

a protecting legislation in their regard, how can the contemptible number of two or three hundred Irish bodies and souls warm into active justice or charitable benevolence the commiseration of the rulers of Ireland? Similar national woes have been so often told since the year 1847 that the cries of the poor, houseless, exterminated Irish are now perfectly unheeded: they die in the crowded cellar, or they dwindle to the grave in the poorhouse prison, or they survive for some years the horrors of the emigrant ship, the hardship of labor in a foreign land, and the broken-heartedness of persecution; but their life and death in the eyes of the legislature is of much less legal concern than the death of a fox or a snipe.

It is even unfashionable in genteel society to allude to cases of landlord eviction: you are met at once by quotations from the statements of cattle shows, the registry of agricultural statistics, the census of the Irish inferior animals; and the subject on hand—namely, the eviction of thousands of men, women, and children—is sought to be stifled under an enormous heap of turnips and mangold wurzel which have been produced during the past year! Surely no man in his senses would attempt to justify the crime of murder because we have now in Ireland more bullocks than we had in the year of the rebellion of '98; and decidedly no man, except a very monster, can defend the banishment of hundreds of human beings (with the rent in their hands), merely because the live stock and the green crops of the Irish aristocracy, *sed and groyan* on the evicted holdings of the former expelled poor, are flourishing in unexampled abundance. The crime of exterminating the poor receives even additional impress of heinousness from this very abundance; and proves that the merciless owners of the soil of Ireland can, in times of their prosperity, and hence without necessity, unhouse, banish, and kill at their pleasure the Queen's loyal and faithful subjects. I have never met an exterminator who, in conversation, can abstain, even one minute, from the grossest abuse of the clergy and the people: he not only banishes the poor from his own property, but he slanders their character, belies their feelings, preaches a crusade of extermination against them: and would if he could (one should think) unite all Irish landlords to combine for the utter annihilation of the small tenant class. And if any one, such as my humble self, stand forward in defence of this abandoned section of the Irish people, he is instantly denounced as a firebrand, an opponent of the social advancement of the country, and, what these sanguinary little tyrants consider the worst of all their malevolent abuse, he is called a Young Irelander!

I am far from asserting that all the landlords of Ireland belong to the cruel stamp of character glanced at in the last paragraph; I know Ireland too well to make such a statement: I am very familiar with the notions and the principles of the majority of the landlords of each county in Ireland. But while I own, as a matter of notoriety, that some of the most influential men of this country are favorable to the interests of the poor, and in their own persons have never evicted a tenant able to pay his rent, there is still withal a relentless proprietary who, having the power, never fail to crush their poor Catholic victims whenever local revenge, political ambition, family ill-grained hatred, or religious animosity must be gratified. The good man has the power to evict, but his name, his honor, his justice, are the security of the tenant: the persecuting landlord has the power also, and in a moment of wicked caprice, he will employ that power in the spirit of malice and vengeance.—Surely, a law should in common justice be framed, not only to take away the power to kill from such a class of men as are described, but to prevent such men from robbing the evicted poor of the fruits of their labor and capital expended on the soil, and added to the property of the landlord. After all that has been spoken and written on this subject, it is a waste of time to utter one word in reference to its further explication: it is sufficient that if only one man in Ireland were killed, and his family plundered by cruel men taking advantage of the imperfect state of the law, it ought to be an argument of sufficient moral cogency to alter its provisions in favor of justice and mercy, and in opposition to savage cruelty and party vengeance.

There is no use in this place to introduce the parallel laws of England and Scotland; with both these references the writer of this letter is minutely acquainted. True, there are even few leases in these countries; and there is no tenant-right there recognised as such. But there are no English Orangemen there; there are no Skibbereen bigots; there are no tract bailiffs; there are no blue magistrates there. The English noblemen, the Scotch gentlemen have tenants of their own creed and politics; there is no national animosity; no religious persecution amongst them; and hence the landlord in these kingdoms is the friend, the father of his tenants. Whereas, in unhappy Ireland, from the peer to the scullion—from the Protestant bishop to the parish grave-digger—from the lady of the highest name to the Protestant stocking-maker—it is all one network of religious rancor, political hatred, covering the entire surface of Irish society, entering into all states and conditions, and emanating, rotting, and poisoning the whole framework of our social intercourse. Surely, there is no parallel in these cases; and while England and Scotland would be foolish to demand such a useless law, Ireland is mad to relax for one hour her legal efforts to wrench from the enemies of God and man this vital and essential act of just legislation.

On this day the glorious news of the defeat of the Indian fiends, and the equally happy intelligence of the brilliant relief of the heroic garrison of Lucknow, have reached the hearts of many an anxious friend in this country. The purse of the entire nation will be cheerfully opened to cheer the sufferings of the survivors of this lamentable mutiny; the names of Nicholson, of Neil, and of Havelock will be justly transmitted to the willing homage of posterity; and they will be ranked amongst the ablest and the bravest soldiers of ancient and modern times.—

Merited punishment, too, will, it is to be hoped, soon overtake the monster Nana Sahib, who has executed atrocities as low down in the scale of shocking crimes as the deliverers of Delhi and Lucknow have soared aloft in the regions of exalted military fame. But while we are all in Great Britain and Ireland, of every creed and class, give our mite to the Indian sufferers, there is not even a sigh breathed for the Irish victims of extermination; not a penny subscribed for the widows and orphans of the persecuted Irish.—There are many Nana Sahibs in Ireland, who have banished wives as virtuous, virgins as spotless, and children as lovely as any of those victims murdered at Cawnpore. And if the polluted records of ships' crews on the passage to America can be believed (as I think they can) abominations as appalling, crimes as atrocious, and agonies as heartrending have been committed on the innocent spotless children of Ireland, while their maiden virtue was assaulted and robbed, their shrieks for assistance at dead of night rising from the steerage cabin of a foreign ship, heard in pity by the terrified passengers; their cries ultimately quenched by the barbarities of the brutal sailors, and silenced amidst the blasphemous of their savage assailants. If all England raise a shout of horror against the Indian Monster, shall the Irish fiend be applauded? and if the "well" at Cawnpore shall be bathed in a nation's tears, is there no grief for the ruined virgins of the Emigrant Brothels?

If Mr. Sharman Crawford, the indefatigable friend of Tenant Right, were consulted by some leading men in other parts of Ireland: and if a public opinion, gathered and expressed, were placed before Parliament, urged with moderation, and demanded as an act of National justice, the next Session for many reasons will be a suitable moment, under a given expected crisis, for obtaining for this country a measure of justice, as well as one of vital importance to the interests, the honor, and the further stability of the empire at large.

D. W. C.

IRISH INTELLIGENCE

THE LEGAL APPOINTMENTS.—It is rumored and believed that Lord Palmerston asked the Attorney-General to remain in office to prosecute Pathors Conway and Ryan, as if he went on the bench, and Mr. Deasy had to be re-elected, he would be met on the hustings by awkward questions, such as "Will you prosecute the Priests?" The government have, it is said, accepted Judge Perris's resignation, so that when the Priests' trials are over they can put Pittgerald on the bench.—*Dublin Correspondent of Mayo Constitution.*

The two Irish judgoahps are now fled. Jonathan Christian, Esq., late Solicitor General, has accepted the vacant seat in the Common Pleas, and Mr. Sergeant O'Brien, M. P., succeeds Mr. Justice Moore in the Queen's Bench. Mr. Hughes, Q. C., is to be the new Solicitor General—a situation which he filled a few years ago; and according to general opinion Mr. Gerald Fitzgibbon, Q. C., will be the new serjeant.—Mr. Justice Christian has appointed Francis E. Thos. Esq., solicitor, to be his registrar.

DONALD TRANTS' DEFENCE ASSOCIATION.—PUBLIC MEETING.—The tyrannical proceedings of landlords and their agents at Gweedore and the Rosses, and the wholesale evictions upon the estates of my Lord Leitrim, are at length beginning to arouse the indignation of the people of Donegal. We observe that a public meeting is announced to be held in the town of Milford, on Thursday, the 21st instant, for the purpose of remonstrating against the exterminating policy of his lordship, and taking such steps as may be deemed advisable, under the circumstances, for protecting the rights of the unfortunate tenantry in this unhappy district. The state of Gweedore, the intended wholesale confiscation of tenant property at Milford, the position of the tenant bill, united in calling upon the friends of the people of Donegal to be up and stirring. Out of evil it often happens that good will come. The conduct of the Donegal landlords has, no doubt, gone far towards shaking off the apathy that seemed to be of late creeping over the people of Ireland with respect to the settlement of the land question. The landlords are the parties that have evoked the coming agitation; we trust that they will keep it going until a satisfactory Tenant Right Bill has been passed into law.—*Derry Journal.*

RETURN OF IRISH EMIGRANTS.—For the last few months persons who left this city as emigrants have returned to their old employments in Kilkenny, and caution their neighbors against venturing to America at present. The story of desolation and death which these poor emigrants relate is fearful, and we hope it may serve as a caution to others to turn their thoughts from emigration and cling to the rock in the old country.—*Kilkenny Journal.*

DEATH OF ONE OF THE IRISH VOLUNTEERS OF '82.—A man named Arthur McCusker (*alias* Cosgrove), and of the patriarchal age of 104 years, died in Loughborough on the 5th inst. He was a native of Tyrone, where he was enrolled among the "Irish Volunteers" in 1782.—*Correspondent of the Nation.*

The first mercantile failure in Limerick has been just announced—the suspension of an old and respectable firm, that of Mr. James Hannan and Son, with liabilities set down at £50,000. Some merchants here are stated to be losers by this suspension, and others in Kilrush; but the particulars are not precisely known. The Bank of Ireland is set down at £18,000. Other failures are sure to follow.—*Sunders.*

On Thursday week, John McGowan, Esq., Mayor, Returning Officer at the last borough election, and his two deputies, Mr. Joseph Foley and Mr. Hugh Connellan, together with two poll clerks, Mr. William Ward and Mr. John Bruen, entered each into security before the resident magistrate, W. C. Morony, Esq., to the amount of two sureties each, in the sum of £50, and themselves in £100, to stand their trial at the approaching assizes, for a conspiracy to defraud certain electors of the borough of their votes on the above memorable occasion.—*Sligo Independent.*

The rapid and frequent communication between Milford Haven, and Ireland is developing the Irish traffic to an enormous extent. During the months of September, October, and November last, upwards of 18,000 head of cattle were landed at Neyland, and forwarded by the South Wales Railway. One day last week upwards of twenty tons of poultry arrived there in one day, and the cargoes comprise large consignments of bacon, butter, and agricultural produce. Space is so much required that every expedient is resorted to, yet there is great difficulty in meeting the greatly increasing traffic.

On Sunday, the 27th December, at Rosshakill, county Donegal, Hugh Blayney, for many years bailiff over extensive estates in Fanel, died from the effects of blows on the head inflicted with stones thrown at him by some persons or persons about a week previously. He swore informations a few days after the occurrence against a relative of his own, one William Blayney, who being apprehended, was admitted on bail, to stand his trial at the ensuing March assizes. This cannot be called an agrarian outrage; as it is said private family matters originated the sad act.—*Londonderry Journal.*

How ENGLAND TREATS THE IRISH POOR.—Nearly every week we publish accounts of the cruelty and injustice to which these unhappy countrymen and women of ours are subjected who chance to require relief in England and Scotland. We lately quoted the case of a lady who for the last thirty-five years resided in England, but who having lately become insane, was transported to this country as chargeable on an Irish poor law union, because she had been born in the town of Blessington, while her father's regiment—for he was an officer in the British service—was marching through this country! This week we publish another proof of the value of the legislative union, and of the love England bears to our people. The wife of a soldier, who possibly at this moment is spilling his blood for England, is banished from the place that was his and her home, and sent across to Ireland on the deck of a steamer at this cold and stormy season of the year, though far advanced in pregnancy, and with a little child of two years old at her side. Vainly, vainly do we remonstrate against this injustice and inhumanity. England will spurn the Irish pauper, while she grows on the blood of our people. Well, we shall take them back, those poor men and women of Ireland, no matter how long they may have given their labor and their wealth to the land that rejects them and robs us. But for what they suffer, and for the wrong and insult we are made to feel, we shall yet have something to say. England may think she can despise us, but as surely as these words are printed, so surely she will reap a bitter fruit from the seeds she is sowing in the hearts of the Irish people.—*Nation.*

That "England's necessity is Ireland's opportunity" has passed into a proverb, although there are different versions of the *modus operandi*, and the result to be obtained. I have no sympathy, not even indignation, but only contempt and loathing, for that exhibition of the *modus* which has received the name of "Sopoyism." I should deplore the counsels which should raise the standard of civil war, and attempt to meet force by force in the field; but I should look with sympathy and respect on the unhappy victims of a mistaken policy, and whilst I should regret that they were throwing away a fair chance of obtaining justice—missing an opportunity of righting themselves—I should say that never had a nation risen against greater wrong and oppression, nor lost by bad leadership, a more glorious cause. But I turn with contempt from those who stretch out their helpless hands to the distant field in which the unholy alliance of Mahomet and Juggernaut against the Cross deals out the vengeance of fiends against England and Ireland, and outrages defenceless womanhood. It is not with indignation, but with loathing, that I see some Irishmen acting the part of women in all except the pure and holy instincts of the sex—talking and scolding, but incapable of either organization or action—depending on the mutinous Sepoy to do what they have neither the strength nor the courage to attempt, whilst they themselves contribute only a helpless yell of triumph to each partial success over the gallant army of Englishmen and Irishmen who, outnumbered and exhausted, are maintaining, against the most fearful odds, the cause of Christianity, civilization, and the glory of our united arms. The fight going on in India is in a good cause, but men have no right, even in a good cause, to peril the salvation of their souls. If it were my vocation to fight, I would go out to India, but under the condition that I might have a good chance of going to Heaven (which my duty to God and myself commands me not to imperil) as if I remained at home. Now, it is no use discussing the grounds or the reason of the belief of us Catholics that we want the Sacraments of the Church, and cannot do without them. Your Catholic readers know and feel this—your Protestant ones must tolerate it and act accordingly, or do without us. If Protestants don't know this they must be taught it. There is but one way of teaching them this, and that is, to hold back from the contest until our rights are conceded. Irishmen are the only Catholics in the British empire whose holding back from the contest is material, and will affect its issue. All the scolding in the world is of no use whilst Irishmen are found ready not only to spill their best blood in England's quarrel, but to incur the risk of eternal damnation as well. The Irishman who, to fill an empty belly, or to better his condition in life, leaves the side of his Pastor and the present grace of the Sacraments, to seek a sudden and unprovided death in a good quarrel, is, I think (but with ready submission to authority, if I am wrong), guilty of rashness amounting to sin. If anybody doubts this let him, if inclined to go and fight in India in the present state of things as regards Catholic Chaplains, ask his spiritual adviser, when he is seated in the confessional and illuminated with the grace which is accorded to the administrator of the Sacrament of Penance, to tell him his duty to God and his own soul in this matter. A man need have no sympathy with Sepoys to abstain from fighting them with the probable loss of his salvation. A man's duty to God and himself is absolute—the duty of enlisting and going to fight the Sepoys is not absolute by any law, Divine or human. I dissuade no one, however, from enlisting; but I recommend every one, in that, as in every other important action of life, to take counsel of his Pastor. There are no politics in the confessional. I go further, and say, that whilst enlistment is voluntary, any man may consider other things, consistent with his duty to God, but of inferior importance to his salvation, and may decide to abstain if other rights or favors than that of the administration of the Sacraments to the Catholic portion of the army are not conceded to him. He may see that he has opportunities before him of silently but effectively co-operating in works of charity or justice of more importance to himself, his country or his religion, than the speedy suppression of a mutiny in India—that England's necessity may be Ireland's opportunity of demanding justice for his religion or his Pastor. I can't tell how strongly men may feel on such points. All I know is, that the national faith of Ireland has been worse used at the hands of England, and is now in a greater state of chronic insult and oppression, than can be matched all over the world by an example of similar treatment of the religion of a conquered country. I know that Catholics in Ireland suffer more wrong and oppression than Christians in Turkey; that their churches and ample revenues are not only taken away from them, but a foreign and hostile creed is flaunting the spoils of conquest in their faces. I know that, by an exquisite refinement of cruelty, the children of the soldier who has sealed his devotion to his standard by shedding his life's blood on the field of battle, or has sunk hopeless or exhausted on the long march under the burning rays of a tropical sun, are sought out as the victims of the proselytiser. I know that the soldier in India must either give up his fair share of valor and promotion, and see his children grow up under his eyes in ignorance amid the license of a camp, or he must surrender them to a Protestant schoolmaster to be educated under a system of proselytism. I know all this. What I don't know is, whether Irishmen like these things, or simply don't care about them. If I ask Mr. Sydney Herbert, he answers me triumphantly by a return of the number of recruits who are willing to fight for the maintenance of the present order of things. He tells me that upwards of one-third of the new recruits are Catholics, and as that is, there and throughout, the proportion which might be expected if Catholics and Protestants were treated with equal justice and favor in the army, I can only infer, though I cannot quite believe that Catholics are so contented with bondage and insult as Protestants are with freedom and favor.—*Cor. of Dublin Tablet.*

The unfortunate depositors of the Tipperary Bank are likely at last to get a small instalment of their claims on that concern, several of the leading shareholders having offered terms of compromise, which have been accepted by the official manager and ratified by the Master in Chancery.—*Tablet.*

THE CHINESE AND THE IRISH.—The *Times* newspaper is always complimentary to the Irish people, and its priesthood—the former are generally "Thugs," and the latter are "Burrilled ruffians," in the language of this great organ of English opinion. And when famine and fever were mowing down our poor people in thousands, this same newspaper gloated over their rain, and almost thanked Heaven that the Irish race was gone—gone with a vengeance. Hardly a number of it that does not contain some insult to the Irish people, or its religion; and yet, that journal, and the English people whom it represents, expect that the Irish should say whatever they say, feel whatever they feel, and swear whatever they swear—that whatever England does is right—and that the English people are the greatest nation on the face of the Earth! This is really the fact; a fact because of our own servility, or rather the servility of our gentry and middle classes, who not merely see good in everything English, but whose no good in anything that is not English! And as long as this feeling characterises the gentry and middle classes of this country, notwithstanding all the insults we receive from the organs of English opinion, we deserve the contempt of the *Times* and the people of England. If Ireland, or the Catholic faith, be not abused in a leading article, we are sure to see the omission supplied by some one of our own correspondents from some quarter of the world. The Melbourne correspondence of Saturday's *Times* classes the "Irish and Chinese" in that city as possessing precisely the same habits—a compliment which, amongst so many others, we hope, will be duly appreciated by the servile sycophants who make up the Anglo-Irish gentry of Ireland! Let the *Times* go on abusing us—we have no doubt that it will still have a party to bound it on against the old Celtic Race; but there is one thing that we can promise it, and that is—HATE FOR HATE; and further, that sooner or later, there will come—A Day of Reckoning!—*Kilkenny Journal.*

RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION IN IRELAND.—Only a week ago, the *Times* drew a labored contrast between England and France. In England, as much as in France, some persons might be tempted to religious persecution; but the power of the press in England deprived them of the power to yield to the temptation: a few words of exposure, and the matter was for a day or two the talk of all England, and was at once set right. An able Correspondent in our present number points out the notorious fact, that by a tacit agreement between the conductors of the Protestant press, this remedy of publicity is denied to Catholics. This very week presents an example to which we would best the special attention of our readers. On Monday last, the *Freeman's Journal*, Dublin paper, published a full report of an action of ejectment tried at the Castleblaney Quarter Sessions, in the County Monaghan. Colonel Lewis, the purchaser of an estate in 1854, took it into his head, like many other Irish landowners, to compel his tenants to educate their children as Protestants.—There was already a National School, frequented by the Catholic children, and one under the care of the Protestant Incumbent, for the Protestants. Neither of these suited the Colonel's taste. He set up a third, under the care of a "Bible Reader," a class of men about whose conduct and average morality we need say nothing to those who know Ireland. To this he required his Catholic tenants to send their children, publicly signifying his pleasure at meeting to which he called them together. The Parish Priest asked whether he might attend to instruct them in their religion; but Colonel Lewis is stated by the Counsel to have replied, that he would admit neither Priest, minister, nor devil. How many of the tenants refused to obey did not appear; two certainly did—John Byrne, and one named McQuillan. On both of these ejectments were served; but the latter being dropped for this session, on account of an irregularity in serving the notice, Byrne alone came into Court. The only witness was Colonel Lewis's agent; but the Colonel himself sat in Court, "by the Clerk of the Peace. The evidence which he thus admitted, sworn in his presence by his authorized agent, was that Byrne had repeatedly offered his rent before this process was commenced, and that his conduct at the meeting was most respectful to Colonel Lewis, but that the reason of his ejectment was his refusal to send his children (of whom he had nine, six girls and three boys) to the Colonel's school, and saying "he had rather give up his land than send his children to a school where their religion would be tampered with." The result was, that the Protestant official presiding at the Quarter Sessions, after expressing in the strongest terms his condemnation of Major Lewis's conduct, dismissed the ejectment, not on that account, which would not be a legal ground, but solely for an irregularity in form, and expressed his regret that the protection he thus gave was only for three months, after which this victim of conscience, his wife and nine children, will be turned without shelter into the high roads. Here is a case to be, as the *Times* says, the talk of all England—say, we may add, of all Europe; a case in which, of all others, we might expect the public press to be both willing and able to enforce justice. So it would, but that it is unfortunately a case of oppression of a Catholic by a Protestant. The consequence is, that the *Times*, which on that very day was chivalrously coming forward as the protector of the Protestants of France, left this case wholly unreported and unnoticed. The whole English press has done the same. Until these words are put into hands of our readers, no one reader of any one English newspaper has had any opportunity of knowing anything of the wrongs and sufferings of poor John Byrne and his family, or of the ruthless religious persecution of Col. Lewis. What the Saturday weekly papers will do, remains to be seen. The *Guardian*, which appears on Wednesday, is as silent as the *Times*; yet it reports a case before another Irish Sessions Court, because in that an Irish peasant was committed for using disrespectful language against Her Majesty.—Alas! let that good and happy mother judge whether that, disgusting as it is, is a crime to be visited as severely as the turning nine helpless children, with their parents, to starve in the high roads, because their father refused to do (what a father who believes that there is such a thing as sin, however little they may believe his religion to be true, must feel it to be a sin of the first magnitude)—to give them an education which that religion taught him, and he believed, would be fatal to their salvation. What the *Union* will do, or again the Liberal weekly papers, remains to be seen. We have little hope that they will say anything of the matter. So far as it is true as regards Catholics, that "the least act of unfairness to the meanest sect in this country would raise a cry from millions." There are, we sincerely believe, millions who would be indignant enough if they knew the facts; but the public press of all sections and parties, with scarcely an exception, are in a conspiracy to prevent their knowing it. The case, moreover, has an important political bearing. The *Freeman* shows that in the single county where this new outrage has publicly been committed, not less than nine thousand families, or more than fifty thousand souls, have been ejected, and nine thousand homes thrown down, within ten years, on political or religious grounds. The reason of the ejectment, no doubt, could seldom be legally proved; for few landlords, however little they may "fear God," "regard man" so little as Colonel Lewis; and whatever may be the cause of an ejectment, excuses can seldom be wanting in a country where it is a common custom to refuse to tenants receipts in full, even when their rents are fully paid, and where, moreover, it is not an uncommon system that the nominal rent is higher than is intended by either party to be really paid, and that receipts are given "only on account." But all men must see that where wholesale eviction is the order of the day, and where a landlord can sit openly in Court and hear his own agent swear that his motive for evicting a tenant with a wife and nine children was merely his refusal to give up his children's religion, we are absolutely without any security that the threat of eviction will not be largely

used to intimidate voters. In England such oppression would be impossible—the mere suspicion of it would, no doubt, raise a cry from the whole country; and we have not forgotten the just indignation of the whole English press when one landlord, the Earl of Stamford, used his power, on political grounds, for the oppression of one deserving tenant. But in this case, if there had been no other, abundantly shows that for the Irish Catholic voter the publicity of the English press is no protection whatever. As a matter of fact, every man who knows Ireland is aware that it is so used on a wholesale scale. The argument, therefore, of the *Times* against the Ballot is simply false.—"The sole plea for its introduction is that voters are intimidated, and we know that, whatever may have been formerly the case, the evils of intimidation are now passing away. Parliament has legislated against them, the press has declaimed against them, the people has effectually struggled against them. No one can pretend that the House of Commons is in any appreciable degree returned by intimidated voters." We must call it impudently false, remembering the challenge of the Archbishop of Tuam, that he and the Catholic Clergy were anxious to leave the voters to vote as they pleased, if the landlords would do the same. The *Times* adds, that if there were compulsion, "it would be far better to suffer and ignore it than to confess that the great English nation cannot control a handful of Lords and Squires." But the fallacy needs no exposure, for it is by adopting the Ballot that this great nation has it in its power, when it pleases, to control the oppressors in Ireland—not "a few Lords and Squires," but the remnant and representatives of that great party which for centuries has abused the power of England, to trample upon a prostrate nation. The simple fact is, that the social condition of Ireland is still radically unhealthy. It has never recovered—as how should it?—the open tyranny and cruelty of the old penal laws. There must ever be natural distinctions; rich and poor, the powerful and the weak, always have lived and always will live together; the peculiar crime of Ireland is that, owing to a long course of oppression, the line of division between these classes too generally coincides with the line which divides the Saxon from the Celt and the Protestant from the Catholic. Under such circumstances, to extend the franchise without giving the protection of the Ballot, is to load with gold an unarmed traveller and then send him among banditti—to fatten up the sheep in order to expose them in the midst of wolves.—*Weekly Register.*

The following is a report of the extraordinary proceedings alluded to above; the perusal of which must excite the strongest feelings of indignation against the Protestant landlords of Ireland, in the breast of every honest man:—

At the Castleblaney Court of Quarter Sessions on Monday the following remarkable case came before Mr. Major, the assistant-barrister:—
Colonel Lewis v. John Byrne.

Mr. McMahon, of Dundalk, with Mr. Row, of Belfast, who came down specially for this case, appeared for the defendant; Mr. Wright for the plaintiff. Edward Clendinning deposed that he served the ejectment on Byrne.

John Armstrong sworn: Attested the service of the notice to quit on John Byrne the 17th Feb., 1857. I am agent of Colonel Lewis on this part of the Keelar and Dunboyler; this tenancy began in November '54, but I altered it to September; I gave him receipts in accordance with the alteration.

Cross-Examined by Mr. Rea: I am agent for Colonel Lewis eleven years; the Colonel came in for the lands in '54; the rent is £8 18s.; the former rent, under M. Fligate, was £8 8s.; when the Colonel came into possession he increased the rent; he added ten shillings a year to it. Are you aware that there is a house on the land? Yes. Do you know who built it? I do not. Was it not built by defendant or his father? I cannot say. Do you know how many children are in the house? I do not. Did you serve them with notice to quit? The children! No, I did not. Don't you know that in that house there are nine children, and so many as six of them girls, with three boys and the mother; for the mother also is unlucky enough to be alive? (Some sensation.) I cannot say how many. Evidently there must be some great motive for such a proceeding—how many years' rent is due? One year's rent is owing. You don't mean it! One year's rent! I must have been wrongly instructed; only one year's rent, you say? That's all—£8 18s. After the famine and the hail storm, and all, one year's rent remains due? Yes. My client refused to pay that, did he? No, he did not. Do you mean to say he offered you that as well as the rest? He did, and I refused to take it. Let me hear that again—on your oath did my client offer you that one year's rent before these proceedings commenced? He did. Where did he offer it to you? In Monaghan and Luncheon. Then he tendered you that year's rent more than once? He did. And that was before those proceedings commenced? It was. He offered it twice before the notice was served, but I would not take it. And are you aware that when you refused it he went and put it in the Bank of Ireland, that you may be sure of it any time. I don't know, but I think he did. To his worship: the year's rent is £8 18s. Mr. Rea: Well, now, once more we offer you that year's rent in open court; Will you take it? No, I cannot. Examination by Mr. Rea continued: There is a church in Inniskoon, I believe? There is. And a National School supported by the state? I can't say of my own knowledge. Did you hear that there is? I did. And there is the school of Mr. Reed also there, belonging to the Established Church? I believe so. You are well aware, however, that Colonel Lewis has built a school of his own in Inniskoon? He has. And appointed a teacher of the name of Wallace? Yes. On your oath, was not Wallace a Scripture reader also? It was. That is Colonel Lewis there, sitting beside the clerk of the peace? It is. Did you tell Colonel Lewis that Byrne tendered you the rent? I don't recollect; I should say Colonel Lewis was aware of Byrne being able to pay. On your solemn oath, Sir, do you not know that this ejectment arose out of his school? It has grown out of it. Very well, that's an answer. And Byrne said he would give up his land sooner than send his children to a school where their religious convictions were likely to be tampered with? I suppose so. You were present at the meeting on the road when Colonel Lewis met his tenants? (We understand the answer was in the affirmative.) How many people were there? I can't say. Can you guess? Perhaps one hundred. And Byrne said that at the meeting? Yes. It was the Colonel that convened the meeting, I believe? He came to meet his tenants, but there were others there besides. They were invited to come, I believe? The tenants were, but the others were not. The Rev. Mr. Beggan was there? He was. And Wallace, the Scripture-reader, was there? He was, and the Priest was there. How long did the meeting last? About two or three hours were spent there. Did any other tenants speak like Byrne at the meeting? McQuillan did. And was McQuillan served with an ejectment? He was; but it has been withdrawn because served on children under sixteen years of age; but it is to come on next session. I believe Colonel Lewis was treated at that meeting with the greatest possible respect? Yes, I should say so. Do you know that the reply of Colonel Lewis to the Rev. Mr. Beggan's proposal to visit the schools, in case the children of his communion should go there, was, that he (the Colonel) would not allow Priest, Minister, or devil to enter his schools? I never heard any such thing. Byrne's family are struggling people, are they not? They are. And in this country where do struggling people struggle to after leaving their home—is it not to the workhouse, a burthen on the industry of the public? I suppose so. Would you take the rent now, and abandon this ejectment? I would not.—*Newry Examiner.*