

as he says, innocent, though if so, it is very, very strange that he kept out of the way so long— however, I sincerely hope that all will come right in the end. As for my doing anything for him under present circumstances, it is quite impossible, but I will see Mr. Esmond to-morrow and ascertain how he feels towards Pierce, or whether he still believes him guilty.

“God in heaven bless you, Miss, I’m sure your word will go far wider the old gentleman! I’ll go home now with a lighter heart than I came, and that you may never know what a sore heart is, and that happiness may attend you here and hereafter, is my prayer now and for ever!”

“I thank you kindly for your good wish,” said Harriet as she left the room; when the door closed soon after her she sighed deeply, and murmured softly as she turned away:

“That I may never know what a sore heart is!—a kind wish, my poor girl! but it comes a little late!—happiness I must try to win for hereafter, by ceasing to look for it here!”

(To be continued.)

THE IRISH CHURCH ESTABLISHMENT—MR. WHITESIDE’S ERRORS.

The debate in which the hideous injustice of the Irish Church Establishment was, for the hundredth time exposed, has come to an end for this session, but surely not without effect. It has been again condemned by all who do not grow fat in its fatness, and rich in its wealth. The learned and just have endorsed the verdict pronounced years ago by Sidney Smith, and proclaimed that “there is no abuse like it in all Europe, in all Asia, in all the discovered parts of Africa, and in all we have heard of Timbuctoo.” None have the courage to defend it only Sir Robert Peel and Mr. Whiteside—both, no doubt, from the most disinterested motives, Mr. Dilwyn had scarcely set down when Sir Robert Peel and Mr. Whiteside arose. All political hostility was forgotten, the wolf and lamb set out on the same expedition, for the woes of Gog and Magog seemed at hand for their common pastures.

“Hand shook paw, and paw shook hand, saying, ‘Hail, good fellow, we’re well met?’”

It is not my intention to review many of the arguments by which Mr. Whiteside endeavored to shelter his bounteous client; the eloquence and sarcasm of those who followed him demolished them with provoking facility. With the treatment of one portion of Mr. Whiteside’s speech, however, we confess our dissatisfaction. Mr. Whiteside spoke not merely as the exponent of a political party, but also “a branch of the Christian Church,” and the arguments he adduced in this last character were left untouched by the withering stroke dealt by Mr. Osborne in passing, and probably it was a sufficient exposure; but, lest Mr. Whiteside or his admirers should imagine his assertions admitted, if not disproved, I shall take the liberty to give them a further, though brief consideration.

For the sake of clearness I shall take the trouble of arranging the arguments of Mr. Whiteside in the order in which I intend to examine them, and I shall do so under the title of Mr. Whiteside’s grave warnings, that “no scholar could doubt them.”

I. “The Established Church upholds the ancient, pure, Catholic faith, which was professedly in Ireland centuries before the English set foot in that country.”

II. “It is a most interesting fact that in the reign of Queen Elizabeth every Irish bishop, save one, attended to the changes made at that time in the Ancient Church, adopted the Reformation, signed the roll, took the oaths, and sat in the Parliament of Elizabeth.”

III. “The pretended impeachment of the orders in the Church of England cannot apply to this orders in the Established Church in Ireland.”

IV. “No scholar can deny the unbroken descent of bishops of the Irish Church from the bishops of ancient times.”

Many of your readers are aware that Mr. Whiteside does not deserve credit for originality in the first statement. It is as old as Ussher and the seventh century. When the secular power had driven the adherents of the Ancient Church to the bogs and caverns, those whom it supported withdrew under the taunt—“Where was your Church before Luther?” A similar question, ages before, had flitted the followers of the Nestorians and Arius, and the rest, with dismay. This was the hollowed tessera fidei of the early Christian Church, and it shall continue so to the end. Ussher, whose antiquarian research and labours effected so much for Irish history, essayed the hopeless task of identifying the Ancient Church of Ireland with that which the crimes of Henry and Elizabeth has established. Many thought that the destruction of our annals which Elizabeth had accomplished, and the dispersion of our religious, who were the depositories of our traditions, would render the effort not impossible. In vain! The brilliancy of truth may be clouded for a while, but its own native warmth dispels the darkness and gives it back all its native lustre. Let us, then, contrast the Church by Law Established with the Ancient Church of Ireland as known by history, and thus dispose of Mr. Whiteside’s first argument. Most of our authorities shall be members of the “Establishment,” from whom he cannot appeal.

“Centuries before the English set foot in our country” the faithful of the Irish Church regarded the Sovereign Pontiff at Rome as the Judge in every cause of difficulty; to Rome they “sent wise and humble men as children to their mother.” The Irish Church taught those missionaries whom she sent through the world heralds of the Gospel; to look on the successor of St. Peter as “the beautiful head of all the Churches—the beloved father—the exalted prelate—the pastor of the pastors”—to address him as “the highest—the first—almost celestial.” This was the teaching, and this the practice of the early Irish Church. What are the teaching and practice of the Church which Mr. Whiteside seeks to identify with it? Happily, the zeal and the fanaticism of many of its members relieve us of the trouble of research. It proclaims Rome the Scarlet Lady that sitteth on the seven hills, and the Pontiff the Antichrist—the beast of the Apocalypse. As Sidney Smith pithily summarizes it, they consider “the Sultan a better Christian than the Pope.”

“Centuries before the English set foot in our country” the walls of our temples were covered with sacred paintings; from one door, opening to the Sanctuary, bishops and priests entered to consecrate, according to custom, the Body of Christ; and, from another, long trains of nuns entered “that they might partake of the banquet of the Body and Blood of Christ.” At this early period of the Missals of the Irish Church contained Misses for the Dead, that they might obtain pardon. The members of the Ancient Church were taught to believe that “the prayers of the living do profit the dead,” and souls were wont to be given to propitiate Heaven for the deceased. Yet against all these the Established Church pronounces anathemas.

If space permitted I could extend this argument to any length. Where, let me ask, is the identity of faith between the two Churches which Mr. Whiteside has invited us to compare? The one acquiesced in the

decisions of an authority which the other pronounces an usurpation; the Sacrifice of the one is declared idolatry by the other—her faith a “leprous error.” Where is the identity? If Mr. Whiteside says they differ only in matters of discipline, then surely his notion of a Church is strange indeed; why not admit, then, the identity of all sects?

Mr. Whiteside next asks—“Could there be a more interesting fact than that which occurred in the reign of Queen Elizabeth? Every bishop, save one, attended to the changes made at that time in the Ancient Church, adopted the Reformation, signed the roll, took the oaths, and sat in the Parliament of Elizabeth.” We confess the assertion came on us by surprise. Though not entertaining a very high notion of Mr. Whiteside’s historical acquirements, and prepared for much reckless assertion, this, his last essay in history, surpassed even our dreams. What does Mr. Whiteside mean by “attending to the changes made in the Ancient Church”? What does he mean by adopting the Reformation? Who is the one bishop whom he excepts from this interesting calendar? Is it Dr. O’Hely, the Archbishop of Cashel, whom Elizabeth’s edict flung into prison in 1583? Was it for adopting the Reformation that Loftus, a primate of Elizabeth’s creation, had him subjected to a long and dreary incarceration? Why was he brought out for martyrdom, bound to a tree his boots filled with salt, and pith, and oil, his limbs smeared with alcohol, and all lighted and quenched at the caprice of his murderers? Why were those tortures prolonged for four successive days. Why did these apostles of the new religion crown their iniquity by bathing their hands in the life-blood of the martyr? Why, because he would not attend to the changes made at that time in the Ancient Church. Who is the one who refused to “adopt the Reformation”? Was it Dr. O’Hely, Bishop of Mayo, whose thighs were broken with sledges, and whose arms were crushed by levers. Was it Dr. Creagh, who was dragged to London, flung into the Tower, and at length put to death by poison. Was it Dr. O’Gallagher, Bishop of Derry, to whom, in his 80th year, the hangman’s halter gave a martyr’s glory. Was it Dr. McEgan, Bishop Elect of Ross, who fell beneath the sword. Who we ask is the one. What Bishop of Kilmore contemned. Sir John Perrot, the Lord Deputy of that day, assures that Queen Elizabeth that none had or could be induced to do so. In 1585 he assures the virtuous and virgin reformer that the sea was usurped by one Dr. Brady, who “dispersed abroad seditious bulls, and such like trash; but that, for the better advancement of her Majesty’s interest, he had taken care to ‘dispossess him.’” What Bishop of Ardagh, of Dromore, of Raphoe, recognised the royal supremacy, and conformed. But it were a waste of time and patience to discuss the matter at further length.

Mr. Whiteside asserts that “every bishop, save one, took the oath and sat in the Parliament of Queen Elizabeth.” We approach this portion of the speech with all respectful awe and timidity, recollecting that Mr. Whiteside has discovered the origin, traced the life, and assisted at the death of the Irish Parliament. But even the shade of Lord Coke, to mention no other, shall not prevent us from commenting on this statement. Granting that “every bishop, save one, sat in the Parliament of Queen Elizabeth,” what is the inference. Mr. Whiteside sits in the Parliament of Lord Palmerston and Sir Robert Peel; he is, therefore, accountable for—does he, therefore, acquiesce in, their legislation. Let Mr. Whiteside take care. If that bounteous dame, the Establishment, were taught to draw this inference, we shall not say who would be the loser. “We need not observe that while of the votes of individuals in that assembly nothing whatever is handed down, we have strong reason for believing the laws enacted were never approved by the majority, and we have the clearest evidence to prove these laws were not and could not be carried out. The Catholic oath was taken during the whole of Elizabeth’s reign, even in the boroughs within the pale.” To say that sitting in the Parliament of Elizabeth implied the adoption of the reform she promoted, manifests the grossest misconception of the history of the period. A single remark establishes this. If Mr. Whiteside takes the trouble of examining the public lists of the Parliament held in 1585, he shall find enumerated the Catholic Bishops of Achery and Raphoe.†

Before concluding the examination of this point, we assert, and we defy Mr. Whiteside to disprove our statement, that of the canonically elected Irish bishops it is impossible to prove that more than two “adopted the Reformation.”

Mr. Whiteside has invited criticism to contemplate “an interesting fact” in connection with the young Church of Elizabeth’s reign. I shall do so—not for the purpose of giving pain to any—but in self defence. The picture was drawn for the consideration of the virtuous Queen; the artist, Sir Henry Sidney; his studio, the Castle of Dublin, in the year of grace, 1576.

“And now, most devout mistresses, and most honored sovereign, I solye adressed to you, as to the onely sovereigne sultreger, to this your sick realme; the lamentable estate of the most noble and principall ipe thereof, the church of Ierne, as fowle, deformed, and as cruelye crushed, as any other part thereof; by your onelye gracious and religious order to be cured, or at least amended. . . . Ye so profane and heathenlike are some partes of this your courtie become . . . if I should write unto your Majesty what spoyle hath been, and is of the churchspicke, whereof there are fower, and of the bishopps, whereof there are above thirtie, partly by the prelays themselves, partly by the potentates their nyasome neighbors, I should make too longe a lybell of this my lre; but your Majesty may believe it, that upon the face of the earth, where Christ is professed, there is not a church in so miserable a case.” ‡

I shall now proceed to a brief consideration of the two remaining arguments selected from Mr. Whiteside’s defence. The length to which my remarks have already extended prevents me from doing more than point out to your readers the line of argument by which the indignant but transparent pleading of Mr. Whiteside is disposed of.

“The pretended impeachment of the Orders in the Church of England” cannot, he assures us, be applied to the Orders in the Established Church in Ireland. And, first of all, is this impeachment a mere pretence? A slight depression may be necessary, that all may appreciate the grounds on which this impeachment was made. Although the new Church unimpaired Orders from the catalogue of the sacraments, yet all held that to be consecrated a Bishop, a certain ceremony should be gone through. An essential part of this ceremony was the repetition of a formula of words, by which the powers and duties of a Bishop were designated. Did the formula, enacted by Edward VI., indicate these duties and powers? Certainly not; it was “as fitting a form for the ordination of a parish clerk as of a bishop.” Hence arose the impeachment which our theologian, Mr. Whiteside, calls “pretended.” Yet almost the entire Christian Church of that day, and the entire Christian Church of the present day pronounce such a “consecration” null and void. The Convocation of 1662 abolished it, and adopted a form as near the Roman as religious hostility would permit. Hence, supported by the authority of the entire Christian Church, including all modern Protestants of learning, Mr. Whiteside will permit us to differ from him, and pronounce the impeachment no mere pretence. And this brings me to the consideration of his last argument.

† Ware’s Opusc. p. 41. ‡ Ussher’s S’yll. p. 13
§ Bibl. Vet. Pat., t. 12 § Odaman. Vit Columbae.
¶ Ougitovus. Vit Brigite.
** Ware, Opusc. p. 34, D Archery, &c.
*** Collectanea on Irish Church History, by Dr. Renahan, p. 39 †† O’Sullivan, p. 110, Note.
‡‡ Leland’s History, vol. 2, p. 320.

“No scholar can deny the unbroken descent of the Bishops of the Irish Church from the Bishops of antiquity.” Even under the threat of being pronounced “no scholar” by Mr. Whiteside, I shall presume to throw some doubt on the “unbroken succession.” Through whom do the Protestant Bishops derive their succession? Can Mr. Whiteside, can they themselves trace it through an unbroken series? They certainly cannot. All who admit the necessity of valid ordination and consecration, as the clergy of the Established Church profess to do, consider it a matter of paramount importance, that no doubtful or broken link be in the chain that connects them with the first bishops of the Church. The Irish Protestant clergy fully value its importance, and hence they have labored much to establish their “unbroken succession.” But what is the result of their labors? Doubt for all, certainty for none. Some derive their succession from Adam Loftus, who I may admit, was validly consecrated; some through Goodacre, of Armagh, and Bale, of Ossory, who, unquestionably, were never consecrated. And now comes the grave consideration—on which side does the probability lie? Harris calls it a choice; Goodacre and Bale were not consecrated, but declared bishops; they acted as bishops; those whom they attempted to ordain came forth from the ceremony simply laymen; and, no matter by what rite, they could never become bishops without previous reordination. These facts suggest a train of reasoning utterly fatal to the pretensions of our Irish Protestant clergy. I shall follow them no further.

I may observe, in concluding these observations, that the speech on which I have commented fully justifies a critique on Mr. Whiteside, which he cannot have forgotten; that talent, like his, is “the resource of those who find it easier to talk than think, and to play with the passions and predilections of others, rather than avow or advocate any purpose of their own. He is a rhetorician.”—Cor. of Dublin Telegraph.

IRISH INTELLIGENCE.

DEATH OF THE REV. MR. BARRY, VICE-PRESIDENT OF ALL HALLOWS COLLEGE.—We regret to announce the death of the Rev. Mr. Barry, Vice President of All Hallows College. He was remarkable for his many admirable qualities of head and of heart. He possessed great talents, and was most assiduous in the constant discharge of every duty that devolved on him.—Emerick Reporter.

The hardly contested debate on the admission of the Sisters of Mercy into the workhouse at Ballinascloe, is drawing to a close. The guardians have received Mr. Brewster’s opinion on the case laid before him, and that opinion of course is, that he is not aware of any rule of law that would make the proposed resolution illegal; that there is nothing in the Act to disable the guardians, with the sanction of the Commissioners, from admitting the Sisters of Mercy for any lawful purpose. Such a proceeding would, he thinks, be contrary to the spirit of the Poor Law Act, because that Act entrusted the religious instruction of the inmates to the Chaplains, and made a special proviso for those who desired to have other spiritual aid. But Mr. Brewster says that there is nothing illegal in the proposal; that it is a question of discipline and expediency, rather than of law, and one on which the board should be guided by the opinion of the Commissioners. And so common sense, and fair play, and good feeling, are going to gain one more victory.—Tribune.

FOOD PROSPECTS IN IRELAND.—For several weeks we have been in the enjoyment of delightful weather. Genial sunshines and balmy breezes have rallied the drooping spirits of our sorely-tried people, and all are now looking forward in eager and hopeful expectation to the coming harvest, on the result of which the prosperity of the country is staked. In the dark hour of suffering Providence seems to have interposed in her behalf, for, up to the present, the healthy appearance of the various crops holds out such favorable prospects for the autumn. May the Almighty in His Omnipotence be graciously pleased to bless poor Ireland with a plentiful harvest. With our granaries once again well stocked, and with internal means at our disposal to ward off temporary distress, it will be our duty to take effective measures to prevent the recurrence of the miseries of the last three years.—Connacht Patriot.

DISTRESS IN IRELAND.—Sir,—The sad story of Irish suffering is too old, alas! to be startling, and should be pleaded for by more effective words than mine. Still, a single instance out of the mass of misery does sometime attract more notice than a general statement of such overwhelming proportions that individual charity turns from it in despair. I lately had a “begging-letter,” such as are common enough to us, all from a Parish Priest in Galway, a stranger to me, on behalf of his starving flock, and was enabled to send him such a trifle as many of your readers might spend on a whitebit dinner, or a new bonnet, and not think much of the matter.—What has made an impression on me, which I should like to convey to some of your readers, has been the disproportionately fervent expression of his gratitude as if so small a service were most important in its effect. He says—“The sufferings of the people and their destitution in beyond description, struggling with famine, want, and sickness for the last three or four years; their chief means taken and seized on by landlords—the little that remained pawned and sold to save their lives and the lives of their children.—For the last four years their crops failed each year. To the Government we applied in vain; to their landlords to no purpose. We know not what to do for this coming month, when we expect that the Great God will open to many the treasures of the earth. It is a long month for the hungry child, for the dying orphan—upwards of seven hundred families in despair. Would to God that we could calculate on two, four, or six to follow your example.” (I have already stated that what I sent was a mere trifle.) “Many of my poor would live and give glory to God. I cannot as yet say how many have died in want and hunger! All who were put to the poorhouse died, hundreds flying to other parishes to beg, and as many as could go to England; but alas! few can go, they are so naked.”

If this simple narrative of their Pastor should touch any Christian heart with pity for his suffering flock, I will gladly undertake to forward to the rev. gentleman any contributions, however small, with which I may be contrived.—Your cbt. servt., C. WELD, Chideock, near Bridport, Dorset, 17, 1863.

MINES IN THE COUNTY DONEGAL.—A mining company is at present making arrangements for the exploration of the well known white sand of Nuckish mountain, and we understand two steamers are to be employed in conveying it from the port of Ballyness, Crossroads. Lead has been discovered in the district of Glenreagh, and an experienced miner is at present examining the quality and probable value of this mine. We hope these mines may prove remunerative as their working would not only improve the social, but greatly tend to elevate the moral condition of the inhabitants of these remote districts.—Belfast News Letter.

EMIGRATION.—A minute return, showing the comparative extent of emigration from the United Kingdom in the first six months of the last four years, and from the years 1815 to 1863 inclusive, in continuation of the appendix to the Commissioners Report, with other information, has just been laid before Parliament. We find that in the year 1860 the total number was 128,469, of whom 60,835 were from Ireland; in 1861 it had fallen to 91,770, of whom 36,322 were Irish; in 1862 the number was 121,214, including 49,880 from Ireland; and this year, up to the 20th of June, the total has been 121,785, and the proportion of Irish was 68,136. The great majority of emigrants gave gone to the United States, a considerable number to the Australian colonies, and also to British North America.

DUBLIN, July 18.—The importance of securing the quickest possible communication with America is now so deeply felt by the whole community that everything which either expedites or retards it is an object of general interest. At a meeting of the Cork Harbour Commissioners on Wednesday a subject was introduced which in this point of view demands immediate attention. The Scotia, the largest steamer of the Cunard line, after a rapid passage from New York, arrived off the old Head of Kinsale on the Thursday previous. Her course was then checked by a dense fog, and nearly 24 hours was stated to have occurred between the arrival at that point and the landing of the mails. A representation was made by Messrs. C. and D. Mac-Ivor to the Harbour Commissioners, on behalf of the Cunard Company, asserting that the chief cause of detention was a sunken danger called Dance Rock, about 7 miles to the south-west of Roche’s Point. Captain O’Brien, the harbour-master, informed the Board that the rock is at present only marked by a buoy, which in foggy weather is quite unobscurable. But for this obstacle there would be no difficulty in fetching the entrance with no other guidance than soundings, even in a fog. While it remains no large vessels can venture to approach in thick weather. The harbour-master urged that a lightship should be placed upon the spot, or that the rock, which is only 12 yards long, and has only 11 feet of water on it at low tide, should be blown up. From the discussion which ensued it appears that the rock is outside the jurisdiction of the Cork Harbour Commissioners, and that when it was mooted on a former occasion the Board had applied to the Admiralty, by whom they were referred to the Ballast Board, but no notice has been taken of their communication, though the latter body had recognized the site of the rock as being within their jurisdiction by having placed a buoy upon it. A committee was formed to take action in the matter, the urgency of which must be admitted by every one. Every week two or more transatlantic steamers arriving home pass by this danger, and a very heavy responsibility would lie upon the parties who are responsible if a vessel were wrecked upon it involving perhaps the sacrifice of hundreds of lives. It is clearly the business of the Ballast Board to remove the danger and if it is not promptly done it is a case which imperatively demands the interference of the Admiralty, if only for the purpose of obviating the delay the transmission of the mails.—Dublin Cor. of Times.

It appears from an article in the Cork Examiner that iron ship building is making steady progress in that city. New ships are frequently launched from the extensive yards upon the river, ordered not only for English firms, but even for foreign merchants. The Cork Steam Ship Company have built a magnificent fleet for their own trade, not to speak of the vessels constructed by them for other firms. The Messrs. Robinson, proprietors of the second establishment for building new iron ships, have at present two vessels of large tonnage in course of construction. One of them has been ordered by Messrs. Malcolmson. The number of men employed in this yard is about 500. The whole of these men have been paid high wages. The importance of this branch of industry will be seen from the fact that the labour alone in the construction of one of these ships costs nearly £6,000, and that the establishment turns out two or three in the year. There are besides along the river a number of repairing yards, in which ceaseless activity prevails. This is a very gratifying fact, when we recollect that this branch of industry was some years ago destroyed in this country by combinations among the workmen. If that evil spirit should be completely banished from the land we should find our manufacturing industry rapidly reviving in every direction.—lb.

The agriculturists of the county Cork have been exerting themselves for some time to extend the cultivation of flax in that country, but not with the spirit and energy that might be expected. There have been meetings and discussions enough, but the great test of earnestness seems wanting. It is not for want of encouragement that the landed proprietors of Cork are so lukewarm on the subject of flax cultivation. A letter from the Rev. Mr. Lewis to Colonel De Moleys states that in the barony of Dingle flax to the value of £60,000 was once annually exported, and that at one time there were 60 looms in Dingle. Now there are only 12, but Mr. Lewis states that flax cultivation would be again remunerative, notwithstanding the competition of machinery elsewhere, if there were only a flax mill erected in that locality. One gentleman present, Mr. Tholey stated that he intended erecting a flax mill himself. Another stated that he would give £18 an acre for a standing crop of flax equal to the specimen produced, grown at Lota from Dutch seed, 4fl. 8s. high. Mr. Whitley stated that the value of a crop of flax to a farmer was that it ripened the earliest and brought him in money to carry on the bulk of his harvest operations. Flax was once extensively cultivated by Mr. William Dargan, and he states as the result of his experience, that it is a mistake to suppose that it exhausts the soil for other crops. But, though the soil will not bear a repetition of the flax crop without having returned to it the elements extracted, agricultural chemists should be able to point out how that may be done by the application of artificial manure. Perhaps it could be done to a considerable extent by saving the flax water and the refuse of the crop. It appears from a return made to Sir Robert Peel that the quantity of land under flax in Ireland this year is 150,000 acres.—lb.

THE SOUPERS.—One remarkable characteristic prevails almost universally a long time. It is the mark of Cain. Never was there a class upon whose brow nature and habit has so clearly written “find.” A traveller soon learns to know them by their countenance before he enters into conversation with them. One of these men, who is especially selected for the eulogies of Lord Roden in his published journal, and who, though in comfortable circumstances, keeps and teaches a proselytizing school, and is richly paid out of the money collected in England, was visited by the writer of this article in company with an Irish friend. Although it was in school hours, the boys were running wild, but on the sight of our car approaching, they were hastily called together, and the teacher, holding in his hand an open Bible, began to question them on points of anti-Catholic controversy. It was evident that he was much excited with drink. After a while the Irish gentleman said, “But Mr. A. I think I remember you a Catholic.” “Sir,” said the teacher in the presence of his scholars, “perhaps you do not know that I am cousin to Napoleon Bonaparte, when he was in Egypt he became a Mahomedan, and I do the same. If our space allowed we could give a score of similar instances. Men like this are among the most loathsome spectacles which this world affords. An honest man, not to say a Catholic, involuntarily shrinks from the touch or sight of wretches who, while Catholics in belief, are teaching children and ignorant people to blaspheme what they themselves secretly know to be sacred, and all for pay.”—Weekly Register.

The lambs of Sandy Row, under the guidance of their most Christian pastor the Rev. Mr. Hanna, did not terminate their July friskings till Wednesday evening last. In recollection of the inestimable advantages attained by the abolition of wooden shoes and brass money, they on that evening smashed several windows in the house of a quiet gentleman whose grievous offence was that he edited the Uster Observer—an able Catholic journal published in Belfast. They furthermore beat a few magistrates, resisted the police, and put in terror of their lives a large section of the population of the town. Combining, however, prudence with valour—entertaining lively recollections of the bridwell and Spike Island, as well as of the glories of William—these sensible gentlemen retreated with admirable celerity from the scene of their amusement when a sufficient police force was called into requisition; and for a period, let us hope will remain the enjoyment of social ease and quietude.

This is the July anniversary once more celebrated. No necessary was wanting. We had the ruffianism, tumult, and cowardly blackguardism customary on these occasions, and above all, we had the Rev. Mr. Hanna. This gentleman has attained the distinctive epithet awarded the celebrated cannon in the maiden city—the “Roaring Meg” for exactly the same reason. Both have often bellowed forth their contents in aid of the glorious, pious and immortal memory; and though Roaring Hanna cannot hope to equal the noise and blaze that attend a discharge from his namesake, he has the satisfaction of knowing he can produce nearly as much loss of life amongst his fellow men. This excellent minister of the Gospel, it appears, proposed to expunge the sublimity of Protestantism to an open air meeting in Belfast on Wednesday evening, in opposition to the attacks made on it by Rev. H. G. Guinness. What the nature of these attacks may have been we are not so deeply versed in the polemical history of Belfast as to know; but we can very easily guess the line of defence that would be assumed by the Rev. Mr. Hanna on such an occasion, and have no doubt whatever what its effects would be. We are pretty certain if it did not deeply penetrate the brains of his Protestant hearers it would seriously affect the skulls of their Catholic neighbours. For he it observed the upshot of most Protestant theological teaching in Uster in July, is concussion of the brain or smashed windows to the Catholic inhabitants of that province. And when a theme of the nature was handled by such an orator as the Rev. Mr. Hanna, the most satisfactory effects might have been expected. We do not think we underestimate the probable results in, at least, an hospital full of fractures; a baronial rate at next presentation sessions of a shilling in the pound for broken glass; and at all event two or three fine, manly Orange murder—probably accompanied by robbery. But the low mental of the law, as usual, spoilt what would have been a pleasant evening. An oppressive Mayor forbade the Rev. Mr. Hanna’s eloquence; and the tyrannous police dispersed his hearers. The glory of the night is now amongst the things that might have been. We have Gray’s lines doubly personified on this occasion. The Rev. Mr. Hanna was not alone “mute and inglorious,” but was also “guiltless of his country’s blood.” It is but another add to the list of the law’s oppressions and the rival Protestant spirit of the nineteenth century.—Cork Examiner.

CLARE ELECTION.—Sir Colman O’Loghlen’s address to the electors of Clare says:—My political opinions are known to most of you. Out of Parliament I have supported the abolition of religious disabilities—the claim of all classes to equal rights—the extension of education among the masses—and the removal of restrictions to trade and industry. In Parliament, if placed there by your suffrages, I shall support the same policy. As an Irish representative I shall vigilantly watch over all legislation affecting Ireland, and shall on all occasions assert her rights, and guard her interests; and believing as I do that her prosperity, in the main, depends on the prosperity of her tenant farmers, and agricultural laborers, I shall support every legislative measure calculated to raise the position of the former, and to stimulate the employment of the latter, by securing to the tenant the benefit of his expenditure on the land, and by removing the anomalies which now fetter agricultural industry. On a future occasion I hope to be able to point to past services as a claim to your suffrages. At present I can only ask for your support upon trust. The position of your representative is a proud one. I value it highly, and, if honored by your support, I pledge myself to devote my best energies to your service.

The Dublin Correspondent of the Times says:—“Half a dozen candidates are named for Clare—Sir Colman O’Loghlen, the Hon. Robert O’Brien, son of Lord Inchiquin, the Hon. P. Butler, son of Lord Dunboyne, Captain C. G. O’Callaghan, Mr. Thomas Rieb, Q. C., and Mr. Pierce Creagh. The last named gentleman belongs to that class of politicians in Ireland called ‘Conservative Catholics,’ who support Lord Derby. The number of electors in the county is 5,768.”

The Dublin Correspondent of the Standard writes:—“Sir Colman O’Loghlen, Bart., has addressed the constituency of Clare, on whom devolves the election of a representative in Parliament, in consequence of the death of Mr. M. Namara O’Connell, the late member; but I have great doubts of Sir Colman being chosen; and I have also greater doubts as to the success in Clare of any supporter of the present Government. O’Loghlen is a name that stands well in North Munster, and the eminent virtues of Sir Colman’s father, the late Master of the Rolls, reflected lustre on the old Milesian patronymic, but the times are gone by, as Longford has shown, when a mere name, however illustrious, would carry an Irish county for an almost avowedly anti-Irish administration, which Clare, I have no doubt, it not mismanaged, will follow Longford’s lead in proving. The Irish Times recommends the immediate candidature of some eligible, independent Conservative. Why should not the gallant proprietor of that truly Conservative and national journal, Captain Knox, who would have defeated the Whig Attorney-General at Tralee, had the Conservatives there been energetic and united, himself contest the county, and become the worthy colleague of Colonel Vandellan?”

The Daily Express recommends some Conservative to come forward, probably with the view of serving its Whig patrons by its efforts to defeat him.

The Evening Mail puts in a good word for Sir Colman. It says:—“Sir Colman O’Loghlen’s address is conceived in a moderate spirit, and his position in the county and personal qualities will, no doubt, command him to the confidence of that portion of the constituency which agrees with him in general sentiment. No other candidate has yet appeared.”

REPRESENTATION OF DROGHEDA.—The Irish Times says that Mr. McConn will not again seek the representation of this ancient borough, and that no Whig has a chance of being again returned by the electors.

The Morning News says:—“A rumor has been current in this town for the last few days, that Henry Mills Esq., solicitor, of 12 Upper Temple Street, Dublin, will be put in nomination as a candidate, on Conservative principles, on the first occasion that a vacancy occurs in the representation of this borough.”

The Freeman’s Journal of Thursday says:—“It is conjectured that Lieutenant-Colonel Macnamara will be a candidate, and the name of the Hon. Captain O’Brien, son of Lord Inchiquin, is also spoken of, but as yet Sir Colman O’Loghlen is the only candidate absolutely in the field.”

MARRIAGE AND GROWING CROPS BILLS.—The Correspondent of the Cork Examiner writes, July 14:—“Mr. Monnell’s Marriage Registration Bill which has passed the Commons, went through committee in the Lords to-night. That bill, therefore, may be considered safe, and I believe the same be said of the ‘Seizure of Growing Crops Bill,’ which likewise has been read a second time at this sitting. Apropos of this bill, it is to be regretted, I think, that Mr. O’Hagan did not accept the amendment proposed by Mr. Longfield, and protect growing crops from seizure under orders of the superior courts as well as inferior, or Assistant-Barrister’s courts. Not only did Mr. Whiteside and Mr. Longfield reason on their side, but had the protection been established to the extent they advocated, namely, absolute protection, it would have been a strong argument for the abolition of the power of ‘distress.’ When the so-called Landlord and Tenant Bill of 1860 was passed, a half promise was given on the part of the Government by the then Attorney-General, now Mr. Baron Deasy, that the subject of the law of distress would be considered in a future session, and a bill introduced for its abolition or amendment. It will be