

been compelled to confess. Such writing, therefore, on the part of the 'Times,' is merely beating the air, a sort of tangent, devised for the purpose of riding off from the consideration of the real point at issue. But here is the true liberal and Freemason principle—the 'Times' says "The Church must learn that she has no inherent right of being in the land, and that she only stands there by permission of the civil power." There is the reality. The State is the Deity—the absolutely supreme—the rule of law, conscience, religion. The Church is nothing, except by permission of the State. Christianity, then, is a myth. Christ never lived on earth—never founded a Church—never gave a mission to the Apostles. This is, in effect, what the 'Daily Times' blasphemously asserts. It is truly shocking that in the midst of a Christian community, even though it is mainly Protestant, a journal of such wide circulation as the 'Times,' should inculcate a principle so utterly subversive of Christianity.

THE 'DAILY TIMES' AND HOME RULE.

THE 'Otago Daily Times' in its leading columns a few days since waxed eloquent at the death blow which it vainly imagines has been dealt to the Home Rule movement, by the majority by which the measure had been negatived in the House of Commons. This jubilation and the accompanying paean appears to have been caused by the disaffection of the renegade Chief of the Glens, and the disapprobation of the ex-Chancellor of the Exchequer; and because of the apostacy of the one and the disapproval of the other, it hugs itself with delight, and predicts that the ghost has been finally laid. Of course the dicta of a journal so notoriously conspicuous for the veracity of its statements, and the correctness of its opinions as the 'Daily Times,' are entitled to a certain measure of consideration, but we imagine our readers will not have much difficulty in summing up the full amount. Notwithstanding that the subject has been thus so summarily and agreeably settled by our contemporary, we confess we are rash enough to hold an opinion—and one not in unison with that journal—on the question. Contrary to its usual practice of hurling invective and derision at everything of a Celtic character, it has changed its tactics, and flattery has been used instead, the pill to be administered being nicely gilded, the better to conceal its compound. Blarney has taken the place of bounce, and laudation has been lavished with no niggard hand. While tacitly admitting that Englishmen do not understand the art of governing Ireland, and that the necessities of that unhappy country have never been understood or honestly inquired into by English legislators, the writer with questionable consistency says the Irish are themselves alone to blame, inasmuch "as they have steadfastly refused to regard the Government of England as other than a foreign tyranny." So that, according to the 'Times,' because Ireland has been badly governed, foully wronged, and her necessities treated with contempt, her sons alone are culpable for not quietly submitting to acknowledged injustice and misrule. While appreciating "the talent, the wit, and the virtues of that most charming people," it is a source of regret to the writer that they should not have bowed their heads in mute submission, and kissed the rod with which they have been scourged. Whilst attesting the national genius which has placed Irishmen in the foremost ranks as barristers, judges, soldiers, and statesmen, our contemporary denies them the possession of sufficient ability to govern themselves. That the men who have won never-fading laurels on the bench, at the bar, the Senate, and the Cabinet, and gloriously upheld the honor of the nation under which they served, should be unworthy of self-government, is unsound in argument, untrue in substance, and a libel on common sense. According to FROUDE, whose recent work assumes to be an authority on the subject, no people are fit to be entrusted with the reins of government, who have not a respect for justice and for law, and a capability of being formed by those who govern and direct them. In proof of the law-abiding character of the Irish people, we may cite the testimony of Sir JOHN DAVIS, an English Attorney-General during the reign of JAMES I:—He says, "There is no people under Heaven that love equal and fair justice like the Irish;" and in the same letter he adds: "There is no people, who are more willing to submit to fair impartial justice, even though it goes against themselves, than the Irish." So much for their respect for the laws under which they live; and if further proof were wanting, their fidelity to right and principle has been shown by their devo-

tion to their faith through centuries of wrong, oppression, and persecution, and the tenacity with which they clung to the fallen fortunes of the unhappy STUARTS, who though worthless, claimed their allegiance as their lawful sovereigns. With regard to the right to self-government by reason of a capability of being formed by good and judicious government, Mr FROUDE himself has so completely vindicated the right of the Irish people, that we shall merely quote his own words on the point. He says: "They are a people singularly adapted to good government." In the face of this admission, and taking it for granted that, as has been asserted, Ireland has been in a state of chronic discontent and rebellion, it naturally follows that the cause of her disaffection arises from misgovernment. The 'Daily Times' asserts that the reason why Ireland has been subjected to the persecution and injustice under which she labored, may be found in the fact "that English legislators have mostly regarded Ireland as a theatre of disaffection, a costly nuisance, which it was politic to retain in their own hands for fear of the ambitious designs of foreign potentates, and have troubled themselves but little to remove the iron from the limbs of the captive." This is plain speaking; yet in the same breath we find the writer, with singular forgetfulness of what he had just written, extolling the magnanimous conduct of the Government in not entirely crushing those fool-hardy persons who dared to rattle the chains by which they were bound; or were guilty of the crime of—in common with their rulers—imagining they were trampled on, and daring to resist. That Ireland has still rights to demand, and grievances to be redressed, even the sophistry of the 'Daily Times' cannot conceal. If after a trial of seven hundred years the grand secret of governing the people "singularly adapted to good government" has not been discovered, justice and humanity alike demand that the captive should be set free, and the galling chains which have been rivetted for seven centuries at once removed.

The charge has also been made "that the work of reform throughout has been a thankless one," which means, we presume, that although Ireland at present groans under Coercive laws more stringent than any hitherto in force, her gratitude for the boon of mere existence under any circumstances, should be boundless. SYDNEY SMITH who, in the "Letters of PETER PLYMLEY," fought as hard in England in the cause of Emancipation as ever O'CONNELL did in Ireland, thus caricatures the horror felt by Protestants when Catholics who had been admitted to the same national table, asked for "a little more":—"Forthwith a general cry of shame and scandal. Ten years ago you were on your backs. Don't you remember what a great thing you thought it to get a piece of bread! and now, with an audacity only equalled by your ingratitude, you have the impudence to ask for knives and forks." The sarcasm of PETER PLYMLEY is just as applicable at the present day as ever it was a generation since; and the No-Popery and Protestant ascendancy every whit as rampant. In one of those letters the witty Canon humorously illustrates the folly of fostering national and religious differences.—"He supposes the captain of a British warship in the presence of a French enemy. Does he call all hands on deck and talk to them of king, country, sweethearts, hearts of oak, French frogs, wooden shoes, and so forth? No! not a syllable of all this! But the first thing he does is to secure twenty or thirty of his prime sailors, who happen to be Catholics, claps them in irons and sets a guard over them of as many Protestants. He then goes on deck and reminds the sailors that they are all of different religions, exhorts the Episcopalian gunner not to trust the Presbyterian quarter-master, issues positive orders that the Catholics shall be fired on at the first show of discontent, and then rushes through the fight examining the men in the Thirty-nine Articles." The evils and absurdities which SYDNEY SMITH lampooned with such caustic force have not been altogether swept away, and there are many modestly claiming credit for liberality and toleration, who, in the hour of difficulty and danger, would court the strong arm and willing heart of the people they have stigmatised as "a costly nuisance." True, there are a few noble Englishmen whose love of justice and fair-play has risen above national prejudice; men who have linked their names and energies with the Spartan band now waging the unequal contest, and whose memories will be cherished for the noble part they have taken with the weak and oppressed in the struggle of right against might. The 'Daily Times' assert it to be neither politic or likely that their labors should be crowned with success. We think differently, and time will tell which will prove the better prophet.