

minute or two, a little boy looked suddenly intelligent, and said, "I know, Sir; it's Sunday!" When our Pharian friends talk of the blessings of the Sabbath, we may ask them to remember some of its curses, the poor children groaning under the "longest day," and the emancipated boy beginning his career of crime by Sabbath-breaking. We may be sure that no one who believed "Sunday to be a purely Christian festival" would have invented either the torture for the child or the sin for the boy.

But whatever doubt there may be as to the extent to which the Acts prohibiting Sunday trading can safely be repealed, there is no doubt whatever that Sunday recreation should not only be permitted, but encouraged. For the poor of large cities the kind of recreation which consists in seeing country sights and tasting country air during a few hours of Sunday, is nothing short of a necessity. That railways make this recreation possible is one of the very few alleviations which have been given to the misery of modern city life. It is quite as much an act of charity, even of necessity, to send a poor man by a Sunday excursion train, as to take an ass out of a pit. The poor of London are in a pit, and a very foul pit too; we cannot do much for them, but we can prolong and sweeten their life by giving them an occasional glimpse into a happier and purer existence. How certainly the country acts as a restorative both to the physical and moral health of town populations, has been stated over and over again by all those best qualified to form an opinion. "The improvement in the general conduct of the people of London," says Sir Richard Mayne, in the report above referred to, "has been very great in recent years, and I attribute it to the increase of facilities for getting out of town." Sir Joseph Paxton, in his evidence given before the Committee of the Commons upon the Beer Act, describes with most convincing minuteness and vividness the effect produced by opening the noble grounds of Chatsworth to the artisans of Macclesfield and Derby. Drunkenness decreases, family union is promoted, happiness is tasted; and even the exercise of that spirit of decorum and respect for property, which the poor invariably display when placed upon their honor, must exalt and strengthen the general character.

The duty of providing as far as possible means whereby the poor of large cities may be enabled to visit the country on Sundays is so obvious, that we may be surprised that even Sabbatarians do not look on it as a work of necessity. We think it very probable that much of their reluctance to see the truth as it is, arises from an unconscious confusion of the English with the Jewish poor. In the Bible they find the lot of poverty blessed, as sheltering most readily within it the excellences of humility, disinterestedness, and unquestioning faith. The way, then, to elevate the poor is, they say, not to break the Sabbath by taking them into the country, but to show them how they may bear and even be grateful for their poverty. This is to forget what a poor Jew was, and what a poor Londoner is. It is not a crust of dry bread and a cup of water that crushes and degrades a man, but unwearying labor, expulsion from honest society, and vicious thoughts. In a hot climate and a thinly-populated country, to listen to the teaching of the law with which he had long been familiar, to restrain avarice, to surrender himself to religious impressions, was a task quite within the compass of a poor man's power, and akin to the long-developed instincts of a Jew. His poverty may be compared with that of a Highland or a Cumberland peasant; they have little worldly comfort, but they have time for sober thought, and bodies healthy enough to be the dwelling-place of a healthy mind. Contrast with this the hopeless, heartless, grovelling, toiling, careworn misery of the poor in Bermondsey or Houndsditch. Health, relief from the strain on mind and body, quiet sleep in pure air, a change for the eye and the brain, are absolutely necessary before these men can be raised from their state of moral degradation. The physical question is the primary one—Can the poor of London be made healthy enough to grow better? There is only one day in the week on which anything can be done to solve this question, and we are asked to throw this day away.

Where are we to stop? it is asked: are we to go on till not only the poor man has country recreation, but places of amusement open for him in towns. If any places of amusement are open, should any be compulsorily shut? The country recreation is so infinitely the more important point, that we do not think the opening of town places of amusement very much worth discussing at present. But ultimately we see no reason to doubt that all amusements may and will be permitted. That the British Museum and National Gallery should be opened, cannot be denied for a moment, on any other than purely Sabbatarian grounds. A more plausible objection is made to permitting any place of amusement to be open on Sunday where money is taken at the doors, because to permit one to refuse another, is to create a monopoly; and if all amusements are permitted, the nation will, it is feared, become absorbed in amusement on a day that should be devoted to better purposes. We have here exactly the same proposition as that urged for prohibiting Sunday trading; and here, again, its truth is equally questionable. If it is a bad thing to indulge in certain amusements on Sunday, why should we suppose that every one will indulge in them simply because he is permitted to do so? The Act of George II., which closes places of amusement, is as much a subject of uncertainty as the Act of Charles II. regarding trade. The Committee on Public Houses noticed in their report how easily it was evaded. "The inconsistency," they say, "that suffers the singing saloons of Manchester and Liverpool and Cremorne and the Eagle Tavern Gardens to be open on Sunday, and shuts in the face of all but the proprietors and those who have free admission, the gardens of the Zoological Society, and the vast and varied school of secular instruction provided within the grounds and building of the Crystal Palace, is too glaring for continuance." The law thus, as it stands, fails where it most wishes to succeed. And if we attempt to lay down any rules as to what amusements are and what are not innocent, we are at once beset with infinite difficulties. What is an amusement? A clergyman lately told us that he had been severely censured by a Sabbatarian for carrying a walking stick on Sunday. We despair, after this, of finding any recreation that all will agree in as innocent. We must leave the matter to the decision of conscience and taste, and we should hope that common sense, good feeling for others, and respect for the religious character of the day, might be trusted to pronounce from time to time, what limits it would be advisable

to impose by custom, not by law, on the liberty of recreation. If we amuse ourselves, it is said, what is to hinder a Continental Sunday being transplanted into England? A Continental Sunday, that is, the bugbear. It is one that we may meet with confidence; for we do not hesitate to say that, in the greater portion of the Continent, the Sunday is kept better than in England. Even the Sunday of Paris is better kept than the Sunday of Edinburgh. What are the two things that we are asked to compare? Let us leave out extremes, and compare the Sunday of a large English town with the Sunday of Germany or Switzerland. In what respect have we the advantage? A German father goes to church in the morning, dines and smokes, spends his afternoon in tea-gardens with his family, and goes to the theatre in the evening. He spends a day more or less religious according to the dictates of his conscience—social, cheerful, bright with innocent pleasure. Who are we, that we should condemn him? It is a very favorable topic at religious meetings to express gratitude that the light of the Gospel shines so much more brightly here than on the Continent, and to thank God that we are not as other men are. Would a German who saw blinds drawn down on Sunday, and walking-sticks rejected as an earthly vanity, much wish to be like us? To say nothing of the much higher and truer Christian liberty of those who have not "made a ghostly idol of the Sunday," the German has conspicuously the advantage in two minor points—the power of sociality and the power of enjoyment. The lamentable want of anything like enjoyment in England, except in field-sports, is the source of most of our great national faults, especially of money-worship.

Let us repeat once more what we have said above, that no question about the abolition of the laws limiting Sunday trading and Sunday recreation can be properly entertained and disposed of until the true notion of Sunday as a Christian festival has settled into the minds of men. No exertions to spread this truth can be too great or too rapid. But the mode of taking advantage of growing knowledge, and of more true and liberal opinions on the subject, is a matter requiring the exercise of moderation, of respect for others, and at the same time of firmness. On the one hand, we cannot expect that prejudices associated with religion should die out at once, or that feelings ingrained into national character should rapidly fade away. On the other hand, timidity may only prolong the struggle; we cannot consent to be defrauded of the liberty that is our due; and we come to the conviction that there is not only sound doctrine, but sound advice in the well-known sentence of "Luther's Table Talk" (p. 310):

"If anywhere the day is made holy for the mere day's sake—if anywhere any one sets up its observance upon a Jewish foundation, then I order you to work on it, to ride on it, to dance on it, to feast on it, to do anything that shall remove this encroachment on Christian liberty."

IRISH INTELLIGENCE.

The Right Hon. J. D. Fitzgerald, who now fills the office of her Majesty's Attorney-General in Ireland, has already given two sums of one hundred guineas each for the completion of the new chapel in Ennis. He has also given a handsome contribution to the Franciscan Friars; and recently he ordered a picture of the Holy Family, from a painting of one of the great masters, which cost five thousand guineas, and has tendered it to the chapel committee.—*Limerick Observer*.

THE POLITICAL EXILES.—John Dillon appeared yesterday in the hall of the Four Courts, wearing his wig and gown. The *Newry Telegraph* (Orange authority), thus speaks of the return of another of the gentlemen who took part in the troubles of '48:—"John Martin reached Newry on Friday evening; and of the hands that have grasped his in the warmth of friendship, sure we are that not the least heartily pressed by him have been those of the many who were known to him to have repudiated "Young Ireland" principles the more earnestly just because that to the infatuation which such principles engendered was ascribable the perversion of a generous-hearted and most useful country gentleman into an erring politician."

MR SMITH O'BRIEN.—The *Limerick Observer* mentions as a rumour that Mr. Smith O'Brien's return to Ireland will be delayed for some time by a tour on the continent with his eldest son, and it is further said that his arrival at Cahirmoyle, his seat in the county of Limerick, will be strictly private.

PROGRESS OF TRANQUILITY.—A Dublin paper notices a gratifying fact, as showing the peaceable and orderly state of the northern Irish counties, that on the 26th of May last there were not in either of the gaols of Drogheda, Dundalk, Monaghan, or Antrim a single prisoner for trial at the ensuing assizes to be held for the northeast circuit, while in one of the two remaining towns on that circuit—viz., Armagh and Downpatrick—there was but one solitary prisoner in "durance vile," and in the other town but five.

A Propos of Government patronage, the *Kilkenny Journal* announces the appointment of Mr. M. Banim, brother of the late John Banim, the Irish novelist, to the postmastership of Kilkenny. The brothers were joint authors of the celebrated *Tales of the O'Hara Family*—a work which must always hold a high place in the annals of fiction.

The most cheering account of the crops are now daily received from every part of Ireland. The potatoes have a most flourishing appearance, and it is stated that even in the heaviest soils the rain has not inflicted any danger.

There is a reduction of nearly 50 per cent, in the number of paupers this year in the Galway workhouse as compared with the corresponding period in 1855. In the latter year the numbers were 862, to 437, in 1856.

In 1855, 6,225,556 gallons of proof spirits were entered for home-consumption in Ireland against 3,440,734 gallons in 1854, and 8,136,862 in 1853. There were in 1855, 2,214 detections of offences against the Excise law, 597 prosecutions, and 464 convictions, the result of which was the immuring in gaols of 246 persons.

The man arrested in Drogheda as "Red Pat Bannon," charged with the murder of Miss Hinds, is not that notorious person. There is now a strong impression abroad that "Red Pat" was murdered by his accomplices to prevent his turning approver.

IRISH TENANT RIGHT.—In the House of Commons on Thursday (5th June), Mr. Stafford asked whether the Government intended to propose any amendments in the Tenant-right (Ireland) Bill; and, if so, whether they would place them on the notice-paper before Wednesday next, on which day the bill stands for committee? Mr. Horsman thought it necessary to make some explanatory remarks before replying specifically to the questions of the hon. gentleman. The House would remember that, at the commencement of the session, the noble lord at the head of the Government, upon being asked whether he intended to legislate during this session upon the subject of tenant-right, stated that the occurrences of last year had not given the Government any encouragement to hope to legislate successfully, and therefore it did not intend to introduce or to take charge of any measure upon the subject. The hon. member for Mayo having obtained leave to introduce a bill, the House had a fair right to expect from the Government, upon the question of the second reading, some explanation of its intentions, and he (Mr. Horsman), being responsible for the omission of any such explanation, begged to express his regret for that omission, which had occurred from an unwillingness to speak in the absence of those hon. gentlemen who had taken an active interest upon this subject in former years. He was in expectation that some of those hon. gentlemen would have entered the house, and therefore he waited, believing it very improbable that the discussion would terminate with the speech of the hon. mover of the bill. The hon. member for Mayo (Mr. G. Moore) expressed a desire that no discussion of the provisions of the bill should take place on that occasion, but that the House should simply reaffirm a resolution it had affirmed in the preceding session—that the relations between landlord and tenant in Ireland were not on a satisfactory footing. The Government had no difficulty about reaffirming that resolution, although he (Mr. Horsman) could not think that such a declaration of opinion would lead to any practical result. (Hear, hear.) He had been quite prepared to state the view of the Government, that proceeding to committee upon the Bill would be a mere waste of time, but a general cry of "Agreed" arose upon the other side of the House, and therefore, seeing the general feeling of the House, the Government deferred to it. As, however, the Government had opposed last year the measure of the hon. member for Kilkenny (Mr. Serjeant Shee), which was not so extensive in its character as that of the hon. member for Mayo, it was not likely that they should support the objectionable provision of the present bill. (Hear.) If, when the motion for going into committee upon that bill was made, the hon. member for Northamptonshire would move its amendment on that day six months, he would have the support of the Government. ("Hear," and loud laughter.)—Mr. Drummond thought it would be as well to know whether the House was to look to the hon. member for Northamptonshire or to the Secretary for Ireland for a declaration of the intentions of the Government upon Irish matters. ("Hear," and laughter.)

ACCIDENT NEAR CARRICKFERGUS.—A few Thursdays back two men were seriously injured at the shaft now being sunk by the Marquis of Downshire, near Carrickfergus. The gearing it appears having got out of order at "the dam," a bucket which was being lowered broke from its fastening, and descending with fearful rapidity fell upon two of the workmen who were employed at the bottom of the shaft. One of the men had his head frightfully cut, several of his ribs broken, and one of his hands pierced through with a pike; the other had his head cut, and his body seriously bruised.—*Northern Whig*.

RAILWAY ACCIDENT—CARRICK-ON-SUIR.—A frightful accident occurred on Friday evening last, Mr. John Brown, farmer, having been crushed to death on the railway whilst turning his cows across the line from water between Carrick and Fiddown. The poor man being deaf and feeble did not hear the whistle, and the train passed over his body, almost separating his head and arms from the trunk, and causing almost instantaneous death. A coroner's inquest commenced on Saturday, and was resumed on Monday—verdict according. A watchman was previously removed.

SERIOUS ACCIDENT.—Between the hours of nine and ten o'clock on Saturday evening one of the most distressing accidents witnessed for a long period in Dublin took place in Capel street. A woman servant, named Hannah Delany, happened to be in the act of shaking a carpet out of an upper window of Mr. Byrne's house, at an elevation of some forty feet from the street, when she lost her balance and was precipitated from the window. As in the case of Caroline Agnew, and of the female who fell from the window in Sycamore-alley, the loose drapery of the poor woman tended in some measure to break the fall.—Her clothes became inflated by the air as she fell, and in a great degree mitigated the violence with which her body was thrown upon the pavement.—Besides this she was first caught in her descent by the projecting bar of a gas lamp-post. However, being a heavy woman, she came to the ground with great violence, and was taken up apparently lifeless; and was conveyed at once to Jervis-street Hospital, where every requisite attention was at once paid to her by the resident, Mr. McGrath. The surgical aid always so speedily available at this hospital was promptly brought to bear on her case, but of course no expectations as yet can be entertained as to the poor woman's recovery.—*Dublin Freeman*.

THE OLD LEAVEN WORKING.—The *Down Protestant*, a violent Orange paper, makes a great flourish about "Popery," and declares that Down is going to demand a restoration of the old constitution of 1688. "During the fine days of June," it says, in grandiloquent style, "thousands of the brave yeomanry and industrious Protestants of the country will assemble, God willing, around a platform, from which will go forth a voice, as the sound of a trumpet, in warning and exhortation." The highest magistrate in the county, the true Protestant landlord, and the humble and honest Orangeman, will meet together, to declare their convictions, and express their resolve that there shall be no further national downward progress to the abyssal doom of the supporters of Rome. Thousands of Protestants in Down will show that they have the olden spirit, and that they need no baptism at the Boyne to make them follow on in the wake of the Prince of Glorious, pious, and immortal memory."—What wretched drivelling!

EMIGRATION.—Number of our poor peasantry are daily leaving us for a foreign shore. The old mania seems to have set in again with its original force.—*Clare Journal*.

The payment by Mr. Vincent Scully, M.P., of the first call of £43 a share on his shares in the unfortunate Tipperary Bank, will amount to the enormous sum of £28,000.

THE "TIMES" ON THE MAYNOOTH QUESTION.—The organized agitation which has been going on some time all over the country on the subject of the Maynooth Grant—an agitation the avowed object of which is the support and carrying out of Mr. Spopner's temporary victory on that question—appears to demand some further notice in connection with the recent debate on the Irish Church. Anybody who has passed through a town of any size in this country for the last month will have seen placards on the walls and in the shop windows announcing meetings on this subject, and calling upon all sincere Protestants to come forward and confirm the late important victory. "Now," it is said, "is the time to strike, when the iron is hot, when a great advantage has been obtained, and can by prompt and decisive action be converted into a permanent and complete triumph. Now is the time to petition the Legislature, to show the strength of Protestant feeling in the country, and to protest against the pollution of the conscience of a Protestant State by the support of a Popish seminary." Now, nobody can affect any surprise that such petitions as these should be largely signed in this country. There are crowds of innocent people everywhere who cannot see an inch beyond their noses, who see no bearings of one part of a whole question upon another, who go solely by their own likes and dislikes in the particular case, and who in this instance simply say to themselves, "Do I like Maynooth, or dislike it? Would I rather there were a Maynooth, or not? I had rather there were not, and therefore I will petition Parliament not to support it." We can affect no surprise that crowds of innocent people in this country, full of sincere Protestant convictions, and not seeing or troubling themselves in the slightest degree about consequences, should urge Parliament to withdraw its grant from Maynooth. These persons have not the remotest idea that anything else will take place, if they get what they want, but the fact itself which they want to take place. They think that if Maynooth is suppressed it is suppressed, and a very good thing too,—that the whole thing is then over, that Protestantism has triumphed, and the State conscience is changed—all which is very pleasant. We observe that of the 638 petitions presented to Parliament against the continuance of the grant to Maynooth only 128 are against "all religious endowments in Ireland," the rest being simply for the repeal of the Maynooth Endowment Act. It is fair, then, to presume that the signers of the 510 petitions which adopt the latter title have no wish whatever to interfere with religious endowments in general in Ireland; that they do not quarrel with the Presbyterian endowments, and still less with the Protestant Establishment in that country. No; we know the names of the leaders and speakers at these meetings, and we know that these gentlemen would be horrified at the bare idea of any misfortune to the Irish Church Establishment, which they regard as the great bulwark of Protestantism. These gentlemen, then, and their followers have evidently no idea that the withdrawal of the grant from Maynooth can have any consequences affecting the Irish Church Establishment. If they had, they would stop their agitation on this subject, for there can be no doubt whatever that the Irish Establishment counts for a great deal more on the Protestant side than Maynooth does on the Romanist.

Now, we say we can affect no surprise that crowds of innocent people in this country should deal with the Maynooth question in this way, because the great majority of men have not the time or opportunity to cultivate political thought. They live out of the political world, and do not see the relations of things in it, and the bearing of one event upon another. But that men like Mr. Spooner, and those who vote with him, who have imbibed the atmosphere of Parliament for years, have been conversant with the ideas, the reasonings, the fears, and the anticipations of statesmen, and have lived in the very thick of political thought,—that they should really suppose that they can deal with the Maynooth question in such a way is somewhat astonishing. Where can their eyes or ears have been all this time? By what sevenfold thickness of political hide have the plainest, the most certain, and the most apparent political truths, been excluded from all access to their minds? What has been the nature of their political existence,—a frost, or a trance, the subterranean sleep of the tortoise, or the snug vacuum of the geological load? How can they, with the facts of the political world before their eyes, imagine that they can play with the Maynooth question as with a single isolated question, affecting a particular Romanist seminary, and there stopping? How can they, with their tender and scrupulous anxiety for the welfare and preservation of the Irish Establishment, gratuitously stir up questions which come into most delicate contact with it, aim wantonly at destroying the very equilibrium which supports it, and by the creation of an undoubted Romanist grievance invite and provoke the most formidable assault upon it?

But, if Mr. Spooner and his friends in Parliament have been deaf hitherto to all reason on this subject, surely the debate on Mr. Miall's motion ought to make them open their ears. How is the Maynooth grant there characterised, and in what light is it regarded? It is expressly and without the smallest doubt or hesitation regarded in the light of a fulcrum or support of the Irish Church Establishment. "If Maynooth is disendowed," says Mr. Miall, "leaving other endowments entirely untouched, what will become of the boasted tranquility of Ireland?" Mr. Miall thus hails Mr. Spooner as his ally, and a most powerful and effective one, in his scheme against the Irish Church:—"He based his chief justification on the fact that our Irish ecclesiastical arrangements were in imminent danger from another quarter." The hon. member for North Warwickshire had obtained leave to bring in a bill for the disendowment of Maynooth. Mr. W. J. Fox ranks "the endowment of Maynooth among the various means which had been taken to prop up the Irish Establishment." What does Mr. Spooner say to being hailed as an ally by the very men whose Irish policy he abominates? Is he entirely comfortable at seeing his strongest opponents think exactly as he does about Maynooth? Is it not a call to reconsider a measure when we find it all at once eagerly adopted by our opponents as the very best for their own purposes? Surely the debate on Mr. Miall's motion ought to open the eyes of Mr. Spooner and his friends. If nothing else will convince them the hearty concurrence of their most vehement political foes ought to do so.—*Times*