



TRUTH IS POWERFUL, AND WILL PREVAIL.

IRELAND.

INTERNAL RESOURCES OF IRELAND.

A second edition of Mr. C. W. Williams' valuable work has recently made its appearance in London, and we strongly recommend it to the consideration of all official and public men. His intimate connection with the Steam Navigation Company of Great Britain, has given him opportunities of studying the subject which no mere author or theorist ever possessed; his statements and calculations drawn from actual experience, are detailed with perspicuity and comprehensiveness of thought.—The work is divided into three sections—

1. The comparative state of England and Ireland, as to internal intercourse, natural and artificial.
2. The capabilities and present condition of the river Shannon.
3. The funds and management organised by the Legislature for the interior improvement of Ireland.

Mr. Williams shows the ignorance of many authors, and members of the British Legislature, in ascribing the impoverished condition of Ireland to want of capital. It actually appears that during the last ten years no less than fourteen millions of money have been remitted from Ireland and invested in English stocks, from the inability of the parties to lay out the amount at home with any certainty of remuneration, and this system of remittances is still in operation:—

"There can be no doubt but that the presence of the available capital in the one country, and its absence in the other, form a strong contrast in the state of things in England and Ireland; neither could any measures of relief be devised more beneficial to the latter, than such as would assimilate it in this respect to England, and induce those who possess the means to invest them in works tending towards the employment of the population, and the establishment of new sources of industry and trading occupations.

"The deficiency of capital is everywhere discernible.—Yet it is an error to say, adequate capital does not exist in Ireland. The question for consideration more imperatively is, what inducements can be held out to its possessors, and what is wanting to their creation? And if these inducements are not sufficiently clear to the home capitalists, to draw them into the market of business or enterprise, how can it be expected from those on the other side of the channel?

"The question, then, of a deficiency of capital in Ireland is not that which first demands attention. Capital will not be wanting when the way is prepared for its useful and profitable application. Here is the true point for consideration. Is the way prepared? In this respect, by far the largest part of Ireland must be regarded and treated as an infant country. Her great wants must be first supplied by the Legislature and by national co-operation, before her natural capabilities can be developed by individual exertion.—Ireland is far behind England in all that can call for, or apply, the aids and elements of individual enterprise.

"It is not therefore from the example of England, or by conclusions drawn from the high-wrought civilization of that country, and the well-balanced gradations of society, which, by their mutual dependence, create confidence among all, that we are to determine what Ireland wants, or how her natural resources are to be made available.

"As far as concerns the application of capital, or the employment of its population, Ireland is not in a condition to be governed on the English system. Englishmen naturally look for results drawn from an experience confined, exclusively, to the contemplation of a state of things in their own country, and which, in its most essential features, bears no analogy to what exists in Ireland. They imagine that capital should flow in the same channels, and follow the same inducements as in England, before either the one or the other has been provided. They see no reason why one country should stand more in need of encouragement or aid than the other; or why capitalists in Ireland require legislative protection or inducements which are not required in England. On this subject, unfortunately a great deficiency of information prevails.

"The absence of available capital in Ireland is visible in the want of improvements in towns, buildings, and farms—it dries up the sources of employment for the population—it leaves nothing for increased comfort and embellishment; parks, pleasure-grounds, farms, furniture, laborer's cottages, fences, agricultural implements—all exhibit the want of that capital which overflows everywhere in England. Again look to the facility with which the subscription of no less than 2,500,000 was instantly raised for the rail-road connecting London Birmingham and Liverpool.

Mr. Williams then proceeds to state the extent of inland navigation in England, all of which has been formed during the last seventy-five years, and amounts, including rail road to 4534 miles, while the whole in Ireland is but 713 miles, and one-third of it is the river Shannon. While entire districts of this country, for 20 or 30 miles, are without even a road or communication with the great navigable rivers, subjecting the farmers to the necessity of sending their produce to market on horseback, there is not a spot of England which, on an average, is not within twelve miles of water conveyance, and every part of it intersected with roads. There has been a great increase of population in both countries during the last twenty years, about one-fourth in Great Britain, and more than a half in Ireland, but there has been no corresponding increase in the means of

intercourse here, and much of the disturbance in Ireland, which have disgraced the country can be fairly imputed to this cause. The funds laid out in forming roads or canals have been frequently mismanaged and defectively appropriated; and no general or business-like system adopted or followed up for the establishment or protection of these works. We witness the effects of this neglect in the low value of labour and agricultural produce; the absence of improvement and domestic comfort—the general stagnation of trade, and want of enterprise.

In the second section Mr. Williams calls public attention to the state of the Shannon, and endeavours to picture it to Englishmen. "Let us suppose," says he, "a navigable river taking its rise in some distant county of England, so far from Liverpool, as Essex or Middlesex. Suppose it continually spreading itself into noble and picturesque sheets of water of more than miles in length, with numerous islands, receiving the waters of many rivers, and stretching its bays into the adjacent counties, as it were to increase the measure of its utility and its beauty. Imagine it winding its way through Hertfordshire and Bedfordshire, Northamptonshire and Warwickshire, and the rich soil of Leicestershire; and after passing by Staffordshire, Derbyshire and Cheshire, and running a course of 250 miles, falling into the estuary of the Mersey in Lancashire. See it presenting to each of the counties the benefit of fifty miles of navigation, and we shall have a correct idea of the extent and capabilities of this river."

This is no imaginary representation: it is a correct view of the mighty Shannon which waters ten counties, runs through the centre of each, and gives it an internal navigation,—with the advantage of a double coast, to the extent of five hundred miles. Yet all this is neglected. For nearly one hundred miles not a boat will be seen on its waters; there are no roads to it, no landing places on its banks, and the whole is left in a state of nature. Abounding with natural manures of the highest value to the farmers, and capable of conveying lime to any part of its coast for the improvement of the adjacent bogland, all is neglected and lies waste. England has framed the great Bideau canal in Canada, at an expense of millions. Will she do nothing for the improvement of the Shannon—for the erection of small quays on the banks—and the construction of roads throughout the surrounding districts? Political measures, however important, will not alone improve the country—they may put down the lawless, but something further must be done systematically and efficiently to call into action the native resources of Ireland. The very magnitude of the undertaking, prevents individual proprietors from embarking in it; their conflicting interests, their supineness, their want of money, must all conspire to deter them; but as it is of national importance, it ought to be taken up by the nation, on such terms as may be most advantageous to the public.

PAYMENT OF TITHE COMPOSITION AND ASSIZES.

It may be interesting to some of our readers to know exactly who are the persons liable in future to pay the tithe composition; we therefore give a short summary, which we think will be useful, as also the mode in which the arrears for the years 1831, 1832, and 1833, are to be collected:—

And the first as to the tithe composition—Wherever a tenant holds under a tenure created after a tithe composition established parish, (a) or after the 16th of August, 1832, (b) the landlord or lessor is the person liable. But where the tenant's interest was created prior to the establishment of a tithe composition in the parish, and prior to the 16th of August, 1832, the tenant is the person liable. Tenants at will and tenants from year to year are, after the 1st of November not liable to payment to the tithe owner (to whom the next immediate landlord is liable), but the amount of the composition is to be added by the landlord to the rent, and recovered as rent, unless a special agreement to the contrary (c).

2d. As to the arrears of tithe now due:—The tithe owner may, if he pleases, proceed to recover by due course of law all arrear of tithe now due, and of course the persons who were liable to the payment of tithe or tithe composition will remain subject to all arrear, unless the tithe owner thinks fit to apply to government, pursuant to the late Act, for the arrears due for the years 1831, 1832, and 1833; in which case the ordinary remedy for those arrears ceases, and a new mode of payment provided, in the shape of a composition, as follows:—the sum advanced by government to the tithe owner is to be divided into five parts, and 1-5th part added each year for five years to the current tithe composition, and this addition is payable by the person from time to time liable to the composition itself (d).

But wherever the same person, who owed the arrear, continues to occupy the land, out of which the arrear became due, the landlord, who is liable to the tithe owner, may, nevertheless, add this addition to his rent, and receive it as such (e).

Wherever the person who owed the arrear is the person liable to the payment of the future tithe composition, he is also

made liable (besides the composition, for arrear) to a further additional payment of 25 per cent. on the arrear of 1831 and 1832, and of 15 per cent. on the arrear of 1833 due by such tenant (j): so that the tenant, who remains in possessions of land owing an arrear, and who is not entitled to hold tithe free, will have to pay—1st, the current tithe composition yearly; 2d, the additional composition for five years on account of arrears; 3d, 25 per cent. on the arrear of 1831 and 1832, and 16 per cent. for 1833.

increased since 1829; and a thriving town, which has not been built in the towns, (Hear, hear, and cheers.) But, for one moment talk of the absurdities of this Irish member of an English borough—the man who tells us that the still ver, the deserted Custom-house, the full store, and empty omach are proofs of national prosperity. Away with all such afflicting hypocrisy, let him visit his darling Limerick, and here he will see the grass growing at the very door of the Custom-house; not even a clerk in the office, and the turf-boat, the only disturber of the beautiful Shannon. (Hear.) Gentlemen, this is not the fitting time to enter minutely into the details of this great question. I have cursorily run over one or two of this right hon. gentleman's favorite detail topics; at when they have those wholesome answers also, such as,—"When you had a parliament a pretty corrupt assembly it was." (Hear, hear, from Dr. Baldwin.) Why, the learned Doctor cheers; and I thank him for the cheer; but give me leave to ask him if we ever had an Irish Parliament. (Cheers, and cries of never.) No, never, for from the passing of Poyning's act, in the reign of Henry the Seventh, to the year 1782,—our parliament was a mere tool in the hands of the British minister—or even in '82 could it be called independent, as long as the Catholics—the great bulk of the population—were excluded from any participation in the affairs of the state. [Cheering.] But to show you that an Irish Parliament, although not independent, is better than no parliament at all, do we not find that after 1782 that self-interest predominated? For in spite of religious distinction, and party feeling, the country was rapidly hurrying on to the goal of national importance, when the tyrant, as our worthy chairman has told you, sent discord raging throughout the land, fomented his accursed rebellion, and when he divided, then butchered us. (Cheers.) But I must ask the Doctor another question—should we alone have stood still when all other countries were progressing in knowledge? Was the mighty power of the Irish people alone to have remained stagnant, whilst the rushing streams of public opinion had circled the dams of ignorance? Should we then have had none of the blessings of that reform which was thought so salutary in England, whose parliament, even in 1832, was voted by its own members, venal, corrupt, and incompetent to do the business of the state? [Hear, hear.] Our chairman has addressed you honestly, and, without flattery, I will say, eloquently upon this subject. He has told you of his conversion, and his reasons. It also may be made a convert; but it must be upon argument, and by coercion. [Hear, hear.] I may be an anti-repealer, but shall be, when it is proved to me that provincial degradation is preferable to national independence—that hunger is preferable to food—that nakedness is preferable to clothing—idleness to industry—proletariat to freedom and respectability. Is the individual whose death is thus noticed. We have known him a long time, and can confidently assert that no better man ever lived. His warm Irish heart, his undeviating integrity and moral attitude, his charity and his simple pleasing manner attracted the respect of strangers, and commanded the love—the admiration of numerous acquaintances. On the 15th instant, much regretted by a numerous circle of friends, Mr. John Doherty, a native of Ireland, and for many years a respectable citizen of this city.

BY J. W. DAYMON.

Store No. 191 Chatham Square.

If a capitalist buy land in Ireland he commonly gives for it the amount of twenty-five years rent—sometimes thirty years rent is given. If he gives the former he obtains four per cent for his money; and if he gives the latter he obtains less than three-and-a-half per cent.

It follows therefore, that the farmers and society are benefited by these investments, because they enable industrious men to obtain lands and cultivate them who otherwise would be compelled to seek for other employments, or emigrate to countries where land may be obtained for the labour of clearing and reclaiming it.

In the present state of society the Irish or English farmers, would lose rather than gain by purchasing the lands they occupy. Suppose the rent to be 2l. an acre for 100 acres in all 200l. a year. This, purchased for 25 years rent would cost 5000l. and that sum vested in the public securities would yield as much as the rent from which the farmer would be released; and if vested in his trade (for farming is a trade) it would yield a far greater income and give employment to a number of laborers.

Rent, therefore, is not the evil thing which it is commonly consi-



NO. 1.

improving, enlarging, and bringing to perfection. The teachers employed to them scarcely ever pretend to go beyond the simple "Rule of Three;" they know their salaries are periodical, and they are also aware that few who send their children there are capable, or if capable, they have not time to examine them, to know whether they are progressing or retrograding. In some of them you will see those who are placed there as their obligatory instructors, have them upon benches learning them the art of singing a hymn, ere they scarcely know the meaning of the word. This may be good enough in its place, but there are other arts more salutary, useful, and edifying, to be attended to, which it should not be allowed to usurp. Parents will send their children for years to those schools, under the impression that they are attaining the necessary rudiments of knowledge, when, very often, to their disappointment and sorrow, upon examination they will find them as ignorant of what they went there to learn as before, and very often depraved in their morals.—These schools, therefore, are of little or no real advantage to the poor youth of the City, who are depending alone upon the munificence, generosity, and chastity of a liberal public. They should be reformed, or abolished altogether; for they are scarcely a shadow of what they should be. Are there not men in this community intelligent and sagacious enough to know that there are many possessing the natural endowments to be an honor, a valuable acquisition to their country if they were but cultivated. Why not establish a College gratis to those who will be found to deserve it, where those on whom nature has shed her rarest gifts, but to whom fortune has been penurious, can taste of the rarest sweets from the garden of knowledge; where they will have an opportunity of studying and cultivating ancient lore, which is now as unknown to them as was the frightful ravishes of sin to our first parents white enjoying the happiness of paradise, instead of lavishing money upon the establishment of "Societies,"—which, in their widest range, are calculated only to keep the bud of knowledge from withering, after it has sprung forth. Let the ground be selected and the seed sown ere these societies are formed. There are many now strutting to Columbia whom nature intended to be of some vocation besides a literary profession; and there are others now suffering the fatigue and inclemencies of the weather at some low occupation, whom nature intended for nobler, sublimer purposes. Here then, oh, ye mock moralists! ye pretended despisers of wealth, and favorers of poverty—here, I say, may be seen the advantages of wealth and the disadvantages of fortune. Do not screen yourselves behind your shadowy pretences—you, perhaps never have felt the disadvantages, but you certainly know them. Who has not felt within himself a sorrow, a regret, when in the knowledge of some youth, burning with an ardent desire for literary acquisitions, and seeking every opportunity to improve himself, to see him the sport of fortune, and the prey of poverty, totally incapacitating him from being able to arrive at that goal with which his very soul was entwined, and in which his hopes were centered.

SARFIELD, Jun

CAUTION AGAINST DR. BROWNLEE'S QUOTATIONS—BY THE REV. PELIX VARELA.

As to the book on the two natures of Christ, Dr. Brownlee is frank enough to state that it is not attributed by all the critics to the Pope Gelasius. Moreover he only quotes those words of the text which he thinks will answer his purpose, viz. "The substance or nature of the bread and wine ceases not to exist; and surely the image and similitude of the body and blood of Christ are celebrated in the performance of the mysteries." I might observe, that the substance or nature of bread can be said to remain, because the sacrament loses not the nature of food, which often is expressed by the word substance, and the exterior qualities of bread, which often are called the nature of it; but let Gelasius, or whoever is the author, answer by the words which precede and those which follow the text quoted by Dr. Brownlee.—"The sacrament we take is a divine being; and therefore we are made by it consorts of the divine nature, and notwithstanding the substance or nature of the bread &c." And afterwards—"It is evident that we must believe of Christ what we profess to celebrate, and receive in his image and as they (the elements) pass to the divine substance by the action of the Holy Ghost, remaining in their virtue: so they indicate the principal mystery, whose virtue and efficacy they properly represent, one Christ real and complete, properly remaining the things of which he is composed." The sacrament, according to the text, is a divine thing, and it makes us consorts of the divine nature, and therefore is called divine, not only because it comes from God; because the baptism, which certainly comes from God, is not said to make us consort of the divine nature, but because it properly contains something of divine nature. Hence the text supposes a real divinity in the sacrament, in which the bread passes or is converted. But the bread cannot pass or be converted into the divine substance properly speaking. Hence it is converted into the body of Christ, which can be called divine, in as much as it subsists in the divine person, and make with the soul and divinity one and the same God Jesus Christ. The substance or nature of the bread and wine ceases not to exist. If the word substance be taken in a strict signification as in the argument, it will follow, that no substantial change takes place in the bread; neither any accidental change, for the accidental properties remain unaltered, hence the bread undergoes no alteration whatever. Hence it does not pass into a divine substance. Hence the Holy Ghost is not operated any thing in it, because, it does not contain it what it did before, and as to any virtue communicated to it, protestants deny that the sacraments give grace by themselves, as the theologians say, ex opere operato. Therefore if we take the author's words, as Dr. Brownlee does, then the Eucharist is not more fit than any other bread for the comparison and argument which Gelasius intended to form. And which that comparison? That as in the Eucharist there are two things united in one sacrament, so in Christ there are two natures united in one person. Now, according to Dr. Brownlee's doctrine, there are not two different things in the Eucharist, but one, that is a bare piece of bread. Hence Dr. Brownlee takes a fool of Gelasius, who certainly formed the most nominal comparison, or rather he made no comparison and no argument at all. If it be supposed that the author meant that the body of Christ is

together with the bread, then the bread does not pass to any divine substance, and moreover we have then three different things, viz:—the body, the soul Divinity of Christ, and the bread, which cannot form any compound with them being not united to the divine person, Then the comparison would be entirely ridiculous. I observe also that such supposition establishes the real presence, and destroys the Calvinist doctrine, and therefore I do not think that Dr. Brownlee will like it much. It is evident, says the author, that we must believe of Christ what we believe of his image, meaning the Sacrament. According to the Lutheran doctrine, we would say, "believe then that there is no hypostatical union between the two natures of Jesus Christ, because there is none the bread and his body in the Sacrament;" and according to the Calvinist doctrine we would say, "believe that there is only one substance and one nature in Christ, because there is only one in the bread." These are two capital errors which no Protestant will admit and nobody will believe that they were embraced by Gelasius. But let us examine the text according to the Catholic doctrine, and we shall find it correct. "As in the Eucharist," we would say, "the real body of Christ supports the real qualities or appearances of bread, which really shows to us an appearance of bread and we would believe it so were it not for the divine word, and as these two really are different things united in one compound, that is in one sacrament with that union that there is according to the philosophers between the substance and the qualities inter substantiam et accidentia: so the human nature of Christ is supported by the divine person and forms one Christ together with the divine nature also supported by the same divine person. The correctness of this interpretation will be perceived if we recollect that at the time of Gelasius, Natural Philosophy was but little advanced and hold the ancient doctrine that the qualities are not modifications of the substance but real forms added to it, and therefore Gelasius could find two really different things united in the sacrament, the one of them viz:—the compound of qualities (accidentia) remaining the same in its nature and in representing the substance of bread.

The above observations are enough to prove that Gelasius could not be a Calvinist, (a Calvinist Pope!) however in order to throw more light on this important subject we may remark that Gelasius either gathered in the Sacramentarium attributed to him, or at least knew the ancient Roman liturgy where we read "At the time of communion, the priest bowing down in the sentiment of adoration and profound humility addresses himself to Jesus Christ, whom he holds in his hands and says thrice—Lord I am not worthy, &c." Could they adore a piece of bread? Could they say that the Priest holds Jesus Christ in his hands holding only a piece of bread? Gelasius could not be ignorant of the Alexandrian liturgy which is that of St. Mark where we read "The priest then takes a larger part of the Host, and having elevated it, bows down and exclaims, Holy things are for the Holy. And all the people cast themselves on their faces to the earth." Shortly after this comes the profession of faith, which the priest makes in the following terms: "This is the body and the pure and precious blood of Jesus Christ the son of God. This is, in truth, the body and blood of Emanuel our God. Amen. I believe, I believe, I believe, I confess to the last breath of my life that this is the life-giving body of thine only begotten son, our Lord God, our Saviour Jesus Christ. He received it from the lady of us all, from the pure and Holy Mary, MOTHER OF GOD." Is it not evident that the primitive Christian adored the Eucharist? The very repetition of I believe, I believe, does it not prove that the Eucharist was something hard to believe, something more than a piece of bread taken in commemoration of the Lord? Now, as to Gelasius, can Dr. Brownlee prove that he never said Mass, and that no Priest ever said Mass during his Pontificate? Then he and his Priests elevated the Host to be adored by the people. Could he then write that it was nothing but a piece of bread? This is enough to convince any impartial reader as to the meaning of the words attributed to Gelasius.

By way of important digression I will translate from the Spanish an interesting text from the learned work of Lobera, El por que de las ceremonias de la Iglesia, pag. 344.—"The elevation of the Host comes from the Apostles, according to Zabio, cap. 187. St. Denis and St. Basil affirm that they cannot find any other origin of this ceremony. The ancient father of the Greek Church covered the altar and the ministers with a veil at the time of consecration, and afterwards the Deacon elevated the Eucharist, while he or the Priest said to the people holy things for the holy. Remondo tells us that an American Bishop and an Abisinian Priest said mass at Paris and made use of the same ceremony of the elevation of the Host. Being asked where they got it from, they answered from St. Peter, and it has been performed by our forefathers, and among them we account St. Denis, St. Basil, St. Chrysostom, and St. John Damascenus."

Returning to our principal subject, I will observe that it is totally improbable, not to say impossible, that had Gelasius denied transubstantiation he would not have positively condemned the author who before him and at his time wrote openly in its favor. And the authors who wrote after him would not have at least left unnoticed the doctrine of that Pope had he taught any such thing.—Gelasius was elected Pope in 472, and St. Leo was elected in 440, who thus wrote:—"You must communicate, doubting not of the reality of the body and blood. We receive into our mouth the very same thing that we profess in our faith, and those who dispute against the very thing they receive cannot properly answer Amen." (serm. 14 de Pass.) So universal is the doctrine of the Church on this point, that the reality of the body and blood of Christ in the sacrament is published even by the tongues of children." (Ep. 23ad Cler. et Pop.) St. Hilary was elected Pope in 461, and wrote as follows—"The body of Christ which we received at the altar is a figure when we see the appearance (extra) of bread and wine; but it is a reality when we believe that the body and blood of Christ really are there." [Apud Grat. de consec. dist. 2. con. corpus.] This text of the Pope Hilary explains at once the meaning of the fathers of that age, when they called the Eucharist figure of the body of the blood of Christ, and answers all Dr. Brownlee's arguments.

Pope Gelasius died in 497, and in 500, that is only three years after his death, St. Remigius thus wrote—"Though you see bread it is really the body of Christ." "The flesh which the word of God, the father, took in the womb of a virgin, into the unity of person, and the bread which is consecrated in the church, are but one body; because as that flesh is the body of Christ, so this bread is transmuted into the body of Christ, and they are not two bodies in one body." [Comment in ep. 10. Ep. 1. ad Cor.] This needs no It is evident that those who wrote immediately before and after Gelasius, those who were Priests with him and under his pontificate, those who knew his sentiments and opinions, those who respected him, obeyed him and loved him, those who were eminent for their learning and sanctity, all of them preached taught and wrote the doctrine of heral presence and transubstantiation, without even noticing those words of Gelasius. Hence either they are not his or they must be understood as we have explained them.

SIXTH WARD.—At a large and respectable meeting of the Sixth Ward, held pursuant to the call of the General Committee, at John Lynar's corner of Cross and Pearl streets, on the 15th instant, Captain George Mills was called to the chair, and John McGrath and John W. Merritt were appointed Secretaries. On motion, George Mills, George D. Strong, and Thomas S. Brady, were nominated and appointed Delegates from the Sixth Ward to represent the Ward in the Democratic Republican General Committee at Tammany Hall for ensuing year. On motion of Alderman Strong, seconded by Thomas S. Brady, Esquire,

ions had
lutely in
inexper
said no

the maintenance of a useless stipendiary force, in fees to the cormorant agent of the absentee, and for upholding public ut, yet Mr. Spring Rice tells us that Ireland is the favoured lace, because she is not taxed; that she is prosperous in consequence of the Union, because her imports and exports have increased since 1829; and a thriving country, because houses ave been built in the towns, (Hear, hear, and cheers.) But, why for one moment talk of the absurdities of this Irish member of an English borough—the man who tells us that the still iver, the deserted Custom-house, the full store, and empty tomach are proofs of national prosperity. Away with all such rafficking hypocrisy, let him visit his darling Limerick, and here he will see the grass growing at the very door of the Custom-house; not even a clerk in the office, and the turf-boat, the only disturber of the beautiful Shannon. (Hear.) Gentle- men, this is not the fitting time to enter minutely into the details of this great question. I have cursorily run over one or wo of this right hon. gentleman's favorite detail topics; but when they have those wholesome answers also, such as,— "When you had a parliament a pretty corrupt assembly it was." (Hear, hear, from Dr. Baldwin.) Why, the learned Doctor cheers, and I thank him for the cheer: but give me leave to ask him if we ever had an Irish Parliament. (Cheers, and cries of never.) No, never, for from the passing of Poyning's Act, in the reign of Henry the Seventh, to the year 1782,—our parliament was a mere tool in the hands of the British minister —nor even in '82 could it be called independent, as long as the Catholics—the great bulk of the population—were excluded from any participation in the affairs of the state. [Cheering.] But to show you that an Irish Parliament, although not independent, is better than no parliament at all, do we not find that after 1782 that self-interest predominated? For in spite of religious distinction, and party feeling, the country was rapidly hurrying on to the goal of national importance, when the tyrant, as our worthy chairman has told you, sent discord raging throughout the land, fomented his accursed rebellion, and when he divided, then butchered us. (Cheers.) But I must ask the Doctor another question—should we alone have stood still when all other countries were progressing in knowledge? Was the mighty power of the Irish people alone to have remained stagnant, whilst the rushing streams of public opinion had circled the dams of ignorance? Should we then have had none of the blessings of that reform which was thought so salutary in England, whose parliament, even in 1832, was voted by its own members, venal, corrupt, and incompetent to do the business of the state? [Hear, hear.] Our chairman has addressed you honestly, and, without flattery, I will say, eloquently upon this subject. He has told you of his conversion, and his reasons. It also may be made a convert; but it must be upon argument, not by coercion. [Hear, hear.] I may be an anti-repealer,—I shall be, when it is proved to me that provincial degradation is preferable to national independence—that hunger is preferable to food—that nakedness is preferable to clothing—idle- ness to industry,—and I resign circular or respect to all of the individual whose death is thus noticed. We have known him for a long time, and can confidently assert that no better man ever existed. His warm Irish heart, his undeviating integrity and moral rectitude, his charity and his simple pleasing manner attracted the respect of strangers, and commanded the love—the admiration of his numerous acquaintances. On the 14th instant, much regretted by a numerous circle of friends, Mr. John Doherty, a native of Ireland, and for many years a respectable citizen of this city.

BY J. W. DAYMON.
Store No. 191 Chatham Square.

THIS DAY.
At 10 o'clock, at the auction room, a general assortment of Household and Kitchen Furniture, viz.—Bureaus; mahogany dining and tea Tables; fine and wind-sor Chairs; Ingrain Carpets; gilt and mahogany Looking Glasses; Venetian, Birds; feather beds, bolsters, and pillows; bedding; field and low post beds, steeds; coats; arduous, shovels and tongs; knives and forks; plated and brass candlesticks; washstand; watches; clothing; carpenter's tools; mantel clocks; crockery and glass ware, &c.
J. DAYMON, Auctioneer, No. 191 Chatham Square, returns his friends, and patrons his sincere thanks for the many favors conferred on him in his line of business, and respectfully solicits a continuance of their patronage. Families breaking up, house-keeping, and persons declining business, will be attended to personally at their houses or stores. Furniture of any articles of merchandise sent to his store will be paid every attention to—Payments promptly made the day after sale.

WANTED.—A Boy to learn the Tailoring business. None need apply without proper recommendations.
FRANCIS GOLDEN, 273 Grand-st.

INFORMATION WANTED

Of CHARLES O'BRIAN, a native of the Parish of Dromoro Co. Tyrone, Ireland, who emigrated to this Country in the year 1827. The last account we had that he was in Philadelphia. Any information respecting him will be thankfully received by his brother Patrick O'Brian, at No. 173 West Street, New York, or the Philip O'Brian.

