

we think the following passages taken from a review of a lately published life of Coligny, which we find in a recent number of the *Saturday Review*, teach:—"It is strange to realize that three hundred years ago a large and most important minority of the French people—containing, in fact, nearly all that was best in French intellect and learning—were incessantly occupied in hearing sermons, singing hymns, making long prayers, and reading the Bible. This was so, however, and at one time it seemed more likely that the minority would become the majority, and that, as La Rochelle actually was, Paris would become. One understands the Huguenots either as an army of fanatics or as Christian martyrs; as marching along shouting the strange songs which have been so happily preserved; as listening to the preachers before the battle; as anything you please except a modern Frenchman. In fact, the Puritanic spirit of the Huguenots, so quickly awakened, so quickly spread, has almost entirely disappeared, even among the French Protestants themselves. They have shown more than a tendency towards rationalism; they have ceased to proselytise; they have no longer any enthusiasm, save in the glorious history of their long struggle. As regards the lower classes there has never been any inclination at all to pass over into the Protestant lines. They may hate their priests, and keep outside the Church; but they do not, therefore, seek the Temple; and the Protestant faith is no longer looked upon as the natural retreat for those who cannot away with the Mass. In fact, the spirit of Gaspard de Châtillon is extinct; French Protestantism of the ancient type is gone long ago; and the modern form of it is well nigh as dead a thing as Quakerism in England."—In these effects we surely discern a worldly system unsuited to the particular genius of the people, and only implanted among them that it might in due time perish, rather than a divine creed restored to its original purity, as the pretence concerning Protestantism is.

It seems that the guileless Anglo-Saxon has never been known to commit anything aggravated in the way of an assault. Of his own nature, John Bull it would appear, is as mild as a sucking-calf, and everything bad that has occurred in his island has come of the presence there of naughty strangers. So, at least, judges the enlightened Judge Day, and so he proclaimed a few weeks ago a Liverpool, when passing a heavy sentence on two Irishmen for an offence of the kind. "Such a dastardly crime," said he, "could not be found in England if it were not committed by men unfortunately imported into the country." Is it any wonder, then, that the dear John Bull should bitterly hate his neighbours? as he most undoubtedly does. The cannibal Maori, perhaps, believed himself demoralised by the example of the neighbour he hungered to devour, and the Australian black, no doubt, considers his territory defiled by the feet of an invading tribe. And yet we have read of things that the ingenuous John Bull himself seems to have obeyed his native impulses in performing. That gentleman was certainly not imported who, the other day, at Birmingham, threw a bucket of blazing paraffine oil over his wife, whereof she died in terrible agony; nor was it a human importation who, a few months ago, murdered all his little children merely to get rid of them; nor have the innumerable multitude of whose feats of kicking and bruising in various ways we have frequently heard been immigrants—but racy of the soil were they. Bill Sykes could have been no worse had his name been Paddy Murphy. We need not speak of those crimes of which John Bull has been guilty abroad, for they are bright with the halo of the national glory and above reproach. But what of the very bench whence Judge Day made his accusation, is that indeed an immaculate seat? Let the memory of Judge Williams and the manner of his death at Nottingham, the other day, make answer. Verily, there is no need of importing the wicked or the vicious into the native home of John Bull, they are there in abundance—and, what is more, importation there too commonly means corruption for the imported

At the opening of the winter session of the statistical society the other day in London, Sir Rawson W. Bawson in delivering an address on "British and Foreign colonies," gave some details as to the reasonableness of Germany's desire to obtain colonies, that were not only instructive but also in some degree suggestive. Since 1820 he said Germany had given to the United States about three millions and a half of people. "In the last three years, 1881-83, their number was 655,800, an average of 218,600 a year, exceeding the emigration from the United Kingdom in the same years by nearly one-third; and the number of German emigrants and their families residing in foreign countries, including those adjoining the Fatherland—viz., Hungary, Galicia, and Russia, amounted at the present time to at least 10½ millions. It should therefore, scarcely be a matter for surprise or exception if Germany should desire to possess colonial territory to which her emigrant population might resort, retaining them under her authority, and profiting by their industry and commerce, and by the extension of the national dominion, instead of witnessing their continual absorption in the territory of other countries, with which

possibly she might have no sympathies." But the suggestion is that in order to accommodate so large an emigration as this, and to preserve it as still an integral and profitable portion of the empire, something more will be needed than tropical islands of limited area, or the torrid and comparatively barren parts of Africa.—The speaker continued, still in a rather suggestive strain. "Germany, too, had acquired a large mercantile marine by the incorporation of the Hanse Towns with the empire; and the necessities of her present political condition obliged her to maintain a powerful naval force, which was available for the protection of any newly-acquired colonial territory, and would find a suitable employment in times of peace in visiting and extending them." Supposing, however, that these territories could not be extended in the times of peace, would that powerful naval force be still put to the use in question? On the whole then these suggestions are highly interesting, and open to us a subject most deserving of consideration.

"ARCHBISHOP MORAN'S 'Historical Sketch of the CAN JOHN BULL Persecutions of Irish Catholics under the Rule of BLUSH? Cromwell and the Puritans,' should be read by every Englishman," says the *Month*, "and if we Englishmen, after reading it, are not ashamed of ourselves, we must be lost to shame." These are words that claim the attention of all Englishmen—and more especially of English Catholics who, where Ireland is concerned, often give us an example of the meeting of extremes, and prove themselves like minded with the Puritans. Indeed, it is a question that deserves careful consideration as to how far English Catholics who refuse their sympathies to the Irish cause, or who, as it occasionally happens, even on the part of sincere English Catholics, bitterly hate, calumniate, and oppose that cause, are identifying themselves with the persecutors of the Church—for it is quite impossible to separate the Irish national cause from that of the Catholic faith in Ireland. The *Month* continues—"Nor can we flatter ourselves by laying all the blame on Cromwell and the Puritans, for, putting aside the fact that, Puritans or not, they were English, the English Monarch and the English Parliament, on the Restoration, confirmed by the Act of Settlement the English robbers in their ill-gotten possessions, and set their seal to the impoverishment of the Irish Catholics. It is a wonder that Catholicity has not been extirpated; it is indeed a wonder that, when the Catholics in the diocese of Dublin in 1657, had been reduced to 3,000, there are now, after two hundred years of almost uninterrupted persecution, well nigh 390,000 Catholics in that diocese." "Three parties, to speak generally," continues the writer, "are concerned in the events related by Archbishop Moran: the English Royalists, the English Puritans, and the Irish Catholics. The English monarchy had thrown off its allegiance to the Holy See, what wonder that its subjects should throw off their allegiance to itself? The English monarchy had created Anglicanism by Act of Parliament in opposition to the protestation of the English Church, what wonder that Anglicans should drift away into Puritanism? Both Royalists and Puritans persecuted the Catholics; the Catholics took part with the Royalists rather than with the Puritans, as the less bad of the two; but when it served the turn of the Royalists to provide for their own security at the expense of the Catholics, the latter were left to the tender mercies of Cromwell and his myrmidons, and extirpation was the order of the day." As at present, we may remark in passing, the order of the day is emigration, whose bearing on the Catholic religion is also adverse. The writer quotes from Archbishop Moran's work—"The Parliamentary party, writes Lord Clarendon (History i., 215), had grounded their own authority and strength upon such foundations as were inconsistent with any toleration of the Roman Catholic religion, and even with any humanity to the Irish nation—and more especially to those of the old native extraction, the whole race whereof they had upon the matter sworn to extirpate." In 1641 the following order was accordingly issued to the commander of the Irish forces—"It is resolved that it is fit his lordship do endeavour with His Majesty's forces to slay and destroy all the said rebels and their adherents and relievers, by all the ways and means he may; and burn, destroy, waste, consume and demolish all the places, towns and houses where the said rebels have been relieved and harboured, and all the hay and corn there, and kill and destroy all the men there inhabiting able to bear arms." The reviewer goes on as follows—"The Lords and Commons of England enacted, October 24, 1644, that 'no quarter should be given to any Irishman or to any Papist born in Ireland.' War has its horrors, and men are disposed to make allowance for great horrors on the ground that they are committed in war, but when the war is waged in cold blood against those whose only crime is loyalty to God and king and fatherland, the murders committed in war become more detestable, because they are perpetrated under the mask of legalised injustice. So Pilate crucified our Lord; so England decimated Ireland." And so, we may add, she continues her course to this very hour. We are, then, given some details as to the doings of particular leaders. "In Dublin, Sir Charles Coote, senr., one of the ringleaders of Puritanism in Ireland (whose career closed in 1642), made no exception in the