

Emilie had wandered away far from the gay company and the brilliantly-lighted salon; she had seen the King retire with two of his companions to the Baron's cabinet, and had observed that Lord Keith had lingered behind in conversation with Angeliere, maddened with jealousy and anger, she had sought her present solitude.

It was early winter, but the apartment to which she had turned her steps was faint with the fragrance of a profusion of rare exotics. Her rage had subsided into a determination to revenge herself in some way which should effectually separate her detested young relation from the object of her misplaced affection, and leaning against the basin of a fountain, her fingers relentlessly destroyed a fair magnolia, the leaves of which she stripped and cast them into the clear waters beneath. She was unconscious of her exterior actions, but her mind was busy enough as to how she should work out her revenge.

"I do not want to injure the Chevalier," she said to herself, "but even this must be, even he must be sacrificed rather than that odious girl shall become Lady Keith, or that he should triumph; for, alas, I fear my very self respect has abandoned me, and that I have betrayed a secret which I ought to have guarded as jealously as my honor itself. I shall put a stop to any previous offer of marriage my lord may choose to make my precious cousin by at once hastening to the embassy. The Earl of Stair will put a stop to this proposed trip to Scotland."

A little later a female, clad in a dark mantle and closely veiled, passed through the back entrance of the mansion used only by the domestics of the household. The confusion within, caused by the influx of visitors, favored both her departure and return. Those who saw her pass swiftly by believed her to be one of the female servants of the establishment, despatched on an errand, little thinking that it was the sister of the loyal Baron de Breteuil on her way to betray the prince, then a guest beneath his roof, into the hands of his enemies.

To be Continued.

FROUDE "FLOORED."

THE "HISTORIAN" REVIEWED BY THE REV'D. DR. MORIARTY.

THE RELATION OF ENGLAND TO IRELAND.

FOURTH LECTURE.

THE PURPOSE OF EXTIRPATION.

The First Massacre.

STRIKING FACTS.

IRISH HUMANITY AND ENGLISH CRUELTY.

(From the Philadelphia Catholic Standard.)

The Rev. Doctor began by explaining that in using the terms "English" and "Protestant," he did not intend any disrespect to any worthy native of that country, or to his Protestant fellow-citizens, but that he was obliged to use these terms in denouncing the settled policy of the English government. — There were two Frances; the France of St. Louis, St. Vincent de Paul, the France of the saints and martyrs, and there was the France of Voltaire, Rousseau and the Communists. So there was an England of Alfred the Great and St. Thomas of Canterbury, and an England of Henry VIII., Elizabeth and Cromwell. It was the latter whose deeds he denounced. He proceeded then as follows:—

AUDACITY OF FROUDE.

Our citizens have never before witnessed such an exhibition of criminal audacity as the display of the foreigner who recently attempted in this hall to justify the most atrocious iniquity that Satan ever invented and his infernal satellites ever perpetrated. The oracle of rancid mendacity and appraisal of the residents of Pandemonium who, though never baptized, is named Froude, labored to spoil the beauty of our Island of Saints, and to depreciate "the Church, the spouse of our adorable Saviour, spotless and unblemished." Moreover, with intrepid malevolence, this phenomenon of history labored to cloud American intelligence, to debase the integrity of the sons of Washington, by leading to an arbitration deciding upon the justice of felony, and the impropriety of virtue. This extravagant proceeding obliged me to submit to the consideration of my fellow-citizens a statement of facts on the authority, and in the exact words of impartial testimonies they being aliens in language, race and religion; and thereby the truth has been asserted, crime has been exposed, virtue has been vindicated and the insult to America has been repelled. The execution of this duty has proved the "relation of England and Ireland" during four hundred years of barbarian usurpation, a simple act of murder, robbery and perfidy, and the endurance of Catholic Ireland an apotheosis of Christianity, humanity and honor.

The unparalleled devastation by slaughter, famine and pestilence which brought about the prostration, called by the murderer the subjugation of Ireland, so well epitomized by Sir John Davies when he said, "the country was brayed in a mortar," might seem to satiate England's greed for ruin. Such was not the case; extermination of the Irish Catholic was the immutable and avowed purpose of the agency of Satan. Hence the abominations and infernal savagery perpetrated by the English usurpation through the instrumentality of thoseimps of hell the Parliamentarians and Cromwellians. My first informant is a Protestant minister, the historian Leland. He shows the design with which these cruel iniquities were committed.

THE PURPOSE OF EXTIRPATION. The favorite object of the Irish governors and the English, was the utter extermination of all the CATHOLIC INHABITANTS OF IRELAND. Their estates were marked out, and allotted to their conquerors; so that they and their posterity were consigned to inevitable ruin.—B. V., chap. 4.

My second evidence, establishing the same fact, is from another Protestant clergyman, Rev. Dr. Warner:

"It is evident from their" (the Lords Justices) "last letter to the lieutenant, that they hoped for an EXTIRPATION, not of mere Irish only, but of all the old English families that were Roman Catholics." — Warner's History of the Rebellion and Civil War in Ireland, p. 176.

Upon this subject—namely, the design of UTTER EXTIRPATION—my next proof is from the equally undeniable authority of Lord Clarendon:

"The Parliament party had grounded their own authority and strength upon such foundations as were inconsistent with any toleration of the Roman Catholic religion, and even with any humanity to the Irish nation, and now especially to those of the old native extraction, the whole race wherof they had upon the matter sworn to EXTIRPATE." — Clarendon I., p. 215.

There were two objects to be gratified by the English Protestant usurpers of the day. The first was the increase of plunder to themselves in the confiscation of the estates of the Catholics. The second was the indiscriminate slaughter of those Catholics, without any distinction of age, sex, rank or condition. The following accusation—fully borne out by the facts—is quoted from an English Protestant historian, Carte:

"There is too much reason to think, that as the Lords Justices really wished the rebellion to spread, and more gentlemen of estates to be involved in it, that the forfeitures might be the greater, and a general plantation be carried on by a new set of English Protestants all over the kingdom, to the ruin and expulsion of all the old English and natives that were Roman Catholics; so, to promote what they wished, they gave out such a design, and that in a short time there would not be a Roman Catholic in the kingdom. It is no small confirmation of this action, that the Earl of Ormond, in his letters of January 27th and February 25th, 1641-2, to Sir W. St. Ledger, imputes the general revolt of the nation, then far advanced, to the publishing of such a design; and when a person of his great modesty and temper, the most averse in his nature to speak his sentiments (if what he could not but condemn in others, and who, when obliged to do so, does it always in the gentlest expressions, is drawn to express such an opinion, the case must be very notorious. I do not find that the copies of these letters are preserved; but the original of Sir William St. Ledger's in answer to them, sufficiently shows it to be his Lordship's opinion, for after acknowledging the receipt of these two letters, he used these words: 'The undue promulgation of that severe determination to extirpate the Irish and Papacy out of this kingdom, your Lordship rightly apprehends to be too unreasonably published.'—Carte's Orm., I., 263.

THE FIRST MASSACRE.

The first great slaughter that occurred in the civil war after the Irish were drawn into insurrection (and never were such pains taken to compel an unwilling people to rise against a tyranny as were taken by the administration in Ireland to force the Irish to resist the tyranny) is the incident I am now going to describe. It is taken from the "Collection," and no preface to excite attention. It was the fruitful source of many a crime. The following is the Irish account:

"1641. About the beginning of November, the English and Scotch forces at Knockfergus murdered in one night all the inhabitants of the territory of the Island Magee to the number of 300 men, women and children, all innocent persons, at a time when none of the Catholics of that country were in arms or rebellion."

Now, I will place in juxtaposition with the above the English Protestant account of the transaction.

"On the fatal night they" (the garrison of Carrickfergus) "issued from Carrickfergus into an adjacent district called Island Magee, where a number of the poorer Irish resided, unoffending and untainted by the rebellion. If we may believe one of the leaders of this party, thirty families were assailed by them in their beds and massacred with calm and deliberate cruelty."—Leland, book V., chap. 3.

There is no substantial difference between these two accounts. The difference in the number of the slain is easily accounted for by recollecting that upon that point the Irish would naturally be the better informed. Both agree in the circumstances of this most unprovoked and diabolical massacre. The inhabitants of the district of Island Magee, innocent, unoffending, unarmed, without a shadow of crime, or the least suspicion of guilt, were attacked at night in their beds by English and Scotch soldiers commanded and led on by their officers, and put to death with calm and deliberate cruelty. Talk of the barbarity of uneducated savages in any part of the globe; you cannot find it exceeding this deliberate slaughter, committed by English and Scotch Protestant soldiers on unarmed beings, who admittedly were guilty only of being Catholics.

TEMPLE'S MONSTRIOUS FALSEHOODS.

It was not sufficient for the English party to commit those most horrible atrocities of which I have given a small proportion of instances. They carried their malignity further; and they accused the Irish of those very crimes which they themselves committed. It is scarcely credible—it would not be credible of any other people except the Irish—that when they were massacred in tens of thousands, they should be accused of the very crime that was committed against themselves. Yet it is literally true.

The charge was brought against the Irish by Clarendon in these words: "On the 23d of October, 1641, a rebellion broke out in all parts of Ireland, except Dublin, where the design of it was miraculously discovered the night before it was to be executed. But that, in other parts of the kingdom, they observed the time appointed, not heeding of the misfortune of their friends in Dublin. . . . Than a general insurrection of the Irish spread itself over the whole country in such an inhuman and barbarous manner, that there were forty or fifty thousand Protestants murdered before they suspected themselves in any danger, or could provide for their defence, by drawing together into towns or strong houses."—Hist. Reb.

Temple aggravates the crime. This is his statement: "One hundred and fifty thousand Protestants were massacred in cold blood, in the first two months of the rebellion."—Sir John Temple, Hist. Reb.

Now, in answer to these monstrous and diabolical fictions, let us see what Warner says:

COUNTER TESTIMONY. "The number of people killed," says Warner, "upon positive evidence collected in two years after the insurrection broke out, adding them all together amounts only to two thousand one hundred and nine: on the reports of other Protestants, one thousand six hundred and nineteen more; and on the report of some of the rebels themselves a further number of three hundred; the whole making four thousand and twenty-eight."—Warner, p. 207.

Thus—upon positive evidence, and upon evidence of mere report, which latter is the thing in the world the most exaggerating; and after all the provocation which the Irish had sustained—is it not marvellous that, in and out of battle there should have been returned as killed, (and that, too, by adding to authentic fact the evidence of rumor), a number of Protestants altogether amounting to only twenty-eight more than four thousand in two full years of civil war? There is the strongest evidence that such a massacre never occurred.

THE LORDS JUSTICES' COMMISSION.

"On the 23d of December the same Lords Justices granted a commission to Henry Jones, Dean of Kilmore, and seven other clergymen, in these words: 'Know ye that we do hereby give unto you . . . full power and authority . . . to call before you, and examine upon the holy Evangelists . . . as well as such persons as have been robbed and spoiled, as all the witnesses that can give testimony therein, what robberies and spoils have been committed on them since the 22d of October last, or shall hereafter be committed on them, or any of them; what the particulars were, or are, wherof they were or shall be so robbed or spoiled; to what value, by whom, what their names were, or where they now or last dwelt that committed these robberies.

On what day or night the said robberies or spoils committed, or to be committed, were done; what traitorous or disloyal words, speeches, or actions were then or at any other time uttered or committed by those robbers, or any other of them, and how often; and all other circumstances concerning the said particulars, and every of them. And you, our said commissioners, are to reduce to writing all examinations, and the same to return to our Justices and Council of this our realm of Ireland."—Temple, Irish Reb., 137.

It is utterly incredible that if there had been any massacres of Protestants by the Irish, an inquiry into that most important subject should have been totally omitted in such a commission as the above. Indeed it would have necessarily been the leading feature in an inquiry of that description. Yet—such a commission did issue to inquire into matters, comparatively of trivial importance, without so much as one single word respecting the alleged massacre. This is indeed "the part of Hamlet left out by special desire."

"It is easy enough," says a Protestant clergyman, "to demonstrate the falsehood of the relation of every Protestant historian of this rebellion."—Warner, p. 206.

The next illustration of the "relation" is the contrast with the acts of the English and Protestant party, and the conduct of the Irish Catholics.

A DIETARY RECORD.

And here, after having selected so many instances, to which I might have added hundreds more, of most horrible cruelties perpetrated by the English Protestant usurper, I am bound to say, that I do not find these horrors mitigated by any acts of general or individual humanity or mercy. It is all murder—murder—slaughter upon slaughter—massacre after massacre—men, women and children. No staying of the hand—no stopping of the sword! Nobody interfering to preserve the victims from assassination; or if there be rare instances, like that of a Colonel Washington, who tried to save a child of seven years, the attempt becomes vain, the victim being torn from his arms and cut up. But with what proud and glowing gratulation do I turn to the conduct of the Irish Catholics during the civil war. I collect from Protestant historians—for on this subject I shall scarcely use one other—multitudinous facts of lenity, forbearance, and mercy; of protection and kindness, of benevolence and charity! The horrors of war mitigated by the multiplied exercise of the tenderest humanity. Oh! what a contrast! What a glorious contrast!

This contrast is rendered still more striking, when we bear in mind that during the time that these virtues were exhibited by the Irish Catholics, the Protestants were committing the horrible cruelties of which I have cited so many.

On the one side was the demon spirit, animating the Anglican party to slaughter and death; on the other was the angelic benevolence of the Catholic Irish, protecting and rescuing from the sword as many as possible, of all those whom the actual fight had spared.

IRISH HUMANITY.

I begin with general testimony borne by Protestant writers to the humane intentions of the Irish. It was in Ulster that the insurrection was first made to explode. In that province almost all the Protestants were Scotch. Yet we find preserved by Carte the following fact. At the commencement of the insurrection,

"The Irish made proclamation, on pain of death, that no Scotsman should be molested in body, goods or lands."—Carte's Ormond, I., 178.

How well these Scots merited so humane and proper a determination on the part of the Irish will be appreciated by those who recollect that it was the garrison of Carrickfergus (chiefly Scotch) that began the work of massacre, by slaughtering unarmed in their beds three hundred inhabitants or refugees in Island Magee!

The next admission is from the profligate Temple; an admission so inconsistent with the principal object of his history! He, too, speaking of the commencement of the insurrection, has this passage:

"It was resolved" [by the Irish party] "not to kill any, but where, of necessity, they should be forced thereto by opposition."—Temple, p. 65.

Even Leland himself—the anti-Irish, the anti-Catholic Leland—has, in other words, the same admission:

"In the beginning of the insurrection it was determined" [by the Irish] "that the enterprise should be conducted in every quarter with as little bloodshed as possible."—Leland, Book V., ch. 3.

THE CONTRAST.

You will remember that I have cited many Protestant authorities to show, what indeed no man acquainted with the history of the times will dream of denying, that the object of the English party—the Lords Justices themselves—was to exterminate the Catholics of Ireland, whether of native Irish or English descent. To remind you the more forcibly of this, I will here just give one passage from Carte: "The Lords Justices had set their heart on Extirpation, not only of the mere Irish, but likewise of all the old English families that were Catholics, and the making of a new plantation all over the kingdom, in which they could not fail to have a principal share."—Carte, I., 330.

Yet it is admitted that the Irish—driven to defend themselves from Extirpation—resolved, as the very first rule of their conduct, to shed as little blood as possible!

It is singular that whilst the English party had the strongest inducements to calumniate the Irish Catholics, they yet should have preserved so many traits of humanity and mercy on the part of the Irish; while at the same time they have not attempted to state a single act of kindness, charity, humanity or mercy amongst the leaders of the English Protestant party. Extermination of the Irish was their object. Accordingly, extermination was their practice. I cannot, after the most minute search, discover one single instance in which life was spared to combatant or non-combatant, being Irish; to Irish man, Irish woman, or Irish child. I do not believe there are any such instances.

There was a peace made in 1643—termed "The Cessation"—between the confederated Catholics and the King's friends in Ireland, with the Marquis of Ormond at their head; and again, a regular peace in 1648. Upon both these occasions the Irish Catholics refused to accept an indemnity for persons convicted of murder, breach of quarter or inhuman cruelty. On the contrary, their leaders were desirous that every person who had shed human blood out of battle should be condignly punished.

THE IRISH CONFEDERATES.

"In the two peace concluded" [by the Irish Catholics] "with the Marquis of Ormond, viz., those of 1643 and 1648, they expressly excepted from pardon all those of their party that had committed such cruelties. And long before either of these peace, Lord Clarendon testified 'that it was the desire of the whole nation that the actors of these cruelties should, in the highest degree, be made examples to all posterity.'—Carte's Ormond, Vol. III.

"And the Marquis of Ormond himself confessed, that those, assuming power among the Irish, had long disclaimed them, and professed an earnest desire that they might be brought to punishment."—Ibid.

In short, the Irish Catholics acted precisely as innocent men would act; not seeking to screen any of the idle or dissolute of their own party, who, in the wild license of civil war, might have slain any Protestant out of battle, or committed any other murder. On the contrary, the Irish Catholics sought anxiously to have all such offenders punished without mercy.

All the official acts of the confederated Catholics were consistent with this pure and honorable principle—the principle of inquiry into the crimes actually committed at all sides; the principle of exonerating the innocent and punishing the guilty. And this principle of justice was repudiated and rejected by the Protestant party!

In every part of these transactions, there is something singular and striking. The confederated Catholics were in possession of power from the year 1643 to the year 1649. They were in possession of, and had the management of, nearly all Ireland, with

the exception of Dublin and a few other places. In 1644, they were at the acme of their power. Their General Assembly met at Kilkenny, enacted laws, and carried on the government. This Assembly was composed almost exclusively of Catholics; the executive were exclusively so. Yet they never were accused of having made a single intolerant law; or a single intolerant or bigoted regulation or ordinance.—They did not persecute one single Protestant; nor are they accused of any such persecution. This, indeed, is a matter of which the Catholics of Ireland may be justly proud. I have always shown from extracts taken from Protestant writers the admission that the confederated Catholics never persecuted a single Protestant.

THE CONCLUSION.

We conclude triumphantly that, in every epoch English usurpation, and under all circumstances, the sole purpose of the "MONSTER" has been extermination of the Irish race; for which it labored in slaughter, pestilence and famine; and it alone has been guilty of unprovoked massacres. Hence, on the side of the distinguished fabulist, Froude, there is "the Saxon and guilt." With cordial joy we assert, in defiance of contradiction or refutation, that throughout the entire relation of the alien and the native, Catholic Ireland has been, according to impartial evidence, eminently and invariably distinguished by religion, humanity and morality, and never guilty of a massacre; so that on the side of the illustrious race there is "Virtue and Erin."

IRISH INTELLIGENCE.

JUDGMENT IN THE O'KEEFFE CASE.—The substance of it is, that the Court unanimously dismisses the argument that the publication of the suspension was an act of "slander and libel" on the ground that it was privileged communication; that three judges out of four—Judges O'Brien, Barry, and Fitzgerald—admit the defendant's plea that he suspended Mr. O'Keefe for breach of the laws, ordinances, and rules of the Church; and that three out of the four—Chief Justice Whiteside, Judge Barry, and Judge Fitzgerald—admit the argument that a sentence founded on the Pope's Rescript is invalid, in the sense that the Courts will not enforce it, and that the Rescript cannot be pleaded in bar of action.—Chief Justice Whiteside argues that the prohibition of foreign jurisdiction by the Act of Elizabeth is still in force except as regards the penalties, and that, therefore, the Pope's Rescript can confer no authority or jurisdiction whatever. But he at the same time seemed ready to admit that the plaintiff should have had open to him "a Domestic Tribunal within the Church," meaning apparently the ordinary Episcopal Tribunal. But if no authority founded on rescript of the Pope can be lawfully exercised, what becomes of the "Domestic" Episcopal Tribunal? It seems to be forgotten that the Bishops themselves receive their canonical institution from the Pope. The fact is that it is childish and absurd to pretend to permit the existence of the Catholic Church, unless you also admit the Pope to be its Head and Supreme Judge. The argument, therefore, of the majority of the Court that the successive Relief Acts had virtually repealed the enactments against the exercise of the Pope's spiritual supremacy appears to us irrefragable.—Tribune.

THE PROTESTANT SYNOD.—How gratifying it must be to the members of the Catholic Church to find that they have an infallible guide and teacher. There are no differences amongst them on matters of faith or doctrine; no contentions on this or that article of their creed. There are between two and three hundred millions of believers in the Church, scattered over the entire world, and all believe the same thing, and thoroughly agree on all matters of faith and doctrine. We repeat that this is a gratifying spectacle, and should make all the children of the Church thankful to God for having been born in the bosom of the Spiritual Kingdom established by Christ.—Dundalk Democrat.

COMMUNICATION WITH AMERICA.—We are glad to see by a telegram from our London Correspondent that a line of steamers is likely soon to be established between Galway and America. The claims of Galway to the position of an American Packet Station are too well known to need any enlargement on here. Galway is the natural and the inevitable port of starting for America. Whether such a line as our correspondent indicates be established now or not, the day is not far distant when in the inevitable course of events it must be established.—Freeman.

GONE TO VISIT OLD PATIENTS.—Cuirra being at a party at the seat of an Irish nobleman, one of the company, who was a physician, strolled over for dinner into the churchyard. Dinner being served up, and the doctor not returned, some of the company were expressing their surprise where he could have gone to. "Oh," says Curran, "he is just stepped out to pay a visit to some of his old patients."

A NOVEL WAGER.—On Tuesday, at the Belfast police court, a gentlemanly looking person was charged with obstructing the thoroughfare. He was performing on an organ which was fixed on a donkey cart, and around him a large crowd had collected. On being brought before the magistrates he gave his name as John Louth, and stated that he resided in the neighbourhood of Navan, and also informed the bench that he had made a bet for a large sum of money that he would support himself for twelve months on "hurdy gurdy" performances. Three months of the year, he added, yet remain. The evidence as to the obstruction not being satisfactory, the magistrates discharged the prisoner, and restored to him his organ cart and donkey. Soon after the musical peregrinations were resumed in a different part of the town. By some it is stated that the player is a landed proprietor in Meath, by others that he is a member of a noble Irish family.

THE IRISH CHURCH SYNOD.—Having revised the Prayer Book last week, this body has had the Hymnal on the dissecting table this week, Lord James Butler being the leading operator. The speeches and the scenes at the discussion of the Hymnal could not be realized, unless by those actually present. Lord James Butler exceeded himself in his scathing analysis of a number of the hymns. He denounced the occurrence therein of these "gentlemen" named "Saints" of the "Adorable Name," and even "Angels." He said that some of the hymns appeared to have been intended for Jupiter; while he characterized the invocations, such as those in the psalms, calling on material objects, animate and inanimate, to praise their Creator or show forth His glory as rank idolatry. He parodied Southey's "Lodov" in caricaturing the spiritual effusions in the Hymnal, and signaled one of the most rhapsodical of them as the delirium tremens hymn, which provoked bursts of applause. Bishop after Bishop has interposed and appealed to the Rationalistic element in the Synod to consider the goal to which the Irish Church is rapidly drifting, but without effect. The Bishops state that numbers of the clergy are resigning daily, and leaving the country, foreseeing the early disruption of the Church as a matter of certainty.

In his late libel on Ireland and the Irish, Mr. Froude undertook to illustrate the state of society in that country a century ago, by a reference to facts intended to show the incorrigible nature of the whole race, and their innate and ineradicable tendencies to lawlessness and crime. The Dublin Review points out very fairly that the principal actors in most of the atrocities recounted by Mr. Froude were not of the Irish race at all.

EMIGRATION.—I have lately had occasion to travel through the southern and eastern portions of this extensive county, (Kilkenny), and in every hamlet the principal theme of conversation is the large numbers who are voluntarily expatriating them-

selves to "other lands," and the heart-rending scenes witnessed at every terminus as the iron horse hurries away with its living burden. This terrible drain must necessarily cease in a short time. Laborers small farmers, and mechanics, though their prospects were never higher, owing to the utopian notions which they entertain regarding high wages and royal fare in the United States, are not settling down here, and this combined with the poor yield of cereal crops for the past three years, is proving compelling the farmer to lay down the land to pasture, so that in all probability stock will constitute our principal means of livelihood for the future.—Cor. of Freeman.

Among the signs of the times is the progress of the war of class against class, of labor against capital, of poor against rich—the very opposite of the spirit of Christianity, which inculcates charity and mutual forbearance. Where it will end, no one can tell; but this is certain, that as in all wars so in this, both sides will be losers. The agricultural laborers of England have entered on the campaign under the leadership and direction of persons in no way connected with agricultural labor. It is the aim of these persons to prevent the saving of the coming harvest, and so they have sent emissaries over to Ireland to warn our harvest men from proceeding to England. We think the English agricultural laborers have many grievances to be redressed; but we do not consider they are proceeding on the wisest or most judicious plan to have them remedied. However, we do not wish to meddle in other people's affairs, but we protest against English emissaries being sent for questionable purposes among our rural population.—Dublin Freeman.

THE LATE WIFE MURDER IN MATO.—A magisterial investigation concerning the above murder was held before R. Harvey, Esq., in the courthouse, Castlebar, in consequence of more important testimony cropping up, which tends to implicate the female prisoner to a great extent as being the principal accomplice in the commission of the murder. Walsh, the murderer of his wife, was conveyed from prison under an escort of constabulary. It is proved in evidence that the female prisoner was observed there many a time at an early hour proceeding from certain quarters, which gave rise to great suspicion. A large portion of the deceased woman's clothes were discovered where they were stowed away by the accomplice, and which is an important feature in this exciting case, and goes to prove her as being the chief accessory. I understand that the male prisoner, Walsh, is by birth an Englishman, and came to this county some years ago. He always bore a most unfavorable character. Another child of his died since the murder, as it was found the morning of this tragic event lying prostrate, almost dying from thirst. There were five deaths in Walsh's family within the last month—his mother, sister, the nurse of his wife, child (unborn), and another child a few days since—its death being accelerated by the death of its mother, it is supposed. Walsh, after his sister was taken from the bed on which she died, slept in that bed that night, in order to recover some goods which he insisted was his property, and other acts which go to show that his conduct was unbearable.—Freeman Cor.

A MURDEROUS ASSAULT.—On Monday Pierce Marcus Barron, D. L., Waterford, committed Michael and Mary Whelan, brother and sister, residing at a place called Ballinavoher, for having committed a murderous assault upon a farmer named Patrick Kirwin, residing at the same place. It appears from the dying depositions of Kirwin, taken before Mr. Barron, that at midnight on Saturday last he was awakened from sleep by hearing his house attacked, and going to the door he received a dreadful blow on the forehead from a large stone; he alleged that it was Mary Whelan who threw the stone; scarcely had he received it when he was knocked insensible by a blow on the side of the head by another stone, which he deposed was thrown by Michael Whelan; when on the ground he was kicked in the most murderous manner; the members of his family picked him up insensible. Dr. Delandie was sent for and having examined Kirwin's body he pronounced him in a dying state. The Ferry Bank Police being apprised of the outrage Sub-Inspector Cury had Whelan and his sister arrested, and Kirwin's dying deposition taken. Kirwin is still alive but in a very precarious condition.

DOWNPATRICK AS A MILITARY CENTRE.—In reference to the rumor that the Government has decided on abandoning Downpatrick as a military depot centre, we have the highest authority for stating that no change has been made in the arrangements up to this day.—Recorder of Saturday.

Michael is a Scotch Irishman, and a staunch Presbyterian; his intimate friend Patrick, is an Irishman, without the Scotch, and a devout Romanist.

Mike had never been inside a Roman Catholic Church, though often urged by Pat to "try it." At length curiosity overcame Mike's scruples, and he accompanied his friend to High Mass at the Cathedral.

The gorgeous robes of the priests, the burning of incense, the altar decorations, Latin prayers, &c., filled Michael with amazement.

He sat in perfect silence for some time, he was so completely dumbfounded. At length he turned to his friend, who was seriously engaged in his devotions, and whispered, "Pat, this beats the Old Devil!" "That's the intention," says Pat, and went on crossing himself as devoutly as before.

INTEMPERANCE IN A MEDICAL LIGHT.—An exhaustive lecture on the subject of intemperance viewed in a medical and social light has been delivered by Dr. Fagan, of Belfast, in the Music Hall of that city, in connection with the Belfast Young Men's Catholic Association. The chair was occupied by the Most Rev. Dr. Dorrian, the Bishop of Down and Connor. The following report of the lecture, which was a very instructive one, is taken (abridged) from the Ulster Examiner:—

Having explained that he did not mean to treat intemperance in its moral aspect at all, Dr. Fagan proceeded:—

"The question of intemperance involves of necessity the consideration of the great cause of it—viz., the misuse of Alcoholic stimulants. I believe, then, it is incumbent on us to inquire into the nature of alcohol, which is the active principle of all intoxicating beverages, and see how far it tends to the health, comfort, and prosperity of mankind. Providence in His wisdom has ordained that all things in nature should be subservient and tend to the well-being of man. When they prove otherwise it is owing to the ignorance or the perversity of his own corrupt nature, that caused him to abuse what was intended for his good. We must try and strike a boundary line between the use and abuse of this powerful agent—show its effects for good or evil on the body and mind, on the community as well as the individual. I may state here that by the term alcoholic stimulant I mean every beverage that contains the pure spirit—alcohol—in varying proportions; and I may here mention some of the strong drinks most generally known, and state the average quantity of the intoxicating element in each of them:

Bum,	contains of alcohol about 60	per cent.
Brandy,	" " " " 50	"
Whiskey,	" " " " 50	"
Gin,	" " " " 49	"
Port Wine,	" " " " from 16 to 23	"
Sherry Wine,	" " " " 16 to 25	"
Claret Wines,	" " " " 6 to 18	"
Champagnes,	" " " " 5 to 13	"
Rhine Wines,	" " " " 5 to 15	"
Beer and Porter,	" " " " 1 to 10	"

Their utility depends, not alone on the quantity of alcohol they possess, but also on certain other ingredients found in conjunction with it. My reason for