

names. So you helped to box the curate, eh? Well, I wouldn't have believed it. Bell Lindhurst passed this over. If she could get what she wanted, Sir Harry might say as much as he liked about her. 'You know, uncle,' said she, 'it's just because I had a hand in the box, as you call it, that I want to atone. Think of his disappointment! 'Think of mine, Bell!' said her uncle. 'Who would have thought the poor old rector would drop off so suddenly? I ought to have sold the living you know.' 'But he is gone now,' said Bell, insinuatingly. 'And you will have to give it to some one before you can sell it.'

wish you all that's proper, eh? Be good to her. All this springs from writing the address on a—hoax! Valentines are not such bad things, after all, are they, Mr. Seltum? THE BISHOP OF LIVERPOOL ON THE IRISH STATE CHURCH. In the course of the Bishop's address his lordship said he would take the opportunity of referring to something now laid before the British Parliament—the Irish Church—and he did so for the reason that the London Standard had quoted some words of his which he used in a sermon he preached in the town of Liverpool, in which he had said if it pleased Parliament to disestablish and disendow the Irish Church, in case any portion of that endowment was offered to the Catholic Church in Ireland, it was for the Pope and the Irish bishops to say whether or not such endowment should be received. But a newspaper writer, in order to create a feeling against what he calls ultramontanism—that was to say, against any man who was a true, downright earnest Catholic—was pleased to represent that he (Dr. Goss) denied the power of the legislature to deal with the revenues of the Irish Church, and that it was for the Pope and Irish bishops to say what was to become of the revenues in case they were taken away from the present Irish Church. What he said was that, in case the Irish Church was disendowed, and Parliament offered any portion of the revenues to the present Catholic Church in Ireland, it was not for him to give his opinion, but for the Pope and the bishops who were governors of the Church to decide whether such endowments should be accepted. The right of Parliament to deal with the endowments of the Irish Church had been denied, and in this country Protestants were in alarm for the safety of their present Establishment. Now the two Churches were widely different, as in England the Establishment was mainly the Church of the upper mercantile and middle classes. There were others who disputed with them, and who urged that they should have political rights and they had got them, but he believed that in England the bulk of the population belonged to the Established Church, and therefore it was in a different position to the Establishment in Ireland. There they had a Church with a clergy, but the Churches were without congregations; there were endowments for clergymen to preach, and no one for them to preach and to teach unto. Now, they must distinguish also that there were two sources of revenue for the Established Church in Ireland. At the time of the Reformation the King and Parliament of their own act transferred the endowments of the Catholic Church to the gentry, and handed over the churches to the new religion. The Church, therefore, was created and endowed entirely by the State. The Times newspaper had said that that endowment belonged to the State. No such thing. The property of the Catholic Church at the time of the Reformation was as much at that time their own property as is the property of the Wesleyan denomination at this time, and if the English Government attempted to interfere with the property of the Wesleyans it would be guilty of an act of spoliation of their property. There is no more reason that Wesleyans, or Nonconformists, or Roman Catholics should be deprived of the gifts of individuals, and the State had no more right over those gifts, and it would be as unjust to take possession of them as to despoil the lawyers or doctors. The fact was that the Church was weak, and when the State was in want it found it a very easy thing to supply its wants by despoiling the Church. The Catholic Church derived its revenue in the same way as the Wesleyan Methodists did at the present day. They were the gifts of individuals given to them as a body. This money they preserved, they established trusts, and handed it down to those who succeeded them, and they had as much right to the mercantile man to his possessions. It was, then, an act of injustice, of downright robbery, to take these revenues away from the Catholic Church, but having taken them away, they became the State's own property; and, therefore, when the Church in Ireland was endowed it was endowed by the State, and what the State gave the State could take away, observing certain rights which those who were the present incumbents might have in these possessions. It was therefore competent for the British Parliament to disendow the Irish Church, and make what use it liked of the revenues. It could not be the Church of the people for the people would not have it. It had failed to fulfil the original intentions of the Church when it was first created, and, therefore, the sooner it was swept away the better. Let them bear in mind, however, that there was a large revenue which the Church in Ireland had acquired since the Reformation. Those were the gifts of individuals—particular persons, who from motives of piety had built churches and endowed them. The State now had no right to interfere with such endowments, for the Church had as much right to that as the Catholics had to what they held, or the Wesleyan Methodists had to their property. If there was a disendowment, the State had no right to that property which had arisen from the gifts of individuals—it was the Church's own property, and it would be an act of spoliation to take it away. He thought he had justified himself with regard to what he had said in another place, and that he had shown that the Protestant Church in Ireland might be justly disendowed so far as regarded those revenues which they received from the State. But, at the same time, his mind was unchanged that the first spoliation was an act of injustice to the Catholic Church. The property was never the property of the nation. It was given by individuals for one purpose, and as long as this purpose was fulfilled the State had no more right to take it away than it would have to take away the endowments of the Wigan Grammar School, or the benefactions to the parish church, and transfer them to Westminster or London. Let every man have his own; what he had honestly come by let him possess. It was the duty of the law to preserve him in that right. He hardly dare address them on a subject which was creating much disturbance in that neighbourhood. It was not for him to give an opinion upon that difficulty, which separated those employed colliers and the colliers themselves. He could give them no opinion upon the justice of the claims, but upon one thing he held that was his duty to speak. And he spoke, not from any principles of the Catholic Church, but upon what all of them, and those who differed from them in religious opinion would at all events recognize as the principle of the sublime gospel of God, there was one maxim which God had taught them—they must do unto others as they wished to be done by. The rule given to them was that, with what measure they measured unto others it should be measured unto them again. It might be that those who had lowered their wages had done it suddenly, without giving them notice, but he would not enter into the justice of the case because he did not understand it, and it had nothing to do with his position as a bishop of the Catholic Church. But as he was slow to allow anyone to interfere with the government of affairs in the Catholic Church, so he did not at any time want to interfere with the government of others. As he knew nothing of the merits of the question but this he did say—that, if they did not wish to work, they had no right to interfere with others to prevent them from working. That was not measuring out to others as they wished to have measured to them, or doing to others as they wished to be done by. Would it not be much better for them to go to work, and to send a deputation to argue the matter with those that employed them, and not to keep their wives and families out of bread? They might carry on the strike for weeks or months and what would be the result? It would impoverish the town of the wages that would have been earned, and

which would never be made; and not only themselves and their wives and children, but at the same time every shopkeeper, every dealer in food and clothing, and the inhabitants of the town generally, would feel for years the effects of the strike. Would it not be better for them to go to work, and meanwhile negotiate with their employers; but, whilst things were in an unsettled state at least to give their wives and children bread. Listen to their cry; let them not starve. They were strong and able men, capable of earning all that was necessary for subsistence and yet were parading the streets idle on account of some question that remained to be settled between them and their employers. Let it be settled. Let umpires be appointed; but meanwhile let them not bring starvation upon themselves and injury upon the town. They would think it hard if those who employed them compelled them to work against their will.— They would say, 'No, I am a free-born Englishman; and can do as I like. If I choose to work, I can work; if I choose to starve, I can starve.' But if their employers were to say they should go to work, and were by violence to compel them to do so, they would say it was intolerable interference, to which no Englishman had a right to be made subject.— These who did not wish to work ought not to be compelled by violence; but, at the same time, they had no right to use violence in preventing those who wished to work from doing so. Every man had perfect freedom, and he ought to have it. In speaking as he was, he was passing no opinion on the question dividing them from their employers, but was speaking from the principles of the Gospel which required them to do unto others as they would be done by. If they would not like compulsion, in the same manner they should not exercise compulsion over those who were willing to work. It was an open question, and they had no more right to prevent others working than a man dealing in certain articles would have a right to stop the opening of a similar establishment next door. The world was free to them all, and every man was free to make his bread as he chose. He was a working man himself, earning his bread by his labor, in the discharge of his duty. He was not set aside to lead an idler's life, and was raised from the working people.— Therefore he considered he had a right to speak, and because it was by his own labor he earned his daily bread, he trusted working men would receive his advice, which he gave to them in good part. It was honestly meant, and he was speaking to honest men, sterling men, Englishmen, who prized their liberty beyond all other considerations. He would advise them to go to their homes, to listen not to the impassioned spirits who would try to sow dissension among them, but to take the gospel of Christ, to learn to do unto others as they would wish others to do unto them remembering that as they measured to others so God Almighty would measure unto them. If they judged their actions by the everlasting Gospel of God he was satisfied in their cooler moments what their verdict would be

IRISH INTELLIGENCE.

REPLY OF THE POPE TO THE ROSCOMMON ADDRESS.—The most Rev. Dr. Gillooly, Bishop of Elphin, has received from the Holy Father the following letter in reply to the address to his Holiness adopted at the public meeting in Roscommon: 'Venerable Brother, Health and Apostolic Benediction.—We have received with much pleasure your most welcome letter and address, in which are made known to us the sentiments expressed by the faithful children of your diocese at the public meeting which they lately held. We could not, venerable brother, but be deeply moved, indeed, at the filial piety, love, and respect towards us and this See of Peter, the mother and mistress of all churches, therein expressed, and at the horror and indignation with which these, our devoted children, have openly and publicly denounced the war now everywhere raged, but especially in unhappy Italy, by the enemies of God and man, against our holy religion ourselves, and the Apostolic See; and at the manner in which they deplore, condemn, and reprobate so many unparelleled crimes and sacrileges committed by wicked men, enemies of truth and justice, who, walking in ungodliness, hesitate not to trample under foot every right, human and divine, and who strive to utterly destroy, if that were possible, the Catholic Church and civil society. We have also been gratified to find with what joy the faithful of your diocese were filled on account of the victory of last year, vouchsafed by the Lord of Hosts to our most faithful and brave soldiers, over the hordes of abandoned men, who with insane and reckless impiety, desired to assail and destroy even this our beloved city. 'To us, plunged in daily sorrow, such noble sentiments coming from our faithful flock—sentiments so worthy of the children of the Catholic Church—have indeed afforded the greatest consolation. 'Wherefore venerable brother, we desire you to intimate and testify in our name to the faithful children of your diocese how pleasing to us has been the public expression of their sentiments, and to assure them of our singular love towards them. Yourself we exhort to have courage, to rely on the Divine assistance and to continue with ever increasing vigilance to fulfil your ministry in those times so full of iniquity, fearlessly holding the cause of God and his Church, and zealously watching over the salvation of your flock. Finally, be assured of our singular good will in your regard; and as a pledge thereof receive the Apostolic Benediction, which with all the affection of our heart we lovingly impart to yourself, venerable brother, and to all the faithful, clergy and laity, committed to your charge. 'Given at Rome, at St. Peter's, the 22nd day of March, in the year of our Lord 1868, and of our Pontificate the 22nd. 'PIUS IX.'

THE CARDINAL AT THE CASTLE.—Mr. Dillon, private secretary to the Lord Lieutenant, writes to the Pall Mall Gazette to say that 'his Eminence' went as Roman Catholic Archbishop only, and received precedence accordingly as the position of Roman Catholic Archbishops was determined when her Majesty held a Court in Dublin in 1849. That assurance may do for the English public, and has tended to quiet remark; but we all know here that Dr. Cullen went in full crimson below as Cardinal, and was placed next to Royalty, and most assiduously courted—in obedience (the Record says) to express instructions from Mr. Disraeli. The Cardinal's journals interpreted the recognition as given to the Cardinal, and have hardly closed his eyes of it ever since. Whatever juggle took place in the form of the invitation, and however anyone may have lent himself to it, the idea intended to be produced by the Ultramontanes in Ireland, and successfully treated, was that the Roman Cardinal had been solicited to grace the visit of the Prince, and condescended to do so. A part of the same policy was the visit to the Catholic University and all the parade there. How much did Mr. Disraeli gain by it? Not a single Roman Catholic vote on Thursday night, when his Ministry was endangered.—Dublin Warder, M-y 2. DUBLIN, May 5.—The personal encounter between the great chiefs of the opposing parties in Parliament is watched with keen interest on this side of the Irish Channel. The Ministerial statement has called forth various comments in the Press. In the Conservative journals the expression of approval is mingled with dissatisfaction at the absence of any positive declaration as to the intentions of the Government respecting the Church. It is regarded as a struggle for place between two able champions who are more solicitous about gratifying their legitimate ambition than pursuing any definite policy. The Opposition papers are equally dissatisfied, but upon other grounds. The Evening Post is indignant at the thought of

the House of Commons being intimidated by the threat of immediate dissolution, and cannot understand why it should submit to such a threat 'with full power in its hands to terminate, by a vote of want of confidence, the political existence of the Government. The Post thinks that it would be wiser as well as more dignified for the House of Commons to bring the matter to the earliest issue. The Cork Recorder, usually moderate in its tone, has lost patience, and says that 'Mr. Disraeli, in his readiness to accept every humiliation, is showing himself to be a kind of political Utrah Heap.' The Northern Whig observes that:— 'Mr. Disraeli still adopts the tone of a master. He must, however, consent to be the servant, and the obedient servant, of those whom he is still inclined to defy. With such a politician as Mr. Disraeli at the head of the Government, and adopting the style he does under circumstances so momentous, a very serious duty may devolve on Mr. Gladstone and the majority of the House of Commons. We have no doubt, however, that every step the leader of the Opposition may take will be deliberately calculated, and be such as to follow up the recent victories, and assert triumphantly the constitutional authority of the House of Commons. Unless the Prime Minister be induced by Thursday to meet his opponents in a conciliatory and statesmanlike spirit, there will be a dead lock between the Government and the majority of the House of Commons.' The pleasant which is felt in the Conservative camp at the absence of a distinct assurance from the Prime Minister of the course which he means to follow is expressed in more than one journal. There is a strong repugnance on the part of Irish Protestants to the policy of 'levelling up.' The Daily Express makes the following observations:— 'A contest between such masters of oratory as the Premier and his rival can never be without interest, especially when the object of their ambition is the highest that a British statesman places before himself—to serve his country in office. Irishmen, above all other subjects of the Crown, dearly love to see a quarrel settled by a fair fight, and have transferred to the seats of intellectual gladiators the admiration which in former times was bestowed on the accomplished duellist. But there is some danger that Parliament and the nation may forget that there are greater questions to be decided than who will be Premier. . . . The great practical questions are—What will be put before the constituencies at the next election, and on what schemes, in reference to ecclesiastical endowments, will the new Parliament be asked to pronounce? Compared with these the matters debated so vigorously in the House of Commons during the present week are of little consequence. . . . A dissolution at the present moment would be useless. Whatever enthusiasm the defence of the Church might inspire would be suppressed by the doubts—it may be that they are groundless—as to what the Government mean to do. Enough has been said in Parliament to show that they are not without some policy beyond that of redistributing the revenues of the Church within its bounds, and if that policy be such as the Protestant electors ought to support, it cannot be made known a moment too soon. We trust that the Government are not likely to misinterpret public opinion on this question so lamely as they did on that of education. Protestants of all denominations, with a few insignificant exceptions, are united in defence of the Church. They believe that they ought to be successful, but they would prefer that the Church should lose the last farthing of her property rather than retain it at a sacrifice of principle. The bare suggestion of an endowment for the Catholic Church would raise such a storm of opposition as has not been seen in these Islands since the Reformation.— Irish Churchmen believe that their Church is entitled to retain her status and principle on every principle of justice, and that Mr. Gladstone's resolutions would violate the most solemn compact, and be as injurious as foreign conquest. But if the alternative be that she is to be despoiled of only half her revenues, and that under the name of 'surplus,' the spoil is to be given to Cardinal Cullen, they would unhesitatingly accept Mr. Gladstone's scheme with all its uncertainty and injustice.' The Mail notices the proceedings of the two leaders in the following terms:— 'The two gentlemen played a game of brag in which the holder of the cards won the trick by boldness; he bragg'd a dissolution; and his adversary did not venture to 'see him,' or to overdo a vote of want of confidence. So last night Mr. Disraeli pocketed the pool. On Thursday it would appear the debate on the Irish Church is to be resumed, and it may be that it will be a very short one. Mr. Disraeli threw out a hint that he may follow the example of Donna Luiza, when that high-toned lady, protesting she would never consent, consented.' He said last night 'he did not accept the two latter Resolutions of the right honourable gentleman any more than the first but he did not desire to waste time in idle discussions and divisors.' It seems now very possible, as, indeed, we thought likely from the first, that this flank movement of Mr. Gladstone may end in his own discomfiture. Neither he nor Mr. Bright had any artillery more efficient than veneration and fusion of the old Irish patriots. Men striving at their utmost, by all arts, to force themselves into office, abuse others for having 'no principle except that of sticking to office.' It is the pot and the kettle over again, and so it seems in the eyes of the country and even of independent men in the House of Commons.' The homely illustration expresses an opinion which is gaining a strength among Conservatives who entertain misgivings as to the character of the programme which the Government have in their own view, but have not yet displayed.—Times. So much has happened of infinitely greater importance since the Irish Reform Bill was first introduced that the world may well have forgotten most of its provisions. The Government proposes that the present qualification for the County Franchise, a 12l. rating value, shall be maintained unaltered. It is the limit adopted for the County Franchise in the English Act of last year, and in recommending that it be preserved intact the Government follows the proposal of the Russell Administration in 1865. Mr. Clibberstone Fortescue, however, on Thursday said it would be impossible to maintain the Irish County Franchise at so high a standard, and justified a declaration at variance with his own proposal as Chief Secretary two years since on the ground that the reduction in the English qualifications last year made some reduction in Ireland inevitable. We do not think this plea when examined, is of any great validity. In 1865 Mr. Gladstone proposed a 14l. rental qualification in English counties, and Mr. Fortescue recommended the retention of the 12l. rating qualification in Ireland. In 1867 Parliament carried a 12l. rating qualification in English counties, which is admitted to be not lower than a 14l. rental; and the maintenance of the Irish qualification would be in perfect consistency with the act of last year and the recommendations of the Government of which Mr. Fortescue was spokesman. The Borough Franchise proposed by the Government, 4l. rating, appears to meet with universal assent, and its only value as a subject for debate is the opportunity it affords for reminding the Government of their departure from the fixed principle of no 'hard and fast' line, which was declared so sacred last year. The franchise clauses of the Irish Bill will thus give little trouble to Parliament. It may be otherwise with the redistribution scheme. Mr. Disraeli is not successful in redistribution. Nothing could be more feeble than his first sketch for the redistribution part of the English Reform Bill twelve months since, except his still earlier sketch in 1858. It is not wholly Mr. Disraeli's fault. A Minister must be strong in Parliamentary support before he can venture to deal boldly with a branch of legislation so deeply affecting the susceptibilities of the House of Commons. Mr. Disraeli was indebted to Mr. Laing and others for much that was

ultimately valuable in the redistribution of English seats; and Lord Nass will probably not be ungrateful for a little assistance in amending the Bill he has introduced. Mr. Pim has put on the Notices an alternative scheme of redistribution, and if we were bound to choose between Mr. Pim's and the plan of the Government, we should greatly prefer the former. There is no reason, however, why the Irish Reform Act should not combine the best of both schemes. The Government proposes to extinguish altogether Brandon, Oshel, Downpatrick, Dungannon, Kinsale and Portlinton as places returning a member to Parliament, thus gaining six seats to redistribute. Mr. Pim would get six seats also, one from Galway and five others not by extinguishing five boroughs, but by tacking them on to as many other boroughs, almost equally small and in the same neighbourhood. He would also in each case add on other contiguous towns. Thus he would make one borough of Athlone and Portlinton, annexing to it Mullingar, Tullamore, and Ballinaloe. He would couple Brandon with Kinsale, Dungannon with Mallo, Enniskillen with Dungannon, and would join New Ross to Wexford, these grouped boroughs being supplemented in every instance by other towns. The principle of grouping excited much prejudice in 1866, but its adoption is unquestionable and if adopted as Mr. Pim proposes, Mr. Disraeli would be able to preserve his principle of last year, that no centre of representation should be extinguished. The great argument however, in favour of Mr. Pim's plan is this: There are about a dozen or more small boroughs in Ireland, and if you touch one you ought to touch all, but to extinguish the whole would greatly diminish the variety of Irish representation. The Government accordingly proposes to take half of them almost at hazard extinguish them, and leave the rest untouched. Mr. Pim would deal with all—abstract from them, by grouping, five or six members; and strengthen the grouped boroughs so as to make them respectable centres of representation. The superior merit of his plan cannot be gainsaid, and we hope it will be in a great measure adopted. Mr. Pim submits also to the House an independent mode of allotting the vacant seats. The Government proposes to give two additional members to Cork county, which is to be divided, to cut off from Down, Tipperary, and Tyrone sections, each of which shall receive one member, and to give the sixth seat to Dublin, which is to have three members elected on the plan of Lord Cairns's Amendment. Mr. Pim's plan so far coincides with this that he would give two members to the county of Cork and the third member to Dublin; but, instead of giving the three members to new sections of counties, he would give Belfast a third member, elected on the minority principle and would create two new groups of boroughs, the Kingsdown group and the Castlebar and Tuam group, each returning a member. The claims of Belfast to a third member especially as it is understood that it must be largely increased by an extension of its boundaries, can scarcely be disputed; and it may be better to create new groups than to cut off portions, of existing counties; but it is pretty certain that to give three members to each of the counties in question would secure a much better representation than either alternative.—Times. We certainly did not expect in the year 1868 to find the Archbishop of York and the Bishop of London agreeing with the Bishop of Oxford in the proposition that a State is bound to propagate that which it recognizes as religious truth out of public funds, even in a part of the Empire where the vast majority of the people are of a different creed. Yet no proposition narrower than this is broad enough to support the reasoning of these prelates. Of all the arguments employed to defend the Irish Church the allegation that it is a Missionary Church is surely the most suicidal, for so long as a Church is a Missionary Church it cannot be the Church of the nation. But, although he seems to adopt this unsound view, the Bishop of London is evidently not prepared to draw the same practical inferences from it as his two brethren. The present revenues of the Irish Church are by no means too large for the conversion of Ireland, and if this be their legitimate appropriation, there can be no excuse for reducing them at all.—Times. HOPES AND CALCULATIONS OF THE ORANGEMEN.—We felt certain that the result would be as we see it when we found Mr. Disraeli adopting the ruinous defence for the Irish Church of a project to establish and endow the Roman Church in Ireland. That policy failed to ensure the Ultramontanes, who did not believe in his power to accomplish such a change—much as they desire it; and it arrived on the same side with Mr. Gladstone and the Volunteers all those Dissenters, in England and Ireland, who know what Popery is, and dread its domination over society. It is not the fact that the Protestants of Ireland have, during the past month, proclaimed a fearfulness much of Mr. Disraeli's Mr. Gladstone. The phrase 'levelling up,' which means really the giving of ecclesiastical supremacy in Ireland to Romanism, is used to indicate that which every holder of the principles of the Reformation must reprobate and oppose; and Mr. Gladstone, in his final speech on Friday morning was able to excuse his own adoption of the 'religious equality' of Disendowment by imputing to the Government the responsibility of originating the question of ecclesiastical endowments by offering endowment and recognition to Rome. 'He would show that the present time was the most opportune for raising this Church question, for the head of the Government told them that it was their duty to create and not destroy, and the noble Earl the Irish Secretary, had said the Government had no objection to establish religious equality, not by taking away from those who had, but by giving from the resources and funds of the State to those who had not. The Government itself, therefore, was the first to raise this question and to raise a distinct policy, about which, however, it was clear the Cabinet itself did not agree, and which a great many of their followers would repudiate.' Mr. Disraeli offered to divide the Irish Church revenues with the Roman Catholics—Mr. Gladstone proposes rather to sweep all away. This is the relative position of the party leaders, and between them the Irish Church comes to grief. We have abundant evidence that no class or denomination of Protestants will sanction the Disraelite scheme of a Roman State Church. The suggestion of it has awakened the country from one end to the other, and efforts have been expended in protests against it which, but its author taken a Constitutional course, would have assisted him to defend the Church and retained for his Government and party at least a great moral position. Let us take one resolution of the Synod of Dublin, passed this week as an index to the opinion of the Presbyterian community upon the subject. In the present momentous crisis (they say), when some of our most eminent statesmen have publicly expressed religious equity by the general endowment of religious denominations in Ireland, it became this Synod to take the earliest opportunity of declaring its conviction that such a course is wrong in principle, and that it must prove pernicious in its results.—In dozens of Protestant meetings the same words almost have been employed to express the aversion of Constitutionalists to such a policy. It is Mr. Disraeli's adoption of it, first indicated by Lord Mayo's Charter and endowment for the Catholic University, that has deprived the Protestants of the nation of that interest in the fate of his Government which otherwise they would have felt.—Dublin Warder. The Dublin Orange Warder now tells Mr. Disraeli that his ruinous policy to defend the Irish Church by establishing and endowing the Roman Church in Ireland, has failed to ensnare the Ultramontanes, and has deprived Irish Protestants of that interest in the fate of his Government which otherwise they would have felt.