

MR. O'REILLY'S LETTER ON SEPARATE SCHOOLS.

To the Editor of the British Whig.

Sir—My attention has been drawn to a pamphlet published by the Chief Superintendent of Education for Upper Canada, the first part of which appeared lately in your columns, entitled "Remarks on the new Separate School Agitation." It purports, amongst other things, to be a refutation of the statements made by me in a speech delivered at the meeting of the Roman Catholics of this city in February, convened for the purpose of considering the defects in the present Separate School Law, and the means of remedying them. The Reverend Superintendent of Education has not confined himself to a refutation of my arguments, but has indulged in personalities remarkable for their virulence and offensiveness, and which, if they prove anything, prove the weakness of his cause. Feeling no inclination to imitate him, and having faith in the justice of the cause I advocate, I shall certainly abstain from making use of any language or referring to any past recollections that might give pain.

It appears to me that since the Chief Superintendent of Education has considered my views of sufficient importance to occupy his attention and to call forth his strictures, he might in common fairness have given them entire, as they appeared in the Catholic journals of the Province, instead of the few garbled extracts from an abridged report which appeared in one of the city journals. Had he done so, I should not have troubled you with the letter. I stated at the Kingston meeting that the Roman Catholic separate school act of 1855 abridged instead of extended the rights and privileges formerly enjoyed by Roman Catholics in relation to separate schools; and consequently, if we consider the Act taken in connection with its preamble, the law is a sham and a fraud, and I maintain it.

Previous to the Separate School Act of 1855, twelve or more resident heads of families within a municipality could unite for the purpose of establishing a separate school. The Council had to grant their application, having no discretion in the matter. And it was the duty of the Council to define the separate school limits, so as to embrace all the rateable property belonging to the supporters of the Separate school. The Municipal Council extend the limits of the separate school section over a whole Township, or a part of a Township as the case might be. Roman Catholics living in contiguous municipalities, could establish a separate school in one of them for the benefit of both. So that all the Roman Catholics of a municipality could unite for the purpose of supporting one separate school, and the children of the inhabitants of a contiguous municipality could be admitted to the school, their parents being exempted under the Twelfth section of the Supplementary School Act. At present Roman Catholics have no right to make application to Municipal Councils to define their school limits, and Municipal Councils have been deprived of the power to allow them to unite as formerly. The limits of the Roman Catholic separate schools, are identical with those of the common schools. And, although Roman Catholics residing within three miles in a direct line from the school-house may be supporters of the separate school, none beyond that limit can. The present law is therefore less advantageous to the supporters of the separate schools, than was the law previous to 1855. Consequently to say that the rights which Roman Catholics formerly enjoyed had been restored to them by the Roman Catholic separate school Act of 1863, is adding insult to injury, or in the words used by me at the meeting in Kingston, the Act so entitled is a sham and a fraud. The very words in the preamble to the Act of 1863 declare, "That it is just and proper to restore to the R. Catholics in Upper Canada certain rights which they formerly enjoyed in respect to separate schools." The Act restored literally nothing which Roman Catholics formerly possessed, and that it contained any, the slightest extension of the principle of separate schools I deny; and in this denial I am sustained by the Chief Superintendent of Education of Upper Canada, who thus expresses himself in his general remarks on the present law: "Every person who examines and compares the provisions of this Bill (the Act of 1863) with those of the Roman Catholic separate schools, must see that there is not the slightest extension of the principle of separate schools, but a mere connection of the anomalies and inequalities of the existing separate school Act." Is a mere correction of anomalies to be dignified by the highly sounding title of a restitution of rights? I say it is a mockery and a delusion. True indeed, the separate school bill, as introduced, by Mr. Scott, contained substantial advantages, and although his bill did not pass in its original form, the Roman Catholics of Upper Canada are not the less grateful to him for his noble efforts on their behalf. But what with the public opposition of the Chief Superintendent of Education and the "purging" by a special committee of the Legislative Assembly, and the further amending at the instance of the Chief Superintendent, by the omission of some clauses, the emendation of others, and the introduction of the twenty-sixth section, the bill became so emasculated as to be hardly traceable to its original parentage. The bill is the bill of Scott, but the Act is the Act of Ryerson. Hence he may well boast, as he has done in his official report, that "the public system has gained vastly from the new provisions contained in the thirteenth, twenty-third, and twenty-sixth sections of the bill, while at the same time it loses nothing by the cautious and just amendments contained in some of the other sections." And well may he declare, as he does in his official capacity, that the present Roman Catholic separate school Act is not in his opinion as advantageous to separate schools as were the provisions of the school law of 1855. See annual Report of Chief Superintendent of Education in Upper Canada, general remarks, pages 171 and 172, published in 1863. This law thus pronounced to be less favorable to Roman Catholics than the law previous to 1855, is forgoth to be a finality. At present in Upper Canada Townships are di-

vided into common school sections. This division is made solely for the accommodation of the supporters of the common schools. Those common schools vary in extent from two to four miles and the lines in which these sections are drawn are straight lines. The present separate school act authorises Roman Catholics to establish separate schools within the common school sections into a Union school section. Suppose they do unite two sections, each of which is four miles in extent, it is clear that under the present Act, the nineteenth clause cuts off a considerable portion of the union section. In no way can a Township laid out in straight lines be so divided into circles as to embrace its whole area. True, Dr. Ryerson tells us that he knows of no common school section of so large dimensions, as those allowed to the separate schools, but his want of knowledge in this particular does not prove that they do not exist, and whether they exist or not, is foreign to the present question. He knows perfectly well that whenever the majority of the householders of any municipality in Upper Canada expresses a desire that local common school sections should be abolished, the municipal council shall comply with their request, and pass a bye-law to give effect thereto. And here I may ask, in the event of such a thing taking place, what shall be the limits of the separate schools? And how many separate schools could be established within the limits of any municipality? I ask these questions here, because there is every probability that the Township system of schools may soon take the place of the present isolated school section organisation.—See Journal of Education, July, 1864. If all the sections of a Township then are united (as they may be under the thirty-second section of the common school law of Upper Canada) is it the second and fourth sections of the separate school Act of 1863 that will then define the limits of separate schools, or for all practicable purposes shall it be the nineteenth section? But why dwell on the details of the law, since the Chief Superintendent himself admits the present separate school law to be less advantageous than the law of previous years. The Chief Superintendent berates me for my ignorance of one of the first principles of political economy, because I cannot see why the property of non-resident Roman Catholics should be rateable for the support of common schools and the Education of Protestant children, and talks of Irish landlord absenteeism, as if there was any analogy between the two cases? Let us see how the Rev. Superintendent applies his principles of political economy. In a given school section there are two schools—the one for the education of Protestants, and the other for the education of Catholics. A Roman Catholic having property within the limits of the section, but being a non-resident, must, according to Dr. Ryerson's principles of political economy, have his property rated for the education of the Protestant children rather than for the education of the Catholic children. Whether it be in accordance with the principles of political economy, as understood by Dr. Ryerson, or not, I still advocate the doctrine that no man should be forced to contribute to the support of a system of education to which he is conscientiously opposed, and I maintain that it is no violation of any principle, human or divine, that the property of Roman Catholics should be rated for the support of Roman Catholic schools and for the education of Roman Catholic children.

In demanding that the property of Catholics, should be rated for the support of Roman Catholic schools, Catholics only ask for simple equality. The common school law makes all Protestants supporters of the common schools, and leaves them no liberty of choice. To assimilate the law with regard to Roman Catholics would be, according to Dr. Ryerson, to deprive them of their rights and liberty of choice. And the doctor tells us, that a recent Encyclical Letter from Rome condemns the individual right of judgment or choice as a damnable heresy. Would the reverend superintendent please to tell us if it be not a damnable heresy to deprive the Protestants of the liberty of choice between the common and separate schools? The rule certainly ought to work both ways! And if this right is the very soul of our civil and religious liberties, dear to the hearts of Protestants, why should Protestants be deprived of this birth-right of our common and mortal humanity? And why should Dr. Ryerson be so jealous to secure to Roman Catholics the individual rights of private judgment and liberty of choice, rights in the possession of which his fellow Protestants are not secured, the doors of Roman Catholic Schools being legally closed against them?

The chief superintendent tells us that this is the first time that a demand has been made for a Roman Catholic superintendent of Education, a Roman Catholic council of Public Instruction, and a Roman Catholic Normal School. It so happens that it is by no means the first time that this demand has been made, and Dr. Ryerson ought to be well aware of the fact. I refer to documents furnished by himself, in appendix B, Volume Thirteen of the Journals of the Legislative Assembly, which contains the project of a school Bill drafted by three Prelates of the Roman Catholic Church, and also to his commentary on the nature of the demand made in Bishop Charbonnel's draft of a Bill. But even admitting it were the first time these demands were made no inference could be drawn against their justice, or that our changed circumstances render them necessary. We already possess Separate Schools—we ask that those schools be made efficient; to that end, we require teachers trained not to teach common but separate schools; hence the necessity of a council of Public Instruction which shall discharge all those functions towards the separate schools which the present council of Public Instruction discharges towards the common schools, and we ask for a chief superintendent, to preside over the whole system, and to exercise, if possible, the same powerful influence, which the present chief superintendent exercises over the common schools. In order to carry out and give full effect to the principles of separate schools, it is necessary to amend the present law in the manner asked for by the Catholics of Upper Canada. The Protestants of Lower Can-

ada have demanded further legislation in relation to their schools, and the Government has assured them through the honorable Mr. Cartier, that their demands are to be favorably considered. The Catholic minority of Upper Canada ask to be placed upon the same footing, and that whatever privileges are conceded to their fellow subjects, the Protestant minority of Lower Canada, as a matter of equal justice should not be withheld from them. In this opinion I am happy to have the concurrence of the chief superintendent of education in Upper Canada, who says, "Protestants in Upper Canada, can surely afford to be as liberal as are Roman Catholics in Lower Canada." That he believes the spirit of intolerance is confined to a comparatively small portion of the Protestants of Upper Canada. That the tolerant principles of Protestantism itself, the peace and best interest of the country, the stability and progress of the common school system—all demand a just and generous treatment of Roman Catholics in regard to privileges which they have long enjoyed which it is not pretended they are abusing—yet privileges which they all appreciate as a protection against local insult and oppression, and which they feelingly and ungrudgingly grant to the Protestants of Lower Canada. Never was more fitting language uttered; never language more applicable to our case, or more forcible and expressive of the justice and reasonableness of our demands. All the Catholics of Upper Canada ask or ever asked is equal justice—to be permitted to judge and decide for themselves in matters of education; and here again I quote with pleasure the flowing language of the chief superintendent, "Nor should it be forgotten that as long as the right of establishing separate schools is claimed by and granted to the Protestant minority in Lower Canada, the right to establish separate schools ought not to be denied to the Roman Catholic minority in Upper Canada and on equal terms." Supposing it, he says, to be a disadvantage for that minority in both cases, it is for the parties chiefly and immediately concerned to judge rather than for others.—See Special Report by Dr. Ryerson, printed 1858, page 17. As our demands are identical with those of the Protestants of Lower Canada, it is fortunate that we have the chief superintendent pleading our right to equal terms with them, and so positively asserting that we are the best judges of what immediately concerns us. Freedom of Education is dear to the Catholic heart, and it is to be hoped that the principle of separate schools may be so extended, and a whole system so constructed, that our Catholic youth may enter into our Primary Schools and continue step by step, from grade to grade, until they have achieved the highest Academic and University honors. It is to be devoutly hoped, that the Catholics of Upper Canada may never cease the present agitation until they have accomplished a work so noble and so worthy of their ambition, and not allow themselves to be discouraged by the weak and ridiculous plea of a finality, put forward by the chief superintendent. Who ever heard of finality in human legislation? When was it discovered that our legislators had arrived at perfection in school legislation? And whence did they become possessed of the power to bind themselves in matters of this kind, much less their successors? Do not the very principles of Reform and Progress, and the spirit and life of our free institutions proclaim that finality is and must be foreign to British Legislation?

Yours, &c., J. O'REILLY.
Kingston, March 13th, 1865.—Whig.

IRISH INTELLIGENCE.

THE RELIGIOUS ORDERS.—The following letter appears in the Dublin papers of Tuesday.—

Dear Sir,—In addressing, through your columns, my Catholic fellow subjects on the present occasion, I am made to feel that, though I am a Priest of their communion, I am not united with them in equality of law. They are emancipated, enjoying civil rights and privileges. I am a proscribed Religious, living under an unequal penal code. I yield to an avoidable necessity in appealing for sympathy and redress in consequence of a recent decision (Simms v. Quinlan) in the Irish Court of Chancery, which to the injury of my religious brethren and myself, enforces penal clauses of the Catholic Relief Bill against the Regular Clergy.

The country had almost forgotten, until this judgment was delivered, that the Emancipation Act of 1829—which enables Catholic gentlemen to enter Parliament, sit on the judicial bench, and to employ for almost all other places of honor and emolument in the State—was an Act of disfranchisement for all subjects who, however loyal and otherwise deserving, should dare thereafter to exercise the rights of Christian consciences by professing the observances of the Gospel, as reduced to a practical system in monastic life. I need scarcely remark that such a law of the British legislature is anti-Christian in principle, an ordinance of unmerited persecution, a dark stain on the charter of Catholic liberties, and, as to any real effect of conscience, neither to be dreaded nor obeyed. Its enactment disturbed the state of tranquil security in which the Clergy of the Religious Orders, after suffering courageously ages of persecution, had been exercising the ministry since the year 1793, when the Irish Parliament passed the famous Act of religious toleration for the relief of Catholics of every description. Sir Robert (then Mr.) Peel, in his speech on the Catholic Question, is reported to have said:—"Since 1793 there was nothing in the law of Ireland to prevent the residence of Monastic Orders in that country."

Great alarm was excited by the announcement of the restrictions against religious communities of men, which were said to form an integral portion of the proposed measure of Catholic Emancipation. Petitions in favor of the Regular Orders were signed by Bishops, Priests, and people against the obnoxious statutes, which were called, in the language of the day, securities. The members of the monastic bodies in Ireland sent a deputation to London—of which two distinguished Prelates, the Most Rev. Dr. O'Connor, of this city, Augustinus, and the Most Rev. Dr. Leahy, of Dromore, Dominican, are still surviving—to watch after the interests of the Regulars during the passage of the Bill through both Houses of Parliament, and to protest, in the name of their religious brethren, against the violation of the freedom of conscience with which they were menaced.

To all the apprehensions of the Regular Clergy, and silence popular complaints and remonstrances, the leaders of the party in favor of Emancipation, fearing lest the exceptions so generally taken to those penal provisions might obstruct or retard the immediate passing of the great boon for the Catholics of the empire, held out assurances that the section of the Bill for the eventual suppression of all monastic institutions in Ireland and Great Britain, should remain a dead letter on the statute book, and in course of time should prove to be quite harmless. That hope is now found to be delusive.

The late important case, decided by the Irish Lord Chancellor has called up the dead law to life and vigor in all the malignity of its sectarian spirit, and all the practical mischief-making of its letter. That hated and persecuting enactment has been employed to drag the venerated Priors of St. Saviour's, Dublin, and of St. Mary's, Cork, with myself, from our accustomed retirement into the public courts of law. A necessity was thus imposed upon our honor and conscience to vindicate, by the advocacy of eminent counsel, the pious Catholic intentions of a deceased friend, whom we still remember and respect in his grave, and to defend the sacred rights with which we were entrusted in the good men's will against an aggressive act of sacrilegious spoliation. Through the judg-

ment pronounced in this case by the Chancellor, we have been deprived of means bequeathed to us by a lamented benefactor towards the maintenance of one of our principal places of worship, and also towards the endowment of the College of the Rosary for home and foreign missions of our order, which we are now endeavoring to erect at Tallaght, near Dublin, amidst many trying financial difficulties.

My object in addressing this statement to the Catholics of the empire is to solicit, in a most respectful and earnest manner, contributions of pecuniary aid for the indemnification of our losses and the payment of heavy legal costs, all of which have been inflicted on the Very Rev. Fathers White, Conway, and myself. Surely, Catholics have not yet obtained full and unqualified Emancipation as long as the members of the Religious Orders of their Church are deprived of the protection of the laws of their country.

B. T. RUSSELL, Prior Provincial of the Order of St. Dominic in Ireland.
St. Saviour's, 30, Rutland-Square, W.,
Dublin, Feast of St. Thomas Aquinas, O. P.; 7th March, 1865.

THE EMPEROR OF THE FRENCH AND THE ARMAGE CATHEDRAL.—The Most Rev. Dr. Dixon has been favored with the following letter from the house of the Emperor Napoleon III.—

Maison de l'Empereur Service de la Grande Aumonerie, Paris, 16 Fev., 1865.

Monsieur,—I have the honor to inform your Lordship that His Majesty the Emperor Napoleon III., desiring to patronize the pious work in which you are engaged, has graciously granted to you for your bazaar of Armage, the primatial see of the illustrious St. Patrick, two beautiful vases, in porcelain of the Imperial manufacture of Sevres. These two vases, remarkable in design and execution, surpass in value fifteen hundred francs. I am very happy, Monsieur, to announce this good news to you. I am confident that in announcing it to the faithful people of your diocese, your Lordship will invite them to pray for His Majesty the Emperor, and for Her Majesty the Empress, and also for His Royal Highness the Imperial Prince, and for France. I am, with the most profound respect,
GR. OMB. LA CHAIX, Le Secrétaire General de la Grande Aumonerie.

THE BELFAST RIOTS.—TRIAL OF THE PRISONERS.—The Right Hon. Baron Deasy sat at ten o'clock in the Crown Court, and proceeded with the trial of prisoners. During the day the Courthouse, through which was distributed a strong constabulary force, was thronged by parties anxious to witness the proceedings. Outside the Courthouse a considerable crowd collected in the morning and remained till the court rose.

THE ATTACK ON THE BROWN STREET SCHOOLS.—In the first case a batch of six persons, including John Fagan, Patrick Mullen, Anne Mullen (his wife) Thomas Keys (a boy), Michael Mooney, and Michael M'Mullen, were indicted for being, on the 15th of August last, part of a riotous mob, which wrecked the national schools in Brown street.

The Attorney-General, the Solicitor-General, Sir Thomas Staines, Q.C.; Mr. J. K. Lowry, Q.C.; and Mr. Shegog, instructed by Mr. Hamilton, Crown Solicitor, prosecuted.

Mr. M'Mahon and Mr. Hamill, intrusted by Mr. Burke, appeared for the prisoners.

In the case of Fagan, the jury returned a verdict of not guilty. M'Mullen was found guilty, and sentenced to two years. Mullen's wife and Keys were also found guilty, and sentenced to one year's imprisonment each; and Mooney to three months. When M'Mullen was leaving the dock he struck the jailer, John Kerr, charged with rioting at the Crescent Barracks, was found guilty, and sentenced to six months.

Four men, named Miliken, Phenix, Mulholland, and Campbell, were found guilty of a riot and attacking the house of Gordon O'Neill, Peter's-hill, and were each sentenced to twelve months' imprisonment.

Robert Davison is now on trial for the murder of John Murdoch.

If the recommendations of the Commissioners be carried out, Belfast itself may become as peaceful as the cities of Cork and Dublin. The following are their recommendations:—

1. That Belfast, which is now simply a borough within the boundaries of a county, should be constituted a county of a town, like Cork.
2. That the police force, which now consists of about 160 men, should be raised to 400; making an addition of 240.
3. That the additional force should be maintained, one half at the expense of the town, and the other out of the Consolidated Fund.
4. That the Lord Lieutenant in council should have power to diminish the gross number of the police force by fifty, if such a reduction should be deemed advisable at any future period.
5. That the force should be under a chief constable or superintendent, who should be invested with all the functions of a magistrate for the purpose of action at the head of the police, but who should not have power to sit at Petty Sessions as a Justice of the Peace.
6. That two stipendiary or resident magistrates should be appointed in Belfast, of whom one should be a Roman Catholic.

The Commissioners, in the body of their Report, refer to the character of the recent disturbances, and to the existing state of feeling in the town; and say that they cannot conceal their apprehension that riots similar to those of August last may again break forth. They add that it is with shame and sorrow that as Irishmen they feel compelled to make their report; and they state that it is owing to the existence of religious animosities in the town that they have agreed to recommend that one of the Stipendiary Magistrates shall be a Roman Catholic.

MAJOR O'REILLY.—It is a remarkably cheering sign of the tolerant spirit which prevails in these days, that an Irish representative of an Irish constituency, a Roman Catholic of the most decided Ultramontane sympathies, who has owed his election, in some degree, to priestly favour and influence, in return for not undistinguished services in the field, as a soldier of the Pope's temporal power, should not only take an undignified seat among the Protestant majority in a British Parliament, but without delay or difficulty secure the cordial respect of the bitterest opponents of his creed, and the recognition of all parties, as a speaker of acknowledged information and authority, of excellent tact and judgment, of an exceptional modesty of temper and dignity of conduct. There are plenty of Irish Catholics and patriots in the House, who are neither shy nor silent; plenty of officers of the army who have always something to say upon military questions; but the former are apt to be more zealous than discreet, and the latter are conspicuous rather for their horror of reduced estimates than for the professional enlightenment or experience they contribute to the discussion of public or professional affairs. The member for Longford may be presented to both as an example. The House of Commons is seldom at fault in its appreciation of personal merits and deficiencies; and any member who takes the tone of the House as if by instinct, and never rises to speak without having something new and useful to say, may count upon a Parliamentary career of honour and usefulness, without for a moment bating a jot of his duty to his country, his constituency, or his convictions.—Daily News.

From information we have received (on authority) it appears that Rayne, the murderer of Mr. Braddell, died a few days ago, on the mountains of Slieve-na-managh. He wandered about for the last few years, no one wishing to act the policeman, but owing to want and wretchedness, hunted from place to place, he at last fell a victim to privation. He was buried a few days since at three o'clock in the morning to avoid detection.—Kilkenny Journal.

POPULAR DEMONSTRATION.—The liberation of the prisoners, who were tried at the Spring Assizes, 1864, for illegal drilling and marching, at Blarney, was made the occasion for a popular demonstration, in which two thousand persons joined. A band was in attendance, and on the appearance of the prisoners, they were cheered most lustily by the assembled multitude, and several national airs were played by the band. A procession was then formed, and accompanied the prisoners to Ballincollig, their native place, where they were received with every manifestation of popular rejoicing and sympathy.—Cork Herald.

FUTURE REPRESENTATION OF CORK.—The present parliament having nearly completed its legal existence, and the signs of dissolution being daily more visible, the election agents are already at work in the county, city, and boroughs of Cork. The representation of the county of Cork in the next House of Commons will involve a contest. The present members, Mr. Vincent Scully and Mr. Nicholas P. Leader, will be driven to a poll by one gentleman at least—Mr. George R. Barry, now residing at Lota, near this city. This gentleman, who is a native of Cork, has returned home after amassing a large fortune in the East Indies, and is at present Chairman of the Assam Tea Company, in London. He has just completed a preparatory tour of visits to the Roman Catholic clergy of the county, by whom, it is said, he has been satisfactorily received, but the terms of his adoption are as yet unknown. Mr. Barry is of their own religious faith and political principles. Mr. Leader is also a native, and has his legal agents already instructed. His continuance in parliament is looked upon as certain, for although he is a Protestant and a Conservative, he is highly respected by all classes as an encouraging and considerate landlord, and a gentleman who gives extensive employment. Those acquainted with the constituency of this extensive county, and the requisites to attain success at its hustings, allege that the contest will be between Mr. Scully and Mr. Barry, the result, in all probability, depriving the new house of the services of the quaint and facetious bon. member.

For the representation of the city of Cork, a desperate struggle threatens. Mr. Beamish has made public declaration that he will again claim the votes of his old friends. Mr. Murphy will defend the position he has so recently acquired, and Mr. Maguire, who will not return to Dungarvan, will redeem his pledge and ask his fellow citizens to substitute him for one or other of the present members. There is, however, another aspirant who promises to be forthcoming when the day arrives—another native of the city—Mr. John Dunbar, a member of the English bar, who, within a brief period, is said to have acquired ample riches in the East Indies. Appearances, however, indicate that the contest will be between the present representatives and the member for Dungarvan; and if what did occur, and what threatened if at the late election, Mr. Murphy had not been declared unopposed, there is cause to apprehend a fierce and irritable contest. The friends of the three members speak confidently of the success of each.

It is doubtful if any one will contest the borough of Bandon with its present member, the Hon. Col. Bernard. The Bandon family deserve every consideration that can be conferred by the residents in the locality, and from the state of the registry no one of other than Conservative principles could safely go to the poll.

The borough of Kinsale is threatened with a contest. Mr. Edmund Collins, of London, asks the constituency to substitute him for their member, Sir George C. Colthurst, Bart. Mr. Collins's pretensions are—his being a native of Kinsale, a Roman Catholic, a "Liberal" in the extreme, and a promulgator and director of many new companies in London. It is, however, believed by those intimately acquainted with the town that these qualifications are not sufficient to displace a gentleman who has established, by deeds, his claims upon the suffrages of the inhabitants.

Mr. Isaac Butt, Q.C., it is conjectured, will continue member for Youghal. The opponent to be dreaded, Mr. Lewis, who gave railway communication to that town and Queenstown, will not canvas the electors, but another gentleman who has for some years sought to be a member of the House of Commons is ready to place himself at the service of the borough. This gentleman is Col. Roche, who commands the South Cork Regiment of Militia, and who, a few years since, unsuccessfully contested the county.

The remaining borough within the county is Malinbeg, which during the present Parliament has been represented by Mr. Robert Longfield, Q.C. At the late registries the battle was fought on behalf of the Solicitor-General, Mr. Sullivan, who is a native of that town, and, being promoted to an important office in the Palmerston Government, his friends are the more desirous to secure him a seat in the Imperial Legislature. Much anxiety is evinced on both sides, as the supporters of the honorable member and the law officials are closely balanced. Every artifice is employed to seduce the independent electors, and those of them who unhappily fall sick are anxiously watched over with positive hopes by the admirers of the future candidates.—Sunderland.

The death of Mr. Senior, Poor Law Commissioner, took place on Tuesday evening under the most sad and melancholy circumstances. The lamented gentleman resided at Ashton House, not far from Mr. Garry's mills on the Midland Great Western line, and was in the habit of crossing the line at the level curving in the immediate vicinity of the mills. On Tuesday evening about the time the train, which arrives at 6.30 p.m. in Dublin was due at the crossing, the man in charge of the gate observed the lamented gentleman crossing down the Dublin road, and as he advanced towards the gate the train being at that time due, and the signal up to indicate that the line was clear, the man in charge warned the ill-fated gentleman that it would be unsafe to cross. At the moment there was a heavy fall of sleet, almost approaching to a snow shower, and it is supposed that this prevented Mr. Senior from seeing the approaching train. The gatesman, however, states that he attempted to stop the unhappy gentleman, but failed and that almost as soon as he reached the rails, the rushing train struck him, and passing over him left him a mangled and lifeless corpse on the track. Death was, of course, instantaneous.

The case at Rathfriland which we report elsewhere is but a mild instance of what has been constantly going on in Ulster. There was a riot—an attack made by Orangemen on some Catholics who were ultimately driven off. As usual, the Orangemen were prepared, and whilst the Catholics had no missiles but bits of mortar to defend themselves with, the Orangemen had their guns and fired them. Only Catholics were arrested, and the witnesses were the men who had driven them off the high road?—The magistrates would only receive charges against the Catholics. Happy, Chief-Justice Monahan declines to condone such proceedings; he saw the manifest partiality, and denounced it very forcibly. "Gentlemen," he said, I am very much disgusted, indeed, with the way in which justice is administered in the County Down. And when the jury handed down a verdict of "not guilty," he said—"The jury were right in their verdict; because they thought your conduct was more that of persons assailed than of assailants—I will do my best to induce the Government to institute an inquiry into the circumstances of this case, and to ascertain why you were selected to stand your trial here, for I believe it to be a gross perversion of duty on the part of those who sent you here. And when the prisoners were discharged, the Chief-Justice said—"The idea of having peace in a county where matters are conducted in this way is utterly impossible."—Irishman.