

Dublin Notes.

(From our Exchanges.)

LOED DOWNSHIRE, who has subscribed £100 to the fund which is being raised for electoral purposes by the Irish Orangemen, is a lineal descendant of Lord Hillsborough, who condemned the Act of Union, as may be seen in the eighth volume of Lecky's "England in the Eighteenth Century." Hill is the family name of the Downshires. The Downshires on the passing of the Union received from Great Britain a sum of £52,500 as a bribe for the votes of seven rotten boroughs in favour of the Union in the Irish Parliament. People wonder here that persons with antecedents so scandalous are shameless enough to put themselves forward prominently in Irish politics at the present day.

Speaking lately at a meeting of the Federation, Mr T. M. Healy said:—"On the day before the dissolution they had to draw a cheque for £33 for necessary expenses, and they had to ask the gentleman, in whose favour it was drawn, not to present it for two or three days. That was the position on the eve of the general election; but within ten days they were in receipt of £10,000—£5,000 from America, subscribed £4,000 of it by Eugene Kelly, and £1,000 from Mayor Byrne. There was cabled from Australia a loan of £5,000 without interest and without security to Mr Thomas Curran, the new member for South Sligo (cheers). And it should be remembered for these gentlemen and for their friends that if Home Rule was accomplished in the next Parliament by the aid of the Irish party that that party would have been non-existent from inability to pay the sheriff's fees were it not for the welcome financial succour that they received from America and Australia" (cheers).

They have thought better of it. The petition against the election of William O'Brien and Maurice Healy for Cork city on the grounds

That eminent amateur politician, Sir Edward Sullivan, met (says the *Irish Catholic*) rather a bad fall during his recent attempt to capture an English Parliamentary seat. It appears that at one of his meetings a miner had listened to him until he was finished. He then asked liberty to put a question to the hon. Irish baronet. The permission was granted, and the miner proceeded as follows:—"Does Sir Edward believe that the Irish people are not capable of managing their own affairs?" "I do, most emphatically," returned the baronet. "Then," said the minor, "you are an Irishman, Sir Edward, and if you are not capable of managing your own affairs in Ireland, don't you think it is an insult to the English people to ask them to allow you to manage their affairs?" Sir Edward subsided.

The manly letter of a Protestant ex-sheriff of Cork, declaring that no public man belonging to that persuasion in the city on the Lee could step forward and declare that his religion had been a hindrance to him in his relations with his Catholic fellow-citizens, came out very timely on the eve of the elections. Another letter worthy of notice is that which appeared a few days ago from a Mr William Coghill in the *Manchester Guardian*. Speaking as a Protestant, he says that, "having worked as a journeyman in an industrial school in Tralee, where every other soul (about 120 in all) was a Catholic, he never had the slightest trouble about religious matters either at work or in the town itself, where the Catholics are eight to one." He adds, "It is only ignorant and insulting Protestants who bring trouble on themselves by failing to respect the religious susceptibilities of those with whom they are thrown." And we may add that in that Catholic town, the capital of the Catholic County of Kerry, the public officials, with scarcely an exception—and particularly those connected with the grand jury, enjoying big salaries and emoluments for almost nominal services—have been and are Protestants from the grand jury secretary down to the bridewell-keeper. Where any exception was made it was in favour of nominal Catholics—men whose Catholicity was merely a tradition. Where any actual work has to be done in connection with these officials it is done by Protestants also, in almost every instance. Ability and good conduct in Catholics go for nothing when patronage is being disturbed—when

We advise our Readers to

DRINK ONLY

SUMMER BLOOM CEYLON TEA

The Purest, Richest, most Economic.

Obtainable at all Storekeepers.

of clerical intimidation will not now be proceeded with. This course (says the *Belfast Weekly*) has, we hear, been decided upon partly because William Redmond has found a seat in Clare, partly on the score of expense, and because the Parnellite leaders believe the petitions in North and South Meath, which are to be proceeded with, will be sufficient for their present purposes. This is letting themselves down easy. We shall soon be told, at least as soon as some other suitable excuse is invented, that the Meath petitions are also abandoned. It was that way in Kilkenny and Sligo, and also at the bye-election in Cork. When an election is lost it is all because of "clerical intimidation," but when it comes to evidence, well, the intimidation becomes invisible.

Among the voters who polled for Mr Thomas Sexton at the Odorney booth in North Kerry was one, John Scallan, aged 102 years. The old man walked to the poll, and after depositing his ballot paper he went up to Mr Davitt, M.P., who was attending to Mr Sexton's interests, and said, "I was eight years old at the time of the '98 rebellion, and I have given my vote for Sexton against the landlords to-day."

Mr Phillip Jones, father of Mr W. Milward Jones, of Rosebank, voted for Mr Hamilton Woods, the Tory candidate in North Dublin. He had not been out of his house for two years until the day before the polling, yet nothing would stop him from recording his vote. He ordered his carriage, was lifted into it, and drove to the booth, where, by consent of the several agents, the sheriff came out and took his vote at the carriage door. This gentleman was born on the 31st of May, 1798—memorable year!—and is now consequently in his 95th year. An example of determination to every voter of whatever party.

Mr T. P. O'Connor, who has been on a general election stamp, relates a funny story of Mr Gilliat, late of Clapham, the now-elected member for Widnes. One day last week Mr Gilliat, who is a comparative stranger in Widnes, went to pay a visit to the vicar of the district, and found him attending to the funeral rites of a well-known parishioner. Mr Gilliat was equal to the situation, joined the funeral procession, and appeared in the front as a chief mourner—an excellent stroke of business, indeed that, amounted almost to inspiration.

the money of a Catholic people is being disbursed. This is not a tale of the penal laws of a hundred or two hundred years ago. It is a simple statement of the facts of this, our own day.

The Rev Mr Cotton's (Carogh Orphanage) trial has now ended. At Belfast, Mr Justice Holmes, sat as a judge of the Assize in the Crown Court. The Rev Mr Cotton was put forward. Mr J. H. Campbell, Q.C., stated he was directed by the Attorney-General to apply for judgment to be entered against the prisoner. Mr Justice Holmes thereupon called Samuel George Cotton: The prisoner stepped forward and was allowed to stand at the counsel's table in custody of a warder, to receive judgment. He applied to be allowed to condone for his crimes by a malt alone, without any incarceration. The judge then read the very learned and peripatetic judgment of the Lord Chief Baron, who tried the prisoner. This gave the full history of the case as tried at the April Assizes, and the subsequent proceedings before the Judges for Crown Cases Reserved, which were against the traverser. His lordship then referred to the penalties directed to be applied by statute to such convicted criminals. They are, said the Lord Chief Baron, the traverser shall be liable at the discretion of the Court to a fine not exceeding £100, or alternatively, or in default of payment of such fine, or in addition to payment thereof, to imprisonment, with or without hard labour, for any term not exceeding two years." His Lordship then summed up the evidence, and decreed Mr Cotton six months' imprisonment, without hard labour, and £400 fine, £100 in each case of guilt, commission, or omission brought home to him. The Lord Chief Baron stated in his judgment he would have given a longer term only for affidavits of physical unfitness supplied by Sir George Porter and Dr Charles Fitzgerald on behalf of Mr Cotton, and he omitted the hard labour, taking into account the sacred office of the prisoner. The Rev Mr Cotton asked Mr Justice Holmes that he should be treated as a first-class misdemeanant, but the judge said he supposed he would get the full benefit of the law, the precise conditions of which he knew nothing of. Mr Cotton said his lordship had the power to direct this. But the judge informed him that he had only power to read the sentence of the Lord Chief Baron. The prisoner then went to gaol in custody