

told me that he wondered how a fly could live in it. Not a man offered to quit their leafless garrison until they found Dogberry wounded, and perceiving it to be mortal, he said, "Do all you can to save your lives; I am done for, but I will fight while I have a round or can draw a trigger; you can do nothing for me. After this they burst from the grove, and a chase commenced that, in the annals of hunting human or quadruped game, never was exceeded. To use a sportsman phrase, they broke cover about nine, and till after four that evening the chase never abated for one moment. After numberless turnings and windings they passed through a skirt of the extensive and low land called the bog of Biragh, and had they been acquainted with the locality, they might have defied their pursuers. They got on to the townland of Ballygowan, the west point of the parish of Ballyralden, when two of them with Hacket got into a field where a Mr. Ashe had been digging potatoes. The spades were surrendered to them, and they covered their arms in the clay, and the men they replaced went to cover the potato pit. In about eight minutes their pursuers were in the field, and lustily demanded if such persons were in view. The answer was negative. Two men of them were so closely pressed that they ran into a house, got upon a kind of cockroost, and were followed in by two of the troopers. The ferns of the place were high and furzy, and fearing to lose them, they rushed out without seeking. The fugitives, not considering themselves safe, left also, and were not long on foot till they were seen by the sportsmen, who gave chase, which terminated in half a mile's run on the townland of Garryalden, parish of Castlelilly. Horsemen closed on them, and leaping a fence from the road, one of their horses got foul in the brambles. The fugitives were keeping their last chance for close quarters, and being now two against two, and within 140 yards of them, "Come," said one to his comrade, "we will take them down." He fired, the horseman fell, and the second horseman in a few moments brought the fugitive down, and the chase terminated. The other horsemen soon approached to where they heard the firing, and stripped the two lifeless men naked and left both there. The other fugitives remained in the place for a few days, and this hunt after Hacket terminated about the middle of October, after seven hours' run, and a distance of twenty miles including the turnings; in a direct line it was fifteen. In the whole chase there was but one of the fugitives killed, and that one fell more than two miles from Ballyralden.

Hacket having gained his old quarters, he found that a man named Taylor, a wood-ranger to Lord Careysfort, had a fine double gun, and he resolved to have it. Taylor slept in the house of Captain Atkin, Hacket's favorite gentleman, who was also agent to Lord Careysfort. He, with another of his associates, called to Captain Atkins, and demanded Taylor's gun. The Captain let down the window, and while Hacket was pressing his demand he fired and shot him dead. He was brought down to Arklow next morning, and hung out of one of trees in the churchyard for the whole day. The next morning his head was carefully impaled on the highest point of one of the towers of the old Norman keep, built three centuries ago by the Butlers, where it remained bleaching in sun and storm for many years after. His wife, Biddy, could not go out of her cottage door upon any occasion without having it in view.

And thus terminated the brief existence of that young and daring outlaw after a period of six months of unequalled daring, for there was scarce a day that he was not engaged in some hazard.

Sir R. Musgrave called Holt a robber, and a low, mean fellow. I don't wonder at that, for Sir Robert, by some fatality, could tell nothing that was true.

But for Holt to say that Hacket was a robber was a falsehood. Holt cannot be excused, for it was spleen on account of Hacket leaving him and taking some of the best men away. When the unfortunate man reached the County Wexford, he had not a shilling in his possession, nor had he one when he fell, and during his outlawry, his wife that he idolized, was supported by his friends.

A MILISIAN.

A REPLY TO SHARMAN CRAWFORD.

TO WM. SHARMAN CRAWFORD, ESQ. (From the Nation.)

Sir—It is now about twenty years since I was present at a meeting at the Corn Exchange, where you manfully raised your solitary voice in opposition to that fatal arrangement of the Tithe Question, which has perpetuated in this country (so far as injustice can be made perpetual) that unexampled oppression—the Established Church. From that day to the present your public conduct has exhibited a disinterestedness singular, I regret to say, in the modern politics of Ireland. A member of the ascendant sect, you have been the zealous advocate of entire religious equality; a landlord, you have been unremitting in demanding a legal recognition of the rights of the tenant; and what is most praiseworthy of all, when unjustly slighted by the people, your efforts to serve them did not on that account relax. I participate in the general sentiment which this public virtue has inspired, and in venturing to criticize the advice which you have just given to the people of Ireland, I freely acknowledge the obligation which rests upon me of advancing substantial and solid reasons for my dissent from an authority which is eminently entitled to respect.

What you advise the people of Ireland to do is substantially this:— 1st. That they should abandon at once, and for ever, all hope of getting rid of "British dominion" in this country. (I take the phrase as you have written it.) 2nd. That they should forthwith set on foot an agitation throughout the country, having for its object the return of members who will support the principle of Tenant Right or tenant compensation. If you can induce the people of Ireland to follow you in the course which you propose, I venture to predict that another bitter disappointment will make more manifest the truth that "British dominion" is the one deadly and abiding foe of the Irish race, and that sooner or later one of those two irreconcilable antagonists must disappear from this soil. For me, Sir, I am one of those who still are not persuaded that to crouch for ever under "British dominion" is our inevitable destiny. You allege the resources of our tyrants and the failure of our patriots as motives for despair. Against these I put the vicissitudes of Empires, inevitable though slow

the unextinguishable and inextinguishable hatred of "British dominion" which, patient and silent, awaits the long-winded opportunity—but, above all, the might of justice which has been so long and so fearfully outraged. Yes! The inherited disaffection still survives—the holy fire still burns through the long night of bondage—still flames up against the murky sky—perplexing those who, twelve years ago, exulted in the anticipated destruction of a race, which still, thank God, is here to spit on them and their hypocritical professions of good will. I do not belong to any secret society. The password and the nocturnal parade have no attractions for me. I am unfortunately too old to be much of an enthusiast. But I say this deliberately, that to cultivate, to intensify, to proclaim to one another, to their rulers and to the world, their undying hatred of "British dominion," and their determination to get rid of it when they can, is for the Irish people the sole means of salvation.

You, Sir, ask us to resign all hope "getting rid of British dominion," and to unite as one man for the purpose of returning Tenant Right members to Parliament. In 1832 we did what you ask us to do now. By a great national effort, and at the cost of much individual suffering, some fifty "Tenant Right members" were returned. What have they done? Where are they now? If you would have us to repeat the experiment, pray state some reason why we may expect a more favorable result. But that was not the only occasion on which the experiment has been tried; the people of Ireland are literally worn out by their efforts to obtain "justice" from the British Parliament. You, Sir, were, I believe, one of about eighty Irish members who voted for what was called "the appropriation clause." On that occasion upwards of three-fourths of the Irish representatives demanded that a portion of the infamous tithe tax should be applied to some purpose of national utility. But "British dominion" uttered a peremptory No! and the abomination remains to this day in its integrity.

To be a citizen of a country whose laws are made by strangers—that is to be a slave. So spoke a great Irishman on a great occasion. In these more enlightened days our notions of freedom are somewhat different. We have the Habeas Corpus—so long as we abstain from troubling our rulers. We enjoy the blessing of a free press and trial by jury—that is to say, while we are too weak to be formidable we are permitted to rail at the laws which we neither make nor can alter; and if attacked by the Government, we have the privilege of being tried by a jury which is packed to convict us. And from this catalogue of our liberties I must by no means omit the priceless privilege of electing representatives whose voices, if they are not silenced by bribes, are listened to with impatient content.

Words have been described as the counters of wisdom and the money of fools. These phrases, "British Constitution," "Habeas Corpus," "Trial by Jury," and "Freedom of the Press," have been so long and so diligently circulated amongst us, that by most of us they have come to be mistaken for the sterling gold of liberty. No doubt a free press is a blessing. That privilege which the *Tines* once stated to be the essence of Irish liberty—to sit on one's own dunghill and curse the Government and the law—is not to be despised. But this question remains yet to be considered—whether a good Government, which enforces the respect to which it is entitled, is not, on the whole, to be preferred to a bad Government, which is indifferent to the hatred it provokes?

You will ask me, perhaps, to what practical conclusion do these observations lead? This will be my answer. Inasmuch as this "British dominion" has proved itself incompatible with the prosperity, the freedom, nay with the existence of the Irish people, it is the duty of all Irishmen to encourage and to disseminate a sentiment of hostility towards it. Should you say that this is wild and visionary, I would reply, and would appeal to history as my witness, that a general avowal of such a purpose at this moment would be more fruitful in beneficial results than the sending of even seventy average Tenant Right members into Parliament. I say rather send one man into Parliament who will courageously tell them the truth—who will tell them that the people of Ireland are universally, profoundly, and justly disaffected—that no time is to be lost—that the Established Church must forthwith have adequate and ample protection from robbery and extermination—or else that ten thousand Frenchmen may speedily settle those long agitated questions, to the great detriment of "British dominion."

It is not in a spirit of reproach that I remind you that there was once in Ireland a member of your family who would never have advised his countrymen to abandon all hope of getting rid of "British dominion." If that veteran patriot, whose worth you largely inherit, and to whose name you have often referred with commendable pride—if he were now amongst us, and had brought down the brave old spirit into those degenerate days, his "suggestions" to the Irish People would be widely different from those which you have recently submitted to them. He would warn them that a European war was impending, that England might have to fight for her life—her shores menaced at every point—her armies in the distant East; that at such a crisis all Irishmen should unite—*all*, if that might be, Protestant and Catholic, peasant and peer. But if the Protestants of this day, neglecting a great example, and influenced by cowardly suspicions, should reject the hand that is proffered to them, then that the Catholic people of Ireland should seek for allies elsewhere; and the patriot would add a prayer, that, if they should come victorious out of the contest, they might afford to the world the spectacle of a people magnanimously forgetting the injuries of centuries, and freely sharing with the minority of their fellow-countrymen the fruits of their victory—the blessings of a free Government and of equal laws.

BISHOP O'CONNOR'S LECTURE.

CATHOLIC AND PROTESTANT VERSIONS OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.

(From the N. Y. Irish American.)

The subjoined synopsis of Dr. O'Connor's lecture, on "Catholic and Protestant Versions of the Holy Scriptures" was delivered at the City Assembly Rooms, New York, on Sunday evening, January 30. The learned lecturer, who was enthusiastically greeted on his appearance, commenced his discourse by saying that the great mass of Protestants, though never openly avowing it, would seem to entertain, and act on the conviction, that the English version of the Bible, which they use, came down from heaven, polished and prepared in its present form, in all its details. They cannot understand the possibility of its being rejected on any other ground than want of faith in the Scriptures; and as for rejecting it through respect for the Scriptures, through love and zeal for the integrity and purity of God's written Word, they look upon the thing as almost paradoxical. Yet the identity of the Scriptures with the version they use, is by no means a matter of course. Like the food of the body, to which, sometimes, poison is added, and it appears delightful to the eye and agreeable to the palate, yet carries death to the system which it ought to nourish, the inspired writings, in themselves perfect, become compounded with the workings of erring man, and are made at times the instrument of his malice, being perverted to diffuse, under a divine garb, the fancies of his own brain or corrupt designs of his own heart. The object of the lecture would be to show the spirit in which the work of translation had been conducted during the last three centuries. How far were the versions produced subject to the charges hinted at? The objections of Catholics may be found, after all, to be the result

of a loyal attachment to the Pure Word of God. A correct translation of any book should be an accurate transfer from one language to another; it should clothe the same ideas in other words, but should contain neither more nor less than is contained in the original. If the original was ambiguous, the translator could not select one of its meanings in preference to another without being a commentator. If the translator modified the sense to suit his own views, he became a downright impostor. There is again a special difficulty in making a correct translation of the Sacred Scriptures—that of procuring correct copies of the original. We have neither the original productions themselves, nor copies that can be relied on. It would be a mistake to suppose that the original text was within reach of every one, even of those who had the Greek and the Hebrew versions. But the effect of doctrinal bias on the mind of modern translators was a matter even more serious. He would consider the versions commonly in use amongst Protestants of this day and of this country. It was a common idea amongst them that the spread of the Reformation in the sixteenth century was due to the translation and use of the Bible in the common tongue. Without examining this, in other points of view, he would undertake to show that the Bible used in the early days of the Reformation, was intentionally perverted for the purpose of giving currency to preconceived errors. This could be proved by assertions of men occupying positions in the reformed churches themselves. Luther translated the Bible, which Zuinglius denounced as corrupt; he said, "Thou corruptest the Word of God, Oh Luther, and thou seemest to be a manifest perverter of the Scriptures. How are we ashamed of thee, O Luther, to be such a man." Another learned Protestant divine said of Luther's version, "It is full of faults," and the synod of Dort formally condemned the Lutheran version and ordered a new one to be made from the original. The spirit in which Luther made his translation may be seen in the language he used when convicted of willful interpolation: "So I will, so I command, let my will stand for the season," was his bold reply. "The word alone (by faith alone) must remain in my New Testament though the Papists run mad." Oecolampadius and other divines made a translation also, but Beza said of it, "It is in many cases wicked, and differs from the word of the Holy Ghost." The same great scholar calls the translation of Castalio wicked, and Molinus said of Calvin, "That he makes the text of the Gospel to leap up and down and uses violence to the letter of the Gospel, and, besides, adds to the text." Beza himself made a translation which exercised a powerful influence on the various Protestant translations made afterwards. (As him Molinus said he actually changed the text. McKeught, a learned Biblical scholar, said of him "that he had mistranslated a number of texts for the purpose, it would seem, of establishing his peculiar doctrines, and confuting his opponents.")

The learned lecturer then went on to say that the early English translations were held by Protestants themselves in no higher esteem. The fact of a new one being required and adopted in 1611 is sufficient proof of their distrust in former ones, for it was not through a desire for a more elegant composition that this was undertaken. It was the result of strong and continued remonstrance on the part of the ministers and people, who declared the version they possessed incorrect and corrupt. The ministers of Lincoln declared— "The version in common use is absurd and senseless, perverting in many cases the sense of the Holy Ghost." Broughton, whom Strype called the greatest scholar in Hebrew of his day, said, "the published translation of the Scriptures perverted the Old Testament in 848 places, and caused millions to reject the New Testament, and run to eternal flames on this ground." All were acquainted with the addition made by Luther to the words of St. Paul to the Romans, 3d chap., and 28th verse: "We account a man," said the Apostle, "to be justified by faith without the works of the law." He is made by Luther to say "by faith alone," or, to follow the order of the German, "alone by faith." The passage was thus translated to establish the doctrine of the sufficiency of faith alone for justification. The Apostle said we were justified by faith, because faith is the first essential disposition for this purpose. It was, as the Council of Trent said, "the fountain and root of justification." It was a common thing in the Scriptures, as in ordinary conversation, to attribute an effect to one, and especially to the principal one of many causes. But why should Luther insert the unguarded, and make them believe the new dogma was contained in the very words of Scripture. Yet this unwarrantable addition, which no Protestant version had adopted, remained in the German Protestant translations, circulated at the present day in this and other countries. In the text, 1 Tim., 2d chap., and 6th verse: "There is one God, and one mediator of God and men," the French Protestant translation, printed in 1843 by the Bible Society of Paris, inserted the word *only*, making it "one only mediator." The French translator interpolated the word *only*. This passage, notwithstanding the boastful use made of it, presented no difficulty to Catholic doctrine. But was not such tampering with Holy Writ truly shameful?

The reformers, in setting up a new religion, found it necessary to resist and separate themselves from the Church which Christ himself had built, and promised "that the gates of hell should never prevail against it." The Apostle did not hesitate, both on account of His constancy and her fidelity, to present the union of the Church with Christ as a model of the unity which should exist between husbands and wives. If the Church were destined to become faithless and adulterous, she would not have been chosen by him as such a model. It was necessary to blot out the great promises from Holy Writ in order to conceal the sacrilegious character of the work proposed by the reformers. The words of Christ no longer read: "Upon this rock I will build my Church and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it." They became, "Upon this rock I will build my congregation." The communion of Christ with His Church became a communion with his congregation—it was a glorious congregation that he presented to himself. Notwithstanding the reasons alleged to justify the translation, the word congregation had already a definite and limited meaning. The promises of Christ were therefore frittered away, and the people were forced to seek some interpretation which excluded the great plan adopted by God to communicate to man the knowledge of the Gospel. But this translation subserved another purpose. It was calculated to form a new theory regarding the authority of congregations as distinct from their pastors. Christ was made to command the people to bring their complaints before the congregation, "And if he will not hear the congregation, let him be to thee as a heathen and a publican." In some passages, for instance Acts, 14th chap., 22d verse, where it was said Paul and Barnabas "had ordained for their priests in every church," it was made to read, "They had ordained elders for them by election in every congregation." And in a French translation it yet read, "they had established elders in every church by the advice of the meetings." As the present authorized Protestant version, with the exception of retaining the word *elders*, has given up this tampering, and these additions, and adopted the Catholic version, it could be seen at once how unwarrantable was their insertion.

It would take too long to dwell upon the many tenets upon which the Scriptures were made to speak against other doctrines, as of the Sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist. So also the old translations carefully retain the word *Tradition* where it is spoken of in terms of condemnation; whereas, when it is spoken of with praise, though the same Greek word is used, instead of *tradition*, they used the words *instruction* and *ordinances*; and again the word *altar*, which implies sacrifice, just as the word boat or ship means a thing to float on the water, was changed to *table*.

The version of the Scriptures, now popular among Protestants in this country, is known as the King James', published in 1611, by order of James I. of England. "Whatever its merits as a piece of English composition may be, they are no compensation if it be found wanting in faithfulness, in presenting in their purity the oracles of God. Having corrected many of the ancient errors, it is not subject to all the charges made against them. But many others remained. He would give only a few out of very many examples:—1st Cor. 9th chap., 5th verse, the Apostle says:—"Have we not power to lead about a sister, a wife, as well as other apostles, and as the brethren of the Lord and Cephas? This would seem to imply that the apostles actually had wives, and that St. Paul claimed the right of having one, if he thought proper—thus endeavouring to strike at the celebrity of the Catholic clergy. The original word, which is translated *wife*, primarily meant woman. It might indeed, mean wife, but this was a restricted meaning, not to be supposed, unless required by the connection in which it is used. There were other Protestant versions in which the apostles were said to be in prayer with the *wives*; but here the authorized version had changed the word back to "women." So manifestly is the translation in the first passage quoted unnecessary, that in the marginal readings found in many Protestant editions, we find a note opposite "wife," saying, "or woman," thereby confessing that this is a proper term. In Hebrews, 13th chap. 14th verse, the Protestant Bible reads, "Marriage is honorable in all." This, too, is quoted against Catholic discipline in regard to celibacy and virginity. In this passage the word is confessedly an addition; that it was not a necessary and proper addition, might be proved from the context itself. The next verse reads, "Let your conversation be without covetousness;" there the word *let your* and *be* were italicized, which was evidence that they also were additions. The meaning of these two passages was distorted, for the verses immediately antecedents showed that the whole paragraph was an exhortation. Why, then, should the translation be made to express an affirmation unless it was done for an express purpose? Hebrews, 10th ch., 38th verse, in the Protestant version, reads:—"The just shall live by faith, but if any man draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him." The words "any man are italicized, which is an admission that they have been added by the translator. The added words have been used by Protestants to prove the inadmissibility of grace. Literally translated it would read, "The just shall live by faith, but if he draw back, my soul shall have no pleasure in him." This is implied the possibility of the person who lived by faith, afterwards drawing back and incurring the Divine displeasure. The "drawing back" is, by the Protestant version, referring to a different subject, and this destroyed the whole text. Against the use of Latin as the language of the Liturgy, they quote the 14th chapter of 1st Cor.: where the display of an "unknown tongue" in the assemblies of the faithful was condemned by the apostle. It would hardly be believed that the word "unknown" has been wantonly added, as the italics in which it was printed are an admission that it has. This admitted addition was found to occur no less than five times in this chapter—in the 4th, 13th, 14th, 16th, and 27th verses. The addition of so important a word was certainly unjustifiable. The object proposed by the addition was well understood by its use. It would take too long to relate all the passages that were made to suit the peculiar views of the translators. Many are now restive under the present one. The Baptists would like to blot out the word "Baptism," and insert "immersion" in its stead. If they could bring this about, the controversy about baptism might be said to be closed. If that were done, it would be a counterpart of turning Priest into Elder, and Bishop into Overseer. It would be amusing, if it were not terrible, to witness how many if not all, the great passages regarding the divinity of Jesus Christ, and the Trine God, disappear under the pen of another set of translators. The Bishop concluded this part of his subject by saying, if the translation of a will, or any other document, from a foreign language were taken before a court of justice, and faults were proved to exist in it, such as he had pointed out, by and in favor of the parties who produced it, would not the whole document be thrown out of court, and a new translation ordered?—Should the Testament of God, alone, be so abused, and they who refuse to receive it in such a form, be deemed as its enemies? There was no such thing as a version without note or comment to be found; and above all, King James's, in common use among Protestants now-a-days, was not such a version. It not only contains the translator's views where choice is unavoidable, but it goes out of its way with wanton additions, false translations, and admitted interpolations, to make the text speak the sectarian views of its authors. When Catholics object to its use, men should regard their objections rather as a proof of loyalty to the truth, than of opposition, as represented by many.

Dr. O'Connor then referred briefly to Catholic translations of the Scriptures, disproving the assertion that they were due to the Protestant Reformation. Many, in various languages, existed even before the epoch of printing. In the Latin tongue, there were more than two hundred editions of the Bible known to the learned before Luther's time, besides the Greek and Hebrew editions, and more than fifty in the various European editions, twenty-three of which, in the German language, were published before that of Luther. The English version of the New Testament, known as the Rheims' Testament, was translated in 1582, at the English College at Rheims, and the Old Testament at Douay in 1609. He quoted celebrated Protestant critics to the point, that the translators of the Douay and Rheims' version had never been convicted of a single willful mistranslation. As to the notes printed along with the text, some interpretation to obscure or ambiguous passages must be supplied; and is it not better to be done in notes, than, as by Protestant translations, by tampering with the text itself? He then referred to the circulation of the Scriptures among Catholics, and said it was not so limited as some people imagined, although they did not labor for it as a matter of life and death for all. One house alone in this city had sold over 70,000 copies of the Bible, and he knew not how many hundreds of thousands had been circulated by the other Catholic publishers throughout the country. Yet many could not be convinced that the Scriptures were not an unknown book amongst Catholics.

The lecture, of which the above is only a brief outline, was listened to throughout with the deepest attention.

IRISH INTELLIGENCE.

AN ASSEMBLY OF NOTABLES.—The "Nobility, Gentry, and others interested in the peace and prosperity of Ireland" (as what Irishman is not?) are summoned to meet "at the Round Room of the Rotundo, in the city of Dublin, on the 27th inst., at 12 o'clock," "on which occasion the Marquis of Downshire has kindly consented to take the chair." Surely a stirring summons, and it might be hoped, a great occasion for a patriotic assemblage of the Notables of the land. After passing through the ordeal of a seven years' famine, and losing by death or flight one in four of her people, Ireland to-day might well expect that all her true sons, high and low, gentle and simple, compassionate, their terrible misfortunes, which have moved to pity not only her own exiles but strange nations to the end of the earth, would unite in a National brotherhood to endeavor, with God's help, to make some atonement to their country and to humanity for the fearful wrongs they had tamely permitted or helplessly endured; or, if despair of achieving any positive good paralysed our public energies, it might still be hoped the recollection of the dire calamities our country has so recently suffered would sober down the drunkenness of faction, and soften the

roudest hearts towards the unfortunate land of their birth. It might be hoped that men pretending to Christianity; to humanity; to patriotism, having witnessed with their own eyes the deaths by starvation of hundreds of thousands of their fellow-creatures and fellow-countrymen, would feel in their hearts and consciences that they could never know peace or rest till they had done their utmost, so far as human means and foresight might avail, to insure that such terrible, such unnatural calamity might never again visit their country.

Well, the Assembly of Notables is convened to sit in Dublin next week, and the circular of summons tells us of the grave subject, truly of national importance, which are to engage their deliberations.—These are, "the better protection of life and property in this country;" and "measures for the encouragement of improving tenants, and the assistance of the laboring poor." A permanent association will be founded for these great objects, in which it "is expected all classes will cordially unite." Surely a practical proceeding, and a just and reasonable expectation.

But let us look a little beyond the condescension of the Marquis of Downshire and the mild circular of the Honorary Secretaries to "the important matters" which the "provisional committee" will submit for consideration of the meeting, and behold a change with a vengeance.

First, we are astounded by the monstrous assertion that "impunity has for many years attended the most atrocious agrarian crimes in this country," and that "this impunity is to be ascribed chiefly to the sympathy of the lower classes, extending to jurors," with the crimes and the criminals. Here, at the very outset, we find assertions directly in the teeth of notorious facts, involving most grave charges against the administration of criminal justice in Ireland, and a terrible accusation, most unfounded, as we believe and know, against the morality of the Irish people. Is it to parrot such extravagant assertions and to endorse so foul a slander on their country that the noblemen and gentlemen of all Ireland are summoned to meet at the Rotundo?

But what is the conclusion drawn by the "provisional committee" for these rashly assumed premises? Why, that "the law needs to be amended and rendered more effective" "for the security of landlords who wish to improve their estates," as also, of course, for "the protection of the well-disposed amongst the peasantry," such as bailiffs, drivers, members of the crowbar-brigade, &c., which means simply that the Draconian land code of Ireland, which has inflicted such wide-spread misery and ruin throughout the island must be intensified in bloody severity, and the scorpion lash, placed by British law in the hands of exterminating Irish landlords, made "more effective." Let us see the worthy means by which these objects are to be achieved.

Firstly—Trial by jury is to be virtually abolished in "trials for agrarian crime," by providing that in all such cases the jurors shall be packed juries, and that when there is any difficulty in packing a jury in the locality, "the venue shall be changed," (not in justice or mercy to the accused party, but with the avowed purpose of securing a conviction), and that, for better security, "the crown shall have the right of requiring a special jury."

Secondly—That Seditious Magistrates, whose duty it seems is not that of Justices of the Peace, but of police detectives and crown prosecutors, should be persons of "education, energy, and ability," and that any of the present men who may not be up to the mark should be shelved "on full pay," and room and comfortable berths provided for those sons of the gentry, who are prepared to hunt the peasantry, if necessary, "with bloodhounds."

Thirdly—That the unquid magistracy should be made still more exclusive and puritan at present, by the enforcement of a property qualification, which the House of Commons has just dispensed with in its own members, and that the magistrates themselves should become more absolute and irresponsible than ever.

Fourthly—That the "efficiency and fidelity" of the Constabulary force should be placed in the care of the "magistrates in Petty Sessions," that their pay should be raised (which may be just, though offered as a bribe), and that they should receive extra pay when engaged in the prosecution of offenders, a dangerous temptation to Constabulary zeal.

Fifthly—That "more effective restrictions should be placed on the granting of public house licences," a very desirable arrangement, if honestly carried out, but which practically means that the magistrates should obtain the free and unfettered power to grant or take away such licences at their good will and pleasure, in which case the public house license would certainly be made the reward of political partisanship, or of something worse—Also that publicans should be compelled to post conspicuously on their premises government proclamations and police notices, on pain of forfeiting their licences, and should themselves be disqualified by law from acting as Poor law Guardian, Relieving Officer, Town Commissioner, or Juror. A penal law against publicans, but which, so far from remedying the vice of "low public houses," would only drive from the trade every man of decent spirit and feeling.

Sixthly—That Grand Juries should have the power to grant compensation to the family in case of murder, and to the individual in cases of malicious injury, and that this power should be absolute, and override that of the ratepayers at Presentment Sessions. Of course this compensation would be levied as an Eric on the offending district, but we trust no member of "the family," who might be sworn against as an accomplice in the crime, would be allowed to receive or share the compensation, as we think "impunity is quite enough to extend to any accused party, even though he might happen to be one of 'the sons of the gentry,' and, as such, possessing the 'sympathy' of his class.

Seventhy—That Viceregal proclamations should be issued, calling on parties accused of crime to surrender, or, in default, all persons harboring them, to be guilty of felony. In which event a man might be made a "felon" for refusing to turn informer on his own father or brother.

Here are seven comprehensive measures for strengthening the power of the landocracy, and making safe and easy the oppression and gradual extermination of the peasantry. In theory some of these proposals are not only plausible but just, such as that relating to the increased pay of the constabulary, in cases where increased duty has been imposed on them, and the granting of compensation for malicious injuries to the person in same manner as for malicious injuries to property. But practically the whole scheme is a bold attempt to revive the old ascendancy of a worthless landocracy, and to bring back the times described by Arthur Young, when an Irish peasant stood as much in dread of "his honor's" whip as any Russian serf or negro slave in America.

Well, having provided thus elaborately for the "protection of life and property," let us see what is to be done for the "improving tenant" and the "laboring poor." These important matters are confined to a single vague paragraph, in which the improving tenant will not find one word about compensation for his improvements, nor is there even a hint of better wages or more Christian treatment for the laboring poor. Something, indeed, we hear about "improving the dwellings of the laboring population and of the small farmers;" but this apparently philanthropic sentiment only calls to our mind visions of the *hubere* and the crowbar. To make a desert and call it improvement has heretofore been the philanthropy of Irish Landlordism. What rational hope is there that in this respect the future will be other than the past?

We respectfully entreat the attention of the Catholic Hierarchy and Clergy, as well as of the people of Ireland, to this bold attempt to review, in our own day, the degrading despotism with our fathers struggled bravely and successfully, but which long covered our land with crime and bloodshed. We question if a single Catholic bishop or priest in all Ireland has