold," a sentiment equally Christian and sensible. With regard to the charge of inculcating a "treasonable morality," that is chiefly based on the following passage taken from the Fourth Book of the Christian Brothers:—"They were for the time forced to yield to the just demands of the Irish nation, but their thirst for dominion over this Island and for control over her purse and her resources was by no means quenched. To effect this (i.e., the Union) a policy equally deep and wicked was pursued. A violent persecution, accompanied in several instances with personal torture, was set on foot against the Catholics. Pitt and his Irish agent, Castlereagh, in extinguishing that senate which had lasted six centuries; which had like all other human assemblies often grievously erred, but which had also shown that its existence was essential to the greatness, the dignity, the prosperity, and the happiness of Ireland." Now, this may be not quite a pleasant passage for English ears, but that it is perfectly true no man who has given the most cursory attention to our national record can deny. It is as certain as that the earth moves round the sun that to compass the Union, a policy equally deep and wicked was adopted—that that policy had as handicmaid Slaughter and Torture—that the accused compact which deprived Ireland of her nationality was written in treachery and sealed in blood. These facts are, we repeat, not very pleasant, but they are true, and the question is whether we are to teach our children what is pleasant or what is true. We may indeed meet the difficulty, as the Board of National Education did in their school-books—namely, by coolly ignoring the history, the language, the very existence of Ireland, by never alluding one single line to a land beautiful beyond all nations, to a history chequered but not inglorious, to historic monuments such as the noble pile that crowns the Rock of Cashel, to a folk-lore rich in suggestiveness and beauty, to deeds of heroism, of endurance, and of faith which may well match the brightest exploits recorded in the pages of Matthew Paris or Froissart. All these the National School-books ignore, and the Irish boy or the Irish girl searches through them in vain for what has been, and ever will be the noblest object of the patriot's study, the history of his fatherland. What would be said of a Scotch school system which ignored the deeds of Wallace or Bruce, and which consigned to oblivion the days of Bannockburn and Arden Moor? But when Irishmen care to teach Irish children the salient and unquestioned facts of Irish history, their morality is stigmatised as treasonable, and their conduct as seditious. We tell Mr. Hawkins, whoever he is, that no system of education will ever prosper in Ireland which is not in the highest sense national—is not conceived, as the Christian Brothers' system is, in strict accordance with the history, wants, and ideas of Ireland—is not, in a word, "pure and racy of the soil."

IRISH INTELLIGENCE.

THE ARCHAEOLOGICAL TRIP OF EDUCATION.—The following is an extract from the Pastoral Letter of his Grace the Most Rev. Dr. MacHale, Lord Archbishop of Tuam, addressed to the Catholic Clergy and laity of the Diocese of Tuam and read in all the churches on Sunday, the 12th of November.

"The question of the education of the Catholic youth of Ireland under the hallowed guardianship of religion has been at length felt by all classes to be one of vital importance, arduous, as it has done, in opposing and determined ranks, the patrons of exclusive secular instruction on the one side, and the champions of the denominational education of the Catholic Church on the other. There is no longer any room for that unmeaning and worthless class, who are continually talking of neutral ground, as if there could be neutrality on the grave and momentous question of religion—indifferent as they appear to the words of our Divine Redeemer, that 'He who is not for Me is against Me;' clearly meaning that the faithful should be ranked among its enemies. It is astonishing to reflect what a slight impression the lessons of history seem to have made on the minds of statesmen who can dream of ever reconciling the people of Ireland to their hobby of a secular, or, in other words, an infidel education. Our predecessors made far greater sacrifices for the faith than we are called on to make; nor can we forget that it was to protect their own faith and that of their children in its purity, the Irish people so long and so courageously endured the terrible infliction of that sanguinary penal code which Edmund Burke indignantly denounced as exceeding in atrocity the ten pagan persecutions.

"You will, then, both clergy and people, show by your resolute attitude that it is in vain any Minister of her Majesty's Government should attempt to impose upon this country a system of alien and un-Christian education. When these Godless colleges, which in despite of a profligate patronage, have been comparatively abortive, were then established, we ourselves did not hesitate to undertake a distant, and then a most inconvenient, and always an expensive journey, to lay before the Holy Father the fears and alarms for our faith, which those institutions justly excited, and to pray for his powerful protection. And it was most consoling to us to return with the glad tidings that the successor of St. Peter, the unerring oracle of truth, had pronounced them as intrinsically dangerous to faith and morals—a verdict, which from the withering effect of which they shall never recover. Is it then when their drooping and almost desolate condition bears evidence that their doom is sealed like that of the charter schools, we are to be silent when threatened by a Prime Minister with a further extension of this Godless education? They know but little of the unrequitable attachment of our people to their faith if they imagine that it is not prized by them beyond any money that might be offered for its destruction. Nor am I without the aid of unquestionable facts to bear me out in this assertion. There are in this diocese six convents with conventual schools in which large numbers of the poorest of our children are educated. Had those schools been in connection with the National Board, six hundred pounds, or one hundred annually for each, would be the smallest subsidy they should expect from their connection. Yet, rather than familiarise the children to the

Accident on the Bannock Railway.—An accident productive of injury to three persons occurred on