

two for wrapping up medicines and fruit, which the shopman would not do with one of the worst of his own books. Mr. Burdon a Protestant Missionary found a young eater in his house at Shaouing stretched upon the bed with Alford's Greek Testament for a pillow. Bishop Courvez found two houses in Singapore the rooms of which were papered with leaves of the Protestant Bible. The Protestant Missionary Dr. Tomlin admits that the Chinese stole Bibles at night in order to apply them to 'domestic purposes,' and that some of the missionaries appeared to consider 'this theft,' a very encouraging proof of their zeal for divine things.

But we have a writer on this continent who gives perhaps the most deplorable of all the testimonies of the enormous failure of Bible distribution. The Rev. Robert Baird [Religion in the United States of America] tells us that up to the year 1858, the Americans had printed in Madras alone upwards of 300,000,000 pages or perhaps 1,000,000 vols. without gaining so much as a solitary convert.

General Sir Thos. Hislop speaking about missionaries and their efforts, says, 'These gentlemen set down their converts in proportion to the number of Bibles dispersed; which, according to his experience must have been a somewhat fallacious calculation, since he tells us that a particular 'resident' had become so embarrassed with the number of bibles sent him, that he sent them to all quarters in bundles of hundreds at a time.' And yet the word was, 'They come! They come! until his office overflowing, he sent them to an outhouse, and finally delivered several thousand copies over to the Dutch authorities there to bear what they might. The General finishes by quoting an enthusiastic missionary who wrote home for three hundred millions of Bibles' and suggests that even that number might easily be got rid of, by delivering them as ballast, or turning them out of doors without an index or a monitor to explain them.

After these testimonies, I think my friends I have disposed pretty conclusively of Dr. Mattison's objection that the Papal Hierarchy have no Bible Societies. Catholics are looked upon by their Protestant brethren, as dead fools. But there is one folly which they have not as yet been guilty of—that of subscribing to Bible Societies, £1,500,000 annually collected in England alone to pay Missionaries—half doctor—half preacher—who are ignorant of the language of the natives to whom they are sent; and to print Bibles which the natives laugh at when received, and which are used in folding up fruit and medicine for even viler purposes! What wonder if Pope Pius VII. called Bible societies, as Dr. Mattison complains, 'crafty devices whereby the very foundations of religion are undermined.' Was his Holiness the Pope far wrong?

But perhaps some of my Protestant hearers will object and say, 'These Bibles which you have instanced as incorrect are 'only' Bibles translated for barbarous people into barbarous tongues—surely European Bibles are at least correct?' To the first part of this objection I answer. Surely the souls of barbarous people are as precious in the sight of God, as those of civilized nations; and a book, which has 'of itself' to bring salvation by the mere reading thereof, ought certainly to be translated aright. But this is by the way. To the real part of the question 'surely our European Bibles are correct?' I answer Hibernice by proposing three others.

1. If Luther in his Bible was 'a manifest and common corrupter and perverter of the text' as Zuinglius very politely says he was.
2. If the Zuinglian translators of the Bible were 'fools, asses, and antichrists, and deceivers' as Luther equally energetically says they were.
3. If the translation set forth by Escolampadus and the Protestant divines of Barle, was in many places 'wicked and 'altogether' differing from the mind of the Holy Ghost' as Beza asserts it was.
4. If Beza's translation was 'sacriligious wicked and atheistical' as the learned Castalio bears witness it was.
5. If Calvin in his translation 'made the text leap up and down'—if he uses violence to the letter of the Gospel' and worse and worse, if 'he added to the text' as Molinus says he did.
6. If Beza in his bible also altered the text as the same authority says he did.
7. If it would require a whole volume wherein to note all the errors of Beza's Bible as Castalio says it would.
8. If the errors in Luther's Bible amount to the most little sum of 1400, as Staphylus and Erner say they do.
9. If the English translation of the Bible doth in the Book of Psalms alone in addition, subtraction, and alteration differ from the truth of the original Hebrew in at least 200 places [at the rate of 3550 for the whole bible] as the Protestant Ministers petitioning, King James declare it does.
10. If the English translators of the Bible 'have depraved the sense'—'obscured the truth and deceived the ignorant'—if they have 'in many places detorted the Scriptures from the right sense and shewn themselves to have loved darkness more than light, falsehood more than truth' as the learned Protestant Mr. Carlyle says they have.
11. If the English translation of the Bible 'takes away from the text'—adds to the text—'is absurd and senseless, perverting in many places the meaning of the Holy Ghost' as the Ministers of the diocese of Lincoln declared it does.
12. If this translation 'perverts the text of the old Testament in 848 places causing millions of millions to reject the New Testament and to run to eternal flames,' as Mr. Broughton a staunch Protestant says it does.

Then—I ask—can the European translations be considered any better than those published for 'only' barbarous people in a barbarous tongue! and had not Pope Pius VII. perfect right to call these Bible societies, which print and distribute such corrupt Bibles 'crafty devices' and

have not Romish Priests as Dr. Mattison so ungrammatically calls us, perfect right to 'burn them whenever they meet with them amongst their flocks? as Dr. M. complains they do.

But you will further object. 'These translations which you have instanced are only translations made by the early reformers:—our modern European Bibles are more correct.—Softly! softly! my friends! As to the correctness of your modern Protestant translations, you yourselves shall be your judges. Answer me I pray. Are Calvinists content with the Anglican translation of the Sacred Scriptures? and are Anglicans content with the Calvinistic translation. This will settle the whole question. It strikes me, that I could mention the names of more than one Anglican clergyman, who have prohibited their flocks from using or keeping in their houses Bibles published by Methodist Societies; and I have no doubt but that this amicable distrust is reciprocated. But, let me ask, how would this same objection of yours sound, if it bore reference to the Apostles and Evangelists of the Early Church? It is surely beginning at the wrong end of a Reformation to begin with a bad bible first and to improve on it afterwards. Human nature may be susceptible of continued improvement: but not so surely a Bible! You claim, that 'the Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible' is your sole rule of faith. What then becomes of your church during all those years of Luther's, Beza's, and Calvin's apostolate, wherein you and they grant you had not a correct Bible? A corrupt Bible according to your own definition, is not a Bible at all, since it is either not 'the whole Bible' or it is not 'nothing but the Bible.' A corrupt Bible is corrupt either by addition or subtraction. If by addition, it offends against that clause of your definition 'nothing but the Bible'; if by subtraction, it offends against that other clause 'the whole Bible.' If then your early church had not a Bible, it had not a soul; it was according to your own showing—a dead church, in plain language—it was a nonentity.

(To be Continued.)

CELIBACY OF THE CLERGY.

(From the London Tablet.)

Even Pagan voices have proclaimed in every age, as they still proclaim in India and China, that men who profess to teach others how to attain union with God 'must themselves lead the most perfect life.'—Infirmitates which are tolerable in those who belong to the world become crimes in those who profess to despise it. If Priests are men, they should also be something more than men. 'You are like us,' is the scornful reproach of the heathen, as innumerable contemporary travellers relate, when they are addressed by European teachers of religion, who come to them without the robe of chastity, and in whom they discern only fathers of families struggling to promote the fortunes of their offspring. 'Physician, heal thyself,' says the mocking heathen, unconsciously quoting Holy Writ to men whose lives contrast so strangely, as even he perceives, with their profession of supernatural virtue. Is this instinct of the pagan world manifested in every age and every land, the fruit of a primitive and uncorrupted tradition, or is it only a debased sentiment, the effect of a disordered imagination, which the wise and illustrious spirit of Christianity reproves? If it were so, we should be forced to conclude that the heathen has a higher ideal of the sacerdotal office and character than the Christian. But it is notorious that the Christian judgment in this matter, except in certain modern sects, who have defiled the infirmitates of our nature as of old others defiled its vices, exactly coincides with the pagan. That chastity becomes the ministers of religion, is no conception of the modern or mediæval Church, as some deem, but was taught by her founders, and had been taught long ages before they had learned to speak. As mental cultivation has increased, and knowledge extended its limits, this universal conviction has indeed acquired a deeper intensity, and Christians have felt a more inviolable repugnance for an unchaste clergy; but if there has been progress in methods of exposition, or variation of disciplinary rules, there has been none whatever in the doctrine itself. It is a law of our nature to protest against an incontinent Priest. Even in the ages when the Levitical ministry was limited to a single family, in which alone it could be propagated, and when consecrations were made to the 'hardness of heart' for which, since the Incarnation was accomplished, there is no longer either pretext or excuse, the sanctity of the altar rebuked the effeminacy of those who offered sacrifices upon it.—'If the law of Moses,' said Pope St. Sixtus, in 388, in a council of eighty Bishops, which menaced married Priests with excommunication and eternal punishment, 'seems to have tolerated luxury in the ministers of religion, let these defenders of voluptuousness—i.e., the married clergy who dared to plead the Hebrew law—tell me why this same law of Moses obliged the priests to continue, during the whole year of their service, continually in the temple, far from their own houses? Was it not in order to separate them from all commerce with their wives, that so the victims offered by them to the Lord should be more agreeable in His eyes, by reason of their purity who sacrificed them?' Let therefore those Priests who desire to retain a privilege abrogated together with the Mosaic Law know that they are deprived by the authority of the Apostolic See of every ecclesiastical dignity, and for ever interdicted from approaching the Holy Mysteries, of which they have rendered themselves unworthy by the turpitude of their unrestrained passions. Such was the decision of one of the earliest Councils of the Christian Church, assembled under the eye of the Vicar of Christ. And if even the Levitical priesthood dared not approach, except in a state of continence, the altar on which was poured out only the blood of impure animals, what shall be required of those whose office it is to handle the Most Holy, and who renew every day the tremendous sacrifice of Mount Calvary! Is the 'Pure Oblation,' ferbly prefigured by earlier sacrifices, meaner than its type and shadow? Is the Christian minister, stunted in gifts and graces, only a degenerate and degraded representative of the Levitical priest? The 3rd canon of the Council of Antioch, A. D. 341, referred expressly to the authority of the 'Great Council' of Nice, held sixteen years earlier, when it not only forbade any bishop, priest, or deacon to have a wife, but even to admit any woman into his house, except a mother, sister, or other relative, 'to whom no suspicion could attach.' And this law of the Church, derived from the teaching of her Divine Founder and His Apostles, to which reference shall be made immediately, never varied. In the fifth century, we have once more the decisions of St. Ephraim of St. Leo the Great, of St. Hilary, and of the Oecumenical Council of Chalcedon. They all breathe the same immutable sentiment, and all pronounce anathema upon incontinent, that is, upon married Priests. St. Leo, like St. Augustine, founds this law upon the mystical union between the Virgin Jesus, the Child of a Virgin Mother, and the Virgin Church, a union, they consider, which ought to be reflected in the pure espousals of the Christian Priest with the same Church. In latter ages, the same doctrine was only confirmed, when St. Leo IX., Nicholas II., Alexander II., St. Gregory VII., Urban II., and

Pascal II. forbade the faithful 'even to assist at the Mass offered by a married Priest. The English Council of London, in the time of Pascal II., agreeing with the Church throughout the world, declared such Priests 'Infamous.' There is no need to multiply these citations, nor is this the place to do so.

Such being the mind of the Church from her earliest foundation, we should naturally expect to find her judgment confirmed by the language of Holy Writ. We are not surprised, therefore, when we read the praises of holy virginity which abound in the sacred pages. 'It is said by Our Lord to be His own peculiar gift,' conferred only upon a favoured few, and creating in them a special likeness to the angelic host. 'Not every one can possess it, He tells us, but only 'they to whom it is given.' And the effects of this magnificent gift extend to another life. 'In the celestial hierarchy, the virgins will have their own place, and the immediate attendants upon the Immaculate Lamb will be, not fathers of families, however just and innocent, but 'they who have not defiled themselves with women.' For this reason the elect are encouraged to 'make themselves sunnaba for the Kingdom of Heaven's sake.' 'It is not man's teaching but God's for this reason St. Paul also disdains even the laity, if they help to can preserve virginity, from entangling themselves in marriage. 'Let them marry,' he says, with a kind of sorrowful compassion, if they have not grace to lead a higher life. 'It is better to marry than to burn.' But that is all a married Priest would have seemed to St. Paul something which language can hardly describe. Marriage is holy, so holy that God has taught the Church to count it among her august Sacraments, but it is holy only to those who are themselves holy, and even they would do better to abstain from it, if they can. Such is the teaching of Holy Scripture. As to the allegation that some of the Apostles were married, we have only to read the replies given by the most ancient Saints and Doctors to understand the triviality of this objection. The question is not, as these great luminaries of the Church observe, whether they were married before they received a higher vocation, but whether they lived in continence afterwards. That the ministers of human sects, whose quasi ministerial office is confined to the utterance of words, should marry, is congruous and irreproachable. Why should they not? They are but laymen. They have no altar, and no sacrifice. Even the ministry of Levites was more solemn than theirs. They pass, therefore, from the nuptial couch to the conventicles in which they gather their disciples, and no one is scandalized. They are types of worldliness, often in its purest and most amiable form, but still of worldliness. You must not seek for the supernatural in them. God has not called them to the office of Priest, and therefore does not give them the gifts which accompany it. They are not virgins, and do not wish to be. They are content with a lower state, for which alone they are fitted. It is not so in the Church which is the Spouse of the Immaculate. She may indeed have tolerated, in rare instances, a married clergy, but it was only from a sad necessity, to avoid still greater evils, and in the hope that communion with the Apostolic See would gradually inspire a holier ambition, and beget a more angelic ministry. And if, in the few cases referred to and for special reasons, she does not prohibit a married man from discharging the priestly office, she absolutely forbids marriage to those who have already become Priests. Even some human sects do the same, so powerful is the ineradicable instinct which admonishes a Priest to abide in his own lot. In Russia, in spite of the almost unparalleled degradation of the sacerdotal class, marriage is impossible after ordination. The Church was never less disposed than at this moment to accommodate her discipline to the impure maxims of the world. She is indulgent to the infirmitates of her weaker children, as becomes a mother; but she still requires her Priests to set the example of a supernatural life. They will continue to do so.—The gift of chastity, without which they would be unworthy to approach the Altar, is still conferred upon them. It would not be given if it were not necessary. That it is always given in the Church, and in her alone, is one of the sure marks of her union with the Most Holy. He has not divorced His bride, and therefore continues to adorn her with all the treasures of His love. He will never cease to do so, until he renews His espousals with her in the day of her final triumph.

IRISH INTELLIGENCE.

DEATH OF FATHER KENYON.—The death is announced of the Rev. John Kenyon, P.P., Templederry, near Nenagh. He was a strong nationalist, and his love of country betrayed him at times into expressions open to misconception by those not intimately acquainted with him. A correspondent in the Tory press takes occasion to libel his memory by saying that his last expressed wish was, that he should be buried in the Protestant burial ground. The absurdity of the statement must be so manifest to Catholics that it is scarcely worth explaining. Templederry churchyard formerly belonged to the Catholics, and is consecrated ground, but like many other places was taken by the Protestants; and Father Kenyon may have expressed a desire to lie with the grand old race that kept the faith, and many of whom died for it, but certainly not because it was the Protestant churchyard.

A NEW IRISH PRESS.—The Irish Times mentions a report that Lord Chancellor O'Hagan is to be raised to the peerage.

On the 9th ult., the Chief Baron opened the Assizes for the Queen's County at Maryborough. In addressing the Grand Jury he stated that there had been but 29 cases since last assizes seven or eight only of which had any trace of agrarian crime. This he deemed very satisfactory.

It is said that, owing of ill health, Mr. Wm. Kirk, of Keady, who was recently elected as representative of the borough, will in all probability retire; and it is said that his eldest son, Mr. John Kirk, of Belfast, will offer himself as a candidate in the room of his father. [Newry Telegraph.]

THE IRISH CHURCH AGITATION.—The Church Defence Society of Dublin are to hold an aggregate meeting of Protestants in Dublin in April to express their opinions on the progress of the Irish Church Bill, and to arrange a like meeting in London before the bill is introduced to the House of Lords. The committee of the same association have expressed their hope that, at the forthcoming election of lay representatives for a projected general Church Conference, no layman will be chosen on whom the parishioners cannot rely for uncompromising resistance to the Irish Church Bill.

RIBBONISM.—The Catholic Bishop of Armagh, in a pastoral against Ribbonmen and Fenians, says:—English Statesmen have spoken and pledged themselves to remove the anomaly of the Protestant Establishment, and give to Catholics equal rights and privileges with their Protestant fellow-subjects. Their sense of justice excites the fury of our hereditary domestic enemies. Every stratagem will be unscrupulously used to defeat the equitable intentions of the Legislature. They will not fail to divide us by introducing secret societies. They know how much Ribbonism has done for them in former times; and hence we may expect renewed efforts to introduce that evil amongst our faithful people.' Dr. McCabe bids his flock beware of 'sham patriots, who are doing the work of our worst enemies.'

DUBLIN, March 23.—A singular outrage was committed yesterday evening in the heart of the city. A number of men broke into a house which had been occupied by a publican, but for the last six months

has been vacant, and wrecked it; with the assistance of a mob in the street, who shattered the windows with stones and rubbish. Some dispute with the landlord is supposed to be the cause. The police could get little information from the people in the street, and have been unable to bring any of the parties to justice.

DUBLIN, March 27.—An action for libel, in which the Rev. P. Lavelle, of Partry, a lieutenant of some notoriety, is plaintiff, and Mr. Proudfoot agent of the National Building and Land Investment Company, is defendant, is attracting no little interest at the Galway assizes. The issue involves most of the subjects of fierce contention arising out of the relations of the tenant to the priest on the one hand, and the landlord on the other. The facts are these:—A letter of the plaintiff, dated St. Stephen's Day, 1868, and addressed to the shareholders of the company, publicly complained that a cow worth £7 or £8, the property of a poor man named Hannagan, had been distrained by the defendant's bill for £3 7s 6d for a year's rent due on the 1st of last November. The letter severely commented upon the management of the company. The defendant published a reply, in which he declared that he never would have had to process or serve a notice to quit on the tenants if it had not been for the plaintiff, who, as he alleged, proclaimed from the altar that if any of them gave up possession he would put them out of the chapel, and had actually turned out 20 families, numbering 100 persons, who for 18 months had been deprived of religious instruction. He was also charged with excluding the constabulary from the chapel, fearing that he would be reported for his language, and with having used his influence to prevent the prosecution of his chapel clerk, who brutally assaulted a poor woman who remonstrated with him for forcibly taking away some of her crops which he claimed for the priest. These charges were denied by the plaintiff and pronounced by his counsel Mr. Robinson, Q. C., to be scandalous libels. The defence was a justification. Mr. Justice Fitzgerald left the case with confidence in the hands of a Galway jury, and in five minutes they found a verdict for the plaintiff, with a farthing damages. They accompanied the finding with an expression of their abhorrence, as landlords themselves, of the system of noticing to quit which had been proved on the trial.—[Times Courier.]

Another of the liberated Fenians, Mr. Stephen J. Meany, a name of more than local repute, has been honoured with a public reception on the occasion of visiting his native town. On Sunday the 'congregated trades' of Ennis met in the old chapel to present him with an address of congratulation, which, it seems, he had consented to accept after repeated solicitations. The Very Rev. Dean Kenny presided, a patriarchal priest, who has reached his 78th year, and addressed the assembly in highly eulogistic terms in reference to Mr. Meany. He thought that, apart from any approval of the peculiar views for which 'that gentleman had suffered so long, so enduringly, and so nobly,' he might, without misconception join in sympathy for the sufferer and pay the tribute of personal appreciation and private friendship. The rev. gentleman panegyricized him as 'a consistent patriot and a practical Christian,' whose power of pen and eloquence of tongue might have raised him to any eminence attainable by those qualities 'had he but taken the course which others have taken and perverted and prostituted his talents to the service of mammon.' The rev. speaker said he was not there to discuss the propriety or impropriety, the justice or the injustice of the matters involved in the movement with which Mr. Meany was said to have been prominently connected, but to implore them not to compromise him personally, or by any indelicate act or language to injure the prospects of the men who are still suffering imprisonment. He added:—'I yield to no man in my love for my native land; I yield to no man in my sympathies for the sufferings and sorrows of her people. I am old enough to remember when even to be a priest was an offence sufficient to earn a punishment as severe, or more so, than that for which Mr. Meany was punished: but I am old enough also to remember the calamities brought upon the land by ill prepared and premature attempts to right the wrong by physical force, and I have experience enough to recognize the truth of the maxim promulgated from the very spot which I now address you by the great tribune, Daniel O'Connell: 'The man who commits a crime gives strength to the enemy.' I am far from saying that a day may not come when his resistance to power will become a duty, but Mr. Meany himself may, if he lives long enough—if he comes to have upon him, as I have, the weight of 78 summers—admit, if he does not already recognize, that an abortive revolution is not only a calamity but a crime.' The sentiments were received with loud cheers. An address was then presented to Mr. Meany, congratulating him upon his release; declaring how they honoured him for the brilliant and eloquent speech which he delivered from the dock in Green-street, when he stood forward undaunted and defiant before the representatives of English rule with a heroic devotion and martyr fidelity to his country's cause; and alluding with regret to the unrelaxed prisoners who still pined within English dungeons and in foreign lands—'some of Ireland's bravest and most talented sons.' They expressed their deepest sympathy and sorrow for them, and said that they felt 'the present partial amnesty does not give that general satisfaction to the Irish people, nor will they believe that an act has been done for which they are bound to feel grateful until the Sovereign extends to them the Royal clemency.' The address contained many warm expressions of admiration and honour for Ireland's martyrs to liberty, of whom Mr. Meany was one of the latest, 'a patriot of true fidelity to the cause of Ireland.' Mr. Meany, who, it is stated, 'appeared deeply affected by the warmth of the demonstration,' delivered a long oration in reply, expressing his pride and pleasure at the magnificent gathering he saw before him, and complimenting the people of Ennis on their patriotism, of which there was an enduring monument erected in honour of O'Connell. He abstained from alluding to 'certain topics,' he said, not from any fear of danger to himself, but lest it should injure the prisoners who were still in custody. As the Dean, however, had observed, 'the day might come,' he said, 'when—when—well, when full justice may be done to Ireland.' This oracular statement elicited loud cheers from the intelligent audience.—[Times Courier.]

Noon and midnight are not more irreconcilable than the feelings which the division on the Church Bill has excited in the minds of the parties concerned. On the one side all is bright and joyous, on the other gloomy and desponding. The Liberals regard the triumph of the Ministerial policy so far as it has hitherto proceeded with satisfaction and pride. They have as yet abstained, however from any irritating display of exultation over their discomfited opponents. Conscious of the overwhelming power which they possess in the sympathy of England, and sure of the position in which the cause of 'religious equality' now stands, they can afford to exhibit a dignified and even generous forbearance while they rejoice rather in the vindication of a great principle than the overthrow of a great party. The defenders of the Establishment, on the other hand do not effect to underrate the significance of the verdict which the House of Commons has pronounced. They expected a large majority in favour of the second reading of the Bill, but they were not prepared to see such a tremendous force arrayed against them. Indeed the numbers exceeded the most sanguine expectations of those who desired the success of the measure. But the Church party, however disappointed, are still unyielding. They still maintain an attitude of uncompromising resistance. They are preparing to contest every inch of the ground against all odds, with the desperate energy of men who feeling deeply, cannot flinch, though they must fall. Parochial meetings are now being held all over the country to make arrangements for diocesan conferences, as recommended by the Bishops. In these resolutions

are passed condemning the Bill, and 'pledging the meeting to resist it by every legitimate means,' as if the battle were only begun, instead of being virtually ended by the emphatic decision of the House of Commons.—[Times.]

The facility with which faction fights can be got up on the most trivial pretexts is illustrated by an account given in a Cork paper of a sanguinary *melee* at Kanturk. A farmer in comfortable circumstances, named Quinn, who died a few days ago, had in his employment a young man named Thomas Murphy. On Monday Murphy obtained a loan of a jennet and cart from the widow of the deceased, and refused to return them, alleging that Quinn had promised to give them to him. The widow sent to Newmarket for her own; who, on his arrival, collected his friends to recover possession of the valuable property. Murphy's friends came to his rescue, and the two parties encountered each other with sticks and stones. The conflict lasted for two hours, and in the midst of it the cause of the quarrel was taken away unobserved. The combatants exhibited marks of rough usage, and the establishments of the apothecaries, it is said, were besieged with persons seeking to get their wounds dressed.—[Times.]

The magistrates of the county of Westmeath met yesterday in Mullingar to consider the state of the county, and adopt measures for 'the repression of crime. There was a larger number of the resident nobility and gentry than has assembled for a long time. Lord Castlemaize Vice-Lieutenant of the county, occupied the chair. The proceedings were private, but their general purport has transpired. A resolution was adopted, on the motion of Lord Longford, to the following effect:—That, whereas atrocious murders and other outrages, all of the so-called Ribbon character, have been recently and from time to time committed in this county, the perpetrators of which have up to the present escaped, with perfect impunity, baffling all exertions of the magistrates and the local police, we now urgently call upon the Government to take this state of things into their immediate and most serious consideration, and to make use of the strongest means which the existing law will permit; or, if necessary, to apply to Parliament for extraordinary powers, in order to endeavour to put an end to such a deplorable condition of society. That we do now appoint a deputation [here the names are stated] to express our unanimous views to his Excellency the Lord-Lieutenant and Executive, and that we authorize G. A. Roobford Boyd, Esq., D. L., to communicate with his Excellency as to the day for receiving said deputation.' Mr. Boyd declared his readiness to proceed by the next train to Dublin, to ascertain when it would be convenient to his Excellency to receive the deputation.—[Times Courier, March 23.]

THE IRISH PROTESTANT REPEALERS.—The Roman Catholics of Ireland are accepting the Irish Church Bill with the best grace, and stating in the gentlest manner their objections to some clauses which appear in their judgment to make the disestablishment and disendowment somewhat too easy to Protestant landlords, and especially to the clause which preserves the Protestant Cathedrals as national monuments. Some of the warmer zealots of the Protestant Establishment are losing their temper, their wits, and their loyalty at once, and instead of being wise in time and tolerably grateful for the easiest of terms for a compromise which no Government could offer five years hence, they are stepping into the shoes of the disaffected Catholics of twenty years ago, and threatening an agitation for the Repeal of the Union. At a meeting held near Dublin last Friday evening, at which the Vice Provost and Dr. Traill, a fellow of Trinity College, were present, the latter gentleman made a fiery speech declaring war to the knife to the nefarious bill, and threatening an alliance with Roman Catholics for the Repeal of the Legislative Union of the two kingdoms if the ecclesiastical union were repealed. Dr. Traill reminded Mr. Gladstone that the principal opponents of the Act of Union had only been appeased by the union between Church and State. Another speaker at the same meeting went in for the Repeal of the Union sans phrases, and so did the Rev. Dr. Langley at a meeting at Fermoy. Protestant letters in favor of Repeal were becoming the fashion in the newspapers, and this evening, at a grand meeting at Dublin of the Protestant Declarationists, we may expect similar sentiments and denunciations to be attended with an emphasis worthy the occasion. If this could be supposed to be the true spirit of that Protestant loyalty which Orange-men have been in the habit of contrasting with the divided allegiance of the Roman Catholics, there could not be a stronger argument for discharging with the least possible delay a debt of national justice to the great majority of the Irish population, so as to place the union upon a stronger basis than that of an ascendancy of a minority. But the fact is that these excited and vociferous gentlemen are not so mischievous or destructive as they seem if Mr. O'Connell's Catholic Repealers were powerless it is not likely that the Repealers who hail from Trinity College, will succeed, and in their cooler and calmer moments, when the present agitation is over and the Irish Church has passed into history, and Trinity College itself, like the English universities, is a national institute, they will become as Conservative as before, and congratulate themselves on the passing of Mr. Gladstone's bill before it was too late.—[London Express.]

It is possible that the effect of the course of legislation upon which the Government has entered may be that disaffection will change sides, and the old Repealers may surrender their right, title and interest in the agitation of the question in consideration of the more substantial benefits which are offered to them. Repeal is at present in a rather dilapidated condition, and would be a bad bargain for the Protestant party, who could have nothing to do with it when it looked attractive. It would hardly be worth the trouble now of putting it in a state of repair. If those who have had it so long on hand find it an unprofitable speculation, it is not at all likely that their successors will be disposed or able to carry it on for any great length of time, even though the 'Nationalists' should be willing to join them. After all the opposition which the latter have received from the Protestants, they will not be in a hurry to embrace the offer of a political partnership dictated by a feeling of irritation which may prove only transient. There can be no doubt however that the desire to have a complete instead of only a partial severance of the Union is taking a strong hold upon the minds of men, even those of position and property, who have hitherto been earnest advocates of British connexion. In their present temper there is little use in reasoning with them but when reflection succeeds passion they may take a more rational view of their true interests.—[Times Courier.]

The Orange system in the North is showing signs of greater activity and strength. A proof of this is to be seen in the increased number of halls which have been erected for the meetings of the 'brethren.' On Monday evening Mr. Johnston, M.P., laid the foundation of another building of this kind at Crossgar, in the county Down. A large number of the brethren and their female friends are reported to have been present at the ceremony, which was presided over by Mr. James Hamilton, of Glasgow. Mr. Johnston delivered a speech, in which he eulogized the principles and practices of the 'Noble Orange Institution.' He observed that isolated Protestants are apt to take a gloomy view of the prospects of Protestantism, but when they join in brotherly union in an Orange lodge, and know that tens of thousands of their loyal brethren are actuated and animated by the same principles, they grow bold and strong in the maintenance of their rights; and they are encouraged to know that not one man or ten men, but half a million of determined men, are banded to maintain the good old cause.' He trusted that justice would be done to them before long in the