

they have read, or perhaps experienced, of the cantrips of the rain-makers and other officials of heathendom, but it is quite evident, that of the office and influence of the Christian priesthood they have no idea whatever. We have no intention of defending Sir Charles Gavan Duffy from the charge, for we write for Catholics, and they know that all such accusations are mere folly, but these wild invectives show us the forces over which our talented fellow-countryman has triumphed, and add to the pride with which we must regard an Irishman and a Catholic who has ever been openly true to his race and his creed, and who has attained to eminence by the power alone of intellect and culture.

The far-famed Diamond of California continues to charm, by her versatility and sprightliness, large audiences at the Princess Theatre, where she is ably supported by Mr. George Giddens. Mrs. Walter Hill also, by her graceful acting, forms a powerful attraction, and maintains the high place she has long occupied in the estimation of the public of Dunedin.

The death of Mr. Thomas O'Donnell will be learned with regret by many of our readers. Mr. O'Donnell had been for some time in failing health, and on Wednesday last he expired at the residence of Dr. Murphy in Stuart-street, Dunedin. He was known and highly respected, not only in this town, but also throughout the province. He was a zealous member of the Catholic Church, and ever foremost in aiding any good work in connection with religion.—R.I.P

HIBERNIAN AUSTRALASIAN CATHOLIC BENEFIT SOCIETY, DUNEDIN BRANCH, No. 73.

The following resolutions were agreed to by a Committee of the Dunedin Branch on September 1st, and finally adopted by the Branch at an extraordinary meeting held on Monday, September 11th, 1876:—

Resolved 1. That in the opinion of this Branch it is deemed desirable to form a District, to be denominated the Otago and Canterbury District, and to consist of the following Branches: Invercargill, Lawrence, Dunedin, Naseby, Oamaru, Akaroa, Lyttelton, and Christchurch.

Resolved 2. That in order to overcome any legal objections a District be at once formed under the present laws, and that immediately after formation the laws be so amended as to suit the convenience of the Branches forming said District.

Resolved 3. That in the event of the aforesaid Branches agreeing to the foregoing resolutions, an application be at once forwarded to the E. D. requesting it to grant a Dispensation, and also to depute an Officer to open the District. The first meeting of Delegates to be held in Dunedin; the place of future meetings to be decided upon at the first District Meeting.

Report of Committee appointed by the Dunedin Branch to revise the present District Board Laws:—Your Committee beg to report having carefully considered the working of the District Laws, and recommend the following amendments, but considering this is a matter which the other Branches should have a voice in, your Committee refrains from finally adopting them until such time as the proposed District is formed according to the present Laws, and the Delegates from the respective Branches have had an opportunity of perusing the proposed amendments:—

1. That the July meeting be abolished, and in lieu thereof one General Meeting be held in each year, in the month of January.

2. That it be compulsory on Branches to send Delegates according to a scale to be agreed upon by the Delegates at the first District meeting.

3. That in order to secure thorough representation, and in order that each Branch in the District may bear a proportionate share of the expenses, Law 46 be amended, and the quarterage to Incidental Fund increased from nine-pence to fifteen-pence per quarter. That all the expenses of the District be paid out of the Incidental Fund, including Delegates' expenses.

The Committee is of opinion that the above is the only method by which thorough representation can be obtained. The amount of quarterage from three hundred and fifty members being considered ample to raise a sufficient sum at once to defray expenses, while it is anticipated with confidence that an annual reduction in the quarterage will be made. The remainder of the amendments being only of minor importance it is not thought desirable to enumerate them here.

NO MAORI EVER A CATHOLIC PRIEST.

To the Editor of the 'New Zealand Times.'

SIR,—I, as a friend of the Maori, read with interest in your issue of this day what they aimed at in their petition to the Legislature in the matter of education. I was suddenly startled by the statement that a Maori of Hokianga had gone to Rome, and after a regular course of studies had been ordained a priest, and came back to act as a Roman Catholic clergyman in his own country. After three years of ministration, it is added, he abandoned his office, and relapsed into his former state. Well, I have reason to say that I was much surprised at this piece of news, for it is as strange as it is false. For the last thirty-seven years I could account, almost as an eye witness, for every event of importance or novelty connected with the Catholic Church in this country, yet I never heard of a Maori being made a Catholic priest. I know that Protestants ordained such persons. I congratulate them. But we Catholics have not arrived at that perfection, nor did we make the attempt. Therefore the history of a Maori Roman Catholic priest having abandoned his office and relapsed into his former state is a ludicrous invention. With your kind permission, sir, I would advise you to be aware not to connect yourself with so grave statements, made with such a levity; to distrust Maori assertions, and particularly Maori translations.—I have, &c.,

A CATHOLIC PRIEST.

August 31, 1876.

A WOULD-BE WIT AND CAN'T-BE GENTLEMAN.

IN a recent number of the 'Musical World,' a London publication, an individual named Goodban published a pretended reminiscence of Sir William Wilde, which, while affecting a sort of regard for the memory of that eminent Irishman, represented him as having conducted himself in a very ridiculous and vulgar sort of way on an occasion referred to by the writer. Goodban says he met Dr. Wilde at Chamounix, on his way to make an ascent of Mont Blanc. When the guide asked the party if they would have mules to aid them in their ascent of the mountain. "Wilde replied in his strong Irish brogue, and a humorous twinkle in his eyes, 'D'ye mane to insult a man that has walked to the top of the Pake o' Teneriffe? Get out o' that, sir, and bring me an Alpine stick, an' if I can't poke myself along with that, may I never taste butter-milk and whiskey again.'" After the party had got some distance up the mountain, Goodban tells us "Wilde began to puff and blow, and show signs of fatigue. He exclaimed, 'Bedad, sir, I'm thinking my legs are not quite in the condition they were when I walked to the top of the Pake o' Teneriffe.'" Goodban offered him a mount on his mule. This, he says, Wilde refused; but he took hold of the animal's tail, and so was pulled to the top of the mountain. This absurd and offensive story bears all the marks of its Cockney paternity. Our distinguished countryman, Sir R. P. Stewart, administered a well-deserved reproof to the writer in a succeeding number of the publication above-named. After some remarks deprecatory of the introduction of the stage Irishman into the pages of the 'Musical World,' Sir Robert says: "In conclusion, I deliberately assert, with the full concurrence of his family and friends, that not one who knew the late Sir William Wilde, as I had the privilege to do, would recognise in your correspondent's description anything but a somewhat vulgar, pointless, and altogether misleading caricature—a caricature which would, unlike most caricatures, recall neither the memory nor the manner of an eminent and dignified professional gentleman, such as Sir William really was." That is a filip for Goodban which he will be likely to recollect for some time.—'Nation.'

ENGLISH ENCROACHMENTS.

UNDER cover of eloquent debates in Parliament, England has been silently pushing on the work of encroachments on whatever remnant yet exists of the ancient rights and privileges of our country.

The most recent act of this kind is the oppressive privilege assumed by English Courts of dragging Irish traders over to Westminster, there to adjudicate upon any difference these may have with English customers. Under this system a shopkeeper in Cork, Sligo, Derry, or any other remote or near town, may be forced to take a number of witnesses over to London, at a great expense, to keep them there for weeks at great expense, to fee English lawyers at great expense, and return—ruined!—and all because of some trivial discrepancy in an account.

This is a matter of the gravest importance, and not the less so because it is one of historical antecedents. It is a pallid parallel of a former famous usurpation.

One hundred and eighty-eight years ago an English society, which had secured the monopoly of rich tracts of land in Ulster for the purpose of "planting," had a dispute with the Protestant Bishop of Derry. The case came before the Supreme Court of Appeal in Ireland—the Irish House of Lords. It decided in favor of the Bishop.

Whereupon the Londoners had the insolence to lodge a complaint with the English Parliament, in 1688, against the conduct of the Irish Parliament, and the English Lords declared the Irish Lords were not judges in the case. The Irish High Court of Parliament was thus declared to be a mere servitor to the English, and its judicial power was usurped from it.

Then appeared the "Case of Ireland Stated" by Molyneux, in which the author upheld the right of Irish jurisdiction in an unanswerable manner. Unable to reply, by any exertion of intellect, the English Parliament, with weak spite, ordered the book to be burned by the hands of the common hangman. They were as fond, in England, of burning books as of burning persons.

The Irish Lords were not dismayed by this confagration. They had, in those days, the spirit of men. Hence they met, passed a series of firm resolutions, and protested solemnly against the attempt at usurpation.

A few years later, in 1703, the case of Lord Ward against the Earl and Countess of Meath came before the public. An order of the English House of Lords evicted and dispossessed the Earl and Countess of their property in Ireland. The Irish Peers, however, having had cognisance of the case, immediately asserted their rights, repudiated the English order, and replaced the Earl and Countess in their estates.

In the same year another, and still more memorable, case came up—the famous Annesley case. Maurice Anne-ley appealed from the decision of the Irish Lords to England, and the English Peers reversed the judgment of the Irish Court. Then matters were pressed to extremities, and a conflict of authority began. The London House directed the Barons of the Exchequer in Ireland to enforce their order. The Sheriff point blank refused to recognise the usurpation, and the Irish Peers protected him.

Then the Irish Peers resolved to place a representation of the matter before the King—an error of judgment, from one point of view, for the King's council, being English, were tolerably sure to support the English Peers. They did so, and, in order to put an end to Irish rights in the matter, they sped an Act, 6th George I., through the English Parliament, declaring that the King, Lords, and Commons of England had power to make laws to bind Ireland, and that the House of Lords of Ireland had no jurisdiction, and that all proceedings before that Irish court were void.