

Tenant Right Manifesto.—Messrs. John Francis Maguire and O'Donoghue, have just issued a long manifesto, addressed to Mr. Cardwell, for the instruction of that gentleman in his promised legislative efforts towards a satisfactory settlement of the Irish land question.—"We can see but one practical mode of effecting the object—namely, that there should be no eviction save for non-payment of rent. We hold that no tenant should be liable to eviction who paid, or was willing to pay, the rent which he had assumed; or who, where a demand was made upon him to pay an increased rent, was willing to pay such rent as, in case of dispute as to its fairness, should be settled by arbitration, or on appeal to some competent tribunal. Now, Sir, this, which we are impelled, by considerations of what we believe to be sound policy, to suggest, if not to demand, is what is practically and ordinarily carried out on every wisely and well managed estate in Ireland; and we cannot see what hardship there would be in compelling owners of property who, from one motive or another, are inclined to act capriciously, harshly, or cruelly towards their tenants, to adopt that system of justice and fair dealing which is the rule with the wise, the good, and the humane—the more particularly so in the case of the tenant, who is almost inevitable consequence of a system of management in accordance with the unfailing instincts of human justice and the eternal laws of God. Compensation for improvements on and in the soil should be granted in a liberal spirit, such as would stimulate the energies of a naturally industrious race, and draw forth the hidden stores of the thrifty and the frugal, from the present state of the law debarred from that enterprise which, if rightly protected, would, while affording them the largest return for their money, also add materially to the wealth of the community. The mass of the peasantry are content to dwell in miserable hovels; but give them security against eviction—in other words, beggary—and guarantee them the value of their houses or other buildings, in the shape of compensation, in case of a final settlement of accounts, and you will see long bear of an architectural revival in the homes of the Irish peasantry. Compensation for substantial or permanent improvements should be limited only by their actual value at the time they were given up by the tenant; for to say that a man who builds a house and out-offices is to have no compensation after the enjoyment of a certain number of years, is to throw an obstacle in the way of those who would desire to erect solid and enduring structures. As improvements in the soil are even more essential than improvements on the soil, it is in the highest degree important that compensation for such improvements should be comprehensive in its character, simple in its operation, and generous in its amount. But much as we desire to secure an honest system of compensation for such improvements as really tend to the better cultivation of the soil, and the increased decency and comfort of the dwellings of the tenant and laboring classes, we cannot disguise from ourselves the conviction of the inefficiency, almost uselessness, of any Bill which does not provide some substantial remedy for the paramount evil of arbitrary eviction; and we trust you will pardon us if we may have seemed to dwell upon this branch of the subject with undue earnestness—knowing as we do, that it is the one of all others to which the anxious attention of the friends of the Irish tenant is most constantly directed. You will further excuse us if we remind you that your proposed legislation is certain to involve the interests, not merely of a class, not even of one country, but of the whole empire. An honest and wise measure can alone content those whose hopes have been frequently excited, and as often disappointed, and to whom Minister after Minister, and Government after Government, have solemnly promised, though in vain, that justice should be done to their long standing claims. The present is a moment eminently suited to conciliation and kindness. The cordial and earnest sympathy of the people of Ireland—the vast majority of whom are tillers of the soil—was never so essential to the power and influence of England as it is at this crisis in European affairs, when so many nations are agitated by angry passions, and the slightest rumor of a new complication is sufficient to paralyze trade and commerce, and fill Governments and communities with suspicion or alarm." The reply of Mr. Cardwell is as brief and uncommunicative as his correspondents could have reasonably expected:—

"Irish-office, Nov. 5, 1859.
 "Dear Sir,—I beg to acknowledge the receipt of the letter which you and The O'Donoghue have done me the honor to address to me. You ask me for an answer at my earliest convenience, not desiring, I am sure, that I should enter upon a discussion of the subject, or that I should anticipate the statement which Her Majesty's Government may think it right to make to Parliament, but only that I should assure you of my having received the letter and enclosure, and made myself acquainted with the views which you express in it. "EDWARD CARDWELL.
 "J. F. Maguire, Esq., M.P."

Tenant Right.—Mr. Sherman Crawford has addressed a letter to Lord Derby on this subject. Referring to the threatened evictions on his lordship's estates at Doon, the former says:—"I maintain that the landlord of the present day has not a commission to act the autocrat, and to revive the extreme power of the feudal tyranny of ages long past, over the abject slaves of serfdom." He calls upon Lord Derby, "to put his shoulder to the wheel, and to secure both himself and the legislature from the stigma of having taught the people of Ireland a knowledge of a wrong, and having withheld its redress."

Reformatories.—The Reformatory System seems to be progressing very satisfactorily. The Dublin Evening Post publishes a list of the "Catholic Reformatory Committee for the North and West of Ireland," which is under the patronage of the Primate and the Prelates of the Ecclesiastical Provinces of Ulster and Connaught. It embraces the names of Mr. Sergeant O'Hagan, John Lentaigue Esq., D.L.; James O'Ferrall, Esq., and gentlemen of position and influence resident in Monaghan, Belfast, Dundalk, Newry, Armagh, Portadown, Londonderry, and Strabane. A female reformatory has been established at Monaghan, and a male reformatory at Glencree. At the recent Quarter Sessions at Monaghan, Mr. Jas. Major, Q.C., gave an interesting account of the Catholic Reformatory now in operation in that town, which is calculated to confer great blessings upon the community, whilst rescuing thousands of poor female children from vice and ruin.

Administration of Oaths.—In the Municipal Reformation Court, on Wednesday, the Rev. Mr. Quin, of St. Lawrence's Seminary, appeared to sustain his claim to be placed on the Burgess Roll; and on being handed the Testament, he expressed his unwillingness to be sworn on the Protestant or "authorized version. Mr. Martin, the Conservative agent, objected to any other than the authorized version being used. After a protracted discussion, during which the Lord Mayor and both his assessors, Messrs. Coffey and Hyndman, stated that they saw no reason why the witness should not be sworn according to his conscience and convictions, the Rev. Mr. Quin was sworn on the Douay Bible.—*Dublin Paper.*

The Fatal Riot at the Limerick Election.—In the Queen's Bench, on Monday, a motion was made in the case of "The Queen v. Edward G. Bell, R.M." to change the venue to the county of Limerick, or such other county as the court might be pleased to direct. After a long argument the Court ordered that a suggestion should be entered on the record to have the trial take place in the County of Clare. It will be recalled that the charge against Mr. Bell is that he ordered the police to fire on the people during the late Limerick election—that three persons were killed and several wounded—and that at the late Limerick assizes an indictment for manslaughter was found against him.

The Eviction at Tuam of the Christian Brothers.—The evictions at Tuam—the threatened evictions at Doon—all of these would have been stayed, or, indeed, we might say never attempted if the owners of the fee knew that the first step after service of the eviction process would be the payment in full to the occupier of the value of all the improvements effected on the holding. If the Lord Bishop of Tuam knew that he would have to pay down in hard cash £600, the value of the improvements made by the Christian Brothers, he would never have brought his ejectment, or possessed himself of the smouldering ruins of the school-house, built for the instruction of God's poor. Lord Derby tells us in his speech, that his ejectment process in Doon is but a *brutum fulmen* to terrify the tenants into a confession of participation in the guilt of murder—a sort of rack on which to torture tenants into admission, or, perhaps, into hinting guilt against others and innocent persons.—If Lord Derby had to pay down a handsome sum in the shape of compensation for improvements before he could apply his eviction screw, we would never have heard of the land process for the discovery of imaginary guilt on the part of the Doon tenantry.—In effect, and in the practical operation of every-day life, a sound, honest compensation bill, with retrospective clauses, would prove an effective barrier to all attempts at oppressive eviction. Still, a bill would be in strict accordance with commercial principles—with the doctrines of political economy, and with the recognised principles of property. No man could object to it, and this was the principle enunciated in the Bill of the Tenant League, modified by Mr. Moore at the Council, and re-introduced by Mr. Maguire and The O'Donoghue. From that bill we would regret to see either Parliamentary representatives or the country depart. Its clauses contain nothing utopian—nothing that common sense could disapprove. We quite feel with Mr. Maguire and The O'Donoghue that the power of eviction has been cruelly abused in Ireland. It has been used to oppress the religious conscience of the tenantry, and to coerce the political conscience of the voter. We would, with them, desire to see the abuses put an end to; but we believe that the means suggested by Mr. Crawford and by the Tenant League will prove more effective than our attempt to make the resumption of possession impossible while the rent be paid, because the one is certain to be carried, while the other is as certain to be resisted. The true and equitable basis for an adjustment of the landlord and tenant question is to treat the landlord's property, the fee of the land, and the land itself, in the same spirit of equity as we desire to have the tenant's property, the improvements, and the beneficial occupancy treated. If the landlord desires to set his land to a tenant, let him do so without the terror of the penalty that if he allows a tenant to enter on the occupancy, he thereon forfeits the fee and becomes a mere rent-charger. If the tenant desires to improve, let him improve, with the guarantee of law that all the property he invests in improvements will be his and his children's and that the incorporation of it with the soil will not, as now, confiscate it to the landlord. Let him build, let him drain, let him fence, with the certainty that the law fences round his occupancy with the assurance that if the landlord covets his possession he cannot resume it until he shall have first paid him to the last farthing his full interest in the improvements he has effected.—This was the principle—the essence of the Tenant League Bill. This was the principle enunciated on behalf of the Tenant League, by Lucas, and by others, in Parliament. This is the principle of Crawford's bill—it is the letter and the spirit of the amended bill of Mr. Moore and of Mr. Maguire, and the O'Donoghue—and if there be earnest action by our representatives in Parliament, this principle will assuredly be carried into legislative effect.—*Dublin Freeman.*

O'Sullivan.—The *Nation* states that Daniel O'Sullivan, the person charged with being a Phoenixite, and whose release from custody we announced the other day, has been allowed out of gaol, not as a free man, but upon the ticket-of-leave granted to an ordinary felon, who behaves himself with a certain amount of decency during a portion of his allotted term. "Such a course as this," says the *Cork Examiner*, "on the part of the Government is but a shabby compromise with duty. If they believed that Daniel O'Sullivan had been justly convicted, and justly sentenced, they should have detained him in prison. If they even considered that his conviction was properly obtained, but that the sentence was in excess, their proper course was to have caused a commutation on the part of the Crown, absolutely and without reservation. Our own belief is that they must have felt—that any man not utterly blinded by party rancour must have felt, the whole trial to be a mockery, and the sentence therefore a nullity. How, then, do they compensate Daniel O'Sullivan for the injustice that had been previously done him? By giving him the same liberty they would accord to a semi-penitent pick-pocket. Those who, more fortunate than Daniel O'Sullivan, were not tried at the same assizes, pleaded guilty on the distinct condition that the plea was a fiction, and that not even bail should be required from them. Daniel O'Sullivan, however, after having already undergone a six months' unjustifiable imprisonment, is not put upon an equal footing with his fellow-accused, but is only permitted to leave the gaol, with the ignominious ticket-of-leave in his hand. This is not alone injustice, but it is a paltry and cowardly species of injustice, too."

The persistency with which the populace of Cork kept away from the Viceroyal exhibition was remarkable. The Lord Lieutenant's reception, says the *Cork Tory paper*, was the coldest and most discouraging ever vouchsafed to a representative of Majesty. The walls and gates of the city were on Sunday placarded with bills of which the following is a copy:—"Irishmen!—Attention!—The last English Viceroy (in all probability) that you will ever see will die at your expense at the Athenaeum on tomorrow evening (Monday). Attend! To show your gratitude to this English deputy, and to the system that produces fat cattle, and a poor exterminated peasantry. Remember the seven hundred years of English dominion you have endured! Beware of cheering for Irish independence, and for Marshal MacMahon lest you offend the ears of this Whig Lord! but cheer heartily for English misrule and British Bridge Baptists!"

Scripture Readers for the Army.—The following extraordinary official notification has been sent to the *Tyone Constitution* by Captain Maclean:—"The pensioners of this district are hereby informed that many opportunities are now offered by the 'United British Army Scripture Readers and Soldiers' friend Society, for employment amongst their old comrades. The Society is greatly in need of devoted and Christian men, to go forth as Scripture Readers to the various regiments in H.M. Service; salaries range from £70 to £80 a year at home, from £100 to £150 a-year abroad, and all travelling expenses are defrayed by the Society. These appointments are open to both married and single men, and to the members of all Protestant denominations.—Candidates are invited to send in their names to the Secretary, 4, Trafalgar-square, Charing Cross, London, with the following particulars in full.—1. age; 2. married or single; 3. what family; 4. what church he belongs to; 5. what regiment he has served in; 6. present employment; 7. are you able and willing to serve in India. The duties would be to read the Scriptures to the men, in barracks, camp, or hospital, when required."

The extensive mills belonging to Robert Culbertson, Esq., of Ballisodare, within four miles of Sligo, were completely destroyed on Friday morning, by fire. Four men were killed, and ten very badly wounded.

John Bagwell, M.P., Marlfield, has subscribed £20 to the Clonmel School of Art.

The Defences.—The *Dublin Evening Mail* has upon several occasions endeavored to draw the attention of Government to the unprepared state of Ireland, as compared with England, to resist any oppression from a foreign foe. The *Mail*, dealing with this subject, makes the following remarks:—"There are many considerations in the social state of this country, as well as in the exposed and undefended condition of our sea coast, to invite the attention of an enemy. In many parts of our island an invader, taking his information from John Mitchell and Co., would expect to find himself in the midst of a friendly population, anxious to minister to his physical wants, and to furnish him with information and every other aid which an active and intelligent race could supply. It would be the contrary in England. There the foreigner would know himself to be in an enemy's country, and every step he attempted to advance would be retarded by the most steadfast opposition, both moral and material, which a resolute and united people could raise against him. The strength and efficiency of the armed force of England would be doubled by the dispositions and conduct of its unarmed inhabitants of every class and degree from the noble to the peasant. Yet England is not to esteem herself safe without 200,000 troops under arms, and a volunteer force besides of scarcely inferior numbers, while Ireland is to stand by her on the strength of the militia and constabulary! It is hard to believe that English writers can be serious when, in speculation upon a French invasion, the notion of casting off Ireland to her own maimed and restricted resources is broached as a part of the system of the national defence. It is, in effect, a proposal to abandon this country without a blow to France. It is an invitation to the Emperor to send an armament over here, under General MacMahon, to take possession of the Government of the country and establish the *Code Napoleon* in Dublin Castle as our future constitution. For in that case, whatever might be the final issue of the war waged by England and her other possessions, it would not be so easy a task for her to regain her lost dominion over Ireland, as it is now, by a judicious, prompt, spirited and confident policy, to secure and keep it."

"Our Gallic neighbours ask how it comes that while nothing is heard from end to end of England but the sharpening of the rifle, there is not a 'minnie' in all Ireland—and that the statute law of England prevents the formation of a single Volunteer Corps in a country whose inhabitants are proverbially the most military population in Europe. Even some of the anti-Irish journals at home ask why are there no Volunteer Corps in Ireland—why is there no organization—no arrangement for arming—no drilling, to provide against the contingency of a landing being effected in Ireland instead of England—a contingency more than once alluded to of late in some of the French journals? The speculations to which the strange contrast between two parts of the United Empire has given rise are amusing as they are absurd. Every cause but the true one is suggested."

Those who ask why are not Volunteer Corps encouraged in Ireland, now that, after the lapse of nearly eighty years, another French invasion is talked of, appear to forget the results that followed from the formation of the Volunteer Corps of 1782. Strip of a defending army—told by England to defend herself or bear the penalties of the unopposed landing—Ireland equipped, drilled, and armed sixty thousand men, the flower of her population. Free trade was carried in the Irish House of Commons, and assented to by the English Parliament, when Volunteer cannon were cast with the motto—'Free trade, or else.' An independent Parliament was won by the ring of the Volunteer muskets. Partial Emancipation for the Catholics followed close upon the obtaining of legislative freedom for the Protestants; and though the wisecracks who sagely ask, Why are there no Volunteers created in Ireland—why does the law prohibit us from organizing to defend our shores from the possibility of a hostile invasion, forget all these things, the *English Minister has not read history in vain; and the word 'Volunteer' reminds him of national, of social, of commercial, and of political liberty, won without the firing of one shot in anger—won by the steady tread, the simple demand, and solemn vote of sixty thousand loyal Volunteer youths, who took up arms in 1827, to defend their homes and families from the horrors of a foreign landing. What sane man could expect a British Minister, with such an example before him, to encourage the organization of Volunteers in Ireland?"*

Irish Emigration from Liverpool.—The official returns of the emigration from the Mersey for the month of October show that out of a general decline of about 800 passengers, the larger proportion of 648 were natives of Ireland. The number of Irish emigrants sailing from Liverpool in October numbered 3,260, against 3,908 in the previous month, and 2,775 in the corresponding period of 1858. The total emigration under the act amounted to 185 cabin and 5,341 steerage, of which it appears 3,200 were Irish, 1,603 English, 263 Scotch, and 157 natives of other countries. The largest emigration was to the United States, when during the month 133 cabin and 3,670 steerage passengers sailed, of whom 2,526 were Irish, 907 English, 89 Scotch, and 148 foreigners, principally Germans. In the previous month of September the numbers were 252 cabin and 4,398 steerage passengers, 3,113 Irish, 993 English, 150 Scotch, and 142 foreigners. In the corresponding period of 1858 the number of Irish emigrants to the United States amounted to 2,223. These numbers are independent of those carried out by the Cunard steamers, which carried out 630 cabin passengers, of all nations and "short ships," in which 405 passengers sailed. The Canadian royal mail steamers have carried the entire of the emigration to Canada, in their four steamers of the month, which conveyed 540 passengers. The Australian emigration trade continues very dull, only three vessels having sailed during the month—conveying 60 cabin and 688 steerage passengers—347 of whom were Irish, 390 English, 83 Scotch, and 48 foreigners, against, in the previous month, 36 cabin and 473 Irish, 301 English, 128 Scotch, and 31 foreigners. In the corresponding period of 1858, 479 passengers left the Mersey for Melbourne. Three "short ships" sailed also for Melbourne, carrying 3 cabin and 59 steerage passengers. One ship with government emigrants—the *Alfred*, of the White Star Line, with 445 passengers, 214 Irish, 171 English, and 26 Scotch, sailed for Sydney, New South Wales, and in the previous month, 189 Irish, 16 English, and 49 Scotch passengers. To New Zealand, one ship sailed having on board 2 cabin, and 136 steerage passengers; only 15 were Irish, 91 English, 29 Scotch, and 1 foreigner, being a considerable falling off compared with the previous month when 10 cabin and 214 steerage passengers—60 Irish, 126 English, and 28 Scotch—sailed from the Mersey. To the Cape of Good Hope, one vessel sailed with government emigrants, 406 in number—158 Irish, 60 English, and 2 Scotch, the selection of the Hon. Wm. Field, to the African coast, 50 passengers embarked during the month. To South America, 28, and to the East Indies, 31 passengers in short ships. It will be seen by the above figures that the decline on Irish passengers was 648, on English 271, and Scotch, 138.—*Freeman Correspondent.*

Harland, who was fired at and wounded on Sunday evening, the 6th instant, at Cooraclevin, near Sligo, King's County, is recovering, says "Saunders," from the effects of the gunshot wounds which he then received. Fox, whose committal has been already reported, has been again remanded for further examination. Fox was some time ago dispossessed by Harland, after which he was pursued by Fox, who threatened his life with a pitchfork.—Thomas Hunt, whose dwelling was fired into at Moneygal, had several slugs lodged in a hat or bonnet box near his bed, and the contents of the second shot, which was fired through his door, lodged in the fireplace at a corner where Hunt was in the constant habit of sitting each night before retiring to bed.—After the shots were fired Hunt loaded his gun, took

it in his hand, and walked to the police barracks, which was quite convenient, and reported the occurrence. The particulars have been fully investigated by the local magistrates, and T. W. who, whose land it was reported Hunt had become the future tenant of, has been obliged to give security to keep the peace towards Hunt, and all her Majesty's subjects. A curious case this!

At Tullamore, three men were captured by the police on Wednesday last, charged with being of the armed party who broke into Boulger's house, and presented fire-arms, and threatened his wife.

A Poser.—The *Nation* has an article criticising Lord Ellenborough's letter on Italy in which the following extract appears:—"I will hope that, stimulated by the insults to Italy which are conveyed in the demands France is about to make in the Congress, they will rise to vindicate their right to choose their own Government, and clutch the arms by which alone it can be secured."

"The right of a people to choose their own Government forms the *verbeum* of many a leading article in the English papers. The following paragraph is taken from one of the London organs and gives the key note of a long composition:—"As free Englishmen, we assert the rights of the Romans' and of all nations, to have a government of their own choice."

"Now says the *Nation*, 'will these 'free Englishmen' acknowledge the right of the people of Ireland to have 'governors of their own choice?' Will they allow the Irish people to declare their own choice in a free and fair election? They will do nothing of the kind, for reasons well known to themselves. But how can the Irish people, being entirely unarmed, and, therefore, according to Lord Ellenborough, worthy of no respect, ask any such request of England? Let them first act on the hint supplied by his Lordship, and furnish themselves with a 'million of muskets,' after doing which it is highly probable that any requests they may make will receive respectful attention."

The Truth About Doon.—In an article under this heading the *Nation* takes Lord Derby to task for having, in his speech, at Liverpool, stated:—

- I. That "only eight or ten persons had been served with notice to quit" on his estates in Doon.
- II. That "these persons so served had only eight or ten acres a-piece."
- III. That "the Earl of Derby had spent far more on these holdings than he had received from them."
- IV. That "there was not one person under notice who had not received from him in one shape or another more than the fee simple of the land."
- V. That "the murder was committed in the presence of a number of the population, and was witnessed by several tenants."
- VI. That the man whom Crowe had served with notice to quit, by order of Lord Derby's agent, had done nothing to improve, but had rather depreciated his holding."

The falsity of these assertions is proved on unmistakable evidence obtained on the spot and elsewhere by the writer. In refutation of the two first paragraphs our contemporary gives the following names of the tenants under notice, with the quantity of land for which each is at present rated by Her Majesty's Commissioners for the relief of the poor:

A. R. P.	A. R. P.
1. M. Hanly, .31 1 34	12. Pk. Meara, .4 3 19
2. Rd. Sheehy, 12 3 34	13. Widow J. O'Brien (a sub-tenant served by order of the 'agent'), 17 2 3
3. Wm. Fox, .9 2 0	14. Rev. P. Hickey, P.P., .30 2 0
4. W. Connel, .36 0 1	15. E. Heffernan, 0 3 0
5. P. Hennessy, .35 2 13	
6. J. Hennessy, .8 1 18	
7. Simon Ryan, 16 3 34	
8. John Ryan, 14 2 22	
9. M. Connel, 24 2 0	
10. M. Kennedy, 12 2 0	
11. Thos. Maher, 41 1 14	
	Total land under notice, .297 1 30

Thus—
 I. According to Lord Derby's statement there are only eight or ten under notice; in reality there are fifteen.
 II. According to Lord Derby's showing there are only from 64 to 100 acres under notice of clearance; in reality there are 297a. 1r. 30p.
 Why does the "bold Roper" shrink so far from the truth, and endeavor sneakingly to hide, under huge falsehood, the magnitude of the evil he has threatened in an evil moment upon the civilization of the 19th century?

III. "He had spent far more on these holdings than he had received from them." The Earl of Derby receives annually "from these holdings" above £200 a-year. Not one of the tenants now under notice is in arrears to the amount of one shilling.—Eron during the famine years, the tenants had no alternative but to pay the rent on the *Red Day*, or turn out. We have, on the surest authority, that all rents, counting from the day his Lordship first came into possession of the property, are paid up by all these tenants to the very penny. So he has got over £200 a-year, well paid, since he came to enjoy the property. Now let us see what he has spent on these holdings:—
 Michael Hanly, £ 25
 Thomas Maher, 235
 Richard Sheehy, 100
 William Fox, 30
 W. Connel, about, 30
 Patrick Hennessy, 20
 James Hennessy, 20
 Simon Ryan, 20
 John Ryan, 20
 Michael Connel, 20
 Mary Kennedy, 20
 Total ever spent on the holdings of the Earl of Derby, £815

It is well known that the present Earl of Derby had obtained the management and the rents of all the Irish property, (9,000 a-year) from his father—the late Earl, long before the death of the latter, indeed almost immediately on the death of his grandfather, the second last Earl. We are sure the present Earl has enjoyed the Irish property, including that of Doon, over twenty years. He has, we know, been receiving over £200 a-year, for more than twenty years, out of these holdings *alone* which are now under notice of eviction. (He receives £700 a-year altogether out of the Doon property.) Considerably over four thousand pounds have passed from these holdings into his lordship's pocket. He has spent £85 on these holdings leaving him a gainer by these holdings to the amount, at the lowest calculation of £3,915, although he has publicly declared that he "had spent far more on these holdings than he ever received from them." It is but fair to remark that Lord Derby gave £100 to a widow whom he wished to eject from one of the above holdings, and who had refused to give up her farm, which her husband had reclaimed from a bog, and upon which he had built a good slated house. The widow, seeing no other alternative, took the £100, and left her house and farm with a sorrowing heart. It is remarked that widows are peculiarly exposed to removal from their lordship's property in Ireland. As another instance of this peculiarity of Lord Derby towards widows, we may instance the Widow O'Brien, who was served with notice of eviction by Crowe, in obedience as Lord Derby acknowledges, to "the orders of his agent." The £100 given to the widow, to secure her removal and satisfy a whim, could scarcely be said to be "spent upon the holding." But giving his Lordship the credit of that outlay, the falsehood still remains enumerated by thousands—it is represented by £3,815 instead of £3,915.

IV. Grant and hold as the last falsehood appears, there was one still greater, bolder, and more patent and cruel, enunciated by the same noble lips when he said, "There was not one person under notice who had not received from him in one shape or another more than the fee-simple of the land!" What did he give to Michael Hanly "in one shape or other?" Not one penny, although the fee-simple of his land would be at least £400. What did he ever give to Sheehy, the fee-simple of whose land would

be over £200?" Not one penny. What did he give to Patrick Hennessy, the fee-simple of whose land would be £400? Not one penny. What did he give to Rev. Patrick Hickey, who expended £400 on his farm, the fee-simple of which would reach £600? Not one penny. We might go through the whole list of the fifteen under notice, and give the same reply in every case except three—the two O'Connell's and Maher—to whom he gave timber and slates for houses, and some tiles for drainage, to the amount of about £85. And that is the sum said to be more than the fee-simple of the land under notice. We have consulted Griffith's Valuation 1850, and there we find the annual value of the holdings now under notice amounting in the aggregate to £213 8s., which at twenty years' purchase, would make £4,263, the fee-simple of the land under notice. Deducting £85 the total amount of all he ever "gave in one shape or other to any of those persons under notice," we find his lordship outstepping the plain figures in the case by £4,178 sterling.

V. The next statement that the "murder was committed in the presence of a number of the population, and was witnessed by several tenants," is a libel, a calumny, a falsehood so gross, so utterly unfounded, so devoid of the smallest particle of truth, that we scarcely know in what forcible language we ought to meet it. If a single individual is known to have been present, let that individual be named, and let it be proved that he was present, and the law will know how to deal with him. The fact is, the man was watched or dogged by the assassin till he was out of sight of every human eye on a lonely road, and murdered unseen. Two gentlemen passed that very road about half an hour after the murder, and returned to within three hundred yards of the spot where the corps lay in half an hour after the murder; and they have assured us that they never met a single person on that road that day. The two gentlemen drove on a cart—we give their names, they are satisfied to give testimony to the fact—one is Dr. Power of Cappawhite; the other is Mr. J. Kilbride, Tomlin.

VI. The sixth statement is, we believe, the most opposed to truth of all. Lord Derby says "that the man whom Crowe had served with notice to quit had done nothing to improve, but had rather depreciated the value of his holding." The fact, as we have ascertained with his widow, is, that that man he is dead, and it is his widow that is served; and his family did more on his little farm than any man on his lordship's estate; or, as we have heard from an intelligent gentleman who farms extensively, "more than any man within fifteen miles on the same extent of land." The farm consists, for the most part of land taken from the hillow river. It was a strand, completely covered with large stones and gravel, deposited from time immemorial by that mountain torrent. That man removed the stones—they are there in large piles to be seen still; he gradually cleared away the gravel and filled the waste; in a word, he created the soil there, and got a premium for the best clover from the Tipperary Agricultural Society, which was established by and under the presidency of Lord Derby.

Such is the truth about Doon. Such are facts. If anything could aggravate the outrage and wrong of Lord Derby's first act, it is his speech at Liverpool—that crop of poisonous calumnies and monstrous violations of truth. The "law" it is true gives him the power to carry out his barbarous and infamous threat; but we tell his lordship that it shall never protect him in adding calumny to persecution, against the priests and people of Doon. They are no assassins; they are no friends, or shelterers, or sympathisers with assassins. They did not witness the murder of Crowe; they do not know who the murderer is; they are not the men their lordly libeller has represented them. He may be powerful, but they are not friendless; Ireland is not without men to expose, denounce, and defy, as we do now, the evil mind and the merciless hand who seeks to trample them in the dust—to extirpate and defame them.

Volunteers.—We find in a letter addressed to the *Times* by Sir W. Napier, some hints as to the uses to which the Volunteers might be turned in case of an invasion:—

"Sir,—Allow me to amend my first letter on a point of importance.
 In 1805 the volunteers were formed in regiments of 1,000 strong, and even in larger masses, clothed in red, and armed, accoutred, and drilled like regular troops. Of use they were, displaying the moral power excited by the danger of invasion; but as soldiers mere minims, without solidity to support the regular army, and offering points of weakness to the enemy, because, having neither artillery nor cavalry of their own, they required the aid of those arms of war from the regulars; for it is by fine combinations of infantry, cavalry, and artillery that battles are won. Soon all would have had to trust to their legs; for be it known to Mr. Wise that absolute running away at the right time is also an essential part of warfare, to be learned with care, though a battle is not the best school for the first lesson.
 The regular artillery would then have feared to close on the French masses, trusting only to the support and protection of unskillfully, untaught, ill-commanded mobs of volunteers.

Now, acting as riflemen, the volunteers will be independent of the regular army, yet support it; and having free play for their own natural intelligence, it will in each be developed according to mother wit—though it is not every mother that gives her son military wit, as proved by Mr. Wise. They would also more easily escape from the evil of incapable commanders, and yet give full play to their own usefulness.

Thus it would be:—
 A rifle infantry man takes post, never cover half a mile from a French column of march, and he pumps into it every shot or knocks over the men and horses of the artillery and cavalry, if at all exposed to his fire. At the same time one or two of Sir William Armstrong's lightest guns, which are said to be of sure stroke at 'two miles' distance, and may be drawn by two horses, can take a post a mile or more behind the riflemen, pounding the enemy's column and protecting our own skirmishers from cavalry, which, however, could make but little impression, giving, as they would do, half a mile start to the volunteers in running away, if such running should be expedient.

It may be said the French have rifles and long ranging guns also. True; and it would be a fair fight between the riflemen on each side; but the heavily loaded Frenchmen would soon tire, and the main column must halt to rally them again. Thus the long ranging arms, pushing the volunteers into their natural career, have quadrupled their power; and, all former points of weakness being swept away they will be a real support to the regular troops, instead of a drain and a burden.

The delay thus enforced on the enemy must be made also under the destructive fire of the Armstrong gun, which would hit always, and never be hit by a counter gun of the same range, for the columns of the enemy could not hide, they must be perforce of Mr Wise's school; whereas the Armstrong gun could and would hide, and, having fired, remove to another place to fire again, so that the enemy's shot, directed only by the smoke, would strike an empty nest.

Each gun, whether manned by volunteers or militia artillerymen—and there are many good ones,—should be attended by small corps of volunteer cavalry always moving with it, ready to support the skirmishers and to protect the gun from accidental roving detachments of the enemy's horsemen. We also should have roving horsemen—aye, and fighting horsemen, numerous and bold. They would soon teach the French cavaliers how much a good horse has to do in warfare; horses never blunder if their riders be earnest and strong-willed. The last *Gazette* having given me a step of rank, my signature will be in future.
 Nov. 4. W. NAPIER, General.