

would suppose, make a serious impression upon the most stolid, wooden natures. Your son, I am sure, must be suffering poignantly.

My son, be banged. He suffering poignantly—pooh! It is I, sir, that am suffering poignantly—I, that am heart-broken, overwhelmed, destroyed by this atrocious business.

Atrocious, indeed, and horrible beyond measure—that a father should have been the originating cause of poor Katerina's dreadful fate.

Katerina's dreadful fate. By San Jago!

But what do you mean by Katerina's dreadful fate?

To be shot or drowned may surely be called dreadful.

Fiddle-de-dee, shot or drowned. Married and made her fortune, you mean. Why, San Jago, what are you dreaming about? Didn't you know, then, that the confounded puss got only a fright and a ducking, and married Alfonso the very next morning?

Pedro and I had set up a simultaneous and joyous whoop that might have been, and I dare say was, heard half a mile off. I could hardly believe that I heard aright; and we both assailed the indignant merchant with a torrent of questions, the chief result of which was to increase his snary consternation.

Where are they, do you say? How can I tell? Spending the honeymoon and my money in Madrid or Paris—who knows? They set off like a prince and princess directly after the ceremony, and I have been locked up, for my share, almost ever since. And Luisa turns out to be the true De Gonsalvo, after all; and Katerina, confound her! that villain Juan's portionless daughter. And you, Senor Inglese, he continued, blazing up into fierce wrath—you knew or guessed all this when you were in Madrid; for which journey I was to pay too; but by San Jago, if ever I give a maravedi, I wish—

Here Pedro and I bolted off, half suffocated with laughter, and pursued by the old gentleman's fierce vituperation, which, however, gradually died away as we threaded the tortuous passages of the old place towards the street; and before ten minutes had passed, Pedro and I were seated, jolly as sand boys, over some excellent wine, and smoking, laughing, shouting, and by and dancing—Pedro, that is, commenced a fandango to his own music till stopped by the host—like two maniacs. The whole matter was clear to me now: the locking us all up, the despotic conduct of the Captain General—it was all explained; and very cleverly, I fully agreed, had the thing been managed. Alvarez, I concluded, as nobody had been killed, would, partly for Katerina's sake, be let off pretty easily; and that rascal, De Gonsalvo, for other reasons, be permitted to escape with comparative impunity.

I was right in both instances. The ex-captain of artillery was not long afterwards released; and to show his gratitude for the queen regent's clemency, immediately joined the motley ranks in arms for Don Carlos, in which company he ultimately received his reward in the shape of a bullet through the head. Juan Alvarez returned to his place near San Lucar, but not to survive very long. The shock he had experienced had broken him down both physically and morally; he never completely rallied; and a plain cross in the tombyard of Los Gozos de Neustra Señora, inscribed with his initials and the date of this death, marks the grave which, it may be truly said, his own hands had prematurely prepared.

I did not fail to wait upon Lady Inez de Calderon, as she had requested, and was so kindly and handsomely compensated for my share of the happily accomplished work, that the numerous stirring appeals to the British Lion which I had prepared during my quasi captivity being thereby rendered useless, were forthwith committed to the flames. From Dona Constancia de Gonsalvo, whose rank appeared to sit as easily upon her as if she had been to the manner bred as well as born, I received remembrances, presents, keepsakes, and a letter at least as long as this narrative for the young Senora Manuel; all of which I promised should be faithfully and personally delivered.

This promise I was enabled to redeem about three weeks after my return to Cadiz, during which interval of time I had sedulously avoided meeting with Senor Manuel. I approached his country house one Sunday afternoon with considerable anxiety as to the position, under all circumstances, of the recently wedded couple. I was not long in doubt. The notes of a guitar, accompanying one of the sweetest voices in the world, in one of the most pleasing of the Romances Moriscos, to which I had seen the elder Manuel beat enthusiastic time on my first visit to the house of Juan Alvarez, quite satisfied me that the simple graces which had enthralled the son had produced their natural effect upon the father, and that I was about to enter a reconciled and happy household. It proved so; and I remained till rather a late hour. Just before leaving, Senor Manuel and I happening to be alone for a few moments, he said quickly and in an under tone;

Ab, that's right. Business must be remembered, after all. Do you send me to-morrow, my friend, your expense account to Madrid, you know. I shall pay it, by San Jago! with all my heart.

What! as a reward for not telling you who I believed to be the real Constancia de Gonsalvo?

Pooh! Katerina is worth all the Gonsalvos in Spain, and a dozen over the market. Here's her health once more, in her absence, eh?—fashion of Englishmen, my boy.

With all my heart. Senora Katerina's good health, and the little one's when it comes. Hip, hip, hurra! And now, good night!

THE END.

THE STATE OF IRELAND.

If we had a population in Ireland as firmly attached to law and to British rule as we believe we have in England, we could afford to philosophise about Fenianism and its origin, and wait till a Fenian showed his head to strike him. But, on the contrary, we have a population who dislike us and distrust us, and are fast beginning to look upon the Fenians as

Heaven-ten deliverers.—The Standard, Jan. 7, 1868.

(To the Editor of The Standard.)

Sir,—I do not dispute the accuracy of the above extract from your journal, nor do I controvert the conclusion you draw that Fenianism must be put down with a high hand. The reign of law must be maintained; nevertheless, the admission is deeply humiliating to British legislation.

It is sixty-eight years since Ireland was deprived of the power of self-legislation, under which, by the testimony of witnesses of all shades of opinion, she had, during the previous twenty years, made most wonderful progress. Since the Union the preponderating influence has been British. Yet though two generations have nearly passed, the mass of the Irish people as you assert, "dislike and distrust us." This is a humiliating avowal; it infers that the legislation has not won the confidence of the people, and proves that the Act of Union which gave the Parliament of the United Kingdom the power of legislating for Ireland, has failed in achieving the main object which Pitt added to justify its enactment, and which, as stated in the preamble of that act, declares its object was "to strengthen and consolidate the connexion between the two kingdoms;" to promote and secure the essential interests of Great Britain and Ireland; and to consolidate and strengthen the power and resources of the British Empire. Have these objects been attained? "We have," as you assert, "a population in Ireland less firmly attached to law and British rule than we have in England." "We have a population who dislike and distrust us."

Can there be a doubt that the essential interests of Ireland have not been promoted or secured by the legislation of the past sixty-eight years as much as those of Great Britain? The dislike and distrust which you say exists, and which I cannot deny, arises from the fact that the majority of the legislators, being British, have either disinterested or permitted legislation which has produced a disparity in the essential interests of the countries.

The financial principles upon which Mr. Pitt rested the Act of Union were fair, simple, and easily understood. They were:—

1. That Ireland should never be called upon to pay any portion of the charge for the existing debt of Great Britain.

2. That the taxation of each country should be in proportion to its means.

Had the debts of the two countries been consolidated in the same manner as those of England and Scotland when they were united, Ireland should have received twenty millions sterling. Not having received that sum she should have got an equivalent remission of taxation which would have given her a million a year; or she should have annually been paid that sum out of her own revenue to expend in local improvements. Such payment for sixty-eight years would have done much to promote and secure the interest of Ireland; but instead of such payment Ireland has had to complain of excessive taxation. Almost immediately after the Union the incidence of taxation was altered. In 1801 the revenue of Ireland was £2,919,217, and that of Great Britain £35,218,525; in 1815 Ireland paid £6,805,573 and Great Britain £69,858,573. The increase in Ireland was 233 per cent., while in Great Britain it was only 198 per cent. Nor has recent legislation done anything to adjust this inequality. Last year Ireland paid £6,775,377, and Great Britain £89,667,849. The latter has doubled its population, and more than quadrupled its resources. Ireland now pays nearly as much as in the height of the war, while Great Britain pays ten millions a year less than in 1815.

A parliamentary paper shows the disparity in the means of each country. The assessment for property and income tax was in 1861 equal to £13 0s. 7d per head in Great Britain, and only £3 14s. 7d per head in Ireland; while the amount of revenue for each pound of income tax was four shillings in Great Britain, and six shillings and two pence in Ireland. The taxation per head had been raised in Ireland from 11s. 2d. in 1801, to 23s. 5d. in 1861; while in Great Britain it was lowered from 67s. in 1801, to 53s. in 1861. The diminution upon Great Britain is partly produced by the increase upon Ireland. Had this burden been reduced in both countries in the same ratio Ireland would pay two millions a year less than she now contributes, and the retention of that sum would tend to promote her essential interests.

Mr. Pitt's principle of proportioning the burdens to the means of each nation has been violated, and were all the revenue raised by an income tax Ireland would pay between two and three millions per annum less, and Great Britain between two and three millions more than they now contribute. The distribution of the Imperial burden materially retards the advancement of Ireland and being the work of an essentially British legislature, it is one of the reasons why we have a population who dislike and distrust us.

It may, perhaps, be said, it is not those who pay the taxes who are the most dissatisfied. Granted; but the payment of so large a portion of their income to the State necessarily curtails their ordinary expenditure, and thus diminishes the fund which would afford employment at home; and as all the excess is withdrawn from Ireland and spent in Great Britain, it is a source of poverty to the former and of wealth to the latter.

It is not my wish to palliate Fenianism, or to say a word to justify the state of lawlessness which exists; but I see that no remedy can be applied until the true nature of the disease is ascertained. The first study of the physician is a diagnosis of the complaint. In referring to the past my object is to discover why the state of Ireland should be chronic as well as acute. The Empire suffers periodically from dangerous humors of long standing. Poverty and crime are intimate associates. Ill-will is the concomitant of ill usage. A state of discontent and lawlessness is so abnormal that we are justified in saying it never exists without a cause. The intensity of its expression is accurately proportioned to pre-existent circumstances.

It is absurd and irrational to trace these disorders to the diversity of creed. Prussia and the United States both mainly Protestant, have a large Roman Catholic population, but they have no Fenianism. England has no more loyal subjects than the French Canadian Roman Catholics. The prelates and priests of that faith in Ireland have steadily opposed the progress of revolution and warned their people against it.

What is it then that produces the dissatisfaction? What encourages lawless men to cross the Atlantic and risk their lives and liberties? What prompts them to apparently most rash and hopeless enterprises? All the inductions of right reason must be reversed if we do not admit that the motion must be equal to the force applied. Treason and dissatisfaction would not appear were there not to use your own expression, "a population who dislike and distrust us." That dislike and distrust arises from the impression that the laws are unequal and unjust; they are the work of a legislature mainly composed of those who have seen (if not fostered) a more rapid growth of their own nation than of this country. The remedy would be equal progress. It would have taken place had the taxation of the Empire been, according to Mr. Pitt's intention, in proportion to the means of each; or had the surplus paid by Ireland been expended according to the Act of Union, upon local improvements in Ireland. Such an expenditure of a portion of the revenue, not of Great Britain but of Ireland, on local improvements, would have developed the resources of this country and increased her wealth. In the train of prosperity would have followed attachment to the constitution. It is quite true that Great Britain saves exactly the amount she places upon Ireland, but she has to accept the complete element in the dissatisfaction and discontent "the dislike and distrust" with which she is viewed. If the effect of these laws is to lessen the attachment of the Irish people to the British nation, must it, if they wish to retain it, make a sacrifice. They must act justly to-

wards Ireland, otherwise they cannot hope to be liked or trusted.

The cure for Fenianism is prosperity. Let me call your attention to that of your myriad of readers to some of the records of Parliament which show what has been done as well as what has been left undone. A vast change was produced in Ireland by the first twenty years' operations of the Act of Union. It had increased her taxation, destroyed many of her industries, and diminished her consumption of those articles which indicate comfort and affluence. In 1820 a committee of the House of Commons was appointed to consider her condition. It reported that the evils of Ireland mainly arose from want of employment, and that was caused by want of capital. In 1826 another committee was appointed with the same object; it reported similarly. The cure administered, however necessary for Ireland; in other respects was not calculated to remove the disease. It was the Emancipation Act, a good and wholesome measure, but one that did give neither capital nor employment. Sir Robert Peel, on introducing the measure, said:—"I apprehend that it is scarcely possible that we can change for the worse. What is the melancholy fact? That scarcely one year during the period that has elapsed since the Union has Ireland been governed by the ordinary course of law."

In 1830 there was another committee of the House of Commons and one of the House of Lords upon Ireland, which repeated the complaints of the committees of 1820 and 1826. One of the reports says:—"A very considerable proportion of the population is considered to be out of employment. It is supposed to be one fifth to one fourth of the entire population. The misery and suffering no language can describe. Their condition is most deplorable, a vast number have perished of want."

Sir G. Cornewall Lewis visited Ireland about this time, and with reference to the penal enactments he wrote:—"The statute books have been loaded with the severest laws; the country with military and police; capital punishment has been unsparingly inflicted; Australia has been peopled with transported convicts, and all to no purpose."

In 1833 another remedy was applied. The measure was a good one but it was not calculated to give employment—it did not provide for those dying of want. The cure then administered was national education.

A few more years passed, and in 1836-7 there was a Royal Commission, which echoed the same dismal complaint—want of capital, want of employment; and as usual, its labors were closed with a very excellent measure, but one that did not reach this disorder Ireland then was dragged with the poor law.

Still the disease grew. In 1845 we had the Devon Commission, whose report is loaded with details of intense suffering arising from want of employment, but again the remedy was most inadequate—she got a reduction in the duty on foreign corn and the Emancipated Estar Court.

Lastly, an impoverished and over-taxed country was by the unwisdom of legislation of Mr. Gladstone and the Whigs still more heavily taxed, still pressed down to the ground. Capital, which should have given employment and produced content, was not granted, but the Irish income, which might have grown into capital was ruthlessly swept away into the British exchequer to save the British taxpayers.

Thus, to a poor, needy country, which requires aid and wanted capital, British legislation has given—Catholic emancipation, national education, the poor laws, the Emancipated Estates Court, and the income tax. She has done everything but that which was right. She has relieved herself of burdens by transferring them to us, and now she wonders that we have a population who dislike and distrust us.

Yet amid the misera of Whig measures, amid the mist of theoretic, instead of material, remedies, it is refreshing to find some faint gleam of appreciation of those just principles which would have given Ireland employment and capital. The present Premier was chairman of a committee in 1838 and thus expressed his views in the report he drew up:—"It is a waste of public available resources to suffer so large a portion of the empire to lie fallow, or leave it to struggle by slow advances and with defective means, towards its improvement, when the judicious aid of the State might quickly make a source of common strength and advantage." I was shown that if the Irish peasantry were placed, in point of comfort, on a par with Great Britain, the ex-cities duties would show an increase of £6,000,000 per annum. This consideration alone, says the report, "ought to silence any objection, on the ground of expense, against affording public aid, such as may be required, for these works, as it gives an enormous profit on the greatest contemplated outlay."

That able Conservative statesman, Lord George Bentinck, whose untimely loss a nation deplored, proposed to meet the material wants of Ireland in a statesmanlike manner by expending £10,000,000 in constructing railways, which would have been material assistance to the country. Lord Derby's suggestions were never carried out by the Whigs, who so long held the reins of office, and Lord George Bentinck's scheme was defeated by an adverse vote in the House of Commons, which adopted Mr. Gladstone's flagitious financial measures under which Ireland is suffering.

If the population of Ireland is to become as attached to law as that of England, and lose its present feelings of dislike and distrust, it will be by an honest and strict carrying out of the Act of Union, by the promotion and securing the essential interests of the Irish people.

Yours, truly, JESSE FIERCE.

Waterford, Jan. 10.

IRISH INTELLIGENCE.

THE IRISH CHURCH.—(To the Editor of the Times)

Sir—It will not be from fear or favour towards Fenianism that the Parliament of the United Kingdom will feel constrained to take into its serious consideration the position and revenues of the Established Church in Ireland; but if a sense of justice to the Irish people did not compel attention to this question, England might well address herself to it, from a reasonable deference to European opinion. In every community on the Continent, and especially in this city, the Irish question is spoken of as one now ranked with that of Poland in the north and that of Rome in the south of Europe, while every journal and every speaker fastens upon the establishment of the Protestant Church of Ireland as the quite sufficient justification for the dissatisfaction of the Irish people. All ignore the freedom which the very establishment of so liberal a form of religion has a tendency to promote and to secure, and until England by legislation on this subject makes good her claim to be the mother of religious liberty, the Fenian movement, apart from its infamous crimes, will have at least the covert sympathy of the Roman Catholic countries of Europe.

The right of Parliament to deal with the position and revenues of the Church in Ireland is questioned only by those who, in asserting that the Church can possess property independent of the State, are the unwitting advocates of the doctrines of the Liberation Society. I am indebted to the Archbishop of Meath and to Dr. Alfred Lee for copies of their writings, the ablest in favour of the pretensions of the Church, but a study of their works has only served to convince me that, contrary to the tenor of their arguments, it is not the Church which is the trustee, but the three Estates of the Realm which hold these revenues in trust for the spiritual benefit of the Irish people. Indeed, it is sufficient for me that Parliament can deal with this question to prove with Parliament rests the responsibility of neglecting it.

If Parliament can deal with the position and revenues of the Irish Church, and this cannot be

disputed, what principles should regulate legislation? What justification will Parliament have for neglecting to legislate with regard to the religious opinions of the great majority of the Irish people? The incidence of any change upon other portions of the empire the spiritual interests of the minority, and the vested rights of the clergy, these points would have unfounded claim to be regarded. But it is now abundantly clear that England wishes to hold Ireland to the Union with peace and quiet and economy, she must govern Ireland as she herself is governed. In ruling Ireland Parliament must look first to the moral and material interests of the Irish people as viewed from their own, and not from an English standpoint. There will be no ground for complaint on the part of Ireland if England will regulate her legislation in regard to Ireland by the golden rule of Christian Government. If England will do in this and all other matters another neighbor and sister as she would that Ireland, were their relative importance reversed should do to her there may yet for a time exist Fenianism, which is an offensive and poisonous offshoot of an unfounded discontent, a disorder to be put down with the strong hand of authority; but after this has burnt out for lack of fuel, there will be peace and prosperity in Ireland such as have not been known in her past history. Nor will such legislation affect by any reflex action the position of correlative questions in England. No act of justice towards the Roman Catholic population of Ireland will menace the Protestant character of our monarchy, that is securely founded upon the will of the great majority of the population of the United Kingdom. No change in the position of the Church Establishment in Ireland need affect that of the Church of England, because the Church of England is the Church of the great majority of the English people. We need have no fear that our army will be sent to aid the Pope against the King of Italy, because we do justice to the religious opinion of Ireland, for it may be safely predicted that the Pope will never gain a majority in the British Parliament.

When I was in Lancashire during the cotton famine, and, in the performance of official duties, I became necessarily known to a very large number of the working class. Some Irishmen one day crowded round me, demanding an answer to their question, "Why didn't England treat Ireland as she had treated Scotland—why did she let Scotland have her religion and put her own Church upon Ireland?" I am not ashamed to confess that I had no ready answer to that question, but at length I told them that, in my humble opinion, it was the aggressive character of the Roman Catholic religion and the comparatively non-aggressive and Protestant character of the religion of the Scotch that mainly accounted for this difference of treatment.

In Ireland last summer I found that most Roman Catholics who had an opinion upon the subject were favourable to a diversion of the revenues of the Irish Church in the direction of works of public utility and material improvement. But looking to the immense difficulties which would attend the selection of locality and design, as well as to the wide-spread feeling against the appropriation of such revenues to other than purposes of spiritual instruction, I shall assume as I believe, that Parliament would be unwilling to entertain any proposal for a diversion of these revenues to secular purposes.

A commission is appointed to inquire into the general condition of the Irish Church—as to its revenues and their apportionment. Judging from the composition of this commission, and from what I have heard of the evidence that will be brought before it, there is no great difficulty in venturing a forecast of the report which will be the result of its labours. The report will probably show that the revenues of the Irish Church are not more than commensurate with the spiritual wants of the Irish people; that the existing arrangements as to churches and parishes are faulty in many respects; that a much better apportionment of revenues and parishes can be made; that, this being done, no substantial grievance will exist. The commissioners will probably be led to make such a report by finding parishes so large that no clergyman, even if he can afford to keep a horse, can pretend to acquaintance with the spiritual condition of his flock—so large that for his flock to meet him at church is practically impossible. They will find other parishes where the Protestant worshippers may be reckoned on the fingers of any one of the members of the commission; and again they will find at least one parish with an endowment smaller than the annual wages of an agricultural labourer. By a readjustment of boundaries and perhaps the removal of some churches these anomalies may be made to disappear.

But would such a report meet the question? It is the existence of the Irish Church as a State establishment which is attacked, and it is this which must be modified or it will soon have to be abandoned. With the utmost diffidence I will venture to sketch a mode in which it appears to my feeble judgment this difficult question can be set at rest. I am, then, disposed to recommend that, after such a readjustment of areas and revenues as I have referred to had been carefully and conscientiously made, an Ecclesiastical Commission should be permanently established, and that upon the vacation of any benefice such Commission should be empowered, upon receiving satisfactory evidence that not less than two-thirds in number of the ratepayers of any parish were opposed to the maintenance of the Established Church, and were themselves unanimously in favour of any other Christian form of worship, to make over the parochial fabric, and the revenues attached to it, to such parish for the performances of such religious worship as this majority approved. The necessity of showing so large a majority would prevent continual religious warfare and the probability of change in the disposition of the fabrics and revenues; if such a majority were not attained, or where the inhabitants did not think proper to make representation of its existence, there would be no action on the part of the Commissioners. The position of the higher officers of the Church would be determined in the same manner. If two thirds in number of the parishes contained in any diocese had so severed themselves from the Church there would be no sufficient plea for the maintenance of a bishop in that diocese, and the Commissioners might be empowered to employ in such a case the episcopal revenues in the foundation or encouragement of parochial schools. But if not less than two thirds of such parishes were Roman Catholic, and were to make representations accordingly to the Commission they would become entitled to the episcopal revenues for the establishment of a Roman Catholic bishop, no clergyman, including bishops and dignitaries being liable to displacement during his life.

Such legislation might include a provision that, from the passing of such an Act of Parliament, no Irish bishop not then created should be entitled to take a seat in the House of Lords. If in the parishes of Ulster the Church revenues were upon the apportionment of parochial majorities not less than two-thirds devoted to the maintenance of the Presbyterian form of worship, the Regium Donum would be reduced by the sum now allowed to such parishes out of this grant. Of the gross income of the Irish Church stated in Thom's Directory at £80,419, only £81,659 is held by lay proprietors; while of the 1,510 benefices, only 250 are in patronage other than Royal or ecclesiastical. This lay patronage would continue to be at the disposal of such proprietors for the maintenance of clergy and services of the United Church of England and Ireland, the Commissioners having power to authorise the sale of such livings to the parishes or to themselves. The Church-tax now levied by a percentage on the value of benefices would fall in the case of those benefices conveyed to Dissenting parishes which would then make special arrangements for the maintenance of the fabric and the performances of services.

I am, Sir your faithful servant.

Rome, Dec. 31. R. ARTHUR ARNOLD.

On this letter the Times makes the following comments—

"Mr. Arnold proposes, it may be said, with the rest of the world, an Ecclesiastical Commission. Without this, of course, nothing can be done. He does not, however, leave much to its discretion, for it would have little more to do than carry into execution some very definite provisions. The first thing to be done is a new ecclesiastical division of Ireland, having regard to the population and area, involving the sub-division of the larger parishes and the union of the smaller. Then upon the vacancy of a living Mr. Arnold suggests that in case two-thirds of the ratepayers are found to be either Roman Catholics or Presbyterians, then the majority shall take the place of the English Church—the revenues, the glebe, the fabric. Perhaps for brevity's sake, Mr. Arnold does not meet the case of a large minority which would certainly feel itself ill-used if totally disendowed; nor does he say whether the transfer is to be renewed from time to time as the successive vacancies occur; nor does he say a word as to the patronage, or some other points, of which by and by. At the vacation of the episcopal sees, they are to be filled by a corresponding process, and the Roman Catholic Bishops so elected are to be Peers and take their seats in Parliament. Some redistributions and new applications of the revenue are hinted at. As Roman Catholic Bishops abroad are content with less than £5,000 a year, and as Presbyterians have no Bishops at all, there would be a considerable saving here and the money might go to relieve the Consolidated Fund of Maynooth and the Regium Donum. Any further surplus might go to schools. Such are the outlines of the proposal, and, indeed, little more than outlines are given. Mr. Arnold does not propose to secularise the Church revenues—to dissipate them in public works or fling them to the landowners. The application to schools we understand to be revolutionary, the first claims being first satisfied. It is not without much canvassing of opinions that Mr. Arnold offers this scheme. We may even say more. Proposals substantially the same, but with variations and not so well considered have long been before the world. But on the more delicate parts of the problem before us Mr. Arnold hardly touches; indeed, not at all. Though the State holds this mass of property for religious purposes, and religious purposes only, yet it must be always remembered that the State has its rights and interests in the matter, and that these must never be allowed to drop to the ground in the transfer from one incumbent or one creed to another. An Anglican bishop or other clergyman holds his see or his living subject to many conditions interfering very largely with his own choice of methods, his own opinions, and his own liberty of action all for the security and dignity of the State, for good order, for public peace, for decency, morality, and so forth. Any clergyman of the Anglo-Irish Church may be called to account for personalities in the pulpit, and for observances in the church not of a purely religious character. Every clergyman may be called to account, and even eventually deprived and disqualified for preferment or offences which the law cannot touch in the case of laymen, and which even public opinion treats very lightly in their case. In many ways a clergyman, if not a servant of the State, which of course he will not allow himself to be, is amenable to civil discipline and control. He can be brought into the Queen's Court and visited with heavy penalties for a word, for a gesture, for a boyish frolic, for an unguarded expression, for anything benefiting his calling in the estimate of a respectable and rather fastidious public. Is all this supererogatory all this control, all this actual right, to fall to the ground on the mere substitution of the 'priest' for the 'person'? Mr. Arnold can hardly intend this; and we can only suppose that he left it to future, but still unavoidable, consideration. It is a part of the subject, however, that must be gone into before we can see our way to any settlement of the question.

THE CHURCH ESTABLISHMENT.—The chapter of the Dublin Freeman's Journal 'Church Commission', published on Monday, deals with the united dioceses of Tuam, Kildare, and Achery, the districts where the Protestant missionary societies have for years chiefly operated. Eleven of its clergymen are stated to be on the foundation of the Church Missions Society. The amount expended by the Ecclesiastical Commissioners on Church fabrics between 1834 and 1865 in the three dioceses is said to have been £59,144 12s. 3d. The Freeman's Journal disputes the correctness of statements by the Bishop of Winchester, Canon Wordsworth, Archdeacon Stopford, the Rev. Mr. Garnett, and Archbishop Trench, respecting the increase of Protestantism in this western locality.

After more than a quarter of a century of missionary labours the Anglicans have now an absolute decrease of numbers from 21,705 in 1834 to 17,167 in 1861. The Freeman's Journal accounts for the failure of the missions by alleging that 'the most sacred articles of the Catholic faith are described in ribald doggerel' and 'handbills' distributed gives as a specimen one called 'The Tuam Mission house Song,' with the air of 'Shan Van Vocht,' of which a verse, as given in the Freeman's Journal, is:—

They told us they could make,  
Says the Shan van Vocht,  
Their Maker from a cake,  
Says the Shan van Vocht,  
And thus they tried to joke us,  
With their magio bonos pocus,  
Till to their yoke they broke us,  
Says the Shan van Vocht.

'This is a mild specimen,' says the Journal, of the missionary agencies 'originated by the late Bishop of Tuam, approved of by the Primate, endorsed by the present occupant of the see, the atrept fingers of which are protected by the public force of the country, and, alas! for his intellect, the object and use of which are approved by the present Archbishop of Dublin. The singing of this and similar productions by Archdeacon Stopford's proselytised ballad-singers in fairs and markets—ministry of the mission—the scattering of it and similar insulting productions in the highways and byways, and the sending of them in envelopes to the archbishops, bishops, deans, and priests of the Catholic Church, are the services rendered by the 'Established Church' to the Catholic people of this diocese for the large endowments conferred on that important institution by a State that claims the affections and is entitled to the loyalty of Irish Catholics.' The Freeman's Journal also states the 'average cost per family of every Anglican in these dioceses at £8 6s. 6d. per annum,' and 'in a group of fourteen benefices the average cost is £37 6s. 6d. per family.'—Pall Mall Gazette.

DUBLIN, Feb. 11.—The Grand Jury to whom the cases of the accused Fenians now in the prisons of this city are to be presented, to day assembled in the Court House. Baron Fitzgerald, Chief Justice of the Court of Appeals, delivered the charge to the Jury, in which he deplored in strong language the outrages which had been perpetrated, and the useless agitation and lawless spirit now prevailing in Ireland. The Grand Jury then withdrew to their chamber, and commenced their labors. Two indictments have been found against the prisoner Lennon. One is for treason, and the other for murder, he being charged with shooting the policeman at Stepaside. The prisoner Pigot has been indicted on the charge of treason.

Two Catholic clergymen of Kerry have prominently ranged themselves within the last few days on the side of Bishop Moriarty in reference to Fenianism—Mr. O'Sullivan, P.P., and the Rev. John Mawe, parish priest of Tralee. The latter has, at one of the celebrations of mass addressing his congregation, reminded them that he long ago advised them against secret societies organized for the overthrow of the Government; 'Though his words were distasteful at the time, he was glad to see that his advice was taken inasmuch as no arrests had been made in their town. A peaceful, orderly, and constitutional course would secure for the country what it needs.'