

the bill to which they objected in toto. The irrepressible Mr. Whalley created much amusement by demanding to know when the Catholic hierarchy had ceased its connection with the Ribbon conspiracy. The house then divided upon the amendment of the O'Conor Don—

For the amendment..... 12
Against it..... 340
Majority against the amendment—328
The announcement of the numbers was received with laughter. The speaker having then put the question—That the bill be read a second time.

Lord Garlick wish to make an explanation in respect to his vote. He had unfortunately gone into the wrong lobby (laughter), and was therefore compelled to vote with the minority (renewed laughter). He had been most anxious to have voted with the Government (hear, hear).

The speaker having again put the question that the bill be read a second time. A division was challenged by Sir P. O'Brien and a few other Irish members. The house divided, the numbers were—

For the second reading..... 293
Against it..... 11
Majority..... 282
Ireland ought to be proud of her representatives in the British Parliament! Instead of each member attending in his place to battle for the constitution of his country, the work is left to a few men who do not fear to speak boldly the language of honesty and truth. Ireland is to be deprived of her constitution! A noble work for the British Parliament after seven hundred years rule in Ireland by England. We regret that the Government of Mr. Gladstone should be so far led astray as to do the work of the enemies of Ireland. It is true the Government has passed useful measures for Ireland, but to what purpose is this if the people of Ireland are to be bound hand and foot and deprived of all political liberty. This is the people of a long oppressed country must feel deeply. It is sought to justify oppressive legislation by saying that crime exists in Ireland; but certainly not more crime in Ireland than in England, where exceptional legislation dare not be attempted. But when the Irish Members are apathetic in their duty what else can be expected for Ireland. The British Parliament, in legislating for Ireland, the crime, forgets what is and always has been the cause of crime in Ireland. The cause of crime the Gladstone Government has, to a great extent, attempted to put down by the passing of the Land Act. It is to be recollected that this half measure was not passed until the evil became beyond bearing, and that even now the landlords have much in their power. There is no country in the world where life or property is safer than in Ireland. Whenever crime is committed, which no one deprecates more than we, it is in general, we regret to say, where a system of heartless oppression was practised for years. The Legislature ought not to be forgetful that those who have power ought not to goad on others to desperation. It is always in the power of those who possess wealth, and have people under them, to treat those people in a kindly manner. That the Irish country were treated in an oppressive manner we have the evidence of the Irish Land Act, where the Legislature had to interpose to protect the tenant because he was dishonestly treated by his landlord—one of the Ministers of England pronouncing the former law "a felonious law." But although the hardworking and industrious Irish had to live under "a felonious law" penal laws are still enacted for them.—Meyo Examiner.

IRELAND AND FRANCE.—Mr Dupanloup thus refers to Irish sympathy for France, in a touching letter published in the Freeman's Journal.—"It is my duty to proclaim aloud how poor, Catholic, magnanimous Ireland had not ceased since the commencement of our trials to send me the most generous contributions. Assuredly we may well say of her, in the sublime words of S. Paul: Altitima paupertas eorum abundantia in divitiis. If ever we pitied her misfortunes, which Providence has at last commenced to assuage, to-day, when we in our turn are suffering, Ireland has not shown herself ungrateful, and whether it be in the gifts of even the poorest of her children, or in the loudly expressed sympathy of her public meetings—has proved that no people on the earth are more truly our friends than are the Irish. They have taken the very bread from their own mouths, as one of their Bishops wrote to me even yesterday, to give it to France. I here offer the generous Irish the expression of my eternal gratitude."

DUBLIN, May 24.—The Home Rule Association, which for some time has been so quiet that people were beginning to forget its existence, has received a fresh encouragement from the recent demonstration in Limerick, and ventured last evening to hold another public meeting. There was a full attendance in the small rooms in Great Brunswick-street in which it has established its headquarters. The most prominent members mustered in force, but did not form a very numerous staff. Mr. Butt, Q.C., the guiding spirit of the movement, was, of course, there. So, also, was Professor Galbraith, F.T.C.D. Mr. A. M. Sullivan, of the Nation, Alderman Plunket, Mr. Murtagh, the proposer of Mr. Martin at the Longford election, Mr. Fisher, of the Waterford Mail, Mr. O'Byrne, of the Irishman, Mr. Waldron, D.L., and about a dozen other gentlemen of less note, were the chiefs of the organization. A few names of new members, most of them from Waterford, were announced. No stronger proof could be offered that the Association has made little or no impression on the public than the very limited list of members which it is able to exhibit after all the efforts it has made to arouse the country during the last 12 months. It is easy enough in such places as Limerick, where there is a large floating mass of popular disaffection, to get up a demonstration of hostility to British rule, and the Association has actually turned to account all manifestations of the kind, as if they indicated approval of such a course, the promise as the federal system. The leaders of the movement know well—and some of them make no secret of their opinion—that the Irish people interpret "home rule" not in the mild sense which the Association professes to adopt, but as denoting a more complete independence. As they do not for the most part think that this is to be obtained by agitation, they do not join the society, although they are ready enough to express their sentiments otherwise when opportunity occurs. Mr. Butt addressed the meeting last evening, and moved the first resolution, which was to the effect that, having regard to the progress which the cause of home rule has made in public opinion, it is desirable that an early effort should be made to create a combined and energetic nation of the Irish people, and that with this object a public meeting should be convened. He explained that the Association was never intended to be a great organization, but it was to be the precursor and guide to a great public organization, rallying the country to an effort for nationality. Their programme was a federal union with England. They had to accustom the public mind to a question which was almost forgotten. No person was speaking of repeal when they met 12 months ago, and he pointed to a work which they had since done as indicating a powerful effect upon the public mind. He asked were not people impressed with the importance of making a great and resolute effort, not by violence, but by insurrection, but by peaceful and dignified procedure, to secure the liberties of Ireland? They should conduct their struggle for national independence in a spirit of good feeling and amity to the great English people. He stated that the reason why the Limerick demonstration had not been made three months ago was that his protes-

sional engagements did not permit him to visit the city sooner. No one man, however, no thousand men, could effect such a demonstration if the people were not heart and soul devoted to the cause of home rule for Ireland. He believed that the demonstration would be repeated in Cork and other places. He denounced the Westmeath Coercion Bill as the disgrace and scandal of the English Government, and he observed that the more liberal Mr. Gladstone was the better disposed he was to wards the country, the more overpowering became the argument that this system of English government which brought the country to such a pass had completely broken down, and proved the necessity of allowing the Irish people at last to see what they could do for themselves. He hoped that at the next election they would not return a single member who would not pledge himself to vote for home government. If there was disaffection—as there was, deep and great—he asked was it not well for England that there were men who came forward as mediators to say to England, "These are terms which you may concede with dignity," and to Ireland, "These are terms which you may accept with perfect protection for the liberty and happiness of your people?" Mr. A. M. Sullivan seconded the resolution. The Rev. Professor Galbraith, Mr. Murtagh, the Rev. Mr. O'Malley, Mr. Fisher, and others spoke, and a committee was appointed to organize a public meeting in Dublin.—Times Cor.

The estate of the Clothworkers' Company in Londonderry has been purchased by Sir H. Bruce, M.P., for £120,000. An attempt had been made on the part of the tenants to obtain the ownership on a guarantee of £105,000. Such of them as were not in a position to become owners are glad that the property has fallen into the hands of Sir H. Bruce, who is regarded as an excellent landlord. As an instance of the value set on land in Tipperary it may be mentioned that a widow named Grace, who held a small farm of 12 acres from year to year, sold her goodwill for £200 to a farmer, who paid the money without hesitation, although warned by the landlord that the rent would be raised. He has since obtained a lease for 21 years.

THE "HOME RULE" MOVEMENT.—The universal feeling in Ireland in favour of Home Rule is being unmistakably expressed. At an influential meeting on Tuesday, in Dublin, Sir George O'Donnell being in the chair and Catholic and Protestant clergymen present, Mr. Isaac Butt made an indignant speech in reprobation of the Westmeath Bill, his sentiments being endorsed by Mr. A. M. Sullivan, Professor Galbraith and other notables. Mr. J. B. Murtagh moved the thanks of the association to Mr. John Martin, M.P., for his recent speech in Parliament, in exposition of the principles of home rule for Ireland. Mr. Waldron seconded the motion, and characterised Mr. Martin's speech as straightforward, manly, and uncompromising, and one that had rendered unequal advantage to Ireland. Mr. Sullivan said that Mr. Martin had achieved a great moral victory in obtaining such a respectful hearing in Parliament for a speech of the character of that which he delivered.

THE COERCION DEBATE.—An eye-witness writes to the Nation.—"An Irish friend beside me remarked upon the creditable demeanour of the House—their courteous and respectful bearing towards a speaker speaking so decidedly against their every prejudice and impugning their dearest convictions. 'Ah,' I answered, 'it is their curiosity. They merely want to hear and see the novelty of an Irish Nationalist leader.' Let me own, however, that in this I did not do justice to the assembly, as I soon discovered; for once or twice, as Mr. Martin came to a strong or unpalatable utterance, he slightly paused, and intimated his embarrassment in speaking as he felt bound to do if he spoke at all in that assembly. Instantly the whole House responded with a friendly and sympathetic 'hear, hear, hear,' and a cry to 'go on,' which soon put him perfectly at his ease. I confess the scene gave me a higher opinion of the dignity of the House and of its sense of civility and fair play than I previously entertained. In truth, the reception accorded to John Martin was the homage paid by adversaries to the sincerity and pure devotion of the advocate before them. His personal character was evidently as well known and as thoroughly respected there as it is here at home in Ireland. And above all, an unerring instinct told every man of them that they were in truth listening to the voice of the Irish Nation—listening to a message that would one day be historical. Nor were the hearty and sincere felicitations of honest Englishmen wanting on this occasion. As I stood by Mr. Martin's side, several came up and warmly expressed their admiration for his speech, and their sympathy with Ireland. Yes, he cried—he did these men an unintentional wrong—when he expressed his opinion that now, as ever hitherto, Englishmen regarded us as 'the Irish enemy.' Not so. I do not believe the Millennium has arrived; I do not believe the English people as a whole have yet come to regard the Irish case through unprejudiced eyes; I know the heartfelt assumption implied in even the 'well-meaning' observation, 'We (English) wish to do what is best for you,' when what we (Irish) want them in all friendliness to do for us is to let us do for ourselves. Nevertheless, I am firmly persuaded that there is a considerable section of the English people, and that there are not a few English representatives too, who are ready and anxious to settle up 'this old centennial feud' in a spirit of friendship and justice, on the basis of a federal arrangement. I prophesy that John Martin in Parliament will do more to further the progress of this conciliatory spirit than has been done by any one man in Ireland for a decade of years."

MR. GLADSTONE AND THE EDUCATION QUESTION.—The Lord Mayor of Dublin and Sir John Gray, M.P., having written to Mr. Gladstone, soliciting an audience for a deputation of Irish Peers and others, for the purpose of placing in his hands a memorial from their several localities, praying that perfect educational equality and freedom may be conferred on the several religious denominations in Ireland, Mr. Gladstone has returned the following reply:—"11, Carlton House-terrace, S.W., May 18, 1871. 'Sirs,—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of yesterday on the subject of public education in Ireland, and I beg to assure you that her Majesty's Government are very sensible of the importance which attaches to all steps affecting this question, and that they will not fail to receive an answer with due respect all representations which may be made to them on the matter. If it is deemed desirable, as you describe should, during the present session, attend in London to lay before me the views they entertain, I shall be happy, when the session is further advanced, and the demands upon me somewhat less pressing, to propose a day and hour for the purpose.—I have the honor to be, dear Sirs, yours faithfully, W. E. GLADSTONE."

"The Lord Mayor of Dublin and Sir John Gray, M.P."

GREAT BRITAIN. THE ENGLISH HIERARCHY.—The Most Rev. Dr. Ullathorne has published a history of the re-establishment of the Catholic Hierarchy in England in 1851, in which is related the following incident at the first synod of the new hierarchy of Oscot, in July, '52, as mentioned by Dr. Ullathorne, and is not generally known.—"The sentiments of that moment will never be forgotten; for, deep and soul-stirring as they were, they found their adequate expression in Dr. Newman's exquisite discourse, published under the title of 'The Second Spring.' During its

delivery, Cardinal Wiseman, in the presidential chair, wept tears of consolation. The bishops and clergy were nearly all in tears. And when the preacher came out from the synod, they crowded upon him, giving full flow to the ardent outpourings of their gratitude. It was an indescribable scene; a scene so overpowering to the gentle preacher that Dr. Manning rescued him from it, and quietly accompanied him to his room."

SUSPICIOUS DEATH OF AN HEIRESS.—On Friday morning an inquest was held in Essex street, Strand, London, on the body of Miss Louisa Johnson, aged 15 years, said to be an heiress who was entitled to £10,000. Mrs. Jane Upward, 4 Thanet-place, Strand, a widow, said that on Friday fortnight the deceased was brought to her house in a cart by her mother and brother. She was in a most deplorable plight, fatigued, badly clothed, ill, and ate food unvoluntarily. Witness was told it was necessary for the girl to live near King's College Hospital until she got into the Brompton Hospital. The next day Mr. Williams called, and agreed to pay two guineas a week for her, but he afterwards shirked it. He did send her a bottle of wine, but her mother called and drank half of it. She then went over to the bed upon which the deceased was lying, and used very extraordinary language, anticipating the girl's death.—The girl died last Tuesday. Mr. John Mitchell, a farmer, living at Ponder's End, said that the Johnson family, consisting of the mother and four children, lived at Lincoln-road, Ponder's End. He had seen the deceased in January last. They went upstairs and burst open the door of a room, and they brought the deceased downstairs. She was quite dirty, looked thin, and was nearly naked. Mrs. Johnson said, "We are in a dreadful state. Mr. Williams will give us no money." The relieving officer said that it was not a case for him. Witness and several of the neighbors assisted the family. Mrs. Mary Johnson examined by the Coroner—Are you married? Witness—No. I live at Branford House, Ponder's End. The deceased was born in 1858. She had been stopping at the Arundel House, Hackney. She was brought home, and then she was in robust health, fat and strong. She could eat anything, and I now confess the truth, because I have touched the Bible. She was a great eater. In 1867 the property was put into Chancery, and then I gave Mr. Williams, the guardian, £1,500, and he has given me five shillings at a time. Sir Richard Malins, the Vice-Chancellor, knows all about it. There is an execution in my house at this time. Mr. Williams said that he had spent over £40. We are parties in the case of "Johnson v. Johnson" in the Court of Chancery. I was compelled to get into debt to feed the dear children. I complained of Mr. Williams to Sir R. Malins. Her father was Mr. John Watts of Wilton Lodge, Regent's Park. I have starved myself to give her food. When I had money to buy chops she used to eat them. She was not starved, but she only got bread and butter. The coroner read a letter written by the witness, in which she said, "I have asked Mr. Williams, 'Are we to starve?' and he replied, 'Yes, and go to the devil.'" Mr. J. Williams, No. 6 Thanet-place, Strand, said that he had the management of the Johnson property. He allowed Mrs. Johnson £194 16s. 9d. for housekeeping during the last twelve months.—She had complete control over that money. The deceased was a girl who would not wash herself, and was in the habit of not undressing herself at night. The Coroner—What we want to know is why this girl died, you being her guardian? The witness, then at great length, detailed that the property was being sold by the Court of Chancery, and Mrs. Johnson was only entitled to the life use of it. The coroner said that it was now for the jury to act upon the evidence taken. Had the death been accelerated by the criminal conduct of anyone? There was no evidence to show that the mother had murdered the girl. The jury returned a verdict of "Death from consumption."

EXTRAORDINARY DISCOVERY OF A FORGOTTEN MURDER.—At the Merthyr Police Court, on Saturday, seven persons were charged with being concerned in the murder of Thomas Davies, a collier, at Llywedd, Aberdare, on the 16th of April, 1867.—The names of the persons charged were—John Price, mason, Cynon-row; James Davies, miner, Miners'-row; Thomas Davies, blacksmith, Morin-place; Dan Evans, miner, Miners'-row; John Rogers, miner, Hill-top; Benjamin Phillips, miner, Herbert-terrace—all of Llywedd; and Mary Ann Price, widow, Stag-street, Aberdare. It appears that on the 16th of April, 1867, portions of a man's clothes were found near an old mine. These were recognized as those worn by Thomas Davies, who had not returned to his home from the Aberdare fair, held the day previous. Information was given to the police, and a rigid search followed. The boarding which protected the mouth of an unworked mine was removed, and ultimately the body of the missing man was discovered at the bottom of the shaft, and upon examination, it revealed traces of foul play. It was at once concluded that the poor man had been brutally murdered, and the perpetrators of the shocking act, fearing detection, had afterwards disposed of the body by throwing it down the mine. Although the police were indefatigable in their exertions no real clue could be obtained, and not a few were at last disposed to advance the theory that the deceased, after partially undressing in a drunken fit, threw himself down the shaft. Such an idea, however, was preposterous, as, apart from the unmistakable marks of violence about the unfortunate man's head, the facts of the boards which covered the mouth of the shaft having been properly replaced at once precluded the possibility of such an act being committed. The excitement in the case died away after a while, and little more was thought of it until two years since, when Anne Greenslade, an old "fortune-teller," was sent for by the friends of one of the prisoners, and they "confessed" to her, but until recently the old confessor seems to have kept matters uncommunally close. Lately, however, she has been in no way reserved, but has spoken freely on the subject, as also has another woman, Jeanette Beales, who now comes forward and solemnly swears to Price's participation in the murder. In consequence of their declarations having come to the ears of Mr. Supt. Thomas, steps were taken for the apprehension of all parties spoken of. The seven mentioned above were brought up on Saturday. Ann Greenslade, the fortune-teller, said—James Davies confessed, by saying that he did not intend going to the fair on the following Friday, adding, "for fear my brother-in-law will draw me into the same trouble as he did two years ago." His mother was there, and made an answer to her son's statement, saying directly, "I wish I could see my son-in-law brought home on dead boards, because he should not draw him into the same trouble. I would willingly take her and the child and maintain them." And the mother and son said that Price and Dan Evans took down the boards (which covered the pit's mouth) and put them up again. James Davies said, "I had nothing to do with the murder of him, only I was amongst the number. I know nothing about any of the other prisoners." Some further evidence having been given, the bench, after some consideration, remarked that there was nothing to implicate five of the prisoners, who were thereupon discharged, but John Price and James Davies were remanded for a week, bail being refused.

ENGLAND AND FRANCE.—It is for the cities to govern, each in its proportion, if, indeed, it be a city; Paris, of course, preponderating as the chief of cities, the model city.—The City, in a word. There could be no indignity greater than that the Parisian

should be outvoted by peasants. It is evident the country has lost its natural attraction to the mass of the Parisians. They dread the dullness, the isolation, the fatigue, the cold, wet, and dirt of the country; and, more than all, the horrid society, such as it is—its manners, *patois*, rude prejudices, and grovelling passions. No doubt, there are various reasons for this difference, but one of them is that French Communism has already done its worst with the country. It has fouled that nest. It has divided and sub-divided indefinitely that which it naturally expected to command. It has filled the country with a worse than pauper race of men, rooted like their own trees, looking down to the ground like their own cattle, occupied in small quarrels arising out of small hopes and ignoble fears. The French village deserves the contempt of the Parisian Communist. It is a petty, slovenly, quarrelsome, and very sordid place. But it owes half its barbarism to Paris, which has suppressed the natural development of the country for the sake of ideas supposed to be favourable to the glory of the nation—that is, of Paris. If ever the memorable request to be left alone had a just application, it applies in due proportion to country life. Of course nothing can be left quite alone, and certainly the rural life of France has always stood in need of legislation as much as the towns; but no legislation can answer unless it take into account the nature and laws of the material—the habits and ways of those legislated for. The legislation which began in 1789 proceeded upon the contrary plan of utterly changing the country by subverting its natural order and destroying its characteristic features. It might be that the Revolution did, after all, but give a final form and effect to long-cherished peculiarities of the Gallic character, but it was nevertheless, a distinct and definite work, professing to be a new basis, and fully entitled to be regarded. It made its mark on the country even more than on the towns; and that it did so we have a signal proof in the determination of the Parisian Communists that the country should have no voice whatever in the government of France. People are said to hate those they have injured; and it is not less true that if they have crushed anybody altogether, they will not select him for an associate or a colleague.—In England, the country—that is, the land and rural life—has been comparatively let alone. It has been legislated for by persons well acquainted with it and deeply interested in it. Country life is still primitive, natural, and in singular accordance with the English character. The consequence is that the population of our cities and towns, for the most part immigrants, or the near-descendants of immigrants, from rural districts, keep up an undying love for the country, and a respect for the country, and a desire to get back to it some day, themselves or their children. If their means at all admit of it, they struggle hard to combine the two in their residence, or in their property and their plans of life. Rich and poor dream of the country. If the rich do it, we must excuse the poor, even though their ambition must often be beyond the scale of reasonable expectation.—Times.

A ROMANCE OF "LOTHIAN"—A romance of "Lothian" otherwise the Marquis of Bute, and his family is made public in the London Court Journal, and it shows very effectively that the family pride may occasionally, as perhaps it ought, rise above the demands of loyalty to even a queen. "The Marquis has never yet made his respects to the Queen." "The reason," says the Court Journal, "of this extraordinary promise, which the Marquis has religiously kept, is to be found in the implacable hostility of the Marchioness to the Queen. The late Marchioness of Bute was the sister of Lady Flora Hastings, the young and beautiful maid of honour, whom Queen Victoria, when a girl of 18, suffered soon after her accession to the throne, to be driven from her presence and hunted to death by slanders long since disproved. The cold and cruel conduct of the young sovereign, at the time, the family of the victim have never forgotten or forgiven. When the Queen, some years ago, visited Rothsay Bay in her yacht, and lay for several days in sight of the superb residence of the Marchioness of Bute, Mount Stuart House, the Marchioness not only refused to attempt to pay her court to the Queen, but actually ordered all the blinds of the windows in Mount Stuart House to be kept closed so long as the royal yacht lay within sight of them.—Time has not softened in the son the bitter sense of injustice which hardened the mother's heart."

ARCHBISHOP MANNING.—Henry Edward Manning, D.D., Archbishop of Westminster, and successor to Cardinal Wiseman is in his 62nd year. His grace is in every respect one of the most distinguished prelates in the Catholic Church. Gifted with rare powers of mind, adorned with acquirements as extensive as they are unrivalled, simple as the tenderest child that hangs upon his words, the Archbishop of Westminster stands almost alone in mental type and personal character. A scholar, whose research and accuracy have been keenly tested, a thinker whose speculations have been examined with unsparring criticism, a social reformer, whose action has been whole-hearted and earnest as the man himself, he has won without effort the applause of the learned, and retained without appeal the sympathies of the crowd. Clear as his transparent style in his whole career; and though he did that which ever touches the English people to provocation, yet he defied their censure, and never ceased to enjoy their respect. His efforts in the cause of sobriety have been unceasing and personal. He has come upon the platform face to face with his countrymen, and has spoken unpleasant truth and keen reproach with his own forbearing generosity. As a preacher he is distinguished for grave dignity, simple expression, cogent reasoning and holy illustration. He seems to speak without effort, but it is because he has thought out the matter patiently, cautiously, candidly, and then resolved his plan. His countenance is singularly expressive, his voice clear and searching. He is heard with attention for his gifts and remembered with fidelity for his truth. The Archbishop's father was a London merchant and a member of Parliament. He sent his son to Harrow school and from thence to Balliol College, Oxford. In 1830, he took his degree of A. B., with honors in the first class; and soon after won a Fellowship. Almost immediately he was selected as one of the University preachers—a promotion of pecuniary advantage, but of great collegiate distinction. He gave up his fellowship in 1834, when he was appointed to the vicarage of Lavington and Lullham, in Sulsex. Six years later he was named Archdeacon of Chichester, a very valuable office, to which was attached a stipend of about £1,600 a year. For eleven years he remained in this preferment, well known as an active worker, a deep and subtle thinker, a ready and earnest preacher. At the end of eleven years, and twenty-one years from his ordination, he left the Protestant communion and joined the Catholic Church. He lost his income as a Protestant dignitary, he swept away his reputation as a Protestant thinker, and he challenged the hostility of the Protestant Church. "Conspiration" is a weak word by which to describe the panic that followed his conversion; and when he became a priest the disappointment of his friends was unexpressable. He became superior of an ecclesiastical congregation at Bayswater, known as the Oblates of Divinity was conferred while on a visit to Rome; and he was further honored by being appointed to the office of Provost of the Archdiocese of Westminster, Prothonotary Apostolic and Domestic Prelate to his Holiness the Pope. For fourteen years he continued to discharge the high duties of his office, and in June, '64, on the ever-to-be-lamented death of Cardinal Wiseman, he was appointed Archbishop of the diocese. While in the Protestant

Church, Archbishop Manning wrote several sermons and other theological works. The most notable were—"Rule of Faith, a Sermon with Appendix;" "Holy Baptism, with introduction;" a treatise on the "Unity of the Church;" "Sermons at the University of Oxford;" and "Thoughts for those that Mourne." The first work he published subsequent to his conversion was entitled "Lectures on the Grounds of Faith." They are worth the patient consideration and frequent consultation of all men. In 1860 he wrote a pamphlet on the "Temporal Sovereignty of the Pope," a splendid statement of Catholic views, supported by irrefragable argument. Four years later he published a sermon entitled "Blessed Sacrament, the Centre of Inseparable Truth;" a Letter, "Working of the Holy Spirit;" and in the following year, "Temporal Mission of the Holy Spirit." Pastoral and letters he has also published all characterized by great width and depth, all brightened with the noblest observances of Christian charity. The Archbishop's recent works and life are too well known to our readers to necessitate our speaking of them here. How courageously he has fought for right and truth against usurpation and falsehood; how brilliantly he has explained the results of the dogma; how he has confuted all opponents and strengthened all adherents, need not be told. These and all the benefactions to mankind which have made his life pure and beautiful, will be remembered by the Catholic world as long as righteousness shall be held in honor.

UNITED STATES.

THE SON OF MEAGHER.—We find in the Brooklyn Eagle the following information about the negotiations for nomination of the late General Meagher's son to a cadetship.—"Some time since Captain Morgan, of this city; Major Haggerty, of New York, and one or two other ex-officers of the Irish Brigade, visited Washington and made, in the name of the survivors of the Irish Brigade, a request of President Grant that he would appoint the only surviving son of the late General Thomas Francis Meagher to a cadetship at West Point, the President having by law several such appointments at his disposal. The delegation pressed the claims of the son of the gallant Meagher, and the President promised to take them into consideration. Much surprise was excited by the fact that young Meagher was not appointed, the claims of one of Brigham Young's sons being considered superior by Grant. Brigham says he does not care for the appointment except as a tribute to the excellence of the Mormon creed. Several members of Congress from this State expressed their willingness to give their appointment to young Meagher, but there was this difficulty in the way.—Under the law the candidate must be a resident of the district represented by the Congressman making the appointment. The lad is in Ireland perfecting his education. The widow of General Meagher is a resident of the Hon. R. B. Roosevelt's district, and therefore the boy can claim a residence in that district. Mr. Roosevelt very cheerfully named young Meagher as his candidate, and his father's eminent services to his adopted country will be recognized despite Grant's choice. The President's Mormon protegee, it is feared, will make trouble at West Point, the lads there not liking the association Grant has forced on them."

It becomes a serious question for the friends of young Meagher whether the nomination and cadetship would be altogether a creditable sort of thing at the present day. West Point has become a rowdy establishment; and though it has not yet anything like its due proportion of negro young gentlemen, that defect will be and ought to be soon remedied. There is no doubt that our colored brethren who are members of Congress ought to exercise their patronage in every case on behalf of a cadet of their own color. These young gentlemen, together with the large blackguard element which now necessarily preponderates there at any rate, must make West Point a dubious sort of school, whether of manners, of morals, or of letters.—N. Y. Irish Citizen.

In San Francisco there is a regular Joss House, or Chinese Temple, in which are six idols, to whom paper and pink are burning all the while. Over against this idol temple, scarcely two blocks away, is the Chinese Mission House of the Methodist Church, just completed at a cost of \$80,000. A little further off is the Presbyterian Chinese Mission. Other churches keep up their Chinese classes. The American Mission Association also is pushing its work among them wherever a door opens. It is quite marvellous to see the growth of churches in California. Churches are springing all over the State, and material prosperity with them, as is proved by the semi-annual statement of savings banks. In those in San Francisco 36,862 depositors placed \$1,289,456, or, on the average, \$854 to the depositor. In those in the interior, 10,683 depositors placed \$5,266,350, or \$193 for each depositor. During 1870 the deposits in the city increased \$1,655,000, and throughout the State \$7,602,000.

PARALLEL BETWEEN COLUMBIA AND ROME.—Mr. Dougherty, a member of the American bar, in his speech at the Philadelphia Meeting, drew out the parallel between the political status of the inhabitants of Columbia and those of Rome with an exactness which we commend to the consideration of politicians in Europe.—"We Americans (said the American barrister) on our inmost hearts are wedded to free institutions, and therefore it is that we demand the liberty of the Pope that the Church itself may be independent. Shall it be said that we willingly submit that our Bishops and Archbishops shall henceforth owe their appointments to the subjects of an Italian King? No; we want no King nor noble, nor foreign intercessor, to stand between us and the Spiritual Head of the Catholic Church. But am I to be told that the people of Rome have voted against the Government of the Pope? I answer, will any of my countrymen call that a free and fair election, carried by the point of the bayonet by the head of an advancing army? I maintain that the Government of the Pope in Rome is in exact keeping with the genius of American institutions. Why is it that our Government is located in the District of Columbia. Why is it that our national constitution deprives citizens living there of a voice in the selection of a President, or any national officer, and denies that which is the very essence of Republicanism—the right to vote for representatives in Congress? It is because our Chief Magistrate, in the discharge of his exalted duties, shall not be overshadowed by any power or liable to be improperly influenced by the people of any Commonwealth, but that he and Congress may be independent and supreme and act, not for the advantage of one State, but for the common good of all. What the District of Columbia is to the United States is Rome to the Catholic world. What freedom could the Holy Father have if subject to one who ungratefully and basely broke his pledged faith with France—France, that made Italy a nation and him her King? What freedom could the Holy Father have if subject to a monarch who owns himself unable to restrain the ruffian rabble?—In a word it is clear to all thoughtful persons that, given an institution such as the Catholic Church, the Pope must be Sovereign, and therefore territorially free and independent, in order to be able to legislate for 200,000,000 of spiritual subjects throughout the world.—Melbourne Advocate.

GALVESTON, TEXAS, JUNE 13.—Another terrible storm struck this city yesterday at 10 a.m. and continued with great fury till midnight, destroying telegraphic and railroad communication, and doing immense damage to the city and shipping. St. Patrick's Church, which was just finished, was blown down and is a total ruin.