

receiving of her first Communion, and to complete her, hitherto neglected education. Her arrival had sufficed to throw the whole school into disorder; she laughed openly at the nuns, and ridiculed the idea of working for the children of the orphan class; so disobedient a pupil had scarcely ever been either seen or heard of within those quiet walls, and never had punishments been so frequent as they had been since the introduction of this proud and disagreeable girl. The Mother St. Euphrasia, whose indulgence was proverbial, that it was said in the house that she did not know how to scold, had been obliged to exert her authority to enforce that of the nuns; but Euphrasia, who cared no more for her than she did for the Sisters Josephine and Therese, acted as she chose, refusing most positively to subject herself to the rules and regulations of the house. She would cut short the religious instructions of the Abbess by her impertinent remarks, the exhortations of M. Beaurogard worried her, and vain, proud and capricious, she considered herself far above any of her companions, and followed no rule but that of her own will and pleasure.

From the very day following that of her entrance into St. Mary's the barrier or palisade of the cliff had excited the wilful girl's curiosity to the highest degree. More than once had she been forbidden to walk in that neighborhood, and finding that nothing she could say or do had the slightest effect upon her, the Mother St. Euphrasia told her at last, that if she were seen again in that part of the grounds she would not allow her to receive her first Communion. This threat had the desired effect. Euphrasia was frightened for a time into submission, and the idea of not appearing in the chapel dressed in the magnificent costume preparing for the ceremony, was in itself sufficient to exercise a beneficial control over her actions. For several days she had committed no open act of disobedience; but frivolous, chattering and idle, she attended to none of her lessons, and prevented the other pupils from paying attention to their various studies, until at last her conduct became so unbearable, that the Superior came to the conclusion that it would be better to send her home the day of the first Communion.

The Mother St. Euphrasia formed another resolution that same evening, and wrote, at once, to the director, of the Convent on the subject. She had resolved to have the old and decayed palisade removed, and to replace it by a strong iron railing, which, without intercepting the view of the sea, the delight of the secluded inmates of the convent, would effectually guard that side of the garden and remove all pretext for disobedience on the part of the pupils of St. Mary's. (TO BE CONTINUED.)

ST. GREGORY VII, POPE AND CONFESSOR.

In a line so glorious as the succession of the Pontiffs it is not for us to pronounce as to their comparative greatness. Nevertheless, "as stars differeth from star in glory," we may say that among the most resplendent of the successors of Peter none surpasses in majesty the Pontificate of Gregory the Seventh, saint and confessor.

St. Gregory the Seventh, by name Hildebrand, was born at Soana in Tuscany about the year 1013. He was educated in Rome. From thence he went into France and became a monk at Clugni. Afterwards he returned to Rome, and was engaged for many years in high employment and trusts of the Holy See during the Pontificates of St. Leo IX., Victor II., Stephen X., Nicholas II. and Alexander II. He was employed in the discharge of the most difficult offices in a time of profound corruption; when disorder and secularism, through the despotism of the civil powers, had widely infected the ecclesiastical state. Three great evils afflicted the Church at that day, namely, simony in the buying, and selling of ecclesiastical offices; concubinage, and the custom of receiving investiture from lay hands. Against these three corruptions St. Gregory contended all his life. As Legate of Victor II. he held a Council at Lyons, in which simony was condemned and punished. He presided over the Council of Tours, in which Berengarism was retracted and the Real Presence. After the death of Alexander II., Hildebrand, then Archdeacon of Rome, was elected Pontiff. He was consecrated on St. Peter's Day, in the year 1073. As Pope he at once put forth his apostolic power and called upon the pastors of the Catholic world to lay down their lives rather than betray the laws of God and of the Church to the will of princes. Rome was in a state of turbulence and faction through the ambition of the Genoi. St. Gregory excommunicated them for their manifold crimes. They in revenge laid hands on him in the Church of Santa Maria Maggiore during the solemnities of Christmas night, wounded him with a sword cut in the hand and threw him into prison. He was next day rescued by the people. After those contests had ceased, arose the chief conflict of his life. The Emperor of Germany, Henry IV., after having confessed his crimes, and after being absolved of simony, and of usurping the right of investiture and of selling bishoprics and spiritual offices to his favourites and courtiers, once more openly relapsed into the same sins. In revenge at the remonstrances of St. Gregory, he called together a council of schismatical bishops, involved also in simony, at Worms, in 1076, and pretended to depose the Pope. He sent this infamous sentence with an insolent letter to Rome. The Pontiff received it in St. Peter's in the midst of the cardinals and prelates. The life of the envoy who delivered it was only saved by the personal intervention of St. Gregory from the indignation of the people. The Pope then in a council at Rome excommunicated the emperor. From that date began the conflict which ended in the deposition of the emperor by the princes and electors of Germany, by the voice of the people and by the authority of the Pontiff. The Estates of Germany, unable longer to endure his tyranny, vices and perfidies, took up arms against him. Finally he was compelled to submit and to seek absolution and peace with God, at the hands of St. Gregory, at Canossa. But the emperor did not persevere in his good resolutions, and endeavoured to ward off his humiliation by creating a schism. He set up Gilbert, the excommunicated Archbishop of Ravenna, as anti-pope. He also, in 1085, besieged the Pontiff in the Castle of St. Angelo. This outrage of the emperor and the turbulent state of Italy and of Rome drove St. Gregory to seek protection of Duke Robert of Calabria at Salerno, where on May 25, 1085, about the 72nd year of his age and in the twelfth year of his Pontificate, he entered into his rest. His last words were of a divine wisdom and patience. As he was dying he said, "I have loved justice and hated iniquity, therefore I die in exile." His faithful attendant answered, "Victor of Christ, an exile thou canst never be, for to these God has given the Gentiles for an inheritance and the uttermost ends of the earth for thy possession." Such was St. Gregory the Seventh, a man of God's

right hand, inflexible in justice, full of tender compassion, consumed with zeal for the purity of the Church of God; invincible against its enemies.

Eight hundred years are past, and we see the same conflict renewed before our eyes. Once more an Emperor of Germany rises up against the Vicar of Jesus Christ. But the circumstances of the conflict now are widely different. Then many of the bishops of Germany, France and Italy were courtiers of the imperial power and traitors to the Church. Now the Bishops of Italy, France and Germany are united in an inviolable fidelity to the Vicar of Jesus Christ. Two archbishops and a bishop in Germany are already confessors for the faith. The enemies of the Church were then in sheep's clothing and within the fold. They are now outside—put out by the just sentence of the Holy See, and known as heretics by a name of their own choosing. Never were the episcopate or the priesthood more pure, independent and separate from secular corruptions. Archbishops and bishops of the Church are now in prison in vindication of its liberty in the choice and commission of its pastors. The empire of Germany is for a moment in the hands of a people fallen from Christianity; held together by military force, without the cohesion of moral unity or bonds of faith. The Pontiffs have little fear from such an antagonist. In their warfare of eighteen hundred years they have withstood and have overthrown mightier and more perilous assailants. The emperors of Germany whom the Pontiffs had consecrated, were within the unity of the Church, and their sway and influence over its internal action were intimately dangerous to its purity and internal strength. No Casarism on the outside has comparatively any formidable power. It may persecute, imprison, banish and slay; but it cannot touch the unity and purity of the Church, which are deepened and perfected by the excesses of civil despotism. Pius IX. has no fear for the undying Church of God; as, before him, St. Gregory was fearless and invincible in the same imperishable See of Peter.

† HENRY EDWARD, Archbishop of Westminster.

"THE ENGLISH IN IRELAND."—WHAT SCOTLAND THINKS OF FROUDE.—"ATROCIOUS ERRORS."

The North British Daily Mail, of April 10, one of the leading Scottish journals, had the following scathing review of Mr. Froude's history of English rule in Ireland:

If a man will write history, he must not start with a foregone conclusion which he is sure to enforce and illustrate. He must not aim at being didactic. He must not seek to write an epic poem, or compose a philosophic treatise. His object ought to be the discovery of facts, and his duty is to relate them in their natural sequence, and with their just proportions. In so laborious an undertaking, he is all the better of some imaginative power, just as a laboring horse is the better of a dash of blood. But he must take heed that fancy does not supply him with facts or color such as he possesses. Disregard of these obvious rules, or inability to observe them has proved the bane of many ancient and medieval writers; nor can it be said that their modern successors are entirely free from such weaknesses. A large part of Livy is pure legend much of Tacitus romance. The medieval historians did not perhaps even aim at truth. Rollin wrote a religious epic, Gibbon a crusade against the Gospel. Niebuhr removed from Roman history many brilliant legends, but substituted, it is to be feared, romance of his own. Mr. Froude has fallen into the same errors though he has perhaps carried them further than any writer of this century—not excluding even Thiers or Macaulay. Of this work, "The English in Ireland," now concluded in three volumes—the first volume of which we noticed some time ago—is a striking example. It is perhaps not intended to be a history at all, but a philosophic treatise to justify certain notions of political science to which the author is fanatically attached. If so, its purpose and mode of execution are not the less reprehensible, whether regard be had to the principles advocated, or to the narration of so-called facts, by which they are sought to be vindicated. Perhaps the only sound reflection contained in the whole work—and certainly often enough repeated—is that it was a great misfortune for Ireland, and consequently, for England, that the Irish seeing they were conquered, had not been entirely subjugated by the English—that is, their national life had not been entirely annihilated, so that they might have become completely English in thoughts, habits, and aspirations. But when once this fact is admitted, and the question presents itself—What, after all the mischief brought by the alternate tyranny and weakness of the Plantagenets and Tudors and culminated in the bloody anarchy of the 17th century, was the proper policy to be pursued in the interests of Ireland and England itself—the principles he would enforce and the maxims he would adopt astonish us no less by their errors than by their atrocity. You ought to have put down the Irish by the strong hand; you ought to have kept the people under martial law; drum-head court-martials ought to have superseded trial by jury; the religion of the vast majority ought to have been crushed out. These were the principles of the policy which according to Mr. Froude, ought to have been adopted in the last, and even, to a large extent, in the present century. In other words, the policy of Bismarck ought to have been carried out with the vigor of Cromwell. There is nothing new or original in such views the only wonder is that they should be resuscitated in the present day; and by an educated English gentleman. They have been tried again and again from the days of Caesar downwards—sometimes with success, sometimes without, but in all cases, except those of actual savages, with most direful results. They succeeded in the case of the Roman provincials, and the result was the emasculation of the people, and the conquest of the empire by foreign barbarians. They succeeded in Moorish Spain, and the result was the Inquisition and national decay. They succeeded in Protestant France, and the upshot was the Revolution of '93. They were tried in Holland, and the consequence was the loss of that country to Spain. They were tried by the first Edward in Scotland, and the result was the interminable wars and the undying hatred of four centuries between kindred peoples. But, what is of more importance to the matter in hand, they were tried in Ireland, and perseveringly acted upon from the time of Cromwell till within the memory of living men, and the results are precisely those which Mr. Froude in common with every well-wisher to England and to civilization so grievously deprecates. With the exception of Scotland in the time of the late Stewart and the low Countries in the days of Alva, it may be doubted whether any country was ever more completely held under the heel of a conqueror than was Ireland during the 18th century. Physically, religiously, intellectually, the great body of the people were entirely prostrate. Deprived of arms, and most of the rights of freemen, they were not even allowed the consolation of religion, and were even denied the benefits of education.

The penal laws were, indeed, a masterpiece of tyranny, which the Grand Inquisitor might have envied. That they were not carried out to the letter was no fault of their framers, but because human nature is not so depraved as to carry out in practice what it might conceive in theory. What more could Cromwell, what more could Machiavelli, what more could Mr. Froude himself have devised? That they fostered treachery and organized perjury, that they produced undying hatred, secret societies, assassination, and ultimate rebellion; what might be expected. When the insurrection at last broke out, it was accompanied with features of cruelty

and ferocity perhaps unparalleled; and those in their turn provoked excesses on the part of the English soldiery hardly credible, were they not too well authenticated. The pitch cap, the rack, the lash, the picket, were the ordinary means of enforcing authority. The spy system, with all its detestable and degrading enormities, was carried out by the Government at vast expense, and with the most unblushing effrontery. Mr. Froude does not attempt to deny these things—they are undeniable—but he seeks to palliate or even justify them as necessary in the times. The atrocities that followed Culloden, the sickening horrors that attended the suppression of the Indian Mutiny, and the Jamaica insurrection, of which Englishmen are now ashamed, might on the same terms be extenuated. It is not in Scotland, with her traditions of Bothwell Bridge and the Grassmarket, that such acts are to be justified or vindicated. There is a curious circumstance in the history of the Irish Rebellion which more than anything else throws light upon its true character, and which was too well known for Mr. Froude to pass over without notice, though, strangely enough, it fails to awaken him from his dream.—Sir Ralph Abercrombie, one of the bravest Scottish soldiers that ever upheld England's flag, was, while the insurrection was at its height, sent over to Ireland as commander-in-chief. No one till now ever accused Sir Ralph of weakness. The stout soldier, who afterwards overcame the Cuirassier with his own sabre at Alexandria, whose genius drove the French from Egypt, and who died in arms as a soldier should die, was not likely to be a dreamer.—Yet, no sooner had he landed in Ireland than he expressed his abhorrence of the entire system by which the Viceroy was exasperating the Rebellion, and even went so far as to prohibit the troops, under heavy penalties, from carrying out the instructions received from the castle. Those in authority tried to cajole and threaten him; but he stood firm, and when his remonstrances were unsuccessful, he at once threw up his command and returned to England. Mr. Froude narrates all this, and gives it as an instance of deplorable weakness, by which the "blood and iron system" was, unhappily, checked in its salutary career, "Credat Judeus!"

Mr. Froude is quite right in saying that the Irish priesthood had far too much power—power, indeed, that was wholly incompatible with regular government. He is also right in portraying the Irish people as the dupes of seditious adventurers—men like Tone, Fitzgerald, and Napper Tandy, utterly void of moral principle, and seeking at any cost their own aggrandisement. He is right in characterizing Father Murphy and Father Roche as men drunk with religious fanaticism; but he forgets to inquire who made them what they were. He gives just but sickening pictures of the horrible treacherous and seditious atrocities by which the Irish Rebellion was characterized; but he fails to see that the penal laws, the spy system, and the torturing long maintained by the executive, formed the school in which such practices were taught and enforced. Though living in the second half of the 19th century he has yet to learn the rudimentary lesson that brutal laws produce brutal acts, that lying begets perjury, and treachery treason; that you cannot repress crime by crime, or the fanaticism of one sect by the religious madness of another. He has yet to learn what not one Englishman in a thousand would now dispute—that the only antidotes to the fanaticism of contending sects is the spread of education, and the enforcement of free toleration; that when a people are fevored by injustice they can only be restored to quietude by conceding their reasonable demands, and rendering all equal before the law, whatever their creeds or their politics; that as the end and object of all Government is the welfare of the governed, no Government deserves the name, or can indeed be long carried on, which is maintained by violence, and enlists among its supporters the worst passions and most degrading instincts of human nature.

These just and obvious principles, very alien from the maxims of the Tudors, of Cromwell, of Dutch William, of Camden, and we regret to say of Mr. Froude—have been more and more acted upon by the British Parliament since the repeal of the Penal Laws, and have culminated in many signal acts of justice during the late administration. Unbending firmness of rule, rigorous, even-handed, justice to all, absolute indifference to parties and sects, the spread of sound education—these are the indispensable conditions of Ireland's present and future prosperity. The Government that is strong and wise to play this part will deserve well—not of Ireland only, but of Great Britain. Meanwhile let the curtain of oblivion fall over the old tale of Ireland's wrongs and England's folly. It is not the part of a wise physician to uncover old sores before they are skinned over; and we cannot but think that Mr. Froude might find better employment for his marvellous power of historic painting than in retouching the fading picture which portrays Erin's grief and Albion's shame.

FEDERALISM V. REPEAL.

LETTER FROM JOHN MARTIN, M.P.

(To the Editor of the Irishman.)

Dublin, April 22, 1874. Sir—I have read with deep interest the letter of Mr. P. J. Smyth, M.P., addressed to the Marchioness Dowager of Queensberry, upon the question of the form in which Ireland ought to claim the restitution of her national rights. It is an able and eloquent letter, and I agree with the Marchioness, that it is worthy of the careful consideration of the people of Ireland. But I think Irish patriots ought to read Mr. Smyth's letter, and then go at once and sign the National Roll.

Like Mr. Smyth, I address myself to the consideration of the three leading questions put by the Marchioness. But I answer them differently from my friend. To the first I say that Home Rule on the principles laid down in the Conference resolutions is not, indeed, a restoration of the identical *status quo ante 1800*, but that it restores the national sovereignty of Ireland with rights and limitations as acceptable to Irish dignity and as favourable to Irish interests as those which prevailed from 1782 to 1800.

To the second question I reply that Home Rule on the principles laid down at the Conference will, in my opinion, give Ireland as much of legislative independence and of the rank of an independent state as Ireland possessed before 1800.

And to the third question I gladly answer, I am confident that Home Rule on the Conference principles would content the national aspirations of the Irish people, and, if loyally accepted and respected by the English people, would end the old feud between the countries. It is plain that I interpret the Home Rule scheme at present before the country quite differently from my respected friends the Marchioness of Queensberry and Mr. P. J. Smyth. Neither of them supposes me capable of knowingly and willingly abandoning the struggle for our nationality—of admitting the validity of the Union in any sense except as a material fact—of condoning the black crime then perpetrated against Ireland. On the contrary, I regard the Home Rule programme as resting, just as did the old Repeal programme, upon right, morality, and history. All the Repeal arguments founded upon right, morality, and history, seem to me perfectly in place in the advocacy of Home Rule. The main difference between the two schemes seems to me to be that Home Rule proposes to arrange beforehand certain questions affecting the relations between the two countries, which Repeal would leave for settlement after restoration of the Irish Parliament. But the practical consideration for the Irish people is whether such an arrangement as the Home Rule scheme proposes is or is not such a one as a restored Irish Parliament would be willing

to make. I think an Irish Parliament restored through England's consenting to Repeal of the Union would be willing to accept either such a relation as that of Norway to Sweden, or as that of Hungary to Austria, or as that of Canada to England.

It is no question of a "distinct destiny," in the absolute sense of the word, neither with Repealers nor with Home Rulers. It is the question, how are Ireland and England to live under the same crown, each as free as the other, each equal in rank to the other, each possessing her national property and independence, and yet both agreeing to be friends and allies? Assuming that our country remains under the same king with England, how are we to adjust our relations with our English fellow-subjects so as to preserve peace and the national rights of both? Is not that the practical question for Irishmen?

It is too easy to criticise any scheme that may be put forward for dealing with so many-sided and difficult a question. Mr. Smyth very harshly criticises the Home Rule scheme. But I think the idea of the people of Ireland is—certainly my idea is—that the Home Rule scheme clearly puts before the world our protest against English rule, our demand for the restitution of our independent Parliament, and our desire to make honourable terms with the people of England, so that we may live under the same crown with them, no longer their subjects, but their free and equal neighbours and allies. Such, in my interpretation, are the principles of the Home Rule scheme. So soon as the English people consent to an arrangement upon those principles, there will be proper occasion for Mr. Smyth's criticism upon the details of the scheme. I may add that I am no more in love than Mr. Smyth with the involvement of my country in England's imperial concerns. But, except by means of violent revolution and separation, I see not how we can escape from that difficulty. It is at least as great a difficulty for Repeal as for Home Rule.

Let us all unite in an endeavour to do the best that we can in the circumstances. Let us care more for the practicable than for the theoretically perfect. Let us, as a people suffering all the woes of subjection to a cruel and greedy foreign rule, unite to offer our English neighbours forgiveness and reconciliation on terms honourable to us and safe for them, and so to obtain relief and prosperity for our afflicted country.—Sincerely yours, JOHN MARTIN.

"THE FIRST FALL."

(From the Dublin Nation, April 25.)

Already the Irish party have carried off the first victory of the season. Twice within the past eight days have they boldly challenged the issue of battle on Irish measures. On last night-week the Irish Municipal Franchise Bill was fought through one of the sharpest and stiffest debates of the season—a debate which ended in a "defeat" that was, as the result has proved, a substantial triumph for the Irish members. On Tuesday last, the Municipal Privileges Bill was moved by Mr. Butt, and carried triumphantly; the Government capitulating with as good grace as was practicable under the circumstances.

These two measures belong, as the Times of last week put it, to a triad of Bills brought in by the hon. member for Limerick to restore to Irish cities and boroughs equal rights, franchises, and privileges with those enjoyed by English cities and towns. As to the first, the Municipal Franchise Bill, which was rejected on Friday week, it proposed to assimilate the municipal franchise in Irish boroughs to the municipal franchise on the favored side of the channel. For, as was pointed out by the Irish members in the debate, an Irishman settled in Liverpool, living in a house valued at £4 a year, may vote as a burgess; but if he crosses the channel to his own land he cannot vote as a burgess in any town unless he inhabits a house valued at twice that amount, namely £8. This system operates as a wholesale disfranchisement of Irishmen in the boroughs and towns of their own country. It, in fact, manacles the Irish municipalities, and gives them only a half or quarter ration of the full freedom which is their right. Thus, while Canterbury, with a population of 20,000, has 2,600 burgesses, Londonderry, with a population of 25,000, is allowed to have only 299 burgesses! While Bristol, with a population of 182,000, is allowed 13,000 burgesses, Belfast, with a population of 174,000, is allowed only 4,300 burgesses! While Chester, with a population of 30,000, is allowed 6,300 burgesses, Cork, with a population of 100,000 (more than twice as many), has less than half as many burgesses, or only 2,000! In fine, the case of the Home Rulers was simply unanswerable; was, in fact, so clear and strong that English members refused up to the last moment to believe that the Government would venture to oppose it.

But up rose the Orange representative of Armagh, Mr. Vance, with gloomy visage and sepulchral tone, to warn the House of Commons, that there was Popery, nay, Home Rule, in this dreadful Bill! The municipalities which it proposed to emancipate and to place on a level with English towns, were, horror of horrors! in most cases fortresses of national sentiment! The Corporation of Dublin especially was singled out for attack, Mr. Vance suggesting that, as it no longer contained an Ultramarine majority, it ought to be clipped in its rights, fettered in its action, and gagged in its speech. The Government, perpetrating a blunder which elicited a groan of dismay and censure next day from the Times and Pall Mall Gazette, took up the narrow and oppressive views of their Orange supporters, and, after an exceedingly tough encounter, succeeded in defeating the Home Rulers by a majority of less than forty votes in a house of about two hundred and twenty members! The cheers that rose from the "defeated" Irish told that they at least knew what they were about—knew they had driven the Government into an untenable position. It took the Treasury-bench gentlemen till next day to find out by the shout from their own journalists, and by the universal decision in political circles, that they had made a huge mistake, and had been completely out-generalled and morally worsted in the whole affair.

It seemed, on Tuesday last, to be a foregone conclusion that they could not afford to repeat so disastrous a blunder by a like course on Mr. Butt's next Bill—the Municipal Privileges Bill. Indeed, the Times of Monday last openly called on Sir Michael Hicks Beach to fling up the sponge. This Bill proposed to restore to the Corporations of Irish "counties of towns"—Dublin, Cork, Belfast, Limerick, Galway, Waterford, and Kilkenny—the right to elect their own sheriffs, clerks of the peace and other functionaries. There were ten times as many reasons, from the Mr. Vance point of view, for opposing this Bill as there were for opposing the previous measure. Yet the Times plainly put it that the Government must knock under. No doubt, pleaded the great oracle, these most annoying Home Rulers will make all these things, if they obtain them, work to the advancement of their party and their cause in Ireland, but, on the other hand, the damage done here in England by voting down Irish questions so manifestly just is a still more grave consideration!

But what would the Mr. Vance class say? Here lay the pinch of the matter for the Government.—In truth, the member for Armagh had a formal notice down, for weeks past, that he would move the rejection of the Bill; exactly such a motion as the Government backed him in last week. The call of the Times, however interpreted, meant—You must on this issue fling overboard your Vance following, or you will lose more heavily at this side of the channel! Great was the curiosity on Tuesday even-

ing to know what the Government would do. They could not afford—in a certain sense they dare not attempt—by a mere party majority to repeat the scene of the previous Friday. No sooner had Mr. Butt resumed his seat, after moving the second reading of his Bill, than the Irish secretary rose and announced (with a few remarks intended to lessen the shock of his conversion) that the Government would yield what the Home Rulers claimed on this point!

What was Mr. Vance meanwhile? What of the declaration of war standing in his name on the books of the House?

This was the really important and significant incident of last Tuesday's debate. Mr. Disraeli had put a gag in Mr. Vance's mouth, sent him off, and politely ordered him to hold his peace. The "Ulster contingent" were openly snubbed; their wall of bigotry was unfeelingly derided; and if they tried any of their usual swagger about civil war and "kicking the crown into the Boyne," it was contemptuously defied. That they took the rebuke in no sweet spirit was eloquently proved by the most eloquent Mr. Leslie, of Monaghan, who openly protested his "detestation" of the Bill, which, with "pain and regret," he found his party chief accepting! Laughter, loud and long, and ironical cheers, greeted the mournful reproaches which, in the name of the Irish Tories, he addressed to the Prime Minister. Government had, for the nonce, at all events, flung their Irish "Maroons" overboard!

And so the cities of Ireland are to appoint their own Sheriffs; that is to say, the people in Cork, Dublin, Belfast, Limerick, Waterford, Kilkenny, and Galway are to elect these officials, in whose hands the grand juries have, in so many instances, been made nests of bigotry, injustice, jobbery, and corruption. It is a great step in its own way to winning real and substantial municipal freedom for Ireland; and the Irish municipalities will not be slow to recognize that, for this boon, they will be indebted solely to the Home Rule party.

IRISH INTELLIGENCE.

DEATH OF EDWARD MAGUIRE, Esq. D. L.—We regret to announce the death of this estimable gentleman last Monday morning in Dublin. Mr. Maguire was one of those useful, unostentatious public men who effect so much and parade so little. A member of an old Irish Catholic family, Mr. Maguire was ever true to the patriotic and religious principles inherent in his race. Mr. Maguire's services as a popular Parliamentary representative were, at different times, eagerly sought by various Irish Liberal constituencies. At the last general election Leitrim and Cavan were both emulous of the honor of returning him, and his success in the latter county was certain. But the lamented deceased preferred devoting his time to the work of the Catholic Union, and to the other great social movements occupying public attention. In the vigour of his years and intellect he has been removed from amongst us. We can but submit to the mysterious dispensation of Providence that has deprived Ireland of so worthy a son, and express the hope that the recollection of the high esteem in which he was held by all classes may soothe the anguish of those bereaved ones who survive to mourn the lamented deceased.—E. I. P.

The Evening Post of Monday has the following—Some of our contemporaries, both here and across the Channel, have been in the habit of asserting that what the Irish required was "firm determined government." We were altogether too much hampered and petted by Mr. Gladstone's administration; we had been surfeited with kindness, and had grown restive from over indulgence. It was stated that we would be all the better from having our requests refused, and a touch of the whip applied occasionally. These journals must be highly gratified at the vigour recently displayed both in Dublin and London by the present Government in its treatment of the "mere Irish." The new Viceroy was ushered into office on Saturday—by the "Lords Justices"—with a communique from the Tory Attorney-General to an Irish "weekly," for using language much less violent than what may be found every week in many of the most largely circulated organs of the English working classes. The Home Rulers of the Grafton Hall, London, have received a similar favor from the Home Secretary, and told that if they are not more quiet in their utterances, their place of meeting will be shut against them by order of the Government. We are not concerned to defend the tone of the articles in the Flag of Ireland or the speeches in the Grafton Hall. But why should one law prevail in such matters for English politicians and another for Irishmen. We are only stating notorious facts when we assert that the articles of Reynolds's News and the speeches of Messrs Bradlaugh and Odger, are a vast deal more "seditious" and avowedly "treasonable," than anything written or spoken by Irish journals and politicians in connection with the Home Rule movement.

MR. LEAHY, Q. C., ON INTEMPERANCE.—The Quarter Sessions for the city commenced on Tuesday. The Chairman, John Leahy, Q. C., in addressing the grand jury observed that he was sorry to have to refer again to a matter which he had been in the habit of speaking to for the past two years—intemperance, the great social evil of the country. Judges, Chairmen of Quarter Sessions, and clergymen had denounced the vice by every means in their power, and yet he felt perfectly shocked to see that there were 25 applications for spirit licenses at the present sessions—25 additional licenses where there were already over 300 public-houses in a population of about 40,000. He really did not know when intemperance was going to stop in Limerick. Judging from the number of cases of drunkenness disposed of by the magistrates, there were in all probability 1,500 cases of drunkenness since the last sessions.

THE OUTRAGE ON CAPTAIN HARMAN.—The private investigation before the Mayor and a number of magistrates respecting the charge against Charles J. Clancy and Henry Clancy for the stabbing of Captain King Harman and three other gentlemen concluded on Wednesday. The accused have been fully committed for trial to the July assizes, bail for the present refused Captain King Harman's condition of health is much improved.

An eminent English historian has recently taken up the subject of Ireland, and his lectures and books are a series of taunts and challenges to Irishmen. He avows his approbation of the massacre of the Irish; he declares that the fogging, the half-hangings, and the pitch-caps of the last century were all excellent. He says the Irish have been misgoverned by England in so far as they have been governed according to the Constitution, and that they do not deserve liberty, because they will not fight for it. When an Englishman trails his coat before Ireland in this fashion, is it wonderful that there should be an angry result? It must be remembered that this writer went across to America for the purpose of blackguarding Ireland; the fashion that he has since done in his book. There he happened to be met by a great Irish orator, and the bumptious Englishman ran away. He gave up lecturing, and came home and wrote his book, in which he has been able to gloat over the cruelties inflicted on Ireland in the past, and lament at pleasure over the weakness which stopped short at their extermination. When a man like this gets into a high place in English literature, is it wonderful that there should be seditious in Irish writings? If there are to be warnings under the Coercion Act let them be given to Mr. James Anthony Froude, No Irish writer in the present day with his utmost power could do, as fitly as much as this ill-learned, bigoted, and resentful man, or to render reconciliation between the two countries difficult, as this bragging and with all his genius, thoroughly vulgar, Englishman. If the Coercion Act could