

at his post. He then exclaimed against his perjured lips having touched the hallowed lips of our Queen (cheers); but now he had been to Paris, and became a conspirator with the Emperor to draw this country into a policy hostile to its interests and degrading to its honour. Looking at the position of the Emperor in Rome, which he held in opposition to the desire of all Italy, to his policy in Mexico, Cochim-China and Japan, where every step was marked with bloodshed and devastation, he saw the ambition of Louis XIV., and the grasp of the first of his name, but there was still reason to suppose he might at least be swamped in the vastness of his designs. The hon. member then proceeded to defend the policy of the North, and expressed his opinion that slavery was doomed, and the restoration of the Union not impossible. He would suppose that it was possible the Union would be restored on the basis of the South, although he did not believe it, for he had faith in the moral government of the world. The United States could, with their army and navy and vast power, drive us out of Canada and the West Indies. He strongly condemned the policy and objects of the Southern seceded States, and spoke of the North as the organised defender of liberty, freedom, and equality. Yet it was in such a cause and against such a Government Mr. Roebuck, who professed to be more English than most Englishmen, asked the House to throw its weight and hostility into the scale. A war with the United States would be a war on the ocean, and everything belonging to both countries would be swept from the seas. When the trouble in America was over, whether the Union was restored or not, it would leave a wound in the hearts of the most instructed and the wealthiest people on earth, which a century would not heal; but he prayed the Great Arbitrator of events would never permit this country to commit the most stupendous act of guilt ever recorded in the annals of the world.

Mr. WYNDHAM moved the adjournment of the debate.

Sir G. GREY said he would not now notice the extraordinary conduct of Mr. Roebuck in constituting himself an envoy to the Emperor of the French, although such conduct was a violation of all confidence and official courtesy. He repeated the declarations of Earl Russell in the House of Lords, and expressed his inability to reconcile them with the statement of Mr. Roebuck. As to his personal knowledge of the views of the Emperor of the French they were totally at variance with the information possessed by the Foreign Office. He utterly denied that there was the slightest ground for the complaint that the confidential communications of the Emperor had been submitted to the Federal Government. Such a charge was preposterous, and Mr. Roebuck must have misunderstood the Emperor, who has always expressed his satisfaction at the manner in which his views had been considered by her Majesty's Government.

The debate was then adjourned.

The other orders were then disposed of, and the House adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS—YESTERDAY.
Mr. W. EWART moved the second reading of the Weights and Measures Bill. The object of which is to assimilate our weights and measures to the decimal system. The motion was supported by Messrs. Locke, P. Urquhart, Adderly, Baines, Cobden and others, and Mr. M. Gibson, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer. On a division there were for the second reading, 110; against, 75; majority, 35. The announcement of the numbers was received with cheers.

CONSOLIDATED CHAMBER—DUBLIN, TUESDAY.

Drinan v. Barnardo.—Mr. O'Shaughnessy moved, on the part of the defendant, for leave to plead double matter. The action was brought for an alleged libel upon the plaintiff in the form of a resolution passed in the Cork City Rowing Club, to the effect that he be expelled from it in consequence of litigious and vindictive proceedings. The action was brought against the defendant, although he was merely a member of the club, and was not officially connected with it. Counsel sought to traverse the publication and to plead no libel; also to plead a justification in respect of the circumstances under which the plaintiff was expelled from the club. Judge O'Brien granted the motion.

LANDED ESTATES COURT—TUESDAY.

SALES—COUNTY OF CORK.—In the Matter of the Estate of Valentine Burchell, Owner and Petitioner.—Part of the lands of Kilmoney, situate in the barony of Kerriurrihy, held under lease of 7th November, 1778, for 500 years, containing 257 statute acres; net profit rent, £83 19s. 10d.; tenement valuation, £128 15s. This lot was not sold, there being no competition.

CITY OF CORK.—In the Matter of the Estate of David Leahy Arthur and Others, Owners; James Beckey, Petitioner. The house and premises known

PARTING.
In parting, perhaps, we are breaking a link
Which may not be united again;
And firm as the chain is, 'tis painful to think
That absence can rend it in twain.
Oh, when shall we meet? Perhaps not until Time
Shall have withered our youth with our bloom.
And where? In some strange and far-distant clime,
Or within the dear circle at home?
When together we dwell, and together decay,
The change is less painful to view—
But oh! it is mournful to meet and to say,
Was it thou that last bade me adieu?
We may meet in sorrow, or sickness, or pain,
Or no more in this dark world of woe;
But still the fond hope of our meeting again
Shall cheer us wherever we go.
And oh! we may meet when our hearts are less warm—
Have been chilled by adversity's blast;
But cold though they be, an invincible charm
Must hallow the scenes that are past.
We shall think on the days with the friends we have seen,
And in fancy live o'er them once more;
And, sighing remember that such things have been—
But will they seem bright as before?
Ah, no! even then to our memory shall steal
Some scenes which with these may compare,
And many a sorrow which they did not feel,
And a joy in which they had no share.

THE IRISH CHURCH.

In the House of Commons on Monday night, the adjourned debate with regard to the Irish Church was resumed.

Sir R. PEEL said—Before this debate closes I am anxious to address a few observations to the House. There can be no doubt that circumstances have greatly changed since this question used formerly to be discussed. Then it too frequently led to strong party demonstrations, or it was the signal for stirring up in the minds of all classes the most serious religious differences. It is recorded that at one period Ministers themselves were terrified at the approach of such discussions as the present, and we know that the debate on Mr. Ward's motion had to be postponed in order that the places of four members of the Government, who had resigned, might be filled up. (A laugh.) What are the circumstances now? The tone and temper in which such questions as this used to be treated are completely altered; indeed so strong is the influence in soothing religious animosities and producing harmony among opposite religious communions which has sprung up, that this subject can be debated in these days with hardly any excitement, except such as is the result of the ability of those who take part in such discussions. I must, however, say that I think my hon. friend the member for Liskeard hardly did justice to the question. He made, undoubtedly, a very clever speech. (Hear, hear.) We all know he is possessed of superior parts (a laugh); but I cannot help thinking that the general tenor of his remarks was too jocose for the gravity of the subject. (A laugh.) As for his facts, they were so voluminous that he positively overdid us with their superfluity. ("Hear, hear," and a laugh.) I hope, at the same time, presently to show that he drew to such an extent on his imagination that he almost altogether spoilt the effect which he intended to produce. I had, however, one satisfaction in listening to his speech, because, although he drew a most terrible picture of the state of the Irish Church, although he endeavoured to show that it was prejudicial to the interests of the Protestant faith and most mischievous in its tendency, as a political institution a blunder, and as a national religion a pious fraud, still he expressed no desire that it should be uprooted. (Hear, hear.) Now, I thank my hon. friend when he tells us he does not intend to destroy the Church, and I must confess that he would not, in my opinion, even if he did intend to do so, succeed. (Hear, hear.) I may, however, remark that as I sat upon the bench behind watching the pious tears chasing one another down his theological cheek (great laughter) as he wept over the position of the Irish Church, I could not help looking on in wondering admiration. (A laugh.) I can well figure to myself Dido weeping over the ruins of her deserted city, or Niobe lamenting according to the fiction of the antique; but my hon. friend with the Rev. J. Bolster, rector of Killaspugmullane (a laugh), and the cobweb founts of which he spoke, standing around him, present a *tableau vivant* worthy of the paces of *Punch* or the department of Science and Art. (Great laughter.) My hon. friend, in the course of his remarks, was constantly alluding to the Liberal party. He asked why the Liberal party did this, and why they did that. He said this question was the stumbling-block or the stalking-horse of that party. (Mr. B. Osborne.—"I referred to the Whigs.") Well, that is the Liberal party. ("No no.") We are all Liberals in these days. There are no party distinctions of that kind. (A laugh.) Be that as it may, my hon. friend contended that this question was the stumbling-block or the stalking-horse of the Liberal, or, if he likes it better, of the Whig party. But the fact, is they could not probably have done so, if the cause of the country was against

—£75,000.] That book is not correct. (Mr. Osborne.—It is the *Church Directory*.) It is as well we should state fairly what the case is. The Irish bishops derive an income of £57,604 2s. 6d., and the hon. member makes that into £80,000 a year by adding the £21,621 which they pay to the Commission. (Loud cheers.) I will not enter on the question whether they receive adequate payment, but the truth is that the bishops do not receive £80,000 a year, but £57,604. (Cheers.) Another statement was that the united dioceses of Killfenora and Kilmacduagh had a bishop with £4,000 a year and only 680 Protestants. There is no united diocese of Killfenora and Kilmacduagh. The former has been joined to Killaloe and the latter to Clonfert from time immemorial. (Hear, hear.) Clonfert and Killaloe and their subdenominations are united in one bishopric. The income is £3,310 a year and this bishopric extends over all Clare, one-third of Galway, and parts of Tipperary, King's County, and Roscommon, having a population, not of 686, but of 15,906 Protestants. (Cheers.) My hon. friend held up the commissioners to the contempt of the House, and he told us that their pay was £6,000, but the fact is that there are two paid commissioners at £1,000, and the £4,000 goes in paying the secretary, treasurer, architect, and clerks. ("Hear, hear," and "No, no," from Mr. Osborne.) There are many other misstatements, which, if I had spoken earlier in the night, I should have been able to refute. ("Go on!") It is rather important that I should go a little into the statistics of the matter, for so much has been said of the dying out of the Protestant religion in Ireland. In 1834 the population of Ireland was 7,941,000, but in 1861 it had sunk to 5,777,000—that is, there was a diminution of 2,165,000 in that time. In 1834 the Roman Catholics were 80 per cent. of the whole population, and in 1861 they were only 77 per cent. The Established Church in 1834 was but 10 per cent. of the whole, but in 1861 it was nearly 12 per cent. I don't think that that is any argument for interference in a question which we settled in 1834 and 1835. (Hear, hear.) My hon. friend referred to the number of bishops. In 1834 there were 22, and their income was £150,000; but the number was reduced to 10, and their income is £57,000. My hon. friend also referred to church accommodation and, quoting from that book of his, he endeavoured to show that there was a great deal more Church accommodation than was requisite. I have gone most carefully into this point, and I find that while you have in Ireland 691,000 members of the Established Church, you have only accommodation for 372,427—that is to say, there is really not church accommodation for half the population. (Hear, hear.) My hon. friend said also that the clergy in Ireland were too highly paid. In England, he says, there are 2,612 people to every clergyman, while in Ireland there are only 325 people to a clergyman. But the truth is that my hon. friend, in taking the English population included the Protestant dissenters of all denominations, who are more than a third of the population (hear); and the real state of the case is this: In England you have 10,620 parishes, and the number of persons to each parish is 598, while in Ireland it is 431. Therefore in reality the difference is not so great as my hon. friend would lead the House to infer. (Hear, hear.) But he says the clergy in Ireland have too large revenues at their command. The total sum given to the working clergy of that country is £320,000 a year. Your armour plated Warrior cost you from £360,000 to £400,000; and surely it is not too much to give to the ministers of your establishment a less sum than one of your vessels of war costs you. (Hear, hear.) You must recollect too that in Scotland, where the voluntary system prevails, the clergy are absolutely paid more than in Ireland. ("Hear, hear," from Mr. Hadfield.) I am not an advocate of the voluntary system; far from it; but it is a fact that under it in Scotland the clergy get more than the clergy of the Establishment in Ireland. Does the hon. gentleman know what the revenues of the Establishment in England are? They exceed £4,000,000, and that for 9,000,000 to 10,000,000 of worshippers is certainly a large sum to expend. It is unjust, therefore, to urge this charge against the establishment of Ireland. You cannot separate the two, and if you wish to deal with the endowments and with the revenues of the Irish Church you must enter into a wider field and deal with all endowments given by the State. It is very desirable that in a matter of this kind you should endeavour to obtain the opinions of those who, from their position, are best able to give an opinion upon it. We have had the opinions of members of the House. We have had the opinions of gentlemen in the land, and I wish to draw the attention of the House to the opinion of those who are at the head of the Roman Catholic Church. On the 6th of May, Dr. Cullen published a letter to his clergy in reference to this debate. After stating that the Protestants have dwindled away since 1834, whereas in reality they were more in 1861 than in 1834, he goes on to make this remarkable statement:—

"The income set apart for this declining church is probably ten times as large in proportion as what is allowed