

the three kingdoms, and this also, against the declared will of England, infinitely the greatest and most powerful of the three. Further, the great bulk of the wealth, business talent and respectability of Ireland, both Protestant and Roman Catholic protest against the threatened disruption, which if carried out would lead they believe, to civil war. The aged leader of the ministry in answer to the deputation that protested against his scheme, with his usual "exuberant verbosity," mentioned Canada an illustration of the happy harmony produced by self-government. It is an argument, however, of no weight. It would be analogous to the "home rule," he seeks for Ireland, were an effort made to force upon Ontario the same laws and ecclesiastical regulations that prevail in Quebec. We know enough of Ontario to feel certain that it would not offer less resistance to the infliction of such a yoke, than the Ulster men are now doing in Ireland.

The Church, in Ireland also is working with tremendous energy to avert the ruin and disaster they are certain will result from "home rule." About a fortnight since there was a meeting on the subject of the "Synod of the Irish church" in Dublin, the Primate of Ireland presiding, and the Bishop of Derry speaking in terms seldom heard from the episcopal bench. Out of 1,229 church parishes in Ireland 1,190 have protested against the "home rule" bill. That is the unchallenged statement of the Bishop of Derry, one of the most eminent of Irish bishops. He took care to add that the 550,000 Presbyterians, a great proportion of them Liberals, are equally unanimous against this measure. At the Leinster hall meeting next day in Dublin, Roman Catholics joined hands with Protestants. In the words of an eye-witness:—All that is substantial and intelligent in Dublin, all that is eminent, all that is prosperous is represented. The great hall was crowded from floor to ceiling. The head of the most prosperous business in Ireland, Lord Iveagh, presided. The meeting unanimously adopted resolutions declaring "home rule" a menace to the lives, the liberties, and the property of the loyal people of Ireland. A great meeting in Waterford, was held the same day, and expressed the same conviction. The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church met in Belfast also on the same day, and solemnly declared its belief that under a Dublin Parliament neither persons, property, nor religious belief would be safe.

A manifesto has just been issued, signed by the very elite of Irish Roman Catholics, protesting against Gladstone's bill. The petition states, "we regard the maintenance of the union between England and Ireland as a necessary safe guard of civil and religious liberty. We believe that the bill lately introduced would be prejudicial to our religion and disastrous to the best interests of Ireland." In the address to their "fellow Roman Catholics," they declare, we believe, that if "home rule" were imposed upon Ireland, it would under the peculiar conditions of the country foster a revolutionary spirit, disastrous to the true interests of our religion." Among the many well known names attached, is Daniel O'Connell, D.C.L., Derrynane."

Much more to the same effect might be said, but enough has been stated to show the duty of all loyal churchmen, to unite in the prayer for "The High Court of Parliament," in this great crisis.—*Arch. Dixon in Guelph Parish Magazine.*

THE INSULT TO THE QUEEN.

When commenting last summer upon the attitude of the late Government towards Romanism we called attention to remarks which had fallen from Lord Salisbury and Mr. Balfour concerning "Typical Romanists." Neither of them would admit that the Popish prelates,

and people of Ireland could be regarded as fair specimens of the disciples of the Roman Pontiff; but as Lord Salisbury, in addressing the Primrose League, nearly twelve months ago, took advantage of the occasion to express his satisfaction at the appointment of Dr. Vaughan to fill the post vacated by the decease of Dr. Manning, we may assume that a Romish prelate, thus distinguished by the Pope, may be regarded as competent in the judgment of the late Premier, to express an opinion on the subject.

On the 12th inst. the Lord Mayor entertained at dinner Cardinal Vaughan and the Roman Catholic Bishops in England. His objects was, as he told his guests, "to pay a tribute of respect, love, and homage to his Eminence;" and, in responding to the toast, "the chief guest" of the evening said that "the honour paid him and his colleagues that night was the greater and more acceptable because they recognized in the Lord Mayor not only a genuine Englishman, but a typical Catholic layman," who had "maintained, unsullied and uncompromised, his great religious principles, in a way that had won for him the admiration of the whole world." This was received with loud applause by the assembly, composed almost entirely of Roman Catholics, so that we have the decision of a Cardinal ratified by his "colleagues" and by a distinguished gathering of "the whole [Roman] Catholic body" in this country concerning this important but somewhat delicate question.

Now that we have secured so excellent a sample of a "typical Roman Catholic," whose orthodoxy in principles and practice is vouched by such unquestionable authority, we find him very much what we have represented such an one to be. It is gratifying to observe that our estimate is fairly accurate, and we beg Lord Salisbury and Mr. Balfour to observe how true it is that "every convert and member of [the Roman Catholic] Church [is required to] place his loyalty and civil duty at the mercy of another, that other being" the Pope: and that (again to quote Mr. Gladstone's words) "the Queen must either be content with a divided allegiance from her Roman Catholic subjects, or none at all."

We have repeatedly insisted upon the fact that the Papacy being a political system, claiming temporal power, under a spiritual supremacy alleged to be conferred upon the Bishops of Rome by Divine authority, the members of the Roman Catholic Church who recognize the claims of the Pope are bound, as they believe, by their duty to God, to admit his claim in priority to that of their earthly Sovereign. They are Roman Catholics first, and British subjects afterwards. Their principles require them to subordinate their patriotism as British subjects to the interests of the Vatican. So long as it suits the Pope that they should serve the Queen there are, we believe, many Roman Catholics whose loyalty to her throne will be most devoted. But their allegiance depends upon the will of another, and that other an Italian priest. They are not free to judge for themselves in the matter; hence we submit that they are disqualified for the loyal discharge of official duties in a Protestant country. When a number of Germans resident in England meet at a banquet we see no harm in their placing the toast of "The Emperor" before that of "The Queen." They are foreigners, and their allegiance is due to their own Sovereign. Is not the position of English Roman Catholics similar to that of German residents in England?

We do not cast any doubt upon the Lord Mayor's expression of loyalty to the Queen; but he "maintained, unsullied and uncompromised, his great religious principles," by giving preference to the Pope. His speech was an admirable specimen of the way in which the most devoted Romanists adapt themselves to circumstances. Very adroitly the Lord Mayor began

by proposing "the health of the Sovereign," to whom "they offered their most heartfelt homage," and for whose welfare they prayed. He "united with this toast the Church, and as he found himself" surrounded "by bishops and clergy and other members of the Catholic Church, he would prefix, as was their custom, the health of him, the great Head of that Church, vice-regent of the King of Kings," to whom "was due in this his year of jubilee the homage and respect which their loved Queen, with all her Catholic people, had to offer him." The Lord Mayor then gave "the health of the Pope," and afterwards that of "the Queen," amidst loud expressions of dissent from some of the guests present.

It will have been observed that when Mr. Clough, M.P., called attention in the Court of Common Council to the painful circumstance, the Lord Mayor attempted to justify this insult to the Queen by a reference to the practice, which prevails in some gatherings of toasting "Church and Queen" together; but his Lordship entirely overlooked the fact that the Church thus coupled with the Queen is that of which Her Majesty is, by the British Constitution, the earthly head, and that the toast implies that she is in Church and State alike supreme. Moreover, according to some reports, the Lord Mayor did not propose one, but two toasts consecutively separate and distinct, giving the Pope a precedence which he does not possess by law.

We believe this is the first time since the Reformation that the British Sovereign has been thus insulted at the Mansion House by the official representative of the citizens of London. We hope they are conscious of the disgrace which they have brought upon the city. We say not a word in disparagement of the Lord Mayor. He has acted according to his "great religious principles" in exalting Leo XIII. of Rome above Victoria of England. When he accepted the office of Lord Mayor he made it perfectly clear that he could not allow anything whatever to interfere with his conscientious convictions; where was the loyalty, where was the Protestant honesty, where was the common sense, of the Liverymen, and of the Aldermen, of the hitherto loyal city of London, when they chose, as the Chief Magistrate of the city, one whose conscientious convictions compelled him to avow his allegiance to the Pope in preference to the Queen? We observe that Sir W. Lawrence, the Senior Alderman, intends to move a vote of censure on the Lord Mayor at the next Court of Aldermen. It is all very well to be indignant with the Lord Mayor, but it is the Corporation who are responsible for this insult to the Queen, who have incurred public censure, and who need to set themselves right with the nation.—*The English Churchman, St. James' Chronicle, London Eng.*

HER MONUMENT.

She built it herself; and yet she did not know that she had a monument. She lived in it; but she did not know that it existed.

She never dreamed that she was great, or that she was specially useful, or that she had achieved anything worth living for. Sometimes when she read the stories of historic heroines, she, too, had her "dream of fair women," and looked with a sigh upon her life made up of little deeds, so little that even she who did them was not conscious of the doing, she whose loom moved so noiselessly that she neither thought how long she was at it nor what a beautiful pattern she was weaving. Indeed, it would have seemed to her, if she had ever thought about herself or her work, to weave herself. But she did not. Her unconsciousness was her charm. Self-consciousness would have destroyed her monument.

She was not a great woman; at least no one thought her so. In truth, they did not think