

Many amiable, but weak minded men, have deemed it possible to bring about a union betwixt the Catholics and Protestants of Ireland. On the Tenant Right question, great assistance was expected from the Presbyterians of the black North: but, as will be seen from the following extract from Mr. Lucas' correspondence in the *Tablet* these hopes have been effectually dispelled. The Catholics of Ireland must rely on themselves alone: a Protestant Irishman is a political as well as a religious monster; and from him no assistance to the cause of Ireland can be expected:

"Looking at the Presbyterians as a political body, and at the most prominent of those engaged to struggle for tenant right, I can only express my opinion that at the present moment, and for some time past, they have been a source of weakness to us instead of strength; that they have played false to us on every point and in every direction: that they have weakened us in Parliament and weakened us out of parliament; that they have betrayed us at the elections, betrayed us on the hustings, betrayed us on the platform, betrayed us in the Council Room, betrayed us in the lobby. I need go no further for, beyond the lobby they have not been able to get.—Having infinitely more electoral power than the Catholics, in proportion to their numbers, if they had the honesty and manliness to use it aright, these slaves of self-interest have not only betrayed us, but they have had the indescribable meanness to betray themselves; and thus the principle of self interest which they devoutly worship has left them just strength enough to betray, where no risk was to be run and some profit was to be hoped, but has left them impotent to acquire the necessary political force which should have enabled them to betray us in the senate house. God knows it has been against the advice of a good many leading Catholics, for whose opinion and position I have the highest respect, that I have labored day and night to promote the union of north and south, and to help to keep together Presbyterians and Catholics in one united phalanx. The absurdity of the attempt is demonstrated by the failure of the experiment. They have proved to be a rotten reed, breaking where they should stand firm, and piercing the hand to which they should give help. For my part—I speak merely my single advice, and I submit it to the judgment of others who are more competent to pronounce—I should be glad if we were to wash our hands of them altogether, and if some means could be found for uniting all the elements of strength existing in those three provinces of Ireland which alone return members to Parliament not hostile to the general interest, for the redress of all the grievances by which this country is afflicted. While the funds of the League have been maintained out of the pockets of small farmers and struggling artisans, to say nothing of Priests, and in other parts, the Presbyterian north, the wealthy, enterprising, industrious, thrifty, stingy Presbyterians of the north, have, in the main, been content to live upon the alms of the south, and to send no money to replenish the Common stock! Union with the south! Why, gentlemen, you must indeed be laughing at us. We have dunned you to your faces in the Council Room; we have urged you with letters through the post; we have tried to shame you through the press; we have proclaimed your short comings at public meetings; but your purses are as rigid as, according to Horace, are the entrails of the husbandman (*dura ilia messorum*), and not a luck-penny could we extract from your tenacious gripe.—Union with the south! Why, we have not had from you even ordinary fair play in a common question of money. What you want is that in the ordinary course of agitation we should collect the money and you should share the benefit of the fund; that in Parliamentary elections we should make the sacrifices and that the members should be yours; and that you should make use of your place in the union to promote treachery and desertion among those whom our sacrifices have sent to Parliament, whenever it will answer your petty and selfish purposes. Once for all, it is impossible to have any alliance upon such terms."

DECREASE OF CRIME IN IRELAND.—The government of Ireland—that is to say, the officials connected with Dublin Castle—have published the statistics of crime and its punishments in this country, for the past year. The report of the inspectors is not a very lively or entertaining document, nor will the general reader find much romantic interest in it. Nevertheless, it is useful in itself, as a thing which may be taken, under certain conditions, as an index of the material and moral status of the country. From this sort of governmental Newgate Calendar with which parliament gratifies us annually, we glean this year some interesting facts. It appears, for example, that the amount of crime which has come under official notice in Ireland has diminished by one-half during the last three years; that is to say, the number of convictions were, in 1849, somewhat over fourteen thousand, as compared with seven thousand and a little more in 1852. This is, indeed, a highly satisfactory announcement. Not for any high value to be set on it as a proof of the sudden growth of a high-toned morality in the country, following on previous depravity, for that is one of those miracles which don't occur in human affairs. But it proves something else which is equally important for us; it proves that the material condition of the country is altered for the better. There is no great and sudden improvement in public morality in Ireland, because it was not needed. Our people, thank Heaven, are, in spite of all their faults and sufferings, an essentially moral and virtuous people, and were radically as much so three, ten, or fifty years ago, as to-day. But a few years since, a succession of unequalled miseries and calamities produced proceedings on the part of the starving masses which rigorous laws stamped with the brand of crime, and which the ministers of those laws punished accordingly. Then the times changed, the causes of these things passed away, and what was called crime proportionately diminished. We shall explain this presently. Looking at the face of the report, prosperous Ulster appears, at first sight, entitled to congratulate itself on its superior morality. But here, too, there is room for explanation; and that explanation, when furnished, affords us reason for mitigating our pride on behalf of our province, and removing any special stigma that may rest on our less fortunate countrymen in the south and west. Let us see how this is. The inspectors of prisons, in their report inform us that, for the last year, the returns of crime in Munster is about two thousand six hundred, as compared with nearly four times that amount in 1847, the year of the terrible famine. In Leinster, two thousand six hundred, as compared with five thousand. In Connaught, one thousand three hundred, as compared with three thousand four hundred. And in

Ulster, one thousand five hundred, as compared with one thousand six hundred. These are the round numbers, quite sufficient for our purpose. Now, what do we find here? That in Munster crime was fourfold more extensive (that is the best word) in the famine year than in 1852. And how account for this? A close examination solves the riddle. Nearly all of what is called crime in Munster in 1847, is found to consist of such offences as famine will excite even the most virtuous to: riots, disturbances, petty thefts of starving men at bakers' shops, turnip and potato fields, breaking of windows in order to be put to jail, and find the food there they could not get outside, and other "crimes" of this character, sprinkled with agrarian outrages, the natural consequences of the savage exercises of what those who look on poor men as mere machines, call the rights of property. This is why the returns of 1852 are so much less than those of three years before; and, as Munster was the greatest sufferer, it naturally furnishes the greatest contrast. But still we find that, excepting Connaught, whose population has been greatly thinned by emigration, Ulster has for the last year, the smallest returns of crime. But here, too, examination of details explains the difference. The excess of the South, and much more than the mere numeral excess, consists of those petty offences that still denote the existence of comparative poverty; and we are bound to confess that, in certain forms of crime, which are the closest tests of general morality, the number is largest in Ulster, though the general return least. We here allude to the offences that bear on the morality of the home (so to say), which are always found to be most numerous in prosperous and wealthy districts, where the religious principles of the people are more lax than in other places. We may, therefore, feel assured that we have no reason whatever to pride ourselves on any superior morality of our province. Ulster has great prosperity and little poverty. With her manufactures and other sources of wealth, she has no inducements to those offences which destitution provokes. If those offences are more numerous in other parts of the country, it is more the people's misfortune than their fault. But even the returns of the inspectors of prisons, dry and matter-of-fact as they are, help, in their own way, to prove what is shown in the book of Dr. Forbes—that, where the old faith prevails most widely amongst the people, there those offences that arise from the sensual passions and depraved inclinations of human nature are fewest.

SWEARING ON A DEAL BOARD.—We mentioned in our last the refusal of the Rev. W. Keogh to be sworn on a Protestant Bible, upon the ground that he did not recognize, in that book, any right or title to the appellation of the word of God. This conduct of the Rev. gentleman has created much surprise, and provoked many uncharitable comments from, the anti-Catholic press. The *Tablet* replies to them as follows:—

"Why should these people try to force upon us their version of the Scriptures, which we condemn and disapprove, and refuse us the benefit of an oath in the way most natural for us to take it? Some of these Protestants are very angry with Mr. Keogh for refusing to do what other men have done before him. It is true that other Catholics—Bishops, Priests, and laymen—have taken the oath on the Protestant Bible, and have thought it lawful to do so; but what is the ground of the difference between those who have thought it lawful and those who think it unlawful? Is it that those who are willing to take an oath upon the Protestant Scriptures think, or mean to imply, that the Protestant version of the Scriptures is indeed the true word of God? No such thing; no Catholic so believes, or can believe, if he know his religion; no Catholic who so takes the oath means to profess his faith in the authorized, that is, in the perverted version, but to do something totally different. The notion amongst those who defend the practise is this:—that any form by which it is agreed beforehand or understood that the taker of the oath means to invoke the name of God is, by the very nature of the case, an invocation of the name of God, an oath, and binding on the conscience. No matter, say they, what the form may be, or however ridiculous or absurd; whether it is to hold up your hand, or to kiss a deal board, or the covers of a book which encloses a pretended and untrue translation of the Word of God. In any case, whether it be the deal board or the book cover, it is the sign or symbol arbitrarily imposed by the civil authority to signify that the swearer attests the name of God. And, as in the one case it cannot be said that the civil power could mean that the deal board was the Word of God, so neither need it be supposed that the civil power means to exact from the swearer a declaration of his belief that the printing within the book covers contains the true and veritable Word of God. Those who object to the practise, deny altogether this mode of putting the case. They say that if the civil power did indeed require a witness to kiss a deal board, or to perform any other indifferent ceremony as a conventional mode of attesting an appeal to the Most High, there would be not the slightest difficulty in a Catholic going through any such appointed ceremonial; but they say, as a matter of fact, that it is not indifferent to the civil power what substance touches the swearer's lips. They say, and they say truly, that the Protestant Scriptures are selected for the oath because they are supposed by the selectors to be the true and unadulterated Word of God. Those who believe otherwise, if they have the good fortune to be Hebrews or Chinese, are permitted to swear in a different fashion, and are not presented with a new Testament at all. They are not presented with it because they do not believe in it, and because for them to take an oath upon a book which they do not reverence as the true and undoubted Word of God, would not merely be objectionable to their own feelings, but repugnant to the very notion under the influence of which the form of oath in our courts of justice and elsewhere has been imposed by Protestant authority. That this last is the true version of the case, speaking in my own private person and my own individual belief, I have no manner of doubt. I am perfectly certain that for a Catholic to take the oath on the Protestant Testament, and to profess at the same time loudly that in so doing he considered an oath on the Protestant Scriptures no more than an oath on a deal board; that he did not mean by kissing the book to profess any reverence for the Protestant Scriptures; and that he had no thought of professing that they were the Word of God; I say I am sure that any Catholic witness who did so would revolt and disgust Protestant feeling, quite as much as, if not a great deal more, than the Rev. Mr. Keogh. The proof of this is the outrageous and insolent attacks by all the organs of Protestantism upon the Rev. Mr. Keogh for his truthful and manly behavior. They all say, or

rather shout at him—What! have you the "audacity to stand up in one of her Majesty's courts of law and declare that sacred volume to be false which contains the version of the Scriptures authorised by law, on which the Queen has taken her coronation oath, and which this Protestant nation believes to be truly the Word of God?"—(*Daily Express*, 21st Sept.)

Let every man speak for himself. I, not certainly standing up in any of her Majesty's courts of law, but here, in the press, speaking in my own proper person, declare that I do not believe that volume to be sacred; that I do believe it to be false; and that whether it is authorised by law—as was, not so very long ago, the hanging, embowelling, mutilating, robbing, and torturing of Catholic Priests and laymen; whether it is the version on which the Queen (God bless her) has taken her coronation oath; or whether this Protestant nation believes it to be the Word of God—all these things are a matter of the purest and simplest indifference to me. I reverence the Queen, but I am not bound to hold her Majesty's opinions upon the Scriptures, upon any matters of religion, or upon any other matter saving those which concern my duties as a good citizen. And as to the authority of law in such a matter, and the belief of the Protestant nation, they truly—as the laws now stand, and as this Protestant nation now shows itself—are grounds, not of simple indifference, but of a strong *prima facie* presumption against anything which they propose to me on such a subject. I do reverence the Holy Scriptures; I do hold them to be the Word of God. So does every Catholic. But for the Protestant Scriptures, the Protestant version—I believe them to be, and to have been, made designedly false, mutilated and corrupt. Why should you push your Protestant Scriptures down my throat? I have nothing to say about them—nothing at least that can justly offend you if you will refrain from insulting all of us by thrusting upon us Scriptures which are not ours—which we have long since formally rejected, and which we will never accept as the Word of God. But if you endeavor to thrust these Scriptures upon us, and if, moreover, you tell us that we are audacious insolent, blasphemous, treasonable and I know not in how many other ways sinful, if we dare to express our adherence to those Scriptures, which we believe to be true, and our rejection of those Scriptures which we believe to be falsified, then we have nothing for it, but to tell you the plain truth, however it may displease you, and however it may be offensive to your ears.

In one word, as it was in the beginning, so it is now and so it will ever be. We receive the Scriptures from the Church, and to us nothing is the Scripture—nothing is the Word of God—except that which comes to us stamped with her authority. Yours, on the contrary, come to us stamped with the Church's disapprobation, and by her authority condemned; and knowing this you have the "insolence," the "audacity," or let me rather hope the thoughtlessness, to ask us and to try to compel us to make, what you intend, a solemn act of worship upon a book which you know, unless you are strangely ignorant, that we religiously condemn.

As my name has been alluded to in this business I have just one word of personal explanation to offer.—I have more than once refused to take the oath on a Protestant Bible on the grounds here stated. Once or twice, having regard to the strong opinion entertained by others to the effect above stated—namely, that on kissing the Protestant Bible I was doing no more than kissing a deal board, I have thought myself under no necessity of inquiring whether the book which I was required to kiss was a Catholic or a Protestant Bible. But when the question is raised in this formal way before the whole empire, and we are told without any circumlocution whatever that in kissing the Protestant Testament we profess our belief in it as the true Scripture of God, I, for one, solemnly declare my intention never again to take an oath without carefully examining the book upon which I am asked to swear, and rejecting the book if I find it not to be my authorized version of the Scriptures—that is, the copy authorised by the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church."

Mr. Lucas's resolution is a good one, and we trust will be generally followed. Why should Protestants thrust their version of the Bible, for which we have no more respect than for a deal board, or a butt-brick, upon us?

## UNITED STATES.

We read in the *N. Y. Freeman's Journal* of the arrival in New York, of His Excellency, Mgr. Bedini, the Papal Nuncio on the 10th inst. The new Catholic church at New Haven, was dedicated to the worship of Almighty God, by His Excellency on Sunday, the 9th inst.

DEATH OF THE REV. MR. DONOUGH.—The Rev. James McDonough, the venerable pastor of St. James Church, Brooklyn, departed this life in his sixty-first year, at midnight of Wednesday last, after a severe illness of but a few days' duration. Mr. McDonough was a native of Fermanagh county, Ireland, and was for many years a priest in the Diocese of Clogher. Since coming to this country he was unceasingly engaged on the mission in different parts of the Diocese of New York.

The *North China Herald* prints a paragraph, purporting to be news of the American expedition to Japan, now cruising in the neighborhood of the Loo-Choo Islands—"Information has privately reached us, that, while the United States fleet were in the neighborhood of Nipicuan, the Susquehanna and Saratoga went on a cruise Eastward, and touched at several beautiful islands, where they distributed live stock. They also touched at an island named Bonian. To their surprise, they discovered a few European residents, consisting of English, Scotch, Irish, and Spaniards, who had left whalers and established themselves there. Among them were about eleven women.—The Governor of this island is a Scotchman. He claims the island as his own, and has been settled there about twenty years. The Commodore has made a purchase of a piece of land, containing about ten acres, for fifty dollars; it is in a good situation, on one of the best sites, of the harbor, and is intended for a Government coal-depot." The authenticity of this story is doubtful. Strict secrecy has been enjoined on all the officers and crews of Commodore Perry's fleet, and information from other sources is not to be depended on.

PRECOCITY.—The Tyler, Texas, *Telegraph*, of the 10th, says:—A good deal has been said of late about the precocity of American youth, but all that we have seen of them is completely outstripped by a Mexican boy of San Antonio. He attempted to give in his vote at the late election, but from his youthful appearance

his vote was challenged, and it was proven on oath that he was but thirteen years of age. The *Ledger* says that he has a wife and a child one year old, and for the sake of gratifying curiosity, the editor of that paper was led to consult a physician on the subject, and was assured that this "boy" could not have been exceeding eleven years at the time of his marriage.

The *Charleston Catholic Miscellany* makes the following admirable remarks in its last number:—

*Miseremini mei, saltem vos amici mei.*—Jos.

The Rev. Dr. Leahy, who is in the Wisconsin Penitentiary, condemned to imprisonment for life, has petitioned, through counsel, for a new trial, but his petition has been refused. It is scarcely necessary that we should remind our readers that the Rev. Dr. Leahy is a Protestant minister, a preacher of the Gospel, who came to this city some 18 or 19 months ago, armed with recommendations and testimonials from about 200 of his fellow-ministers of every Protestant denomination in the Northern and Middle States, in order to preach a crusade against Popery. His "religious service" (we are using the very expression of his clerical friends and patrons) was to consist of an obscene lecture, of such a nature that neither children nor females could be allowed to enter. We have not forgotten these things; nor are the citizens of Charleston, Catholic or Protestant, likely soon to forget them. But some of our editors, especially of the religious press, seem to have forgotten all that is past. They yet talk of Leahy as "Monk Leahy," "the ex-Priest," the "ex-Monk," &c. He is none of these. His friends in this city, whether lay or clerical, affected to patronise him, because he was a Protestant preacher. The Baptist, Methodist, and Presbyterian press, and even one of our secular papers, contended that he had a right to vomit his filthy sentiments in public, because he was a "Protestant minister." He was actually admitted to preach in the Presbyterian and Methodist pulpits of Charleston, as a clerical gentleman (God save the mark!) of good standing and well recommended. Has he since then forfeited his ordination, or been deprived of his clerical title? Has he been deposed from the ministry, or excommunicated? If so, please let us be informed when and where it happened. His subsequent crimes (prophesied more or less by Catholics, be it remembered,) cannot rob him of his Protestant ministry and doctorship. It might as well be pretended, that the Torreys, Averys, Doyles and others of the Presbyterian and Methodist clergy, who are now breaking stones in some of our Penitentiaries for kidnapping negroes and other crimes, have lost thereby their clerical status, and are no longer entitled to the prefix of Reverend.

Instead of getting up petitions and urging Executive clemency on behalf of their unfortunate brother, the Parsons strive to disown him and shake him off. In the day of his prosperity they crowded round him, shared with him their pulpit and their parlor, they gave him friendly "advice," and relished exceedingly his filthy, vulgar conversation. But now that he has committed a crime—none of your fashionable, pardonable crimes—but one that hands him over to secular justice, they quit his company, they will not lift a finger in his behalf—they even pretend not to know him; they talk of him as a monk or a priest, or something of that sort. Shame on such base ingratitude! We know that the apostate reaps always as the fruit of his sin not only remorse, but ignominy. But this does not lessen the meanness of his reverend brethren, in abandoning him, like an outcast, to his present fate. He was, we know, a worthless nettle, which in weeding our garden, we, naturally, threw over the Protestant side of the fence. The Parsons reverently took up the nettle, handled it with affection, and for a long time carried it about everywhere as if it were a lovely and marvellous exotic, that must necessarily elicit the admiration and sympathies of their congregations. Now, serpent-like, it has stung the friends that cherished it; and the reverend gentlemen, who bore it about in triumph, on examining their hands, find them not only soiled, but painfully galled and blistered. Hence they have dropped it; disowned it, abused it, and now they try to make men forget that they ever loved it, and held it dear. But we shall take good care that it be not forgotten; and from time to time we shall remind our readers, Protestant and Catholic, of the Rev. Dr. Leahy, Protestant minister in good standing, who was welcomed here in Charleston by his brother-ministers, because he came with insult and outrage, with ribaldry and obscenity, and, if necessary, with riot and bloodshed, to bear witness against Popery; and who now lies under sentence of the law for the cold-blooded murder of a rival paramour!

A ROW AMONGST THE MISSIONARIES.—For many years the Sandwich Islands have been at the mercy of these gentry, who have not neglected to make a good use of their opportunities—"privileges" the Saints call them—to enrich themselves at the expense of their miserable converts. Whilst the families and wealth of these Missionaries have been increasing, the population of the Islands has still more rapidly diminished. At last however, a spirit has been evoked which promises to drive the hypocritical scoundrels, who have worked such havoc amongst the fairest regions of the Pacific, from the place which they have so long occupied, to their own aggrandisement, but the ruin of the natives.

By the last advices from the Sandwich Islands we learn that large meetings of the people had been held, and petitions adopted and numerous signed praying the King to banish from his Councils the Reverend gentlemen, who to their functions as ministers of a heavenly, add those of ministers of an earthly sovereignty. The following are amongst the "Resolutions" passed at these meetings:—

Resolved, That the Ministers of Finance and Public Instruction, members of his Majesty's present cabinet are not so fortunate as to have either the confidence or esteem of this meeting, nor, as we believe, of any considerable portion of his Majesty's native subjects, or of foreign resident citizens throughout his kingdom and that their retention in office is in direct opposition to the wishes and interests of a very large majority of the natives and citizens of the Sandwich Islands.

Resolved, That these same Ministers, having the command of the principal channels of influence, viz., Treasure, education, and the almost absolute control of government patronage, have most willfully neglected their duty in not using the means within their control to protect the people from the pestilence which is now depopulating the islands. That, instead of devoting themselves to the public good, they have ever sought their own aggrandisement, regardless alike of the high duties devolving upon them, or of the evils necessarily following their malfeasance in office.