

fall autumn's sun broke for the first time through the passing clouds. It was the first day after the departure of her beloved husband that Lucinda concluded to walk out into God's beautiful and invigorating air.

Suddenly the Witch of Oakdale stood before her and greeted her with the kind words:—"You have been weeping, noble lady, I can see it on the dark glow of your eyes. I can readily guess the reason: Count Walter is not here; may God console you!"

"You are impudent, old Gertrude," returned the countess, throwing a look of wounded pride upon the unwelcome disturber of her sweetest thoughts; and rising from her mossy seat, intended to withdraw.

Then she measured the bent form of the so-called witch with an earnest gaze, and said at last: "Has the old woman of Oakdale so little confidence in the strength and purity of the lady of Rabenfels, that she thinks Lucinda would be weak where the knight should forget his duty?"

The witch waited till the lady ceased speaking; then carefully drying with her apron the silent tears that appeared on her dark eyelashes, she offered the angry lady countess her hand in token of reconciliation, and spoke in a mild tone: "Do not be so angry with old Trude, noble lady; my intentions were so pure, and I swear to you by the memory of my mother, that it was not my intention to insult you."

A friendly smile escaped the beautiful eyes of the countess, and taking a seat, she motioned Gertrude to sit beside of her. But the witch thrust her crutch into the ground and cowered at the feet of the countess in the damp grass.

Then she stroked her long disordered hair from her face, gave way for a short time to some passing thoughts, then, recovering herself, she commenced to relate.

(To be Continued.)

REPEAL AND FEDERALISM.

To the Editor of the Irishman:

KILCASCAN, May 29, 1874.

Sir,—A friend has sent me your paper of the 16th and 23rd instants, in which I find myself referred to by some of your correspondents, in a manner which induces me to place without reserve before the readers of the Irishman my views on our present Home Rule movement.

I cordially give my humble support to that movement; not because I deem Federalism as being in itself the very best thing for Ireland; but because I consider it the very best thing that we have any reasonable chance of speedily obtaining. From the moment when I first, in early boyhood, learned the enormous crime committed against Ireland by Pitt and Castlereagh, in the suppression of the Irish Parliament, I have been a Repealer of the Union.

The plain, obvious remedy was clearly to repeal the Union; to restore the stolen property to the right owner; to restore the Irish Legislature to the Irish Union.

The Irish people who had been swindled and butchered in the Union, made attempts from time to time, to recover their rights. An effort for that purpose was made by a few individuals in 1805. In 1810, the old Orange Corporation of Dublin, carried Repeal resolutions by a majority of thirty.

In 1813, the question of Repeal was again publicly agitated. In 1830, O'Connell addressed a series of letters to the Irish nation, exhorting them to give effect by meetings and petitions to what was undoubtedly the general sentiment. In 1832, there were nearly forty members returned in the Repeal interest. In eighteen hundred and forty, the Repeal Association was established by O'Connell, who frequently said that if the Union should not be dissolved during his lifetime, he wished that on his tomb should be inscribed the words: "He died a Repealer." In fact, O'Connell, with occasional intermissions, agitated against the Union from the day when he opposed its enactment in January, 1800, to the day of his death, in 1847.

He did not create the National aspiration for self-rule. He only gave utterance to what the immense majority of his countrymen felt. He had with him the might of truth; of plain, cogent common sense;

of much public opinion in Ireland; and of powerful ability as an orator and popular leader. These elements of strength he had; and I have no doubt that if to these he could have added the cordial support of the great mass of Irish Protestants—if the Irish Protestant body adopted, and acted on the principles displayed in 1810 by the corporation of the metropolis—he could have led the combined Irish nation, Protestant and Catholic, to an easy victory. But the Protestants, with some splendid exceptions, abandoned the national sentiments by which in 1799 and 1800 they had, to a large extent, been actuated. The cause of their desertion of country was not far to seek. The State Church was a snug provision for the junior branches of the Protestant nobility and gentry to whom it furnished an income of about £700,000 per annum.

The State Church was professedly secured, in perpetuity, by the Union, of which the 5th article provided for its maintenance as "an essential and fundamental" portion of that measure. And as it could not but be felt that the monopoly by a Protestant Church of the whole ecclesiastical state revenues of a nation chiefly Catholic, was a barefaced outrage on common honesty, the recipients and expectants of that income naturally feared that an Irish parliament, if restored, would disestablish and disendow their lucrative institution. Seven hundred thousand pounds per annum, and a certain amount of social status, were effective bribes to be bad Irishmen. It is true, that the National interests of the Protestants, as Irishmen, would be strongly benefited by domestic legislation, as many of them knew and admitted.

Influenced, then, by the combined stimulants of terror, bigotry, and pecuniary interest, the Irish Protestants, as a body, withheld their support from the movement for Repeal. The apathy of many, the active hostility of others, threw such formidable difficulties in the way of O'Connell, that it is not at all to be wondered at that in 1844 he began to consider whether a Federalist agitation, for the restoration of Ireland to a resident Parliament for the control of our purely domestic concerns, might not acquire support from the Protestants, whom the bugbear of a Catholic majority scared from the movement for simple Repeal.

The above extract receives further light from the following passage in the letter I received at the same time from Mr. Ray; a letter obviously written with the sanction, and expressive of the sentiments of Mr. O'Connell:—"We are on the very eve of knowing whether or not the Federalists will make a public display. If they do not do so within a week I will again address the people; not to vindicate or excuse, but to boast of the offer I have made, and the spirit of conciliation we have evinced. If, on the other hand, Ross, Crawford, Caulfield, and Grey Porter prepare a Federal plan, what a step will not that be in the Repeal cause—even if we confine our efforts without being actually joined by them?"

"I have shown your letter to the Liberator. He says that, as a matter of course, he was prepared to hear of cavils, and exceptions, and dissatisfactions regarding his address; such being always ready to meet any proposition, the more so the less it is understood. And yet Federalism is not tangible in shape; his aim is to induce a declaration from the Federalists. He says he wonders you did not perceive that in the very paragraph where he talks most particularly of his adhesion to Federalism, he, in special words, guards himself from being pledged to any precise forms. Moreover, he adds that you cannot forget that the Association is already pledged to the principle of Federalism, and that several of its most leading members have joined as Federalists."

The fact was that Mr. O'Connell had been given an intimation that in the event of his raising the Federal banner he would receive a valuable Whig accession. He raised the banner, but the Whigs did not come. Finding that his Federalist experiment was not efficiently supported, and that it added no strength to his agitation for Repeal, he explained shortly afterwards in a public speech, snapping his fingers, "Federalism is not worth that."

Looking at his Federal move in connection with his whole career, the truth seems to me to be this:—He would have greatly preferred simple Repeal if he could have obtained it, but finding that his gigantic exertions to obtain it were neutralised by this cause to which I have adverted, he was not unwilling to compromise with Federalism. We are not to condemn the present Federalist agitation because O'Connell snapped his fingers at Federalism. He proclaimed that the move in that direction was worthless when he found that it gave him no tangible help. He would doubtless have treated it very differently if he had seen—as we have seen—sixty numbers returned to Parliament on the faith of the Federal principle.

Some of your correspondents attack certain arguments adduced in support of Federalism. I have nothing to do with those arguments. I would greatly prefer a return to our old constitution of 1782—if we could recover it. But as you yourself most wisely say in an editorial sentence—"The practical good is to be considered as well as the ideal best." And in this Federal programme there is so much of what is practically good, that when taken in connection with its incomparably greater feasibility. I feel impelled by my sense of patriotic duty to support it. First, let me remind your readers that our objects are these:—

"To obtain for our country, in accordance with the ancient and constitutional rights of the Irish nation, the privilege of managing our own affairs by a Parliament assembled in Ireland, and composed of the Sovereign, the Lords, and the Commons of Ireland.

"To secure to the Irish people the right of legislating for and regulating all matters relating to the internal affairs of Ireland.

"To secure to the Irish people the advantage of constitutional government by making it a part of such Federal arrangement that there should be in

Ireland an administration for Irish affairs, controlled according to constitutional principles by the Irish Parliament, and conducted by ministers constitutionally responsible to that Parliament."

The above objects cannot, I presume, incur the censure of any Irish Nationalist. There is, however, another provision that leaves to an Imperial Congress the power of dealing with Imperial questions—the relation of the empire with foreign States, and other matters of Imperial character.

Frankly, I wish we could recover Home Rule disencumbered of this condition. I do not suppose the separate action of an Irish Parliament in Imperial questions would produce Imperial difficulty. Our greatest men saw no such danger: Grattan, Foster, Gould, Plunket, Bushe, Saurin, and their brilliant confederates. But it must be remembered that there are multitudes of politicians on the other side of the Irish sea, as well as a considerable number of our Protestant fellow-countrymen, who imagine that such danger exists, and who will either remain neutral, or strenuously oppose us, unless their apprehensions are removed by a Federal government. Again, the sectarian dread of Catholic ascendancy, the traditional fear derived from the pulpit, the novel, the so-called history, and a thousand other sources of erroneous impressions—this fear, although utterly absurd and groundless yet deters a large number of Irish Protestants from combining with us for Repeal of the Union pure and simple. But they think that there is safety for themselves and for their religion in the species of connection with Protestant England that Federalism preserves. We need their help; the help of every man who will honestly assist us in the up hill task in which we are engaged. So far as a survey of our forces enables me to judge, I am obliged to conclude that the Federal project will receive the support of a large number of auxiliaries who certainly would not support simple Repeal. Federalism, if not so good as Grattan's Constitution, is beyond all comparison better than the blighting, desolation and degrading Union. I do not see how any man can doubt that it is vastly more attainable than simple Repeal. An organization has been formed for the purpose of obtaining it, and has made extraordinary progress since the time of its commencement. And we now, sir, to split up that organization into mutually hostile sections, by degrading the policy which its leaders have adopted from a solemn and intelligent conviction of its greater feasibility. But pursuing such a fatuous course we should expose ourselves to the scorn and ridicule of every enemy of Irish domestic legislation, and we should destroy our only reasonable prospect of soon restoring the Parliament of Ireland. Our task demands from us the most unbroken unanimity; and while I concede to others the credit of conscientious intentions, I must say that I should consider myself extremely culpable if I were to encourage my countrymen to desert the Home Rule League in pursuit of an object which, however theoretically better than Federalism, is incontestably more difficult of attainment.

Let us imagine the League broken up; some of its members drifting into an agitation of simple Repeal; others still demanding a Federal Parliament; others disgusted with the mischievous division, abandoning all political effort in despair. Can any one fancy that the recovery of our old Constitution would be facilitated by such a wretched exhibition of incapacity and unsteadiness? Let us not shatter into fragments our national strength. If preserved in its integrity and wisely guided, it will avail in all human probability to achieve the restoration of our legislature.

A correspondent of the Leinster Independent makes it an argument against the League that Mr. Butt was once Mr. O'Connell's opponent on the question of Repeal—just as if a man could not be an honest convert! Mr. Butt is also accused of heartless indifference to the popular misery. The writer can never have read Mr. Butt's noble "Plan for the Celtic Race," a work that breathes the warmest sympathy for our suffering people. Mr. A. M. Sullivan is next referred to as having denounced the Fenian movement. Why the poor Fenians would have farred much better had they taken Mr. Sullivan's advice, which would have saved their best men from atrociously cruel imprisonment. Mr. Galbraith is next stated to have been a staunch Orangeman until the disestablishment of the Protestant Church. Sir, Mr. Galbraith, whose friendship I am proud to enjoy, never was an Orangeman in his life, and the repetition of the statement in question is a sad proof of the vitality of falsehood. Mr. Galbraith has repeatedly denied the accusation; but it reappears now and then, and is, I do not doubt, received as truth by your correspondent.

Pardon the length of this letter. This, I think, the first time I have encroached on your columns; and my apology is, that as my opinions have been made the subject of comment and inquiry, I thought it would be right to place them candidly before your readers.

I am, sir, your faithful servant,
W. J. O'N. DAUNT.

MR. BUTT, M. P., ON CURRAN.

On Wednesday night Mr. Isaac Butt, Q. C., M. P., delivered an interesting lecture on the "Life and Times of John Philipott Curran," in St. Joseph's Catholic Schools, High-street, Deptford, in aid of the building fund of the institution. The chair was occupied by Mr. W. D. Barnett, J. P. of Greenwich who was supported by the following gentlemen:—Mr. McCarthy Downing, M. P.; The Chevalier O'Leary, M. P.; Major P. O'Gorman, M. P.; Mr. R. O'Shaughnessy, M. P.; Mr. W. E. O'Sullivan, M. P.; Mr. M. Brooks, M. P. (Lord Mayor of Dublin); Mr. A. M. Sullivan, M. P.; Mr. N. Ennis, M. P.; Mr. O'Connor Power, M. P.; Mr. H. Kirk, M. P., and many other local and influential gentlemen.

Father Pannin briefly introduced Mr. Barnett as the chairman of the evening, who introduced Mr. Butt.

Mr. Butt, who on rising was greeted with deafening cheers, the whole audience rising and waving their hats, commenced his lecture by remarking that he had very sincere pleasure in showing to his countrymen that he took an interest in anything that promoted their good, or in which they took an interest and he had a greater pleasure in showing upon an occasion like the present, in which the clergy and the people were cordially together, that he felt with them. He had selected for the subject of his address to them that evening a person whose name had a magic hold upon the hearts of Irishmen and of the Irish people—the immortal John Philipott Curran. He was about to venture on a biography of that great man. He was not sure he had the materials for that, for it was singular that in the memories and speeches of his life, numerous as they were, there was a meagreness that was surprising, and accustomed as he was to history and the evidences of history, it was undoubted that many of the stories which were told of him were apocryphal. He would endeavour, however, to draw the materials, by which he would attempt to illustrate the marvellous career which had made his name memorable to the hearts of his countrymen, more from his speeches than from those doubtful records upon which he was disposed to look with a somewhat suspicious eye, and upon which he did not place much faith. Curran was born in 1750. Even about his birthplace there was a doubt. In most memoirs he was stated to have been born in Newmarket, County Cork. Some of his (the speaker's) friends in the neighborhood of Kanturk pointed to the spot near there which they held to be his birthplace, but it is generally believed that he was born in July, 1750, in Newmarket. His father was a man in the rank known as that position which was generally called the humble rank of life. He had come from the North of Ireland to

live with and attend on a gentleman there, and had attained, or rather risen to, the position of feneschal of the manor court of Newmarket. A number of stories were told of Curran's early life; not much faith was to be placed in the majority of them. This, however, was certain, that a Protestant clergyman in the neighborhood, attracted by his talents brought him to his own house, became his teacher in classics; and finally, at his own expense, sent him to school in the county. From thence he went to Middleton College. He entered as a Sizar, and afterwards became a Scholar; and when he was 25 years of age—viz. in 1775—he was called to the Irish bar. He (Mr. Butt) had seen and read some very romantic stories of his early struggles at the Bar—how he walked about for years before securing a brief, and much more to the same effect—and very interesting some of the stories were; but he was very much inclined to think that the majority of these stories were not to be relied upon. He was called to the Irish Bar in 1775, and eight years afterwards he entered Parliament for one of the Irish close boroughs, as the colleague of a great and well known man. In eight years he had made a position that made him selected as the leader of one of the most powerful parties—the Irish party that achieved Irish independence—(defeating the Whigs). The very next year they found him placed in a foremost position in the party; and making an important motion in the House of Commons. He believed the men of that party had intellect and power enough to distinguish genius and ability, and the knew of no better sign of a party and no more honourable exercise of their power than to distinguish genius in a young man and bring him forward to a position which he was qualified to claim (loud cheers). Curran was born in 1750 and died in 1817, and those sixty-seven years which constituted his span of life were memorable years in the history of the world. When he was born the American colonies were dependent upon the English Crown. In his lifetime they asserted their independence, and Washington achieved that glorious victory which made the country in the end a great and glorious Republic (loud cheers). The French Revolution broke down the ancient dynasties and the feudal system of Europe; a godless nation cast off all the restraints of religion only to subject themselves to military power, until the genius of an Irishman on the field of Waterloo restored peace and tranquillity to the world. In those sixty-seven years many scenes of interest passed in his own native land. Within the lifetime of Curran, the Volunteers of Ireland achieved the independence of their native country (loud and long continued cheers, and a Voice—"and will again!"). Within the lifetime of Curran, the independence achieved was taken away, and the Union—which had ever since 1774 certainly not brought blessing to their native country—was the consequence. In those sixty-seven years events had passed full of momentous interests both to Ireland and the world. Curran entered the English Parliament in 1783 and left in 1797, when a disastrous and ill-advised decision carried Grattan and many of the Irish patriots out of the British House of Commons. His speeches in Parliament had not made his reputation. It might be they had restricted reports of them, but no speeches he made in Parliament at all equalled his own fame or the speeches he addressed to bars and judges at the Irish Bar. He had selected some to illustrate his style of speaking, but before doing so he would ask them to bear with him for a few moments while he spoke of the history of Ireland between 1784 and 1800. It was a period of which, he was sorry to say, his countrymen did not know as much as they ought to do, and a great many fallacious notions were abroad respecting that period.

In 1782 Grattan and the Volunteers resisted the claim made by the Parliament of England to pass laws, and thus succeeded for a time in obtaining freedom. Ireland prospered for a time under an independent Parliament in a manner that no other nation prospered before. But it would be a mistake to suppose that the constitution or the Government of Ireland was a perfect one, and the speeches which he would read to them rather complained of that very Government. In Ireland then, as in England, the great majority of the members of Parliament were returned by the proprietors of close boroughs. He thought there were only 126 members returned by popular election out of 300 members. The Government administered by English Ministers and by a Parliament composed very largely of the nominees of Englishmen, and by an English Administration, did not give entire satisfaction to the people of Ireland any more than the Parliament of England gave satisfaction to the people of England. It was a curious thing that they heard sometimes of Irish treason, but he contended that there was just as much treasonable feeling manifested in England against the system of close boroughs as there was in Ireland on the same subject. In 1791 the Society of United Irishmen was formed. It was formed perfectly legally, it was an open Society, and the oath which they took only bound Irishmen to forget all differences of opinion, of politics, of creed, and unite for the common good (cheers). Lord Castlereagh was a member of the Society (loud hisses). In progress of time the Government tried to but down in Ireland, as they had but down in England, all attempts at reform. The Irish Society became a secret society, just the same secret societies in England became secret, and trials for high treason took place in both countries, until 1798 it culminated in the rebellion. If they would just bear in mind the short outline of events he had indicated they would understand better some of the speeches to which he would call their attention. He chose them more in illustration of Curran's style and manner than for anything else. The hon. speaker then read numerous and copious extracts from Curran's political and legal speeches. Including his description of the pension lists when the Sovereign had the power of award of almost inherited pensions, a speech on Catholic Emancipation, and many others. In commenting on one of Curran's speeches the lecturer said—Homer had said that there was a twilight which was even more favourable to the robber than darkness itself, and he (the lecturer) might observe, without any disrespect to the Lord Lieutenant, that there was a twilight of royalty to which anarchical darkness was preferable. Mr. Butt concluded with a few remarks relative to Curran's last days. In 1806 he was made Master of the Rolls, and continued in that position until 1814, when he retired in ill health, and died in London, at Amoln-place, Fulham-road, between Brompton and Chelsea. His remains were placed in the Paddington Cemetery, and afterwards removed and deposited in Glasnevin, Dublin. No man was more genial and high spirited than Curran, and no man was more subject to those fits of depression. It was said by a Latin poet that man stole the fire from heaven and brought down sorrow with it. The genius which stole the fire from heaven brought down woes and sorrows of which common humanity knew nothing and the depression which marked the close of his life, and even in his most brilliant days they could recognize with sorrow the woes that genius brought even to its chosen ones. When he saw the gloom of Ireland falling away into the distance, and with no new geniuses to replace them, they could understand the gloom which afflicted him. He asked should ever those glorious days return to their native land (loud cries of "yes!"). The land that produced Grattan and Curran, and sent Sheridan to shed his genius over the English Parliament, was not destined to be for ever trodden down. In those great men he saw the ancestors of the genius to which they were the inheritors—genius such as no other country could boast. Let them remember the greatness and responsibility that was cast upon them. Let them prove themselves worthy of the great men who had gone before them; of Grattan, and Curran, and others; and if the sword of freedom was handed down by feeble hands, let

them make up for that feebleness by the firm grasp with which they held it (loud cheers). Let them hand down to their children the remembrance of those men and the glorious days gone by, if not in words as glorious as those he had read to them, at least in words which would for ever keep green the memory of Ireland's greatest and best patriots (great enthusiasm). The speaker resumed his seat amid an ovation.

A cordial vote of thanks was given to the chairman, and the meeting closed. In the evening a selection of Irish airs was given by the brass band attached to the schools.—Irishman, June 13.

IRISH INTELLIGENCE.

DEATH OF THE VERY REV. FATHER BENVENUTO DOMBALKANS, O.S.F.C.—It is with the deepest regret we announce the demise of the above saintly and respected religious at his convent, 49 North King-street, Dublin, in the 81st year of his age, and the 35th of his sacred ministry. The deceased Father was a native of Rotterdam and for many years the devoted and beloved pastor of an extensive district in his native country, and for the past twenty-five years he was a true and zealous priest of the Capuchin order. The last eight years of his life he spent in ministering to the spiritual wants of the sick and dying in the hospitals of North Brunswick-street in Dublin, where, it may be truly said of him, he lived and died. He was beloved by the poor who have lost in him a dear and valued friend, and also by the members of the Order, who deplore a kind and food-berished brother, as well as a wise and self-sacrificing and exemplary father.—Requiescat in pace.—Irishman.

A CATHOLIC SYNOD.—We believe it was in the year 1851 that the last Synod of the Irish bishops was held in the ancient town of Thurles, county Tipperary. It was there the Irish hierarchy met to consider questions affecting the interests of the Church. The education of the people was a leading topic, and when the Synod separated, denunciations were launched against the Queen's colleges as "godless" institutions. The Catholic University sprung from that convention, and in all probability the approaching convalescence will make a new effort to place the foundation in St. Stephen's-green on a firm footing. The Cardinal has not yet fixed the time and place of the meeting, but Dublin is likely to give its name to the coming occasion. The O'Keefe case, and the issues raised by it, will engage the earnest attention of the bishops; whilst the question of education is sure to absorb a considerable portion of their time. It is also asserted that the recent conflicts between the priests and the lawyers in the matter of elections will be discussed with reference to the waning influence of the clergy in political affairs.—Irishman.

We learn from the Irish Times that notwithstanding the anxiety expressed respecting a crisis in the linen trade of the North of Ireland generally, and in Belfast particularly, there do not appear—if the usually accredited sources may be relied upon—that any grounds exist for uneasiness. All we gather is that trade is slack, stocks are heavy, and some large firms are working at a disadvantage. The rumours of heavy failures are also groundless, the prevalent opinion being that foreign firms, who have not been prompt in their payments, will shortly meet all demands, and confidence will then be restored, and there is nothing exceptional in the slowness of business at this period of the year.—Cork Examiner.

THE DROGHEDA PETITION. The end of this election contest has been reached by Mr. Justice Barry, who gave final judgment. Before the trial arrived at its last stage, the Court of Common Pleas had sat in judgement upon the points referred to their decision. Judges Lawson and Keogh were in favour of unseating Dr. O'Leary, while Judge Morris and Monahan would validate his election. Messrs. Keogh and Lawson might be termed the unseating judges of the Irish Bench. As the Court could not agree the matter was sent back to Mr. Justice Barry, who gave judgment on Monday, and at the same time made a few thrusts at a certain "brother." He said, "the most singular misrepresentation has been published respecting the fact of this case. According to the newspaper reports Mr. Justice Keogh laid particular stress upon the expression, 'the old lobby-room practice.' The learned judge seemed to think that this practice had some peculiar significance and must have been adopted with the express view of defeating the Ballot. To prevent any misapprehension I can only say that the existence of any corruption, or evil intension in this 'lobby-room practice' was not even insinuated on the part of the petitioner." Judge Barry then made some observations upon the anomaly of his position, and concluded by declaring Dr. O'Leary duly elected, and that each party should pay his own costs.—Irishman.

It is stated that Mr. John Nolan, Secretary to the Amnesty Association, has intimated to a deputation of Nationalists his intention of addressing the electors of Galway. The Freeman understands that there is a movement on foot for indemnifying Mr. O'Donnell from the consequence of Judge Lawson's order to pay the costs of the Galway election petition. That paper feels confident that if it anticipates the Bishops of the West, on a careful investigation of the facts, come to the conclusion that no moral stain attaches to Mr. O'Donnell, the appeal will be responded to with alacrity. The Spectator says that Mr. Justice Lawson's judgment at Galway, however sound as to the main point, the freedom of the Galway election—a matter, on which there is a direct conflict of evidence, and on which the Spectator has no opinion—involves this new and, as it seems to that paper, most unfair doctrine that Catholic priests alone among the clergy must abstain from interfering in elections, except by silent votes—must in fact suppress their own claim as citizens. It appears to the Spectator that the Judge's doctrine is that the priest may vote silently, but for him to agitate as a Protestant clergyman may, is not only disgraceful but illegal. That paper says that if there is one thing certain about Ireland it is that the priests when opposed to the popular feeling have no influence at all, and that they are always obliged to go on political subjects with their people.—Cork Herald.

A preliminary meeting of the proprietors and others interested in the drainage of Lakes Carras and Roue, near Foxhall, was held recently in Ballinrobe. Present, F. M. Lawen, chairman; C. C. B. Miller, Charles Jennings, Wm. Burke, and C. C. Boycott, Esqrs. The chairman explained the object of the meeting, and produced a map of the district, and intimated that Captain Nolan, another proprietor, was favorable to the project. Mr. Miller, one of the trustees of the Slurulo drainage district, expressed his apprehensions that any material increase in the outfall at the point indicated might injuriously affect the Slurulo drainage. Mr. Lawen, also a trustee, expressed strongly the opinion that the proposed outfall would have ample scope—that the expense of the proposed work would be about £500, for which at least 200 acres of land now submerged in winter would be gained by the outfall. The result of the meeting was that a resolution was adopted, directing the employment of a competent engineer to take levels and report thereon, also to make out an estimate of the proposed works.

THE GALWAY JOINTMENT.—The following is the report on the Galway election presented to the Speaker of the House of Commons:—"At the trial of the above election petition, I determined—1st, That Francis Hugh O'Donnell, whose return at the election was complained of, was not duly returned and elected. 2nd, That the last election for the said