time, trouble should fall upon you, or you brother and sister of England may not have it selves and professing the same faith." in their power to confer, then forget not that in sion to seek the aid of Louis of France.

With reverent gratitude, for she thought she might in some way aid her royal mistress through the monarch, Florence raised to her lips the hand of le Grand Monurque, and with deep emotion, faltering out her thanks, fell into the little train which had accompanied the royal exiles from St. Germains, and who, having made their adieus to King Louis, prepared to culties of a general system of education in a comreturn thither.

(To be Continued.)

A LECTURE ON CHRISTIAN FREE SCHOOLS.

BY THE RIGHT REV. RISHOP OF ROCHESTER.

Bishop M'Quaid spoke as follows : - My best thanks are due to the gentlemen whose invitation has given me this opportunity of addressing my fellow-citizens on the all important question of "Christian Free Schools."

Some estimate may be formed of the importance of the subject from the fact that there are in the State of New York one million five hundred thousand children of school age; as also from the vast pecuniary interests at stake, as the State alone in its Public and Normal Schools, Academies, and for educational purposes, expends more than ten millions of dollars annually; whilst the Universities, Colleges, Christian Free Schools and private schools of every description disburse a sum of money running into

Pecuniary considerations, however, dwindle into insignificance when comparison is made with those higher interests that concern the future welfare, prosperity and permanence of our Republican institutions. A people who are to govern themselves need virtue and morality much more than intellectual knowledge to appreciate and preserve the forms of self-government. Hence it is so truly said that a Republic needs moraland virtuous citizens.

Influenced by motives of political self-preserva tion the various States of the Union have sought from time to time to devise and establish systems of common schools for all their children. With the consent of a majority of the people, common schools for secular education, as it is called, have been organized in all the States.

New York State has as general, broad and liberal system of Public Schools as any other in the Union. Whilst the system of schools now existing has many opponents, some of whom deny the right of the State to educate children any more than to feed and clothe them, the vast majority concede the right to the State to impart an intellectual education to all

who choose to avail themselves of the boom There are two points almost universally accepted. The first is the primary and natural right of parents to procure for their children the best education they can, (and no education is worth having that leaves out religious culture.) and their duty to guard and protect the hearts and minds of their offspring, in their years of tender and confiding trustfulness from

every danger to morals, virtue and good principles. The second conceded point is the want of right in the State to interfere in the religious teaching of parents or children, confining itself strictly and solely to the secular knowledge, and excluding absolutely all religious instruction.

We shall see before the close of this address that when the State professes to impart an education purely secular and free from all religious teaching she lays claim to do an impossible thing; that if she could give such an education it would be a great misfortune to the children, to the family and to the State; that the attempt to give it is doing great harm, and inflicts great injustice upon those parents who are hindered by the interference of the State from providing for their children the description of religious training which best enables them to satisfy the dictates of conscience.

The present system of Public Schools in this State professes to exclude all religious exercises. We are ten told that this is the American system, and that it is very impertment for foreigners to wish to bring religion into schools against the American idea. So far as any system of Public Schools can be said to have an American idea, the idea will be found to be "Education based on religious instruction."

The first schools established in New York city and in many places of the State were religious deneminational schools. These schools were supported by the churches with which they were connected and by their patrons. Religious exercises formed a as inadmissible as a school exercise within school part of the daily duties of the class room. The early hours, and that no pupil's conscience or inclination founders of this Republic were not able to understand how they could bring up their children in the knowledge, love and service of God by banishing the Bible, prayer and religious exercises of every kind from the school. Hence religion was reverenced and its duties attended to in all institutions of learning in the country. The American system of education in its incipiency, and for a long while, was one founded on Bible teaching and religious exercises. The present system is un-American, anti-American.

In the year 1805 some benevolent gentlemen of New York city, seeing that many children did not attend any of the Parochial schools, came together to establish a "Free school for the education of such poor children as do not belong to or are not provided for by any religious society." The first schools of this new organization were put in operation by the generous contributions of benevolent individuals, but their benevolence soon took the form of taxation, and from helping in the cause of education they soon absorbed, through State support and generous taxes, all schools of their standard, effectually crushing and driving out of existence the Parochial schools which they had been formed to assist. As in the earlier days, a great deal of religious teaching was given in the schools of the Public School Society, the various denominations of the city did not object strenuously to this gradual absorption of Parochial schools into the monopoly of the Public School system. Indeed the first free schools provided for the religious instruction of the children through the instrumentality of the dif-

ferent sectarian denominations of the city.
Prayer, Bible reading and the singing of religious hymns formed part of the exercises of the public schools of New York until 1840, at which time began the famous discussion "on the rights of Catholics in relation to the public "schoos." Besides, in those days, the attacks upon Catholics by teachers and pupils were frequent and annoying; the reading books contained much that was offensive to Catholies, who, few in number and poor in this world's goods, were looked upon almost with contempt and were barely tolerated. They had only a small number of schools of their own, and perhaps not over five thousand children in Catholic schools in the entire State. I may here remark that the German emigration had scarcely begun at that date.

Before the controversy had got fairly under way, and before the violent and fanatic bigotry of the masses had been excited, Gov. Seward in his annual message to the Legislature, in 1840, inserted these remarkable words:

"The children of foreigners, found in great numbers in our populous cities and towns, and in the vicinity of our public works, are too often deprived of the advantages of our system of public education, in consequence of prejudices arising from difference of language or religion. It ought never to be forgotten that the public welfare is as deeply concerned oughly fit to attain it. To turn the hearts of the however, the Minister received the news from Irc- nobler condition than any they have filled for the

Turenne, so bear in mind that if, at any future in their education as in that of our own children. I do not hesitate, therefore, to recommend the estab-lishment of schools in which they may be instructed should require some favor granted, which my by teachers speaking the same language with them-

Gov. Seward speedily gave way before the clamor that hour of need or distress you have permis-sion to seek the sid of Louis of France. but he was in advance of the people.

John C. Spencer, Secretary of State, described by S. S. Randall, in his history of the "Common School System" as a remarkable man, "possessed of transcendent intellectual endowments and unimpeachable moral worth," * * * possessed of a mind a gigantic in its comprehension and microscopic in its accuracy," made a report to the Legislature of 1841, in which, whilst stating clearly and boldly the diffimunity divided up into many religious denominations, gave the only solution that is possible:

"On this principle of what may be termed absolute non-intervention may we rely to remove all the apparent difficulties which surround the subject under consideration. In the theory of the Common School law which governs the whole State except the City of New York, it is fully and entirely maintained and in the administration of that law it is sacredly observed. No officer among the thousands having charge of our Common Schools thinks of opposing by any authoritative direction respecting the nature or extent of moral or religious instruction to be given in our schools. Its whole control is left to the free and unrestricted action of the people themselves in their several districts. The practical consequence is that each district suits itself, by having such religious instruction in its schools as is congenial to the opinions of its inhabitants. . .

If there is not ontire fallacy in all these views-if the experience of twenty-five years derived from the school districts of the interior is not wholly worthess—then the remedy is plain, practical and simple. It is by adopting the principle of the organization that prevails in the other parts of the State, which shall leave such parents as desire to exercise any control over the amount and description of religious instruction which shall be given to their children the opportunity of doing so. This can be effected by depriving the present system in New York of its character of universality and exclusiveness, and by opening it to the action of smaller masses, whose interests and opinions may be consulted in their schools, so that every denomination may freely enjoy its 'religious profession in the education of its youth.

These wise, statesmanlike, and truly American views of John C. Spencer had to give way before the ignorance and religious bigotry then dominant in the State. Whenever a time comes for the settlement of the school question upon an equitable basis, we shall have to go back to something like what John C. Spencer proposed in 1841. Instead of leaving the control of schools to parents, the State has stepped in as absolute master, monopolized education by levying ten millions of dollars to be used in its own way, in its own schools, driven away almost all competition and trampled down unfeelingly the humble endeavors of poor parents, who, in this land of freedom and equal rights, presume to educate their loved ones with that " amount and description of religious instruction" which conscience tells them is good, expedient, necessary.

And now that the common school system has triumphed over every competitor and ten millions of dollars are annually expended for educational purposes, what is the education which the State offers its children?

I shall ask two State Superintendents of public Instruction to answer that question. Their authority will not be disputed.

Henry S. Randall, in his report to the Legislature

in 1854, wrote :--"In view of the above facts, the position was early, distinctly, and almost universally taken by our Statesmen, Legislators and prominent friends of education-men of the warmest religious zeal, and belonging to every sect—that religious education must be banished from the common schools, and consigned to the family and the church. If felt that it was the least one of which the circumstances admitted. Accordingly, the instruction in our schools has been limited to that ordinarily included under the head of intellectual culture, and to the propagation of those principles of morality in which cts and good men belonging to no sect. can equally agree. The tender consciences of all have been respected. We have seen that even prayerthat morning and evening duty which man owes to his Creator-which even the pagan and savage do not withhold from the gods of their blinded devotion-which, conducted in any proper spirit, is no more sectarian than that homage which constantly goes up from all nature has been decided by two of our most eminent superintendents shall be violated by being compelled to listen to it. · · · I believe that the holy scriptures, and especially the portion of them known as the New Testament, are proper to be read in schools by pupils who have attained sufficient literary and mental culture to understand their import. I be-

am clearly of the opinion that the reading of no version of them can be forced on those whose conscience or religion objects to such version." This very year a gentleman residing in one of the neighboring villages of this county, whose child had been made to stand outside the school room, during the reading of the Bible, because it objected to that reading, appealed for justice to Mr. Weaver, the present Superintendent of Public Instruction,

lieve they may, as a matter of right, be read as a

class-book by those whose parents desire it. But I

and received the following answer: "Albany, Feb. 11, 1871.

"Sin:-The laws of this State do not require pupils in the Common Schools to participate in reigious exercises of any kind, and neither teacher nor trustee has power to compel any pupil to unite in such exercises. According to the construction of the law established by the Department many years ago, the teachers may engage in such exercises be-fore or after school hours, with such pupils as choose to attend. See Code of Instruction, 349, 355.

" Your obedient servant, "ABRAM B. WEAVER,

"Superintendent." The New York Tribune of Nov. 25, 1869, in replying to an attack of the Episcopalian, would give up the Bible in New York City, where the law seems to permit its reading, as the only means of defending the Common School system against the assaults

of Catholics. As I prefer to let others speak, it will be pleasant to hear what a secular newspaper has to say of a system of education that dispenses with prayer, the reading of the Bible except as a class book for its

literary merits, and religious exercises of any kind.
The New York World, September, 1871, comment. ing on a remarkable address of Gov. Brown, of Mis-

"The truth is that the mistake of means in our system of education arises from a perversion of ends. On account of the recency of its establishment our school system answers much more nearly than those of older countries to what are considered by the majority of modern men the chief end of man in our time. That end is to get on in life; to make money, and to gain what money brings. To that thanks, however, to the noble lord for not pushing it purpose the present system is entirely adequate. • now; for he could not carry it." Human happiness is no longer defined in the

words of the Catechism, 'to glorify God and to enjoy him forever,' nor even 'to live through the whole range of faculties, but to get a fortune. * And our present system of education is thorBrown and his co-workers will find to be a long urged the day before; the Ministerialists talking job; but until it is done a right system of education cannot be established."

There is a picture of the education furnished by the State of New York to its children. It is calculated to show them how to get and spend money; and its highest morality is some worldly wisdom culled from old Pagan authors, or a literary classbook called the Bible.

Down to these depths of religious degradation system of education to keep us from its advantages and to hurt our church. They have hurt themselves as Christians and honest men; they have emasculated education of all that gives it vitalizing power; they have helped to place the canker-worm of infidelity in the body politic, through the children; we have suffered in a pecuniary way, and because, like good citizens, we suffer when the country suffers.

Let us now examine the subject under another aspect. The present system of godless education has been fastened on the State by the religious peode of different denominations. Surely we shall find the principle of "education without religious hurches.

Alas! theory and practice are not always in acyou the sad spectacle of preaching going one way, and practice suiting itself to circumstances.

The preaching of the leading men in the churches of the country is excellent, and its application to the higher classes is the same; they preach differently to the poor. Here are my authorities:

Thirty presidents of American colleges at Oberlin, Ohio, assembled to attend the second annual meeting of the Central College Association, an organization designed to promote collegiate and higher education, and destined to operate in the Western States, and I think down as far as Tennessee. Ex-President Finney-to Americans this gentleman is the countries, which had been generally deemed well known-addressed the meeting and laid down final. There was the stronger reason to expect this the principle that "religion must be taught. The highest judicial authority had decided the Christian religion to be the religion of the land." At the close of the session they passed three resolutions, two of which I will give you:

"Resolved, That we note with pleasure the evidences of increasing interest in the literary, scientific, and especially the religious education of the youth of our land; believing, as we do, that education not based upon Christian truth is of questionable value.

"Resolved, That we commend these interests to the sympathies, prayers and liberality of Christian people and congregations, that our schools may be increasingly useful as fountains not only of sound instruction but also of earnest, elevated picty."

I wish you to notice that the testimonies I am bringing forward are principally from men high in their churches, in charge of colleges and busy in educating the children of the wealthy. But, if the children of the wealthy whose parents have education, have time, have means at home to attend to their religious instruction, need all the religious training that is here spoken of by these gentlemen and by others, how much more do the children of the poor, the children of the masses, the children of the American people, need it? They who are gathered into our colleges and universities are but a handful compared with the millions covering the land that are to be found in our schools and places of elementary learning.

(To be continued.)

HOME RULE.—XII. THE UNION DEBATES. In our last, we left Ireland in a ferment at the

threatened introduction of the projected measure, for no formal proposal of the Union had yet been made by the Government; although the discussion, which arose out of the moving of the address to the King, and which lasted twenty-two mortal hours without intermission, might really be considered the. first Parliamentary Debate on the subject. The motion for the address was carried in the afternoon of the 23rd January, 1799, as we have seen by a majority of one, which could scarcely be looked upon as a ministerial triumph, considering that Pitt had privately instructed his agents at the Castle not to | in a situation worse than the present. introduce the Union unless they were sure of a majority of fifty. Indeed, the result of the division was everywhere accepted as a victory by the anti-Unionists. On the following day, when the address, in Parliamentary parlance, was reported the debate was resumed with the same earnestness of purpose, and the same determined opposition on the part of the friends of Ireland. The sitting was of about equal duration with that of the preceding one; and, on the division which followed, the Government was beaten by 111 votes against 106, the latter being technically supposed to be Irish representatives; but, in reality, for the most part, the mere nominees of Government supporters, or the hungry expectants of ministerial bounty. When the report was ordered to be read on the 24th January, Sir Laurence Parsons (afterwards Lord Rosse) objected to the paragraph which was understood to refer to an Union, as pledging the House under a metaphorical expression to admit the principle of a legislative Union. He reprehended the Government who had selected such a time for the introduction of this "unfortunate measure," and denounced the official supporters who had so long assisted the Minister in resisting the claims of the country. "Yet the independent gentlemen of Ireland," he said, "in despit of all the direct and indirect means which had been employed to pervert them on this occasion, have proved to the nation that their present independent Parliamentary Constitution was dearer to them than their lives and that it was but with their lives that they would ever surrender it. There is not in the world a more open, warm-hearted, grateful, and unsuspecting people than the people of Ireland. This unfortunate and ill-advised attempt, however, must destroy in them all future confidence towards the Government, as long as it was constituted of those men who on that occasion had been so forward to sacrifice the rights of their country, even though that day should put a complete termination to the fatal project; for they might rest assured it was necessary they should put it down decisively, otherwise that country would continue in a state of ferment and agitation, every day more and more prejudicial to the connexion between the two kingdoms."

So important was considered this speech, and so damaging to the Government plans, that Lord Castlereagh immediately rose to disclaim any desire to re-argue the question so extensively debated on the preceding day, and in a specious manner he urged that the paragraph which was objected to implied nothing more than the readiness of the House to enter into the consideration of such measures as should be most likely to consolidate the strength of the empire, and did not imply that the House was specifically pledged to the measure of an Union. At the same time, he declared that, as he was convinced the measure was one of great and important advantage, "he would never lose sight of it." Ponsonby replied in a spirited manner, taunting the minister with "the unconstitutional arts which he had practised," and with his inability then to pass the meahad appeared both in and out of Parliament-"no

Mr. Edgeworth, a name familiar in Irish literature, avowed that, "when first the measure of an Union was mentioned, he was friendly to it; but, when he found the sense of the nation against it, he changed his determination."

whole community from its present courses Mr. same arguments were used on both sides, as had been grandly but vaguely of the benefits that were sure to follow, especially to the hitherto oppressed Catholics, who sympathised with them; whilst the anti-Unionists, flushed with the hope of defeating the Minister, vehemently reiterated all the legal and constitutional objections against the passing of such a measure. When the result of the debate became known, the have the Christian people of the State fallen. We joy of the nation knew no bounds. Printed lists of Catholics believe that they forsook their carlier the voters were circulated amongst the people, "in order that they might know their glorious defenders, that every honest man might engrave their names and their services on his heart, and hand should be inclined to favour the scheme, he would them down to his children's children;" whilst those who had voted for the Union were publicly hooted, and everywhere treated with the utmost derision and contempt.

So sanguine of success, however, had been the British Minister that, without waiting to hear the result of the discussion in Ireland, he had actually introduced into the two Houses of Parliament in England, on the 22nd Jan., a message from the King recommending an Union. In the Lords there was instruction" a cardinal one in all the Procestant no opposition; but Sheridan in the Commons made a vigorous stand for the legislative independence of his native land. Indeed, the high-spirited and paord. I shall, therefore, be obliged to exhibit to triotic conduct of Sheridan in all the lengthened and disheartening debates on this question should make his memory ever dear to Irishmen, although unhappily all his brilliant fame as "the dramatist, orator, minstrel, who ran through each mode of the lyre, and was master of all," is associated with the glory and greatness of England.

When the address in reply to the King's Message was moved in the English House of Commons, Sheridan said "he conceived it incumbent on Ministers, before they proposed the discussion of a plan of Union to offer some explanations with regard to the failure of the last solemn adjustment between mode of proceeding when the declaration of the Irish Parliament in 1782 was recollected. The British legislature having acquiesced in this declara-tion, no other basis of connexion ought to be adopted. The people of Ireland, who cherished the pleasing remembrances of that period when independence came upon them as it were by surprise, when the genius of freedom rested on their island, would come to this second adjustment with a temper which would argue not tranquility, but disquietude not prosperity, but calamity; not the suppression of treason, but the extension and increase of plots to multiply and ensanguine its horrors." How prophetically true was this of the attitude of Ireland towards England since 1800, and of the constant state of ill-suppressed disaffection in which her people have been seething ever since, is written in letters of blood. The unfortunate insurrection of Emmett in 1803, the abortive attempt of Smith O'Brien in 1848, and the multiplied Fenian and other conspiracies of later years, exhibit Ireland before the whole world as in a chronic state of rebellion against the English Government, and the widespread discontent and disaffection of the people remains to this day a standing protest against the cruel, illegal, and unconstitutional acts by which her power of self-government was corruptly and forcibly taken away. In justice to Sheridon's memory, there is another passage from his speech on the same occasion, which should never be forgotten: "There were topics," he said, "on which silence would be unworthy of the mejesty of truth, and his country had claims upon him, which he was not more proud to acknowledge than ready to liquidate to the full measure of his ability." But there is much in the wise, noble, and patriotic speech which he uttered in that debate that deserves to be recorded and re-echoed even after the lapse of seventy-two years. His predictions of 1799 are the truths of 1872. "To render an incorporate Union in any respect a desirable measure," said this illustrious Irishman to the bigoted English Parliament of that day, " the sense of the nation ought to be freely manifested in favour of it; but there was no prospect of obtaining such a concurrence, and an Union carried by surprise, by intrigue, by fraud, corruption, or intimidation, would leave both countries, with regard to permanency of connexion

. If by such acts they deprived Ireland of the power of resisting any claims made upon her, if thus they wrung from her her independence, if thus they intimidated and corrupted her Parliament to surrender the people to a foreign jurisdiction, he would not justify the Irish in a future insurrection, but he would say, that the alleged grounds for it would wear a very different complexion from the late." Again, he went on to say, "To the period of the last somm adjustment, the great impolicy and heinous injustice of the British Government towards Ireland for 300 years is notorious and avowed."-Truly, the man who had the pluck to utter such sentiments in the face of the Fuglish Parliament of that day, had the spirit of a martyr and the comage of a hero; and his last hours deserved the tribute of a nation's gratitude, instead of the niggardly pittance, doled out by a prince's hand, which was contemptuously rejected as it deserved. He "Is it reasonable to suppose that a country, the object of such insult for three centuries when at last she had wrung from our tardy justice that independence which she had a right to claim, and had obtained commercial only sixteen years afterwards, so far advantages, should forget all prejudices, as to surrender the means by which she ocquired those advantages-would this be the case if the free sense of the country were manifested?"

Again, he asks, what the advocates of Home Rule after the bitter experience of seventy years ask with increased force and the unanswerable logic of results " Was the Parliament of England competent or qualified to legislate for the Parliament of Ireland? Impossible. Every advantage of situation favoured the one; the other was unfitted for governing, or giving law, by every disadvantage of situation, and every dissimilarity of temper and habit. Lord Chancellor Clare said that the English Parliament was less acquainted with the state of Ireland than any other body of men in the world. How then was the Parliament of England better fitted to legislate for Irishmen than that of Ireland with its experience.' Here spoke the sagacious statesman and the true patriot, and well would it have been for England better still for Ireland, and best of all for the empire if his wise counsel had been listened to and followed. The amendment which he then proposed, however was of course defeated, because it has always been the blind policy of English rulers to suppose that whatever system they choose to adopt towards Ireland must be the best, because it is English, and must therefore be carried at all hazards, and in spite of every opposition from those who are made the victims; forgetting or wilfully ignoring the fact that the character of an old nation cannot be changed by Act of Parliament, and that the natural instincts of race will inevitably triumph in the end. The traditions, habits, and aspirations of an ancient highspirited people, of such distinctive characteristics as the Irish, are not so easily extinguished as some have idly hoped and imagined to be possible; and the now universally admitted failure of English sure—thanks to the public virtue and spirit which domination, cruelly exercised for 300 years to subdue and destroy Irish nationality, is the best commentary on this question, and, at the same time, the strongest condemnation of those who would still blindly adhere to the vicious and exploded system of the past.

Of course, when the question was put to the English House of Commons, Sheridan's amendment was rejected, and the Address voted. In the meantime,

land of Castlereagh's defeat; and when Pitt again brought forward the project of Union on the 31st January, he thought it prudent to be more plausible. In that patronising strain, half-chiding half-forbearwho were thus made use of to deceive and ensuare ing, which is sometimes adopted towards mettlesome some of the so-called leaders of that body, and those children, he graciously condescended to say, "That the Parliament of that kingdom had the right and the power of rejecting a proposition of that nature he did not presume to deny; yet, convinced as he was that the measure would not only tend to the general benefit of the empire of Great Britain, but would particularly increase the prosperity and ensure the safety of Ireland, he deeply lamented the unfavourable reception of the scheme in the Irish House of Commons. But if the British Parliament propose that its opinion should remain recorded as a determination by which it would abide, leaving to the dispassionate judgment of the legislature of Ireland, the future adoption or rejection of the plan? He then drew a highly-coloured picture of the commercial and political advantages that were sure to follow, and of the " common interest" which Great Britain had always felt in the safety of Ireland, and he threw out artful hints in abundance about the danger of granting " full concessions to the Catholics' until this wonderful metamorphosis had taken place. A greater mockery of constitutional forms is not on record in history than this pretended appeal to the "dispassionate judgment" of the Irish Parliament, when it is beyond controversy that Castlereagh inmediately set in motion his wicked machinery of corruption, scattering his lavish bribes on all sides to buy up the members with unstinted hand. Three commissioners were appointed for bribing members (under the name of compensation for the loss of their seats, and patronage). Dr. Duigenan, Lord Annesley, and Mr. Jameson, distributed by Lord Castlereagh's appointment and authority a million and a-half sterling amongst Lords and Commons, Members sold their seats, retiring in favour of some small official or nominee of the Castle, and the price of a single vote was familiarly known. It was 8,000% in money or a civil or military appointment to the value of 2,0001, per annum; whilst some were dexterous enough to get the money as well as the appointments, and in more than one instance those who were bold enough to drive a sturdy bargain with the Minister received as much as 15,0001 Peerages were sold and the money applied for purchasing seats in the House of Commons. Chief-Justice Bushe said: "The basest corruption and artifice were exerted to promote the Union : the worst passions of the human heart were entered into the service; and all the most depraved ingenuity of the human intellect was tortured to devise new contrivances of fraud." Obscure barristers, without any knowledge of law, were foisted on to the Bench of Justice; and even the sacred lawn of the Episcopacy was made a commodity of barter; whilst the minor creatures of corruption were taken in swarms, and sent to feed and fatten on the land. And, as regards the "full concessions to the Catholics" artfully held out and dangled before their vision by Pitt, the hypocrisy of the Minister and his satellites is written in the painful struggles of thirty years for that Emancipation which was finally forced from England at the threat of Civil War. —Catholic Opinion. HIBERNIOUS.

IRISH INTELLIGENCE.

THE O'DONOGHUE, M.P., ON HOME RULE.—The

O'Donoghue has addressed another letter to the Cork Examiner on the Home Rule question. It is mainly a continuation of his arguments in the previous letter. The document is too long for transfer to our columns, but the following are the principal passages :- "I expect you to say what you supposed would be the effects of Home Rule upon Ireland as opposed to the existing system and to illustrate your meaning by contrasting the Parliamentary performances of the English members, who may be designated Home Rulers, with those of their English and Scotch colleagues. The answer you vouchsafe is to refer me to a passage in an article you wrote some months ago, no doubt a very cloquent passage, but one which carefully avoids the slightest reference to facts, and leaves everything to the imagination. To those who say, Surely you have a Church Act, a Land Act, and the promise of an Education Act, and what more do you want? You reply, everything that is comprised in the two words -National Life. Now, I ask you, do you mean to affirm seriously and solemnly, in the face of the country, that Home Rule, under the federal arrangements you advocate, will have the effect of investing Iroland with any of the attributes which constitute the national life of a nation? What are those attributes? Are they not universally recognised as being the power of levying war, of contracting alliances, concluding peace, of establishing treaties of commerce, and doing all the other acts incident to the exercise of such power. Look to the United States, your, federal model. Does Rhode Island, does Vermont, does Connecticut-do any of them, taken individually, possess national life? Is it not perfectly plain they do not, any more than Ireland would under Home Rule? What is it then to say that Home Rule would endow Ireland with national life? Is it not at the very best a mischievous rhetorical flourish, the merest buncombe, the most hollow clap-ttap? Is it not to place a false issue before the country? When you declare that what is sought by this agitation is everything that is comprised in the two words national life, you use language that would be perfectly applicable in a struggle. I believe I am justified in maintaining that the great aim of O'Connell's life was to secure for Ireland the blessings of good government. This was his aim as the Emancipator, this it was that induced him to raise the banner of Repeal. If at the close of his glorious career he used language almost identical with that employed at its commencement, it was because he was forced by the events of his day to the conclusion that justice would not be done by the Imperial Parliament. After Emancipation he helped the Whigs to carry the Reform Bill of 1831 on the understanding that they were to disendow and disestablish the Irish Protestant Church, and carry certain other measures he deemed of vital importance to Ireland. The Whigs violated their pledges, and O'Connell raised the cry of 'Repeal.' How often did he for a period give up the Repeal agitation, and for what purpose? In an address to the Irish people prefixed to the reports of the Precursor Association, and bearing the date of February 18, 1839, I find the following from the pen of O'Connell:—'I venture to recommend it to the consideration of all Kerrymen-if justice shall be done us now, we of the present generation are bound to submit to the Union. If justice shall be refused, the Irish people would be the basest of slaves if they did not exert every energy in their power by legal peaceable, and constitutional means to obtain the Repeal of the Union. Justice or Repeal. We offer the alternative—we may be mocked and derided for the offer-it is made in good faith, and we entertain no doubt, under the blessing of God, that Ireland will be able, without a crime and without a stain, to right herself, unless the British Parliament will do her justice!' Such was the deliberate declaration of O'Connell in 1839. Sir, the Imperial Parliament has done us justice, and I cannot entertain the shadow of a doubt that I am walking in the footsteps of O'Connell in recommending my fellow-countrymen-for the sake of their country, for the sake of all who are dear to them on earth, in the name of Him who presides over the destinies of nations—to rest satisfied with justice."

RELIGIUOS FIDELITY OF IRELAND .- In all their miseries, and in all their oppressions, they have kept virtues and qualities that fit them for a higher and