

AMERICAN
OPINION.

THE utterances of the New York Press on the Explosives Act also go far towards explaining the attitude of the American mind on the Irish question.

Even those papers that approve of the Act have still a strong word or two to say as to the measures that should be taken to remove the causes of the dissatisfaction that has led to the wild theory of dynamite, and, to judge from what they say, it would not appear as if England can expect much help from America in repressing even the most extreme conspiracies that are made against her. The *Herald*, for example, while it does not consider the Act unreasonable, thinks that England is bound to remove the causes of Irish dissatisfaction. "Dynamite" it says, "is merely a symptom of a disease which now deserves study in order to find a remedy more than ever. For us to advise England would be as foolish as it was for England to advise us in our Civil War. But the moral in both cases is the inutility of repressive laws. Great Britain is bound to remove every cause tending to make the Irish poor, unprosperous, and discontented." And again, it recalls the facts connected with the Bernard affair in 1868, when, although sixty people had been mangled, England refused to legislate concerning the matter. "Not one human being has been hurt by the dynamite," it adds, "yet England indulges in extravagant domestic legislation, and her reported representation to the United States about 'liberty to conspire' is significant in view of the Philadelphia Convention." The *World*, on the other hand, considers the Act offensive, and speaks very plainly as to what the results may be of the present troubles. "The relations" it says, "between England and Ireland are a constant menace to the repose of the United States and the prosperity of Great Britain. Angry notes between Lord Granville and Mr. Frelinghuysen would disturb vast interests on both sides of the Atlantic. But we cannot accept the passions of England as our guides here. The Cuban incident during President Grant's administration proves that it is impossible to mend our laws to meet British convenience; but the Americans will insist that England should restore peace to Ireland. If Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Forster cannot do this, Lord Salisbury and Sir S. Northcote should give the matter a trial. Why do not the British voters begin with this? If nobody in England has a remedy, why make faces at New York? Why do the London journals ask America to dam the stream which wells up under their own eyes?" And again, it says, "For centuries England made not a single concession to the Irish appeals for justice. The Irish have learned the lesson that the readiest way to secure any reforms is to destroy the property and disquiet the lives of Englishmen. It is perfectly natural that the English should prefer moral suasion, which they can control, and perfectly natural that they should desire to enlist foreign Governments as their police. But it is scarcely credible that they should expect such a demand to be granted. If the English cannot govern Ireland without summoning all mankind to assist to suppress the Irish resentment of their processes, there is clearly nothing for the English to do but to allow Ireland to govern herself." Finally, the *Sun* says, "The Explosives Act endows the Government with powers nearly as unlimited as those once exercised by the Spanish Inquisition, or as were wielded by the notorious Third Section at St. Petersburg. A retrospective clause would have made this law the engine of a persecution as intolerable as any that was ever sanctioned under an autocracy. The fact that the expediency of such a clause was mooted by influential organs of public opinion best indicates the extent to which fear has paralysed the normal principles of the English people. No more striking proof of terror could be furnished than the reckless and headlong celerity of the passing of this Bill."

KIDNAPPED?

IN connection with a trial that has lately taken place in London, and to which some allusion has been made in one or other of our daily contemporaries, we find some particulars in the *Standard* of April 11. The case was that in which a young Polish Jewess, who it was alleged desired to become a Christian, had sought shelter in a Catholic Home conducted by the Sisters of Mercy, and under the jurisdiction of the Most Rev. Dr. Lacey. According to the evidence given by the Bishop and the Superioress of the Home, the girl had come there last September stating that, in consequence of her desire to become a Catholic, which she owed to having associated with Catholics and attended their places of worship in New York, whither her father had escaped from the Russian military service, her relations in England had treated her very harshly and had turned her out into the street, whence she had made her way, in a very filthy condition, to the Home. There she had been taken in and had remained for some time, receiving frequent visits from her grandmother, who was always allowed to see her alone, and who seemed satisfied at the treatment bestowed on her. The Superioress, moreover, who had had some doubts as to the sincerity of the girl's professed religious desires, had constantly recommended her to return to her friends, which, however, she refused to do, and she at length left, in company of a respectable married lady for the Home of Notre Dame de Sion at Paris.

Nothing more than this was known about her by the heads of the English Catholic Home. The fact of the girl's having been sent to Paris, we may add, is quite sufficient of itself to show that there had been no design on the part of the Sisters of Mercy to interfere with her liberty in any way, and that they had only done for her what charity inspired them to do. The French police arrangements are such as to make it certain that no attempt at deception or unfair dealing could have been made in the Parisian Home, and they are such also as to prove that the truth was told as to where the girl had been sent to from England. No suspicion can, therefore, be attached to the Catholic Institutions concerned in this case.

A HISTORY of Cromwell's doings in Ireland, THE "SOGGARTH" recently published in Dublin by the Rev. Denis AROON." Murphy, S.J., once more reminds us of how closely united the priests and people of Ireland have been in all the sufferings inflicted upon that country—the priests bearing the extremity of all the evil, and enduring it without flinching in order to strengthen and sustain the courage of the suffering people. In Cromwell's time, then, a price was placed upon the head of three "beasts" respectively—the second "beast" being the priest whose head was valued at £10 or double the price of that of the wolf. But the priest still did not desert his people or seek for his own safety in a flight from the country, as he might have done. "I wandered through woods and mountains," says the Bishop of Ferns speaking of the time that followed the horrible massacre at Wexford, "generally taking my rest and repose exposed to the hoar frost, sometimes lying within caves and caverns of the earth. In the woods and groves I passed more than five months, that thus I might administer some consolation to the few survivors of my flock who had escaped from the merciless massacre, and dwelt there with the herds of cattle. But neither woods nor caverns could afford me a lasting refuge; for the heretical governor of Wexford, George Cooke, well known for his barbarity, with several troops of cavalry and foot soldiers, searching everywhere, anxious for my death, explored even the highest mountains and most difficult recesses; the huts and habitations adjoining, in which I had sometimes offered the Holy Sacrifice, he destroyed by fire; and my hiding-places, which were formed of branches of trees, were all thrown down. Among those who were subjected to much annoyance on my account, was a nobleman in whose house he supposed me to be concealed. He searched the whole house with lighted tapers, accompanied by soldiers holding their naked swords in their hands to slay me the moment I should appear. But in the midst of all these perils God protected me, and mercifully delivered me from the hands of this blood-thirsty man." Of the massacre itself, the Bishop had already given the following particulars:—"On that fatal day, October 11, 1649, I lost everything I had. Wexford, my native town, then abounding in merchandise, ships, and wealth, was taken at the sword's point by that plague of England, Cromwell, and sacked by the infuriated soldiery. Before God's altar fell sacred victims, holy priests of the Lord. Of those who were seized outside the church, some were scourged, some thrown into chains and imprisoned, while others were hanged or put to death by cruel tortures. The blood of the noblest of our citizens was shed so that it inundated the streets. There was hardly a house that was not defiled with carnage and filled with wailing. In my own palace, a boy hardly sixteen years of age, an amiable youth, also my gardener, and sacristan, were barbarously butchered; and my chaplain, whom I had left behind me at home, was pierced with six mortal wounds and left weltering in his blood. And these abominable deeds were done in the open day by wicked assassins." Another famous bishop of these troubled times, we may add, taking our information from another source, was a native of the Scotch Highlands, named McDonald, whose skill in playing the bagpipes stood him in good stead as he went about disguised in the tartan of his clan.—The stories told of the piper-bishop, as he is called, are many, and his adventures and hair-breadth escapes from the hands of the murderers are very wonderful. Bishop McDonald, however, was destined, after all, to give his life for his flock, and after a saintly career of some length he died of starvation. The whole story of Ireland's struggles, in fact, is the story of the priest's devotion, and the extremity of all the suffering was willingly borne by him.

HOW THEY
WORK
THEIR SYSTEM.

ESPECIALLY comforting to the people who are engaged in the worship of the great god secularism, and in sacrificing their children in his honour—and especially creditable to the moral standing of statesmen in Victoria,—as well as suggestive concerning the management of the famous system generally, are certain extracts that have recently been published from the evidence taken by the Royal Commission.—Junior teachers appointed over the heads of senior teachers, unqualified and unnecessary teachers appointed and even immorality considered as no bar to the teacher's profession,—such are the interesting particulars that the *Australasian* gives us in the following paragraph:—"the extracts which the *Argus* has