

In two minutes, pantaloons and columbine were gone. I was suddenly left alone in my glory. Before I could collect my thoughts, a splendid Sardanapalus whispered in my ear that he was the manager of the Park Theatre; and that if I would relinquish any engagement I might be thinking of for the approaching pantomime season, he would take care to make it up to me liberally. He asked me to call at the green room next morning. I did so; and you saw the result to-night. It's a delightful life, when one has not got the toothache. But our professional columbine at the Park is neither so young nor so pretty as Clarissa, nor has pantaloons ever asked me to dinner. All that I have seen of the Jinkses ever since, is that they were on a front seat in the boxes three nights ago. At the end of one of my most brilliant scenes (in which I gave the real pantaloons the very same box on the ear which I had previously rehearsed at the fancy hall) Jinks laughed heartily and turned rather red; Clarissa, on the contrary, instead of laughing according to custom, looked as if she were going to cry. And yesterday there was an advertisement in the second column of the *Times*, which could only be meant for me, stating 'that the past should be forgiven,' and all the rest of it. An anonymous five-pound note has lately reached me, directed in my kind aunt's handwriting 'to Signor Giacomo.' So, I suppose I shall have to come down to plain 'Jones' again. But I must run the season through, or at least enjoy my success a few nights longer. It would not be fair to Sardanapalus to rob him of his crown at a moment's warning. How the dear public would miss me! I expect every day to receive a deputation from the Jinkses and my maiden-aunt; and if I do yield to their entreaties (which I think I shall for Clary's sake), by George! Wilson, the Temple of Hymen in my wedding-scene shall exhibit a tableau of unrivalled splendor.

THE QUESTIONS OF THE DAY.

(To the Editor of the Tablet.)

SIR,—I am very glad to find from the able letter of "A Catholic Priest" that I do not stand alone in wishing for some trustworthy solution of the great political problems of our time. The previous communication of the same valuable correspondent I happened unfortunately, to miss, but I am told by a very competent judge that it threw much light upon this important subject. I fully agree with him that the questions involved are far too great and complicated for brief and superficial discussion; and I hope it is not too much to expect that they may receive an answer, or at any rate some authoritative illustration, in the decrees of the approaching General Council. Meanwhile we possess the materials, of something like a correct decision upon them in the political axioms of the Encyclical and Syllabus. Those axioms are so consonant to the principles in which I was educated under the Tractarian leaders at Oxford, and in which I have been since confirmed as a disciple of the Catholic Church, that I am not conscious even of a temptation to dissent from them, and were I so conscious, a mind of course feel myself in duty bound to labour after overcoming it. The problem therefore, of which I seek the solution is one which should propose to adjust existing facts and phenomena with those axioms, or to show, on the other hand, where the conflict with them, and require us to abandon or modify our opinions in consequence. I will proceed to state some of my difficulties and I shall be only glad to find that they are imaginary. With regard to the proposal for the disestablishment and disendowment of the institution popularly called the Irish Church, there cannot, I suppose be two opinions as to its strict legality on Catholic grounds. The principle of establishment is surely not illustrated but rather caricatured by an establishment set up for the maintenance and propagation of heresy. Endowments have lost their claim to respect and consideration which are not only not applied to the purpose to which they were consecrated, but to purposes the very reverse of those for which they were in the contemplation of their donors. So far, then, we cannot, I conceive be wrong as Catholics in promoting this object by all means in our power. But we must keep clearly before our view that we condemn the Irish Establishment not because it is an establishment in the abstract, but because it is an establishment degraded and desecrated to the purposes of error, with all its immoral consequences. This, however, is a ground which cannot be put forward without injury to our cause, and therefore we are content to rest on others which are more popular but may involve at the same time a surrender of important Catholic principles. We are led to maintain either that the Voluntary system is abstractedly better than the principle of endowments, or that no religion should be established unless it be the religion of the majority. On the former of these arguments I will remark at once that it warrants a Government in the adoption and protection of any religious error which may happen to be dominant, and in the disavowal of religious truth when it happens to be unpopular. In short, it makes truth dependent on the will of the majority for the time being. It is in pursuance of this view that the English Government exhibits the ludicrous spectacle of establishing one form of religion in England and another in Scotland. But it commits in Ireland that flagrant violation of its own theory with which it is justly twitted by the consistent maintainers of that theory, as well as by the enemies of Establishments in general. Catholics are strongly tempted to lend their voices to the same cry; and so they make it quite plain that they are using an argument *ad hominem*, they may do so without compromise of the great principle which they keep in the background. But I fear our tendency is to fall in with this argument unconditionally, and thus, as the saying is, to sanction a law that makes against ourselves, by virtually denying the objectivity of religious truth, and the duty of Governments, in a normal state of things, to protect and uphold it.

But there is a further difficulty. Not only are Establishments now no necessary guarantee for the truth of the religion established; the very idea of an Establishment, in the sense in which the Church understands that term, has become obsolete. The union of Church and State does not mean such union as reserves to the Church her own independent rights and action in all that appertains to her own province, the State meanwhile aiding and supporting her by a dutiful and loyal support and cooperation, but one rather in which the State uses her as a tool for its own purposes, and under the cover of a condescending and contemptuous patronage, cripples her freedom of action, and exercises a real though disguised ascendancy over her. Hence the principle of an Establishment requires not merely an indefinite sanction, but a theological definition. It may be quite true that the union of Church and State is incomparably better than their mutual independence, in the abstract, and yet that such mutual independence is far better than that union as it is in these days generally understood. Better it surely is than any arrangement which makes the Church a mere dependent and stipendiary of State. Again, according to the true Catholic theory, the Church holds of right those endowments which have come to her through the munificence of benefactors and is answerable to God, rather than to the State, for

the discharge of the trust committed to her. But, in the formation and endowment of a new Establishment (such conceivably as might be contemplated by some politicians for the Catholic religion in Ireland) this view of the case would, it may be feared, be set aside in favour of another which would bring in the State, instead of the benefactors, as the party to which the Church would be beholden for what is really her own. The same would be the case, if according to one proposition, the property originally given for maintenance of the Catholic religion were to be distributed in certain proportions between the professors of that religion and the professors of different collateral errors, while the State would by such an arrangement be committed not merely to the inconsistency of maintaining different religions in different parts of her empire but opposite religions in one and the same. Nor is there any difference between such an arrangement and the principle of secularisation, except indeed to its disadvantage. The appropriation of sacred endowments to national objects, and much more their appropriation to the relief of the poor, would be a destiny at least as religious as their application to the support of heresy. At the same time, the plan of secularisation properly so called, has objections of its own in the view of a Catholic. This brings me to another question on which I cannot see my way. It is I believe an axiom of Canon Law that no prescription holds good against the claim of the Church. This being so the endowments originally given by Catholics for Catholic purposes (unless the Church have formally renounced her claim to them) are now as much her property as ever, and if they should happen to have got into the hands of a thief. Now, as long as these endowments remain, as it were, in a lump, there is a chance, however remote, of their one day coming back to the Church who owns them. But, if once alienated to secular purposes, they are absolutely irrecoverable. Hence it is that approved moral theologians do not allow us to prejudice the claim of a proprietor by disposing of found property in the ways which, however excellent, are not known to be in accordance with his intentions, so long as there exists the bare possibility of restitution. But it is said that the Irish bishops, by a recent decision have renounced once for all on the part of the Church her claim to these endowments. If such were the intention of their declaration, and if they had the power of making such a renunciation, there is no doubt an end to the question. But to myself the intention is not clear, and I do not know whether the tacit acquiescence of the Holy See, without some formal act on the part of that See, would be theologically adequate to the effect of such a declaration. This difficulty is no doubt the result of my ignorance of one thing at least I am sure, that the Irish bishops intended to do nothing which they had not a right to do. I had proposed to myself to say a few words on the question of Voluntaryism versus Endowments, which is another problem of the day, and one worthy of much consideration. But my letter has already extended to an inordinate length, and I must hold over the inquiry to a future and indefinite period.

Your obedient servant,

FREDERICK OAKLEY.

May 12.

IRISH INTELLIGENCE.

MAYNOOTH COLLEGE.—A resolution was adopted by the House of Commons on the night of Thursday week in which it was stated that no portion of the Protestant Church property should be used for the endowment of Maynooth College or any Church in Ireland. From this some persons argue that Maynooth College will soon close its annual grant from Parliament, and that if the College is to be continued it must be supported by the voluntary principle. We do not think this interpretation is strictly correct. But if it be true, then Trinity College, and all the Queen's Colleges must be closed up. The principle of disendowment in that direction must not be confined to Maynooth alone, but extended to the Protestant and Presbyterian Colleges. 'What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander.' But we think that to disendow colleges because the Protestant Church will be disendowed, is arguing on false premises. The grants for education come from the State—the tithes or rent charge is paid chiefly by a Catholic nation to provide bishops and parsons for a small minority. The former is a benefit to this nation—the latter is a wrong to five millions of Catholics; and in removing a wrong, we are not called upon to destroy what is useful as well as necessary. The reasonable mode of proceeding is to disendow the Establishment because it is an outrage on Catholics; and to continue the grants for education, because they will be followed by useful results. So far as we can ascertain the Catholics of Ireland did not solicit the grant to Maynooth. It was offered to them and they accepted it on independent terms. That offer was made through fear, and not as evincing either love or respect for the Catholic faith. The American revolutionists had triumphed over England, and the French revolution was raging when Maynooth was endowed. The offering was made to prevent Irish students from going to the Irish College in Paris, where they might imbibe dangerous political principles, and then import them to this country. We do not think that England is so foolish as to abolish the grant, because it would be the commencement of a new series of troubles. Our country has been plundered; the estates of most of the Catholic Chiefs have been grasped by Protestants; and if Maynooth be disendowed, it is more than probable, that a call will be made to have these estates returned to the descendants of the rightful owners in order that the nation may be enabled to sustain the burden of a great Ecclesiastical College for the education of the priesthood. To avoid such a state of things the English liberals should be cautious. They should take care and not go too far. To abolish the Church endowment would give relief to Catholic Ireland; but to deny Maynooth the grant from the State would be a gross wrong, which would certainly lead to bad consequences. We would warn those who advocate such a pernicious course to restrain their feelings. Ireland is not now in a position to be trifled with. She has been plundered ten times over, and if the paltry grant to Maynooth is taken from her, she will hardly bear the indignity in peace. She will then insist on having Trinity College, and all the Colleges in England and Scotland disendowed, for she will not submit to anything less than equality. We have no fears, however, that the grant will be withdrawn, for England is not in a position to challenge the hostility of the bishops, priests and people of Ireland.—*Dundalk Democrat*.

THE 'TIMES' ON IRELAND.—It may appear a paradox and an audacious paradox, to lament that Ireland has never produced a patriot of genius; but, if the truth be told, it will be found that it is to this deficiency rather than to a lack of Royal residences that the comparative neglect to which Sir Colman O'Loughlin called attention last night is to be attributed. We cannot, of course, hope that the statement will be at once accepted. We seem to hear a crowd of Irishmen running through the names of their illustrious countrymen, all of them patriots and all of them men of genius. Not to go back to the days of primitive learning, when Ireland was the home of European knowledge, the very existence of which has been doubted, Swift, Burke, Goldsmith, Moore, and many more will be cited. There is no one among them who fulfils the double qualification. Swift was a man of genius, but as the late Mr. Thackeray declared, he was an Englishman who happened to be born in Dublin. He never refers to the peculiarities of the Irish character except to ridicule them, and his letters about Wood's halfpence were but the accidental expression of spleen excited by what he deemed neglect. Burke was a man of

genius, but he was 'born for the universe.' Ireland was to him a subject of political illustration and speculation, and though he 'narrowed his mind' to party, he never confined it within the limits of provincial patriotism. Goldsmith was a real Irishman in his faults and virtues, but, in spite of the *Deserted Village*, he never seems to have cared much about his country; while Moore, in spite of his Irish Melodies, found his greatest happiness in English society, and chose to spend his life, when free to select his own place of residence, in an inland English county. What has the past existence or non-existence of an Irishman of genius who was also a patriot to do with Royal visits to Ireland? If we turn to the debate of last night, we cannot fail of an answer. Sir Colman O'Loughlin called attention to the absence of a Royal residence, and took the opportunity to lament the infrequency of Royal visits to Ireland. Since William III., if indeed, his Irish campaign can be called a visit, no English Monarch has set foot on the island except George IV. and Her present Majesty. Upon an accurate computation by Ulster King-at-Arms, it has been discovered that, in the course of 170 years, fifteen days in all have been spent in Ireland by English Sovereigns. This limitation of the Royal presence there is greatly to be lamented; but there is some excuse for it in the absence of a Palace to which Royalty might resort. Mr. Disraeli, who expressed the utmost sympathy with Sir Colman O'Loughlin's feelings, dwelt at still greater length on the absence of a Royal residence, not merely as an excuse for infrequent visits, but as the cause of their shortness and infrequency. There have been difficulties, he pleaded, which could not be overcome, the chief being the want of a Palace where Royalty could take up a permanent abode. Mr. Gladstone, who followed Mr. Disraeli, had the same sort of sympathy; the same excuse, and same hopes. We have no wish to be rude, but, as we are on Irishmen and Irish affairs, we may venture to say that there is a monosyllabic word, made classic by its use in the *Vicar of Wakefield*, which is forced on our memory by these expressions. If the absence of a Royal residence were all, how has it happened the Queen has been able to visit Scotland? When Her Majesty came to the Crown there was no Royal residence fit to receive her in the North. There was indeed Holyrood, and we believe Linlithgow is in name a Royal palace; but the one is about as habitable as the other. If Holyrood be deemed a Royal residence so is the Castle at Dublin. Balmoral is the creation of Her Majesty and the late Prince Consort, and the Queen having been graciously pleased to admit her subjects to her intimacy by the publication of her works, we are enabled to trace the origin of this 'Highland home.' It has all been owing to Sir Walter Scott. Sir Walter was a man of genius, and he was also a patriot, and his patriotism was in the highest degree provincial. He was a Scotchman from the crown of his head to the sole of his feet. He had a real belief in Scotch one-pound notes, which may be advantageously contrasted with Swift's forced frenzy about Wood's halfpence, more especially as Swift really did understand the defects of Wood's scheme and Sir Walter was absolutely ignorant of the currency controversy in which he engaged. Sir Walter was such a Scotchman that if his belief were proved it would have been found that he looked upon George IV. as a Scotch King who had annexed England, not as a King of England ruling also over Scotland. But Sir Walter Scott was also a man of genius, and with his genius and his intense pride in Scotland he took Europe by storm. His works have been translated into every language, and read by all nations. The Prince Consort, a person of the widest cultivation, was captivated by them, and when he became an Englishman he took the earliest opportunity to pay a pilgrimage to the scenes consecrated by the genius he admired. The 'Highland home' naturally followed, and the 'Highland home' still exercises an uncontrollable fascination. There is nothing to wonder at in all this. It is the touch of nature which makes the whole world kin. The scenes among which we have spent the days when life was most susceptible of emotion, the haunts consecrated by our deepest trials, are those which allure us through all time. No Royal residence in Ireland will ever wear Her Majesty from the Highlands; no Palace in the West will withdraw her from Balmoral. We may look at the matter in another light, and we shall arrive at the same result. George III. was never out of England yet he was fond of movement; he liked to visit his favourite Bishop, and he went to Weymouth regularly year after year. If the Continent had been more accessible, he might not improbably have visited Hanover, yet we may be certain that he would as soon have thought of visiting Iceland as Scotland. Why should he? He may have heard that Dr. Johnson had been there, and had said something of its 'prodigious fine prospects' after he came back; but Lord Bute himself could not have tempted him across the Border. No magician had arisen to throw a charm over the North Country, making it to all men from their earliest days a world of romance. Ireland is now where Scotland was. Englishmen are slow to believe in the beauties of Irish scenery, and are more impressed with the defects than the virtues of the Irish character. If some Irishman were to appear who, without whining about it were to compel us, through his own intense sympathy with his countrymen, to sympathize with their hopes, their fears their wrongs, and their sufferings, he would provide a Royal residence in Ireland without the necessity of a Parliamentary vote. At present there is no promise of his coming and so Sir Colman O'Loughlin asks for a Royal residence. Mr. Disraeli is benevolently civil in response, and Mr. Gladstone is not to be outdone in good wishes to Ireland. We fear nothing will come of it. We do not grudge the money. We spend as much over and over again in follies which are not merely useless but injurious. But there is a shade of the ridiculous in the proposal to feed a nation with bonbons, and the anonymous Member who last night reminded the House that there was also a Welsh nationality in the United Kingdom had the right of it as a matter of fact. The discontent we deplore in Ireland has its origin in resentment against priviledges and if we would remove it we must take away the occasion of offence.—*Times*.

In all fairness it must be admitted that the disestablishment of the Irish Church has been proposed with all due gravity and solemnity, and only as a political necessity that could no longer be averted. Everything has been said and done to spare feelings and interests, and to conciliate those who might feel themselves the special victims of the inevitable sacrifice. It is proper, and it would be wise, that this delicate matter should be acknowledged, and as far as possible mitigated, by the partisans of what must be called an eminently partisan Church. The Irish Church, it might be said, without any fault of its own, is the Church of a party, driven by its unfortunate circumstances to a tone of language and conduct at variance with every kind or degree of spiritual pretension. Its ill success and unpopularity are the only excuse for its harshness and violence; for, indeed, it is too usual to find the disappointed and hopeless ill at ease, devoid of sympathy, and resentful. The best man in the world would find himself sorely tried in a parish or a diocese, where his advances were repelled and his mission discredited. Sensible men will feel this, and make allowances for the excesses of Orangeism, or whatever else it is called there. But the friends of this cause will make a great mistake, and drive matters from bad to worse, to the extent, perhaps, of realising the results they now only predict, if they endeavor to import and naturalise the faction fight on the floor of the House of Commons. Nowhere is it more necessary that everything should be done with decency and order; nor was there ever an occasion which more demanded the respectfulness usually observed by gentlemen towards one another. Here are we, alarmists tell us—say, some Irish gentlemen, not very apt to be frightened, tell us—on the eve of a great constitutional and political crisis. A year hence, they assure

us, we are all to be at the mercy of men without faith, without law, without loyalty. The strongest lungs, if not the bravest arm, are to carry the day. May it never be! we fervently pray. But already we seem to be in the way to it; and the officers are the champions of the Church most interested in quieting, and, if possible, controlling the insurgency of the multitude and the lawlessness of brute force.—*Times*.

It is one of the most remarkable facts of the day that a shining—or rather burning light of the Irish Establishment—has solemnly declared that Fenianism is the work of God; and not only that, but that Fenianism has been raised up by God to scourge England for her sins and shake her empire to its base. We shall give his account in his own words, and his preface will show he has arrived at this after continuous meditation, private prayer, and mortification, purely spiritual, and arising from having to receive a very good salary for doing nothing. We quote from the *Aston News*:—"The Rev. Dr. Treaham Gregg, of Dublin, supported the resolution, and said he had got a very good living in the Church of Ireland, and, strange to say, by the extraordinary anomaly of the law, he had no duties in connection with that office to perform. His case had been singled out and discerned upon as a marked one; he had given the Rev. Mr. Williams, of Southampton, one of the lecturers upon the case, an answer to all his argument in the two last pages of the tract which he held in his hand. In that tract he had regretted that he was placed in the position he held, but that he considered it his bounden duty to give every hour, every minute, every second of his time to the work of God in private meditation or prayer. He had brought forward the results of these exercises he had expounded in a letter entitled, 'The Church of Ireland, addressed to the Churchwardens of St. Nicholas Within, Dublin.' It was to quiet the discontented Fenians that the attempt was being made to destroy the Established Church in Ireland. He admitted that Fenianism was a great fact. 'He had seen its vast extent in America, where a whole nation of Irish were supplied with money and all the means of military power, and he believed that America would one day use their power to shake our empire to its base.' This Fenianism was the creation of English selfishness—English complicity with idolatry. When Solomon worshipped the gods of the heathens, 'God raised up one adversary and then another' against him. 'The same power that had raised up these adversaries' had raised Fenianism, and it was certain to smite us unless we abandoned our abominable inconsistency."—*Dublin Irishman*.

The Dublin correspondent of the *Post* informs the readers of that paper that organisations, recently formed throughout the Provinces, are holding public meetings in support of the Church. The speaking at these gatherings (his writes), it need hardly be said, is intensely Protestant in character. At a meeting of the Ulster association, the other day, a Mr. Charley declared that if Mr. Gladstone were followed, 'we would have to adopt the republican motto of France—Liberty, equality, and fraternity.' This gentleman however, does not regard the Church as wholly overthrown. 'I hope,' he went on to say, 'that in the new House of Commons the Church party will be stronger than in the present; and I consider that, even though this measure should be passed by a majority in the Commons, the House of Lords should reject it. It is possible that, with the new constituencies, and with the Protestant feeling that is being revived, the Conservative section of the community may gain a great many seats, which may place them in a majority; and if this should turn out to be the case, as it is quite possible it will, then our Church is safe, and the Protestant community will suffer no loss by having us, the great bulwark, standing between them and infidelity and superstition.' The following resolutions were passed:—That we will resist by every legitimate means, the encroachments of the Papal power in our land, and we will defend to the best of our ability the endowments of the Protestant Churches of this country, and the establishment of the Protestant religion. We look upon the many concessions which have been made of late years by the successive Governments to the Romish party as dangerous in their tendency; and regarding, as we do, the maintenance of our Protestantism as the best and only bulwark for the protection of our liberties, are of opinion that our allegiance to the Constitution depends on its remaining essentially Protestant. 'That we regard the movement against the Protestant endowments of this country as revolutionary in its character, and only part of a scheme intended ultimately to annihilate our whole civil and religious liberties; and, believing that the movement is conducted by unscrupulous ex-places men solely for their own personal and selfish ends, we deprecate all apathy in this crisis, and consider that it is now imperatively incumbent upon us to take measures for ascertaining upon whom we may depend as friends.' Viscount Massereene was in the chair at this meeting.

If the morning papers are to be trusted as reliable sources of intelligence, the report of the Commissioners appointed by the present Government to inquire into the condition of the Established Church in Ireland was signed and forwarded to the proper quarter on Tuesday. It is said that the Commissioners recommend the suppression of one archbishop and five bishoprics, which would leave in Ireland one archbishop and seven bishops. We shall soon know all about the Charter for a Catholic University in Ireland. The Earl of Mayo told Sir Colman O'Loughlin on Tuesday that a correspondence had been originated between Her Majesty's Government and the two Prelates appointed at the meeting of the Irish Roman Catholic Hierarchy, held in Dublin, to communicate with the Government on the part of the Archbishops and Bishops. That correspondence is now nearly complete, and Lord Mayo hoped that in a few days it would be laid on the table of the House of Commons. Until the correspondence has been seen by the House the Government are under a pledge to take no steps as regards a Charter for a Catholic University.—*Tablet*.

The London *Saturday Review* has a well-considered article on the disposition to be made of the churches in Ireland, in the event of the passage of the disendowment bill. We subjoin the concluding part:—"Now it becomes a serious question, in case of disestablishment or disendowment, what is to be done with these fabrics. If the change is meant to conciliate the great Roman Catholic population of Ireland, it will hardly do to leave these ancient buildings and sites of buildings in the hands of a small body, who will no longer be even an established body. It will be small satisfaction to a Roman Catholic inhabitant of Cashel if the Protestant Bishop and his Chapter lose their other temporal rights and privileges, but retain the most galling of all—the power of shutting out the Church of the majority from that glorious group of buildings, hallowed by every religious and historical association in the hearts of the Irish people. It is now a rankling grievance for Oormac's Chapel to remain unused and uncared for, the freehold of men who cannot or will not make any use of it, while those who no doubt soon could make use of it are shut out. But the grievance will be ten times greater if the body who is now authorized, as the Established Church of the country, to play dog in the manger should cease to be the Established Church, and should be allowed to play dog in the manger all the same. The present state of things, if unjust, is at least intelligible, but a state of things which left the ancient churches and sites of churches in the hands of what would then be a small sect would be as unintelligible as it would be unjust. The few cathedrals and other churches in Ireland which have been kept up in anything like a decent state have a chance of being preserved while they remain in the hands of a

body established by law, and possessed of competent revenues. They would have a chance of being preserved if left to the voluntary zeal of the great bulk of the nation. But they would have no chance at all in the hands of a minority which would have sunk into a mere sect. In a great city like Dublin, it would doubtless be reasonable to divide the churches in fair proportions between the two religions, as is done in so many German towns; where the two religions exist side by side. But of what use could buildings like Saint Canice and Killaloe be to a small sect, which would doubtless no longer be able to maintain the faintest shadow of a capital establishment? In the hands of the Church of the majority they would at least have a chance of being cared for and kept up; as the property of a mere Protestant sect, the case would be hopeless. And as to the village churches, no one would wish to disturb the Protestant owners in the possession of the paltry buildings which they have run up within the last fifty years. A distinction, too, might be drawn in favor of churches restored recently by private and Protestant munificence, such as that displayed by the late Primate and by Mr. Guinness. But how about the ancient sites and church yards? They are, strictly speaking, of no use to anybody. The churches, small and ruinous at best, have sometimes only the foundations left; there is hardly a case in which they could be now used for divine service by either side. All that still cleaves to them is a sentiment, which sentiment is surely likely to be much stronger in Roman Catholic than in Protestant hearts. And around the churches lie the churchyards, to which at all events the Irish people cleave with the deepest affection as the last homes of their fathers. Surely, if any change is to be made at all, no change can be more reasonable than to vest the freehold of these ancient sites, ruins, and burying grounds in those who alone are attached to them by any sentiment, and to whom it must be a grievance to feel that it is only by a sort of sufferance that they have anything to do with them at all. It may conceivably be right to leave things as they are, to vest everything in a dominant Church, though the Church of the minority. It cannot be right to vest objects which are revered by the majority in the Church of the minority, when that Church is no longer dominant. If the Irish Church is to be disestablished or disendowed, surely one essential part of such disestablishment or disendowment is to secure some use for sites and fabrics of which the present owners can make no use.

The Government Church Commission recommend that there should be only one Protestant Archbishop and seven bishops in Ireland for the future.

JOHN MITCHELL ON FENIANISM.—Mr. John Mitchell has addressed a third letter on Fenianism to Mr. John Martin, one of his associates during the Young Ireland agitation in 1848. His former communications were intended to show 'the collapse of that enormous sack of gas called Fenianism.' He now replies to some of his critics, and endeavours to reassure the 'good and worthy Irishmen, who, he says, have been pained and disappointed at hearing the truth about Fenianism. Dr. O'Brien, the Roman Catholic Dean of Limerick, lately charged Mr. Mitchell with having glorified Stephens, and thereby deceived a good many in Ireland. Mr. Mitchell denies that he had ever mentioned Stephens 'with common respect,' and retorts in the following terms:—"One thing is very plain to me, that the Dean of Limerick, though he is no Fenian—though he fought Fenianism in its hell—though he cannot contradict one syllable I have said of it, but rather confirms all—yet bears a grudge against me for letting the wind out of the bag. He thought it useful to have such a shape of terror looming in the background, while he is agitating his little 'Repeal'—by way of frightening the British Government, as it were—poor, simple, and timorous British Government!—as if the British Government did not know better than you or I, or Dr. O'Brien, the exact measure, the height and the depth, of the Fenian sensation." But, while Mr. Mitchell proclaims war against the impracticable enterprise and unscrupulous delusions which have 'exposed brave men and innocent families to destruction upon a mere blind impulse of subterfuge,' he takes care not to let it be supposed that the spirit which gave rise to the Fenian organization is at an end. In his opinion it has been strengthened by the defeat of Stephens and his successors.—"The Irish element on the continent of America, in sloughing off its contracting 'shell' of Fenianism, cannot but grow into something stronger, sounder, and far more formidable than ever. For that collapsed concern, with its high-sounding pretensions, its monstrous exaggerations and delusions, its factions and dissensions, its phantasm army and its flying Dutchman navy, and its insolent denunciations of all who did not belong to it, kept at a distance the best nationalists in America, as well as the best in Ireland. Mr. Mitchell believes that Irish Independence will be won whenever England engages in a foreign war, and in order to hasten it, he begs to advise the American Government and the French Government that England is now and henceforth utterly powerless to resist any aggression or to resent any affront.—*Times*.

CHARGES ON FENIANISM.—At the Petty Sessions held at Buttevant on Thursday, a journeyman tailor named Sweeney, who had been sometime previously in the employment of a tailor in the town, was put forward charged with endeavouring to seduce a soldier of the regiment at present quartered at Buttevant from his allegiance to become a member of the Fenian Brotherhood. It appeared in evidence that the prisoner had formed an acquaintance with the soldier, in the course of which he had spoken at various times of matters connected with the organisation, and had given his new friend to understand that another rising might be expected at no distant date. The prisoner, according to the evidence of the prosecutor, gave a considerable amount of information regarding the working of the Brotherhood, some of his statements being, however, of a rather curious character. When arrested by the police on the charge the prisoner was completely defiant, and bore himself before the magistrates with the greatest indifference. He was returned for trial at the Cork assizes.

At Nenagh Petty Sessions on Saturday, Constable John Moore charged Patrick O'Connor and John Stockpools with singing and playing seditious songs. The constable deposed that, on the night of the 6th inst., between ten and eleven o'clock, he met the prisoners, followed by a crowd of boys, proceeding down Spout road; one of them was playing a concertina, and O'Donnell Abbot being asked for, he immediately played that tune, which was chorused by the crowd. The constable followed them, and arrested the prisoners. The prisoners said they were ignorant of the song being illegal. Their worship sentenced them to two months' imprisonment each, at the expiration of which they were to enter into their own recognizances to keep the peace.—*Nenagh Guardian*.

His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant having been pleased to commute the sentence of imprisonment on William Hopper and Stephen J. Hanrick, who pleaded guilty at last commission to an indictment for having been discharged from Kilmallick Prison, and embarked for America on board the *Damascus*, one of the Montreal Steamship Company's vessels from Dublin.

Sullivan and Pigot, the two Dublin editors who have been imprisoned there for some time for alleged seditious articles, have been released from confinement on a writ of error.

The statement that Her Majesty's Steamship *Helicon* had gone in pursuit of a suspicious craft in Scotland. There is no reason to suppose that any vessel of the sort is on the coast. The *Helicon* did leave on Government service, but not of the nature stated.—*Express*.