

interpretations. So great were the suspicions thus aroused and so perfidiously woven the web, that I had to leave Rome and to condemn myself to live in complete solitude. Yes, my lord, such has been my life for near a year past. I had selected an unknown and almost inaccessible retreat, and these accusations were heaped by my absence. But I heard of the Grand-Vestals' sorrows, I hastened back to Rome, to devote myself to her for whom I would give my life, and at the first step I am again beset by this secret persecution. . . . I am denounced.

'Young man,' said Vibius solemnly, when Metellus had ceased speaking; 'you asked my advice, . . . here it is. Leave Rome instantly, return to your hiding-place. Should it not be safe enough, burrow, if necessary, in the bowels of the earth, but hide, try to be forgotten. This is all I can say to you.'

'I shall do it,' exclaimed Metellus. 'Yes, I shall go! but not until I have ascertained whether a man whom Sosthenus followed yesterday, and whom he saw enter one of the taverns of the Villa Publica, is not Phœdra, my father's murderer, the victim I demand of heaven and hell since two years past.'

'Good-bye,' said Vibius, addressing the Vestal and Metellus. 'You have heard and understood me. Reflect and act.'

And the cautious old courtier left the room, muttering to himself: 'By Minerva! one must have prudence. Let us keep clear of these dangerous mysteries. I have got enough already with my unlucky jest about the flies!'

CHAPTER XIII.—THE DAUGHTER OF THE CÆSARS AND THE DAUGHTER OF THE PEOPLE.

Whilst Metellus was narrating his story to Vibius, the divine Aurelia had given orders to send up to her the new slave she had purchased. 'I shall soon see,' she thought, 'whether I must sacrifice this young girl to I don't know what exigencies.'

Cecilia was introduced into the 'cubiculum' where her mistress awaited her coming. The poor child had scarcely recovered from the sufferings she had borne during several months, and from the cruel emotions she had felt during the act of mancipation which separated her forever from her father and her lover, from all who cared for her.

She knew not whose slave she had become, but surmised from Aurelia's magnificent cortege and the splendors of her house, that she must be a wealthy patrician. But she had often heard speak of the refined barbarity of the matrons towards the unfortunate creatures who waited upon them, and she could not help fearing that God had destined her for new trials. She approached Aurelia with respectful deference, but with such evident fear that the latter could not fail to notice it.

'Come nearer,' said kindly the noble girl, placed so high by fate and who was moved by the appearance of the charming creature whom fortune had made her slave; 'come, I am not a very terrible mistress.'

Encouraged by the caressing tone of this sweet voice, Cecilia raised her eyes, and she thanked God in her heart, when she saw the gentle face of Domitian's niece.

'What is your name?' inquired the divine Aurelia.

'Cecilia, madam,' replied the young girl humbly, but without fear this time.

'Say that you have not come here to betray me,' said Aurelia abruptly, and looking her slave full in the face.

'What do you mean, madam?' exclaimed Cecilia, who drew back involuntarily, so surprised she was at this strange question. 'I, betray you! . . .'

'Oh! I knew that could not be!' said the young patrician, noticing the spontaneous movement and evident surprise of the slave. 'Let us see, however,' she added, remembering the remarks of Vibius. 'What did that horrible Regulus say to you when I took you away?'

'Regulus? . . . Regulus?' repeated Cecilia, astonished and hesitating. 'Who is he?'

The young girl did not know her torturer's name.

'Regulus, who stood near the slave-dealer who sold you.'

'Ah! . . . his name Regulus. . . Well, madam, he told me I should be free as soon as I would obey him.'

made it her duty not to divulge the names of his brethren in the religion of Christ? The divine Aurelia remarked her slave's hesitation and felt offended; but she also suspected she motive of her silence.

'Can it be that you are a Christian?' she asked, and there was a certain bitterness in her voice.

'Yes, madam, I am a Christian,' replied Cecilia, who could not suspect what a revelation this simple word contained.

'You are a Christian! Ah! I understand now! But I am not an informer!' cried Aurelia in a tone of reproach. Then a suspicion flashed to her mind.

'How does it happen?' she added, 'that you can be a slave if Flavia Domitilla protected you?'

'I was sold by my father, without Flavia Domitilla's knowledge.'

'By your father?' exclaimed the divine Aurelia. 'But this is dreadful! Ah! I remember now, it was written on the ticket of sale that you are of free condition. It is then true?'

'Yes, madam.'

'And your father sold you. A father may then sell his daughter?'

'It seems so, madam, since the judges have declared that it could be done.'

'The judges! What! judges have said this? But, were you not defended by Pliny-the-Younger?' asked Aurelia, remembering what Vibius had said.

'I do not know, madam. I know that I was brought before the Pretor, and I saw there my father, my betrothed, and other friends who claimed me. I knew also that this man you call Regulus came to tell me, some time after, that there was no hope for me and I was really his slave. But whether or not I was defended by Pliny-the-Younger, I cannot say.'

(To be Continued.)

THE LAND QUESTION OF IRELAND. (FROM TIMES SPECIAL COMMISSIONER.)

No. 7. NENAGH, Aug. 18.

The line from Clonmel to this place, by Limerick, diverges from the valley of the Suir along uplands of no great interest until you reach the little town of Cahir. Here it touches the extreme slopes of the Galtees, and, crossing the valley of Aberlow, runs for miles westward through the Golden Vale. As you advance into this magnificent tract the bounty of Nature seems to increase in proportion to the remoteness of man; the noble pastures become more rich, the signs of good husbandry grow less frequent. No estate from the Limerick Junction to Limerick can be compared to that of Lord Darby as regards the external signs of prosperity; the character of the country is that of marvellous but undeveloped fertility, the broad expanses of radiant verdure are ill-fenced, ill-wooded, and not half-drained, and there is a marked deficiency of good farm buildings. As you draw close to Limerick the usual influences of a large city make themselves felt, cultivation appears more careful and trim; you pass enclosures and market gardens, and the scene is animated with more traces of industry. Tearing from Limerick to the north-east, the train penetrates the lowlands between the Shannon and the high mountain range that divides Tipperary into its two Ridings; and, after going through a district traversed by streams descending to the great river, and in places extending into wet fens, you reach a fine wide plain, surrounded by hills, from the centre of which rise the low roofs, round tower, and steeples of the town of Nenagh. This place is the capital of the North Riding of Tipperary, yet does not differ in any respect from the ordinary small country towns of Munster. It is composed of the usual main street of plain square houses with slated roofs, intersected by streets of the same kind edged on all sides with lanes of mud cabins; and, as often is the case with towns in Ireland, its most conspicuous public buildings besides rather a pretty Court-house and a quaint old bastion, lately repaired and known by the name of the Round of Nenagh—are the large union workhouse, the gaol, and the barracks. The trade of Nenagh is wholly confined to agricultural produce and retail commodities, and the place has rather a decaying aspect. The population, as has been the case with the inland towns of Ireland generally, has declined between 1851 and 1861 from 7,349 to 6,282 souls.

In consequence, doubtless, of the proximity of the abundant quarries at a short distance, slate roofs cover a very great number of houses, but you meet many thatched mud cabins, especially along the skirts of the mountains. Agricultural wages, which at the time of the Devon Commission did not exceed 4s. a week, and were even less, now range from 6s. to 10s.; farm servants living with their employers receive from 10l. to 14l. a year and their food; and, owing probably to the demand for labour in the slate quarries, I heard fewer complaints on this head than when I was at Clonmel. On the whole, the condition of the agricultural labourer at the present time is reasonably good; he appears tolerably well clad and fed; and the immense emigration of this class which has occurred during the last 20 years in this and other parts of the country is fast diminishing, and will soon, probably, cease. The rent of land in the days of Arthur Young varied from 10s. to 25s. the Irish acre; at the period of the Devon Commission it had risen to from 15s. to 55s.; it has only very slightly advanced; and, following the proportion I have before made, I have no doubt that it is now less burdensome than it was 25 or 33 years ago. Although differing in a few particulars, the landed system of this neighbourhood is, nevertheless, essentially the same as that which prevails throughout the country, and is attended by the same general consequences. The great majority of the owners in fee are Protestants, the mass of the farmers being Roman Catholics, and this circumstance, no doubt, causes a certain amount of social antagonism. The few Roman Catholic proprietors, however, that are found are not more liked than their Protestant equals; indeed, some who have been introduced through the operation of the Landed Estates Acts were described to me as being very unpopular. Absenteeism prevails to a considerable extent, and is accompanied by the usual results in serving the occupier from the owner of the soil, though some of the absentee estates are administered upon an equitable system. A large number of moderate-sized estates occurs in this neighbourhood than elsewhere; the owners of them are usually resident, and some are certainly good landlords, but I have heard several condemned as unjust and grinding, and not a few, I believe, are embarrassed and needy.

These conditions of the ownership of the soil, though consistent with a certain amount of prosperity, cannot, even when viewed by themselves, be pronounced to be of a good tendency. Turning to the state of the occupying tenantry, I found it, generally speaking, the same as that in the other places I visited—that is, it is not, on the whole, unprosperous, considered in a material point of view, but there is a great deal to cause just dissatisfaction, and elements of serious disorder are latent. I heard, as usual, some complaints of rack-rents, and instances, as a matter of course, might be cited; but I am satisfied that the land is not, generally rack-rented; with rare exceptions rents have not risen in anything like proportion to prices; and, as a rule, the farmers are well off, many of them having good balances in the banks, the accumulations of years of successful industry. Passing, however, to the circumstances of the occupier's tenure, I met, in rather an aggravated form, the whole train of unfortunate phenomena to which I have already directed attention. The landlords, with few very exceptions, much fewer than in the neighbourhood of Clonmel, have done very little in the way of improvement, and almost everything that during two generations has been added to the value of the soil has been the result of the labour of the tenantry. Yet leases in this district are exceedingly rare, even for the most brief agricultural terms; on some estates they are peremptorily refused, and that sometimes I believe, most unjustly; and thus the class which, in point of fact, has well nigh created the wealth of this neighbourhood has no certain interest in the land in which its capital and industry have been sunk, is liable to be extruded from it at a six months' notice without a shilling of compensation, or may see its legitimate profits siphoned away by a dishonest increase of rent by the landlord. Such a state of things, whatever the cause, is obviously injurious to the general welfare, and makes the tenant a mere dependent, exposed to wrong of every description; and though I am far from saying that the landlords here have abused largely their enormous power, I have been told certainly of some painful instances. Thus it has been said that on some estates notices to quit are regularly served every year in order to give the landlords the means of raising the rate of rent as they please, and I have been informed of cases in which a wretched tenant has been forbidden to remove from mere frivolous whim and caprice; a restriction which, if it were in a contract, would be clearly contrary to public policy, being thus made a condition of tenure. A good deal of coercion, too, has been practised, even of late years, at elections; and when I add that, precarious as they are, the sale of farms held at will is common, that great prices are given for these interests, and yet that the landlords may extinguish them as they please, this order of things must be described as at least being open to fruitful abuses.

I shall not at present discuss the question—reserved till I shall consider hereafter the landed system of Ireland as a whole—to what extent these deplorable anomalies may be charged on landlords or tenants in Ireland, or whether they are not rather due to a complication of unfortunate circumstances. I must here, however, anticipate an objection that is certain to occur to many of your readers. The greater portion of the land of England, probably, is held under tenancies at will merely, and, as this state of things is not fruitful of evil, why should we suppose the result to be different in Ireland? But in the first place, a tenant at will in England receives his farm in good order from his landlord, and, as a rule, never sinks capital in it; the Irish tenants-at-will or their predecessors in most instances have entered holdings that were in a rude, uncultivated state, and have deposited in them the fruits of years of industry. In the second place, the tenant-at-will in England is, speaking generally, a man of substance, who can deal with his landlord at arm's length; in Ireland he is, for the most part, a mere peasant, who can seldom contract on terms of equality. Again, too, the feeling between landlord and tenant in England is more kindly than in Ireland, and more calculated to lead to liberal dealing; and, above all the taking of land in England is regulated in part by local custom and in part by the competition of capital; in Ireland it is still regulated in some degree by the competition of poverty. The case in England is that of a fair partnership in which the partners, if they unite their funds in the common stock, do not confuse their shares, and stand on a footing sufficiently; the case in Ireland is that of an association, in which the weaker party is often practically compelled to expend largely without being able to obtain security for his expense, and has nothing to trust to for a return but the honour or forbearance of the stronger, whose apparent interest is the other way, who is sometimes not well-disposed towards him, and of whom he is usually the mere dependent. The cases, therefore, are essentially different; and to apply principles that, as respects one, may not be attended with tangible evil to the other, which is entirely distinct, is false logic, and may be bad legislation. I proceed to give one or two illustrations of this vicious system in this neighbourhood, taking, probably, a very favourable instance. Close to this town is the fine estate of Mr. St. John O'Brien, well known as one of the most popular of Tipperary landlords and though, unfortunately, usually an absentee, liked by the people and generally respected. His agent, too, bears a high character, and I do not doubt has ever entertained a thought of doing an intentional wrong to a tenant. I walked on the lands as was pleased with them, and entered casually into conversation with the good dame of one of the most substantial occupiers. There was an excellent slated house on the farm that cost probably 1500l.; and this and the adjoining offices had been built, she informed me, out of her marriage portion. The rent

was, and always had been, at a fair value; her husband was merely a tenant-at-will; yet he had never received a penny of compensation, or any equivalent that I could discover, and he had neither a lease nor a prospect of one. I asked why he had been so unwise as to lay out his money on another man's land without a particle of real security. She replied, pointing to a ruined cabin, 'That was all the accommodation when I came here, and a decent couple could not live in it.' I then asked why he had not applied for a lease, and with what tenure he would be satisfied, regard being had to its outlay. She answered that 'Mr. Stafford O'Brien preferred his people to trust to his word; that they did not like to trouble his honour; that, perhaps, his agent and he would not be pleased; that the land would possibly be revalued if an application for a lease were made; and, of course, than a mere 21 years' lease would, in such circumstances, be of no advantage. Things might as well remain as they were, trusting to a gentleman who was good to the tenant and kept faith, unless they could get a term of 50 to 60 years; that would be of real use to them.'

In another case, on the same estate a house worth about 250l. had been built under similar circumstances, and I heard comments of much the same character. Such instances, and I select purposely an estate that bears a good name, deserve, in my judgment, serious attention. Here is a tenant who is actually forced, if he would maintain his wife and family in comfort, to invest his capital in his landlord's land, unless he chooses to run the most doubtful chance of being able to find a farm elsewhere. He adds enormously to the value of the property, the owner and his agent consenting; but he does not obtain any return, except the bare continuance of occupation, and for this, being a yearly tenant, he has not a shadow of security. He is perfectly aware of his precarious position, and would gladly, if he could, be assured a tenure that would restore his outlay or confirm him in the possession to which, until compensated, he has a moral claim; but though his landlord is an upright man, and is deservedly liked in the neighbourhood, he is beset by a vague fear that, if he shall make this equitable request, he may displease the superior he deems at heart, that he may give some unknown offence, that he may bring unpleasant consequences on himself; and he prefers to remain in perilous uncertainty, trusting to 'a word that may be as good as a bond,' but which is neither equally clear or durable, to seeking to procure a guarantee to which he is unquestionably entitled, but the concession of which will, he thinks, be distasteful. Does not such a case throw a light into the recesses of the land system of Ireland, and show how in its existing condition, it works injuriously to the public good, how it may generate ill-will, mistrust, want of confidence, and how it may lead to cruel injustices? And if such things are done in the green trees, what may be done in the dry—if cases like these are of common occurrence on the property of owners who merit esteem, and who would not actively commit a wrong, what may and does happen on estates of which the owners are of a different character, or are tempted by embarrassments to appropriate what in conscience belongs to others? I know it will be replied that all this is theory—that Irish tenants do not care for leases, that they actually like being tenants-at-will—silly planibilities with which ignorance or self-interest endeavour to set aside reason. It is likely enough that many tenants in Ireland in a similar position to the one I have described would never put forward a claim to a lease; nor should I blame them, if they professed themselves dissatisfied with an ordinary term of 21 years. But, notwithstanding some sapient notions to the contrary, Irish nature resembles human nature. It likes reaping where it has sown; it prefers security to ruin and uncertainty; and there is nothing an Irish tenant prizes in the abstract so much as a durable tenure.

The neighbourhood of Nenagh has been free from agrarian crime during several years. Yet in this, as in other parts of the country, the agrarian spirit more or less prevails. Few landlords would, I think, dare to provoke it. It affects perceptibly the management of property. There is a curious equity in this evil spirit which in most instances is respected; the great object of the popular desire being to retain the occupier of land in possession, but subject to a not unreasonable rent, it seldom visits with its vengeance a landlord who evicts a defaulter in this respect, but only those who evict on what is called 'title'—that is, after a notice to quit. This is exactly similar to Trades' Unionism which, like other confederacies, has its standard of right, from which it does not readily deviate, and which assumes the mask of justice as it wags among the peasantry. Here, as elsewhere as I went among the peasantry, I heard of vague demands for 'sixty years' and wild assertions to a kind of right to the soil; but such expressions were not well defined; and in most instances the claim was restricted to a tenant right after the sale of good will, and to an extension of occupation which would give compensation for past improvements. One rash enthusiast said to me boldly, 'We have pulled down the tyrant Church, and we will next pull down the tyrant landlords!' but, as a general rule, I heard the tenant's case put forward in a tolerably rational manner. One very important class of persons was more open or more precise in its philosophy with respect to the Land Question. I have had the honour of being introduced to several heads of the Roman Catholic Church, and these prelates, whenever they touched on the subject, seemed not to have extravagant notions, to appreciate the problem in its various bearings, and to understand the enormous difficulty of solving it on the principle on which it must be settled—respect to existing rights of property. But nearly all the younger Roman Catholic clergy whose ideas on this matter I have endeavoured to ascertain have been more absolute in their tone; have denounced the landlords, as a class, severely; and have declared, with remarkable unanimity, that nothing ought to content the tenant save a perpetual or very long interest, at a rent to be adjusted by the State. This language, from the lips of men who possess extraordinary influence over the people, is significant whether it is the genuine expression of sentiment or the result of a class unhappily during many years not a little hostile to Irish landlords, and too prone to involve them in a sweeping condemnation.

THE IRISH UNIVERSITY QUESTION. (From the London Tablet.)

If we had only read the comments which most of the daily papers have been making on the resolutions of the Irish Episcopate, we should never guess that the demands of the latter were anything else than what the Pall Mall Gazette says they are—'to legislate to regulate all public education in Ireland.' Nothing less could account for all the withering denunciations of such attempts as these to bring the State under bondage to the Church. Let us see what it is that is snubbed as so hopeless and impracticable a demand. The bishops begin by laying down the axiom that mixed education is a bad thing, and inconsistent with Catholic principles, and they appeal with confidence to the known sentiments of a Catholic nation to oppose, by any constitutional means, the extension and the perpetuation of the system. They go on to say that Catholic parents have a right to procure, as far as possible, for their children a good secular education. Moreover, that if a Catholic education does not start fair with other competitors in the race, religious equality cannot be said to have any real existence. The bishops have learnt that Her Majesty's present advisers intend 'to legislate for Ireland in accordance with the wishes of its people' and they declare their conviction that the vast majority of the nation will be satisfied with nothing short of a 'complete system of education, based upon religion.' Now, supposing Government to have made up its mind to provide this, two courses are

open to it. The one is to give a legal and independent status to the Catholic University, which would be equivalent, as far as the State was concerned, to founding a new university. Even this, we should imagine, would not be so very monstrous a proposition in a country where the vast majority is Catholic. But, as a matter of fact, the bishops have asked much less. They have expressed their willingness to accept a Catholic college in a national university, to whose honor and emoluments all religions alike should have access, on the condition that they, like others, should be fairly represented in the governing body. It is hard to see how a demand could well be more moderate, unless, indeed, it is outrageous presumption to hope that any provision will be made of which the mass of the nation can avail itself, and unless all schemes will be refused consideration which are in any way acceptable to the majority. It is all very well to say that to comply with the desires of the Catholic Irish is impossible, because the Protestants of England and Scotland will not bear of money being voted for Catholic purposes, but we fail to see in what respect any principle would thus be touched that is not already sacrificed by the existence of denominational gms in England. To say that the wishes of two-thirds of the United Kingdom are to override the wishes of the other third, is an argument which would have been just as valid for the retention of the Church Establishment as for that of the educational system. It is therefore imperative on those who argue thus to assume that a compliance with the Bishops' demands would give them a control over the minds of future generations, and an influence quite independent of the voluntary consent of the laity. We have stated on a former occasion what we believed would be the answer of the laity, if consulted, but, as far as the requirements of the Bishops go, they expressly disclaim any desire to interfere with the rights of other denominations to such education as it may please them to adopt. It is true that they assert, and justly so, that for the measure to be complete, the Queen's Colleges should be remodelled on the denominational principle; but there is nothing in the seventh resolution at all incompatible with the existence in the National University, alongside the denominational colleges, of a totally 'sectarian' college for such persons as prefer a 'Godless' education. It is, therefore, totally untrue to say that their claims are in the least of a despotic character, or that they point to anything which can in any case be termed a 'Catholic' instead of a Protestant ascendancy.

The real truth is, that many people who have been obliged to recognize the fact that Ireland is a Catholic country cannot bear to give up the idea that by a judicious system of education, it may possibly be made a little less Catholic. There is no other way of accounting for the outcry against denominational education in Ireland which we hear from those who are its strenuous supporters in England. The doctrinaire Liberals who would wish to see it banished from England are equally of course more consistent, but they are equally open to the objection that they insist upon administering Irish affairs in accordance with English tastes. It is of no use to argue that it is an intolerable thing that the State should be asked to assist the Irish in obtaining higher education, based upon religion; the question is whether the mass of the Irish nation desires it, and that it does so is not in the least disproved by the fact that Catholics have used Trinity College more extensively than the Catholic University. What is really proved is that there is a vast number of people to whom it is of urgent importance to obtain degrees which are recognized in law. If the Catholic University had obtained a charter when it was applied for, we have no doubt that the propositions would have been exactly reversed. And the further conclusion which we may draw is how extremely oppressive it must be to refuse a legal status and legal power to grant degrees to the University which is so eminently national that the nation has established it at its own expense.

In the remarks which we have made upon the tone of the English press on this subject we have already stated, especially had in view the daily papers, and we feel bound to make a particular exception in favor of the Saturday Review which frankly admits that the demands of the Irish bishops are not so unreasonable after all. Our contemporary also recognizes that Ireland is a Catholic country and observes that that it may be as well 'to legislate so far as we can do so without injustice to other sects or injury to the public, on the assumption that it is such. We crave permission to go a little further. Not long as we legislate for Ireland only upon what are our own ideas of what is good for her, instead of considering in the first place what it is that Ireland wishes, so long must we expect that the sister country will refuse to believe that we have anything but our own interest in view.

CRIME IN ENGLAND AND CRIME IN IRELAND—A CONTRAST.

While some of the English papers, metropolitan and provincial, are pointing to agrarian murders in Ireland—the only murders committed—they ignore altogether the frightful fact of the rapid increase of every species of crime in this country. Take up any daily paper published in London for the last fortnight, and you will be actually surfeited with pictures of revolting crime: of every shape and form. Murder and suicide, infanticide, burglary, stabbing, shooting, drowning, and a variety of unmentionable forms of crime. Look at the reports of the police courts and divorce courts in England. Let our English censurers look at it, and let their heads for shame. No one, God knows, with a spark of manly feeling could palliate assassination or cold-blooded murder, whether the victim be a tyrant landlord or a tyrant of another kind; but we must and shall ever rebel with all the force of our nature, the slander that would ascribe to Ireland a land of murderers! Landlords have been shot in Ireland, and will probably be still shot down until a wise, effective, and strong law steps in to protect the lives of hundreds who are driven daily to death and destruction, and concerning whom scarcely a word of sympathy is spoken by the English press. The murder of a landlord is accounted a terrible crime (and so it is), but the slow and torturing crucifixion of hundreds of human souls—this is not murder! No! it is only asserting the rights of property.

With the exception of agrarian offences, Ireland is almost free from crime. In the relations of married life, there is never seen such diabolical transpiring as what is seen in this country. Mothers in Ireland do not smother their offspring, or poison or neglect them that they may obtain the burial fees. Husbands do not act as Priests towards their wives; and seldom, indeed, are there instances of the father murdering his son, or the son murdering his father. All the touches of the sublime and beautiful 'human nature belong to virtuous and moral England—that paradise of private judgment and woman beating. Poor priest-ridden Ireland, where Pat is absolved from his sins of commission and omission! harken to the voice of your accuser! List to the taunts of the liar, the libellous, and the reprobate, who takes up the stone to cast it at your head! We know something of this country, for we have travelled not a little of it; and we would rather Ireland was sunk fifty fathoms below the level of the sea, her race extinct, her language lost, and every vestige of her existence destroyed, than witness her swimming in such a seething pool of moral filth and abomination as this kingdom. Touch my dog, and you touch me, says the sportsman as his arm is raised to protect his faithful companion. Touch our country, and you touch us; and we should be more cold than the coldest living reptile that crawled the earth if we did not strike down the liars that libel our country and slander our race. We have no quarrel with Englishmen as a body. We can and will their burly bulk betimes in standing up for