

(Continued from third page.)

and the interior working of his mind you must judge by the imperfect aid of the facts which are before you, and grope your way to a just inference as best you can. One thing I shall make clear—that no Bible or Testament was brought to the lodging of Father Petcherine at his request or with his privacy. And if this were so, how is he answerable for the matters subsequent, even if you should believe that, in the mass of books, a Bible and Testament were really consumed? If, as is conceivable, in the great bundles which have been described, one or two books, wholly different in their character from the rest, found their way to the chapel yard, the traverser is not accountable, unless he knew that they were there. And there is no proof that he knew anything of the sort; that he examined the bundles at all; that he did not, as he may fairly be supposed to have done, assume that the books sent were such as he had denounced, and deal with them accordingly. Still more, there is not a particle of evidence that at his lodging, before the bundles were removed, or when they were removed, there was amongst them either a Bible or a Testament. But pass from the lodging and come to the chapel yard, and remember that it was an open place—people going in and out continually—a crowd assembled—some Catholics and some Protestants—every one entering who pleased;—and, remember more, that the books remained there upon the ground, within reach of every creature in the throng, for some half hour before Father Petcherine arrived, and that during such a considerable period there was nothing to prevent the casting of any book upon the heap by any person. Are you prepared to make Father Petcherine answer for acts done in his absence? Are you prepared to say, that the acts which give colour to this prosecution were not so done? Can any man of you, with cool judgment and safe conscience, venture to say so? And if you cannot, is not your duty plain? I care not whether the books in question—two books only—found, even on the assumption that you entirely rely on the evidence of the witnesses, one on the top of one barrow, and one on the top of the other, I care not whether they were put on those places by Catholic or by Protestant, by a foolish friend or an astute enemy of Father Petcherine,—he is not responsible for the act. The Attorney-General has spoken of religious fanaticism—unfortunately, it has prevailed much in the world, and wrought deadly mischief to the best interests of the human race; and it is not confined to one religion or another, but, from time to time, has manifested itself in all. Now, if an over-zealous Protestant, believing he would do his religion service by blackening the fair fame of his fellow-man, because that man was a Catholic Priest, and so bringing odium upon the Catholic Church, which he had been taught to hate with a depth of malice in precise proportion to his vulgar ignorance of her tenets and her spirit—if such a person, remembering the ingenious devices, the saintly forgeries, and the pious frauds, which, from time to time, have been exhibited amongst us, deemed it no harm to seize his opportunity on that dark November morning, and put the Bible and Testament quietly upon the barrow, will you make my client answerable for that? Or, if, on the other hand, a Catholic thought fit to cast them there—And there are Catholics, who have been roused to answer scorn with scorn, and hatred with defiance, and stung to fierce retaliation by the sectarian outrages, which darken the annals of our time—by continual slanders against all they deem most venerable, upon the Priesthood and the Prelacy, and the holy women who have given their lives to Charity and Heaven—by outrage upon the effigy and pollution of the name of the Pontiff, whom they revere as the chief of their Church and Christ's Vicar upon earth—by insult to the images of their canonised Saints, and the Mother of their Redeemer,—by impious assaults upon the Cross itself, and sacrilegious desecration in the open day of the Holy of Holies, before which they worship with trembling love and awful reverence! Action provokes reaction: strife breeds strife—and whilst good and wise men bear with each other, and agree to differ, and live in harmony, and exhibit mutual deference, respect, and kindness, sectarian hatred is still our shame and curse, and prompts to deeds as evil as that which was committed, if to the chapel yard of Kingstown the Protestant zealot brought a Bible and a Testament that he might jeopardise a Catholic Priest, and disgrace the Catholic Church, or if they were brought by a zealot on the other side, to prove his contempt and scorn for the religion of his Protestant countrymen, I repeat, you must exhaust the reasonable possibilities of the case before you dream of imputing guilt to the accused; and I have made these suggestions that you may see how grievous would be the wrong if you should visit on Father Petcherine the consequences of the acts which may have been done by others in his absence, even should you reach the conclusion that there was any burning of a Bible or a Testament at all. Now gentlemen, let me invite your attention to the evidence of the crown; and I hope to demonstrate to you, by adverting to the statements of the successive witnesses, that, if you are asked to convict in this case, you will be asked to do the most monstrous thing that ever was demanded at the hands of a jury in a court of justice. Do you remember the evidence of the boy Duff? He gave it simply, and I think, truthfully. I ask you to consider it, and to say whether on that evidence alone I am not entitled, in common fairness, to your verdict? One thing is very observable in this case. The charge is a charge of wilful and blasphemous destruction of the Sacred Scriptures, and the imputation against Father Petcherine is this, that it was his design and desire to bring into contempt the Christianity of this land by destroying the book of God. Gentlemen of the jury, my learned friend, the Attorney-General, referred the court to two cases, and to an old authority, which I entirely adopt as expounding truly the common law. He referred to two cases tried before judges, as eminent and learned as any that ever sat on a bench, and he referred to these cases for the purpose of instituting a parallel between them and this. But I tell you, that, if the Attorney-General had been disposed to give me an opportunity of contrast he could not have done better than by reference to those cases. What was the case in Londonderry? The charge there was of open, audacious, contumelious destruction of the Scriptures. There was no concealment, nor any pretence of concealment. The very judgment, which my learned friend read, speaks of words of contempt for the Sacred Scriptures, demonstrating the intention. Who the person was who committed that offence I do not know; but it would appear that he was not a Christian at all. Whether he was or not, does not matter much. He was a man going out openly, resolutely, with the full knowledge of what he was about, and in the face of the public burning the Scriptures, and proclaiming to the world that he burned them in the spirit of contempt. Is that case anything like this? I say it is quite the converse of it. Some such case the crown should have established if they expected a conviction. It is no trifling thing to impute blasphemy to a Minister of God—it is no light thing to impute it to a Catholic Priest; although he is, as I have said, a Priest, clinging to his religion with all the energy of his understanding and all the devotion of his heart: I have discussed the Mayo case. The case in Londonderry was the same, the case of a man, openly and without concealment, and contemptuously—burning the Sacred Scriptures. That is not this case—it is the converse of this case. And now what is the case the crown have proved? Will my learned friend, who is to speak hereafter—will he tell you that this is like the cases referred to by his leaders? Will he tell you that it is free from doubt and obscurity? I say to you that before this trial ends my client's innocence shall be as clear as the sun's light at noonday. But will my learned friend venture to put it to you that you can with safe conscience convict the traverser? Now, what is the evidence? You heard my cross-examination of the little boy. One of you asked a question that was more to the point than any which I put. What is his testimony? What story does

he tell? On his evidence alone I claim your acquittal of my client; independently of the evidence which I shall offer on the other side. I am here for a man accused of an offence, which, though not punishable with the last punishment of the law, is an offence, in his circumstances and position—as formidable to him—in the mere imputation of it—as any that can be imagined. I have not to make my case; it was the duty of the counsel for the crown to make out theirs. Every man is entitled when he comes into a court of justice in the capacity of a traverser to say—up to this hour I am entirely innocent—up to this hour no tribunal constituted with power to judge me has pronounced me guilty, and the law of the land declares me wholly free from stain or imputation. He is entitled to say to the crown—as I now say—"Make out your case; you wish to set aside the presumption of the law, and to establish guilt against a subject of the Queen—establish it beyond a doubt." There is no evidence that Father Petcherine ever examined the books which he directed to be brought to him. He desired those books to be taken out of his room—they were heaped into a wheelbarrow, and when this was done there is not a particle of evidence upon which you can act that there was a Bible or Testament in any of the bundles. The little boy said, at first, that he thought there was something like a Testament amongst them. He spoke of a particular book which he did not open, but which he said was like a Testament. Will my learned friend press it upon you that this is evidence, that, at the moment when those books were taken from the lodging of Father Petcherine, there was a Bible or Testament among the books? There is no pretence for saying that the little volume which the boy saw lying on the wheelbarrow was a Testament at all; and is it possible that you can be insulted by being asked to take it as proved that there was a book of that description there upon the occasion? I do not believe the crown will press that case. The books are put upon the barrows—a number of boys are about the barrows, and, I repeat, there is no evidence that Father Petcherine, when they were taken away, had made any examination of them at all. The books were burned some forty yards from the public street, and it would occur to any one that, if the traverser's intention had been to offend any member of the community, he would have selected a place more suitable to such a purpose for manifest it, that, for the purpose of knowing that the Bibles were burned—if they were burned—a person must have chosen to walk in from the street and institute an inquiry into the matter. We have evidence that half an hour elapsed after the books had left the house before Father Petcherine arrived at the yard, and in the meantime men and women were passing through it, and it was competent, as I have said, for any one in the crowd—Protestant or Catholic—I care not which for the purpose of my argument—to have cast any book he pleased upon the barrows or the fire. And now, gentlemen, pause and ask yourselves what security would there be for any one if Father Petcherine should be held responsible on such evidence for what might have happened during his absence? What safety would there be for any man, Catholic or Protestant, if on evidence like that a traverser is to be condemned for the crime another person might have committed entirely without his knowledge? If any man—I cannot too often press the question—a zealot on one side or the other—cast a Bible on that heap of books, is the Rev. Mr. Petcherine to be made answerable for the act? He goes to the vestry, and it does not appear that he looked at the books in the yard, or any one of them, or was in a position to judge what books were there at all. I ask you as reasonable men to regard the evidence, and say if you can believe that there was anything in his conduct to lead justly to the conclusion that he knew anything of the presence of Bibles or Testaments in the place? One person said the fire was lit before, and another after, he went away; but this matters very little. The question is, what books were burned, and intended to be burned? The question is, whether, having directed immoral books to be destroyed, Father Petcherine knew that there were Bibles or Testaments among those which were, in fact, destroyed? It is impossible, gentlemen of the jury, in any fair or rational view of the case, to dream of convicting my client on the evidence produced for the crown. What happened after he went into the vestry? In about twenty minutes or half an hour he returned to the chapel yard;—and even by the evidence of Duff and the others it does not appear that on that second occasion, when he came out into the yard, he saw what books were there, or could have seen them, for they were burning for half an hour before. So that the transactions of the chapel do not help the case for the prosecution in the least degree, for the same knowledge which Father Petcherine had of the books when he left his lodgings, and that only, he had when they were consumed. That books were burned is certain; but, I reiterate the question, were Bibles or Testaments burned among them—and if so, had Father Petcherine any knowledge of the fact? Are you satisfied that there were Bibles or Testaments burned on that occasion, and if there were, that Father Petcherine destroyed them, or authorised their destruction, abundant opportunity having been afforded for persons of different classes, positions, and religious belief to bring them to the fire without his knowledge? Is it possible for you to come to such a conclusion? What is the rest of the evidence for the crown? Take it "in globo," and it does not advance the case for the prosecution one jot. If the counsel could have offered tenfold the evidence they have produced, and a thousand bits of the Bible or Testament, the question still remains, who put that Bible or Testament there? And unless it be satisfactorily proved that it was done by Father Petcherine, you cannot as an honest jury think of convicting him. My learned friend suggests that if Father Petcherine authorised the burning of the Bible he would be guilty of the offence. I admit if he authorised, or assented, or was a party to the putting of the Bible there, he would be open to the imputation; but that is just the turning point of the case, on which, I aver, he will be entitled to your acquittal—For what reason is there to say that between the coming in of the books and the arrival of Father Petcherine—even assuming there were Bibles there—he authorised, directed, or assented to the act? The whole of the evidence amounts to this—that there were a Bible and a Testament in the chapel yard—I cannot find that there were any other copies than those discovered then, but there were bits of a Bible found on the day after, and passed round from hand to hand in Kingstown for the inspection of the curious. It will be for you to say if you are satisfied on that point; but if Father Petcherine designed to burn the Bible, and bring it and Christianity into contempt, he took the oddest way possible to do it, for the scene of the burning was not an open place, and no person came there who had not a suspicion of what was contemplated, or who was not directed to come, and pick up information; or if he desired to burn the Bible contemptuously, or in scorn of Christianity, or of any Church, would he not have directed the people to bring in many copies of it, which must be numerous enough in Kingstown? The object was, to burn immoral books; and I ask you, as fair, impartial, and honest men, acting upon evidence, and according to your oath, to scout the notion that his purpose was to burn the Bible. If he intended to do what is alleged against him he might have got fifty copies of the Protestant version, easily enough for the purpose in a place where Biblical propaganda is so common as in Kingstown. Witness after witness has been produced to prove that one Bible and one Testament were seen. Come first the Messrs. Lawson, and their evidence at the most is, that on the top of the barrows, as I understood, there lay a Bible and a Testament—on the top of one barrow a Bible, and on the top of another a Testament. That is a circumstance worthy of serious consideration. They were on the top of the barrows—not hidden or mixed up with the other books, but on the top of them, precisely, in the place where a person would put them, if that person wished that they should be found—

The second Mr. Lawson was an unsatisfactory witness as I ever saw. You heard his evidence, and saw how difficult it was to get an answer from him whenever he thought it might be employed for the benefit of the man whom he came to convict and condemn. You remember what he said when he was asked how he knew it was the New Testament to which he swore so roundly. Oh, he said, the Testament was new. (Laughter.) What was his notion of the New Testament as distinguished from the Old Testament? He said it was the New Testament, and when pressed again he repeated that he knew it was the New Testament, because it was new. (Laughter.) He said that on the evening of the day in question he met Hutchins (there was some strange sympathy between them), and they came to that particular place on that particular occasion to make a particular inquiry. Do you believe what he says, that they did not talk about the books when they met? Then Mr. Charles Lawson goes next day to look for evidence; and people that seek sometimes can find, for they know where the thing they look for has been left.—Then you have a number of people brought to prove that they found bits of a Bible and Testament, and among them the Rev. Mr. Wallace, who preaches a sermon against the Redeemist Fathers, and writes letters in *Saunders's News-Letter* under false signatures, and shifts his mask with malignant dexterity to prejudice the case against the accused. And those bits of a Bible or Testament are produced for the purpose, I suppose, of showing that a multitude of Bibles and Testaments were burned. Even if that were the case—if 50 copies of the Bible had been burned, would that prove that the act was done by the direction or with the knowledge of the traverser? I am certain, gentlemen of the jury, that you are not satisfied with this part of the case, or that you have reached the conclusion that the crown have sustained their charge against my client. Let us take the whole of these witnesses—Mr. Dorking, Mr. Hutchins, the Messrs. Lawson, Mr. Wallace, and Mr. Synge, and Mrs. Whittle—and it will be found they are as odd a family party as ever was met with. I will not say there was management or collusion in the transaction; you will judge of that; but it is perfectly plain that all the witnesses are moved by the same spirit and the same feeling, and have the one purpose and object, and somehow or other they have marvelously come to the same conclusion upon a consideration of the one book divided into a multitude of pieces. It strikes my humble judgment, with all respect for you, that you must believe there were but the one Bible and the one Testament in the chapel yard, whoever put them there. And I repeat—for it cannot be too often repeated—that the very fact that there was only one Bible and one Testament is proof triumphant and conclusive that Father Petcherine never could have desired to burn them for the purpose of insulting the Protestant religion, or any other religion. Neither Mr. Dorking nor the policeman speaks as to bits of Bibles, but they both distinctly swear that on the tops of the barrows there was only one Bible and one Testament. Neither of them conveys to you the slightest reason for thinking that Father Petcherine had acted or part, directly or indirectly, by himself or any human being under his counsel or control, in putting the Bible or Testament on top of the one barrow or the other. The policeman most distinctly corroborates what I think is the material part of the evidence of Dorking, that the chapel yard was open for the admission of all who chose to enter. It is proved there was a crowd, and Halpin said, and Dorking said also, that it was perfectly in the power of any one of those who stood by to cast a Bible and Testament where they were found. Beyond that they leave the case of the crown precisely where it was left by Duff; they allow you to grope about, to imagine, to speculate, and to suspect as to the person who put the Bible and Testament on the heap. The only remaining witness for the crown is certainly one of remarkable character, a man whose evidence is inconsistent with all the other evidence in the case, a religious gentleman to whom I adverted before, who says he has had nothing to do with the getting up of this prosecution, and is not "zealous or interested in it." I will not ask your attention to his assaults upon his fellow-man—to his publication of his sermon while he knew the trial was pending, and that it was likely to do injury to the accused. But I will ask your attention to this, that Mr. Wallace told you, most distinctly, he did not believe he prejudged the cause, or had done any one thing to affect my client injuriously in the slightest degree; and then you heard him admit to you, he could not deny it, that he preached and published a sermon, declaring to the world that the Redeemist Fathers had publicly burned the Bible in Kingstown. How could he sit in that chair and look you in the face, and tell you that he had preached and published that sermon, and yet that he had not done a wrong to my client, or anything to prejudice his case? Only preach a sermon to a large congregation—only inflame their passions as fiercely as you can—only pronounce that to be a fact which is fiction—only tell those who may be jurors, or have friends on the jury, that the man who is to be tried is a guilty man—do all that, and you do not prejudice or injure him! And if all be not sufficient to secure conviction, publish your sermon, and circulate hundreds and thousands of copies, condemning the accused, and still say you have not done him wrong. Gentlemen, I do not like to assail any man, and least of all a Clergyman of any Church. But what am I to say to the evidence which has thus been given? The Rev. Mr. Wallace has sworn to you as positively as he could that he came to the chapel yard at a quarter-past ten o'clock on the morning in question, and that, standing outside the gate, about forty yards from the spot where the fire had been, he saw a little boy kicking into the fire what appeared to him to be small Bibles. It is quite impossible my client can be affected by that evidence; for no one can rely upon it. But I ask you to consider it in relation to the rest of the case, and I ask you to come to this conclusion, even giving Mr. Wallace credit for an intention to speak truly; that he has not, in fact, told the truth in a case in which his passion and prejudice have been excited to such an extent as to lead him into error. If he be correct in swearing there were many Bibles, where were they, I ask you, when Dorking, and the policeman, and the Lawsons, and Mrs. Whittle were in the yard? If, instead of one Bible and Testament there were a heap of them, do you think they would have escaped the attention of the astute and ingenious Lawson? Do you believe the policeman, whose habits and duties accustom him to accurate observation, would not have seen them? I say there is no sane man, who considers fairly all the facts of the case, who must not decide that Mr. Wallace's evidence contradicts all the other evidence. He fixed himself in his information, and again in his testimony to-day, to a particular hour, half-past ten o'clock, and at that time he says that there were books unconsumed—that the boys were kicking Bibles into the fire wholesale. The policeman swears that at nine o'clock all were burnt; that the remains were smouldering in the fire, and that nothing remained but a few scattered leaves. Upon this part of the case the evidence of the Rev. Mr. Wallace is to be specially noted, not merely because I utterly disprove it by the other evidence, but because its nature and character explain the entire of the case, and show you that there is contrivance or collusion in it, or management or fraud; or that men have been so animated by factious virulence and sectarian passion that they have induced themselves to believe that which is not true. Recurring to my original position, I say that this accusation has had its origin, not from the act of Father Petcherine, not because he did anything that would give even a colour or pretext for the charge against him, but because the minds of many people are so full of the grossest prejudice and prepossession, that they give to proceedings, the most innocent, a complexion and effect which, under other circumstances, no human being ever would have dreamt of. My learned friend, the Attorney-General, opening this case with great ability, stated that

if the exhortations of the Rev. traverser were merely to bring in books of an immoral tendency, there would be no wrong done, and no cause of complaint; and it is monstrous to say that, if such they were, anything that occurred afterwards, either at his lodgings or in the chapel yard, made him responsible for burning a Bible, of the existence of which there is no evidence to show that he had any knowledge under the sun. A great and grave question for your consideration is the question of intention. First you have the question of fact—whether there is one particle of testimony on which you can rely fixing the traverser with knowledge or consciousness in the slightest manner of the burning of the Bible?—That is the first question, and on that question I confidently expect your verdict. On the second question in evidence I shall address myself to the observations of the Attorney-General, and I shall prove conclusively that the state of things which he supposed as possible to exist is the very state of things which, in fact, existed—that my client in his sermon referred to no Bible, but spoke simply, and solely, and exclusively, of immoral books, and nothing else—and that he never, directly or indirectly, by suggestion, by advice, by counsel, or command, required any man under his control to bring in any book except an immoral book. If I prove this to you, surely there is an end to the case. Even without that proof, I believe the matter is concluded on the evidence of the prosecutors. With that proof, I know not how the Crown can venture to press the case at all. The material question here regards the purpose of the accused, and on that question you can judge only by acts and conduct. It is only for the All-seeing God to determine, with full knowledge, and absolute certainty what is the interior working of the souls of His creatures; but you must consider here whether or not the acts of my client should lead you to one conclusion or the other, and if I prove to you those acts—by his conduct and by his counsel—that he never countenanced, approved, encouraged, or abetted the burning of a Bible, it will be your bounden duty, as honest men, to give him your verdict. These, as it seems to me, are the main considerations in this case. I have stated them to you at length, too great length, but you will pardon me. I repeat that my interest in the result is deep, because I think my client worthy of that interest. My interest is deep, also, because I believe that in the issue of this trial there is more than my client's personal protection—far more—involved. I think that issue, if it be an acquittal, not on legal technicalities, or on the assertion of strict legal right, but an acquittal because you are morally satisfied of the innocence of the traverser, will do an incalculable amount of good. It will correct error and soothe down passion, and harmonise the people of this divided land. The whole matter is before you. You have a great responsibility and a solemn duty. If I have succeeded in mastering prejudice and removing prepossession, and inducing you to look at the case in its simplicity and in its truth, the result I feel to be absolutely certain. I ask you merely to apply to it the common principles of justice which protect the meanest man charged with the basest felony. I ask you confidently to say, that there is no case against my client. I ask you to declare, that the proof of the prosecutor has failed—failed utterly—in connecting him with the fact which you must find and the intention which must be demonstrated, before a hair of his head can be brought into peril. Be faithful in the discharge of your high function; act without fear and without favor; vindicate the law and establish the immunity of innocence; and though faction may rage around the traverser, and sectarian hatred raven for his prey, and slanders spit its "poison-spume" upon him, do equal justice between the crown and the accused, and make this day memorable in our country's annals by demonstrating that, although he is a stranger, tried before men of another blood and race—although he is a Catholic Priest and some of you are Protestants—he has not erred in committing his liberty and his honour to the protection of a jury of Irish gentlemen.

The learned gentleman's address occupied three hours, and the conclusion of it was greeted with loud bursts of applause again and again repeated, notwithstanding the efforts made by the officers of the court to repress it.

The court then adjourned.

SATURDAY.

The trial of the case against the Rev. Father Petcherine was resumed at the sitting of the court on Saturday morning. As on the previous day, the neighborhood of the court, and every avenue leading to it, was occupied by anxious crowds from an early hour. The interior of the court itself was also densely thronged in every part. The deep interest felt in the proceedings was rather increased than otherwise.

Shortly after ten o'clock the judges took their seats on the bench. The Rev. Mr. Petcherine, accompanied by several of his friends, and by his agents, arrived some time before, and was received with the warmest marks of respect and veneration by the assembled crowds inside and outside of the court.

Counsel on both sides having taken their seats, and the Clerk of the Crown having called over the jury.

The first witness called for the defence was, Mr. James Caulfield, who was examined by Sir Colman O'Loughlin, Q.C. He said—I am a Roman Catholic residing at Kingstown; recollects the time the mission of the Redeemist Fathers was going on.

Counsel—Were you present at any of Father Petcherine's sermons?

Witness—Yes, I heard several. Were you present at the sermon in which he spoke of immoral publications?

The Attorney-General—If it is proposed to go into evidence of what the traverser stated in his sermons, your lordship will see that there are many grounds on which this evidence is inadmissible.

Judge Crampton—It is quite impossible to receive any such evidence.

Mr. O'Hagan—Under these circumstances your lordship will permit me to consult with my colleagues as to the course I am to adopt, for the objection of the Crown takes us entirely by surprise.

Mr. Justice Crampton—Surely, you are not easily taken by surprise.

The learned counsel then retired, and returned to court in about twenty minutes, when

Mr. O'Hagan said—My lords, I have consulted with my colleagues, and we have come to a decision in this case. My lords, I have nothing more to say than this—let the crown take its course—let the court take its course—we offer no evidence, and abide the decision of the jury.

The Attorney-General—As the traverser has offered no evidence, I don't consider it necessary to call upon my learned friend and colleague, the Solicitor-General, to offer any observations on the case.

Baron Greene then charged the jury.

THE VERDICT—ACQUITTAL OF FATHER PETCHERINE.

During the absence of the jury in this case the utmost anxiety was manifested to learn the result of their deliberations, though there seemed to be little room for doubt of what it would be. All eyes were turned to the jury box, and their return with the verdict was awaited with the most breathless expectation. At twenty minutes to three o'clock they came into court, and the foreman handed down the issue paper.

The Clerk of the Crown, having called over the names of the jury, asked—"What say you, gentlemen?" "That the Rev. Vladimir Petcherine is NOT GUILTY."

Upwards of five thousand dollars have been already subscribed in Boston and in its vicinity for the spread of Protestantism in Ireland and in response to the appeals of Rev. Messrs. Arthur and Scott, the Wesleyan deputations from there.