

we condemn it unreservedly, and desire to see it speedily and effectually suppressed. But still it appears to us that there are no rightly feeling men who will not abhor a good deal that has been done in this matter—the English papers are filled with accounts and pictures that should bring a blush to the face of every Englishman, and of which Irishmen as well, remembering that Irish soldiers have also had their part in it, must feel ashamed. The illustrated papers show us a horrid massacre of naked men, armed only with a spear, and falling thick before the showers of bullets and balls poured into them from a distance, or else received on the point of the bayonet, against which they rush in frenzy—piles of slaughtered corpses are pictured on every side, and nothing more disgusting can well be thought of. Of the frame of mind, moreover, formed in men who are the witnesses of all this sickening sight we obtain some idea from such sentences as this which we take, for example, from the correspondent of the London *Standard*:—"The mounted infantry made during the morning splendid shooting, promptly showing to the fanatics that Osman Digna's charms continue ineffectual. Lieutenant Davin shot one man on a camel at a full 1000 yards' range, while the condition of the stones behind which the enemy had fired showed very sufficient reasons for their prompt retreat."—The coolness with which this "splendid shooting" is spoken of is very suggestive, and verily the suggestions it convey are not pleasant. We can understand how, with such a frame of mind, men can go the length to which those English commanders went who basely placed a price on Osman Digna's head, and held out a premium to assassination—for in sight of this wholesale, hideous, killing men may well become inhuman. But if this work must needs be done—and we do not deny that there may be a necessity for it—not, of course, including the intended assassination of Osman Digna which was at once condemned—is there not some reason to question the good of having its details so fully reported, written minutely by correspondents, and illustrated by artists? It may be necessary even to slaughter these savage braves, so as to prevent greater evils, for were they to march on Egypt unchecked unimagined horrors must accompany their invasion—not to speak of Mahommedan outbreaks that would almost certainly occur elsewhere—but the effect on the public mind of such revolting descriptions, so minutely given, must be extremely debasing, and will not only pander to, but create the vilest tastes in those who study them. Correspondence from the Soudan cannot be looked upon as of much advantage, then, and it is to be regretted that the ears of the public should itch for it.

The Rev. Dr. Stuart has returned to the charge. Referring to the letters of the Bishop of Dunedin, PATER FAMILIAS? from which we have quoted above, at the adjourned meeting held on Monday, the rev. gentleman said, as reported by the *Evening Star*, "that some Roman Catholic children might have joined with the Protestant children in singing hymns; but he was satisfied that they did not do so by the consent or instructions of the Committee. He hoped that it would be understood throughout the length and breadth of Otago that this Society had never interfered, nor intended to interfere, with the religion of the Roman Catholic inmates.—(Applause.) He was pleased to read the manly letter of Mr. Reenie, in which he gave a flat denial that the Committee had been guilty of the base conduct imputed to them by Bishop Moran. He hoped that the Bishop would withdraw his statement, and join his fellow-citizens in supporting the Institution.—(Applause)" This our readers will perceive to be a speech that might be made by a man willing to act the bully and able to do so because he had the mob at his back.—It might, moreover, be the speech of a man either capable of telling a falsehood, or so stupid as to misunderstand plain English, for if our readers will refer to the extracts we have taken from the Bishop's letters they will see that the statements made in these letters were altogether different from those assumed by Dr. Stuart. But of the sincerity with which Dr. Stuart pretends to condemn any intention to pervert the faith of Catholics and defends the committee against such an imputation we obtain a proof a little further on, where the rev. doctor is thus reported of referring to a statement made by the Chairman relative to the instructions given by the uncle of three Catholic children that they should not be brought up in any Church. "The Rev. Dr. Stuart regretted very much to hear the statement just made by the chairman. He remembered that not long ago the Supreme Court of Philadelphia decided, in a case where a man had left a large sum of money to some children on the express condition that they were not brought up in any faith, that the will must be set aside. These children, referred to by the president should be brought up in the faith of the country, despite the injunction of the uncle, which the Committee were not bound by."—That is supposing the uncle's directions to be set aside these children should not be brought up in the Church into which they had been baptised but in "the faith of the country"—and if the faith of the country were Mahommedanism or Bhuddism or perhaps even Vaudou, or Fetichism the doctor's opinion would

most probably be the same, so long as the children concerned ought to be Catholics.—But we see by his decision the amount of credit that may be given to any denial of a desire to proselytise Catholic children on the part of the rev. Dr. Stuart. He has here made a glaring contradiction of himself, and once more spoken in the manner of a man strong in the support of a multitude. Meantime, we should be glad to know what is the "faith of the country"—Perhaps the doctor believes that he himself may still figure as the *Pater Familias*.—But if so, and if the Kirk still rules the roost, why in spite of the long monopoly it enjoyed of the Province, in spite of the labours of its ministers, their godly exhortations from the pulpit, their roaring in the streets, their denunciations of all that was opposed to them, their noise and violence, why has it been necessary for the reformation of the place that a band, for example, like the Salvation Army, expressly condemned by a Presbyterian minister of late, should enter upon the field of their apostleship, and to a great extent supersede them? How comes it that Bishop Nevill felt authorised, as he evidently did at the Luther meeting, to assume a superiority—even if a vague one to them? How comes it that on the very site of their first church there now stands an infidel lecture-hall, and that some of its founders were once prominent men among themselves? Whatever be the "faith of the country," then, it certainly does not seem to be that of the Kirk, and the ministers of the Kirk, under whose ministry all the change occurred should, if only for their own sakes, be very chary about recalling it. And, indeed, when these children grow up, if they find themselves educated as members of no church, the probabilities are that they will belong to the majority. What the "faith of the country" may be, then, it is difficult to divine. Had Dr. Stuart, however, spoken of the common bond of union, binding all the sects together here and elsewhere—and including as well as the extreme evangelical the extreme atheist—we should have understood him clearly, but the sincerity of any man so bound in repudiating the proselytism of Catholics may well be doubted. In any case Dr. Stuart's sincerity and true mind on the subject are very plain, for he has betrayed himself in a manner as glaring as it is ludicrous.

THE San Francisco *News Letter* is in a mighty great fuss entirely because of the Irish. Rebecca, when she also was a wily old woman, was in no greater fright, or pretended for reasons best known to herself to be in no greater a fright, about the daughters of Heth, than is this newspaper about the sons of Green Erin.—And is it not something if these sons actually "run the United States," and have gone out of their own country where their hands were tied to control the political power of one of the greatest countries in the world?—If in so short a time they have arrived at holding in their hands the destinies of the great Republic, we say more power to them. The outcasts who have so rapidly possessed themselves of this vast control deserve to take a leading place upon the earth, and nothing can prevent them from doing so.—The *News Letter* is fierce as to the matter of dynamite and attempts to make much of it against the Irish of the United States, but the trick will hardly tell among a people whom on every side we find bearing testimony to the worth of Irish settlers.—To complain, moreover, that Americans make much of the Irish for interested motives is to cast a stigma upon them for which no true American editor would permit himself to be accountable.—The *News Letter*, besides, appeals to the 'No Popery' cry in trying to raise an alarm lest the public schools should be turned into 'Catholic seminaries,' a change, nevertheless, that would be a public gain in any case, and that considering the kind of work those schools are now doing and the strange, froward generation they are bringing up, would be a change of inestimable value.—It is one, nevertheless, not at all likely to take place, as the editor in question very well knows.—But the height of audacity is reached by this editor when he speaks of the Irish settlers as utterly unworthy to rank with the men whose grandfathers fought for independence. Even were it true that Ireland had not been fully represented in the war of independence—which is very far from being true, for Irish immigrants had a large part in that war, Irish settlers would still have a right to rank with the descendants of those who had fought in it. They would have such a right by virtue of the part they took during the civil war in saving the republic that the war of independence had founded, and when they well repaid to the United States the hospitality accorded to them, and made good their claim to gratitude in the future. When the *News Letter* speaks of a civil war that may break out to solve the "difficult problem," by which is meant the place that Irishmen have won for themselves in their adopted country, it would be well for those who read its words to recall the manner in which Irishmen bore themselves during the last civil war, in which they largely helped to ward off the catastrophe of successful secession and to save the country. If, then Irishmen are influential in the United States they have won their way well, and are able, as they deserve, to hold the position they have gained, notwithstanding the brutal cry of dynamite that cowards raise against them—to be echoed among ourselves also—in Anglo-Saxon interests whose nature is thus betrayed.