

he published them. This is a proof of the voracious appetite for scurrility which he possesses. How the wealthy and respectable part of the community can patronise a paper abandoned to such licentiousness, I cannot think.

I am glad, Sir, to see that you have chosen a more honourable, upright and gentlemanly course. Your paper is, in every department, superior to any in the Island, and seems in a fair way to maintain its standing. This impression, I am glad to find, is fast gaining ground here, and I think the country will not long hesitate which to support.

By publishing this article, you will oblige one who seldom troubles you.

A FARMER.

New London, Nov. 6th, 1843.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE COLONIAL HERALD.

Sir; I have read the articles which have lately appeared in your paper, signed A COMMISSIONER, in answer to CURTIUS' first letter. Their character and tone afford some very distinct revelations of the moral man of the writer; and as he has assumed the task of portraying "the political character" of CURTIUS, I shall indulge myself a little, by way of exordium to my weightier remarks, in noticing some of the peccable points in your correspondent, discovered by his productions. That writer, then, has evidently a very high opinion of himself. Phrenologists, I have heard, attach great importance to a good development of self-esteem, in making a clever controversialist. But I very much doubt its competency to cope with well attested facts and sound argument. And perhaps when your correspondent has run his poll against a few more of these, it may considerably reduce his organ of self-importance. Another trait in this gentleman's character is peevishness. This is very natural. An advocate for the sacred dogmas of the divine right of kings, the paramount claims of wealth, and the hereditary rights of blood, in this sceptical age, when these things are falling into contempt, will naturally feel indignant against the laxity of modern principles. But he may as well be patient. He will probably find CURTIUS made of such perdurable material, that all he will gain by his anger will be additional hard thrusts and vexation.

A worse quality than either of the foregoing, which I regret A COMMISSIONER has evinced, is a most prevailing propensity to pervert the sentiments of his opponent. I shall notice a few instances. His comments on CURTIUS' remarks on the irresponsibility of our civil government, present themselves first. He represents that writer as inculcating, that our authorities, "over and above the duties of their offices, should invoke the privations and plunge into the toils of human life." This idea has not the most remote connection with CURTIUS' remarks; and I presume he had as little wish as any person could have that our rulers should do so. His reasoning only censured the arrogance which claims exemption from these things as an "inherent right," rather than as a favour—the privilege of their office to be first earned and deserved before it should be enjoyed; and which—instead of being an argument for a lofty contempt of the people—should be a motive to the contrary—a respectful sympathy with their "interests and pursuits," and a grateful attention to their wishes. Neither did CURTIUS maintain, that "because a man is thought more competent than his neighbour to fill a public office, he should, from the date of his appointment, become chargeable with some extraordinary amount of philanthropy, in addition to what he before possessed." I presume that, had he advanced the idea at all, instead of thus putting the cart before the horse, he would have said, that a man's possession of philanthropy—and patriotism, he might have added,—the greater the amount the better—would be a reason why he should be "thought more competent" than others to fill an office. But CURTIUS' public officer, sympathising with the people's interests and wishes, and A COMMISSIONER'S scarecrow, "bursting with sympathy, like Paddy with 'loyalty,'" are widely different specimens of humanity; and CURTIUS charging our officials with a want of becoming sympathy and respect for the people, and A COMMISSIONER representing this to mean, that the official of this Colony is "really more prone than in any other Colony to suppress within him whatever of christian benevolence or social interest he might previously have felt," are vastly dissimilar ideas. And these are things which all the miserable sophistry of your correspondent will not induce a candid public to confound. Another notable instance of misrepresentation is found in his second letter. He charges CURTIUS with saying, that wealth and superiority are disqualifications to official appointments; and that "in his (CURTIUS) opinion, a man who holds two or three thousand pounds' worth of land should be, on that account, ineligible for a seat in the Council." Now, CURTIUS said neither. He represented monopolists as unsuitable to form the Executive of a country, and land monopolists among the rest, as no monopoly is more dangerous than that of the soil. And he did not need A COMMISSIONER to make his ideas more explicit. But, monstrous as it may appear to your correspondent, that a man's holding £2,000 or £3,000 worth of land should create a disqualification to his holding a seat in the Council, it may, nevertheless, be a perfectly sound maxim—though penned by so unlikely an oracle as A COMMISSIONER. In a country where the tenure of the land is the principal grievance of the people, it will be the highest disqualification to Executive authority, that the party has, on this point, an interest opposed to that of the people. The above instances of misrepresentation prove your correspondent's inability to encounter the positions of CURTIUS by fair argument. Instead of answering them, he has made it his business to distort them, and then to cry out, in affected horror, "A't these monstrous sentiments?" Indeed, he has acknowledged his incompetency to cope with CURTIUS, unless by being permitted to consider him as a monster of iniquity; and says, that in any other view he "would not obtrude himself on the public, but would leave to competent hands the less easy task of correcting him!" Here is an acknowledgment!!

The next virtue in A COMMISSIONER'S character is, his faculty of exaggeration. He says, that those whom he calls demagogues have taught the people, "that the difficulty of paying their rent is entirely owing to its being unreasonably high." Now, he knows that all parties acknowledge—even those who maintain the injustice of rent—that the difficulty of making cash payments is owing to the limited resources and straitened markets of the country. Again, he says—"the proprietors' ancestors purchased the Townships seventy or eighty years ago;" though he knows that most of them have been purchased within forty years. And again, he says, the demagogues—a distinction, by the bye, I think, even beyond his reach—have taught "a uniform resistance of payment" of rent. This he knows to be a pure invention of the truth-loving and honourable Tories! Once more, he says that the dissatisfaction of the tenantry with their landlords has been produced by the spoken and published ebullitions of cunning agitators! Very cunning men, truly, these agitators, who could persuade a whole community that their landlords had never settled their lands nor paid their quit rents—that they have compelled squatters to take leases at high rents or leave their improvements—that they have exacted cash rents, at the same time that they denied titles to the settlers; that they have taken the people's property, by seizures and otherwise, for less than one-third of its value often—and that, owing to the pressure of rents, the tenants suffer the greatest privations—if none of these things were true! Are not these things cognizable to every man in his senses? And if they do not exist, as facts, could any agitator, however cunning, persuade people that they do? Or, if they do, is the skill of a cunning demagogue necessary to make people dissatisfied with them?

As I shall probably have to draw a full-length portrait of this rascal before I am done with him, I shall be content, at present, with adding another shade to my hasty sketch—namely, his skill in defalcation. This is evident from some references in the last paragraph. He has represented the friends of Escheat as "cunning demagogues," as "agitators, too ridiculous and contemptible for notice;" "clodhoppers and ignoramuses." He has evidently read the *Islander* to some purpose. He uses filthy epithets with almost as much facility as its editor; and bids fair to become his successor, even if there be no truth in the report which makes him his assistant. It is probable that he frequently occupied the gallery of the House of Assembly last Session—though he

was unsuccessful in his endeavour to get a seat on one of the "cushioned chairs," and "£30 cash," and listened to the edifying harangues of some honourable gentlemen while the State of the Colony was discussed. But what-*ever* have been his opportunities, his attainments in the art of blackening character are considerable. Notice his description of CURTIUS. One who has made evil his good—a leveller—destitute of wealth and honour—a disappointed solicitor for proprietary patronage—an aspirant after legislative honours and immunities—a corrupt agitator—one actuated by malice towards land proprietors—a person of loose and immoral character, &c. Is he not an exquisite limner?—and should he not be employed to draw the likenesses of all the Tories in the Island? His description of CURTIUS, however, I am told, is altogether a failure; and is generally considered, in the Irishman's phrase, to be "a personal reflection," thrown back by the faithful mirror which CURTIUS has held up to his view. If so, he has taken the original faithfully, and is an adept in the art. You probably, Sir, do not understand it, nor the advantages of it. A ready and apt use of opprobrious epithets is an excellent substitute for arguments, when they cannot be procured. It is also prudent to daub an opponent's face with dirt, as that prevents the filth on one's own being so distinctly observable, for it looks fair in the contrast. Besides, an outcry against sin is an evidence that we would not indulge in it.

I give A COMMISSIONER credit for sincerity, in acknowledging his dissatisfaction with the subject which CURTIUS has chosen for his letters. But among the great variety of subjects upon which a political economist might choose to discuss, few, I presume, would be willing to be confined to the very narrow range which your correspondent has indicated—much less entirely precluded from discussing one of much more general importance than any of them, because A COMMISSIONER did not like it. To the very limited list which he has furnished, I might add a few more, if only for the purpose of giving the charm of variety to his studies,—such as, the kind of *live stock* most suitable for the Gambia market for improving the breed, &c.—the most summary and effectual method of getting up *ex-officio* libel prosecutions, &c.

Your correspondent thinks that CURTIUS has performed an unnecessary labour, in explaining and proving the right of British subjects to canvass the proceedings of their legislators. Being unable to refute it, he professes acquiescence, and with a very knowing air cries out, "Oh, every body knows that!" Yes; but a great many do not understand it, and many that do, do not admit it, at least practically. The first must be enlightened; the latter confounded. The articles to which he refers, as instances of the exercise of this right, were, as his own account of them will show, not manly, honest and serious investigations of the conduct and measures of our legislators, but silly buffoonery, or filthy personal vituperation, launched against a few individuals by persons who found it easier to ridicule "their persons, habits," &c., than to refute their positions and arguments.

This writer is next so stupid as to call the principles of political philosophy a "theory of moral sentiments," and so corrupt in his own sentiments, as to pronounce the doctrines that the true end of civil government is the greatest good of the general community, and that public officers are but the machinery for effecting this end, "strange doctrines." They may be strange doctrines on board a man-of-war, and they may be unwelcome doctrines to the exclusive aristocrat on shore, though to him they can hardly be strange. But that they are sound and wholesome doctrines—alike advantageous to the governing and the governed—your correspondent will hardly dare to dispute. Another instance of his mental obliquity I shall here notice. He acknowledges the difficulty of paying their rent "experienced by many tenants." But he denies that this difficulty is in any way the effect of the rents being too high, or that it is unjust for the proprietors to demand such rents, although they purchased their lands at an almost nominal price! Let our politicians attend and learn a lesson. Rents which are altogether beyond the lawful interest of the purchase-money, and the circumstances of the tenantry to pay, are not too high!! A COMMISSIONER avouches this.

I must now notice the most serious charge made against CURTIUS altogether—that of misrepresenting the constitution of the Councils, in two particulars: first, with regard to the number of proprietors in the Legislative Council; and secondly, as to the extent of the family connection in the Executive Council. CURTIUS asserts that there are three proprietors in the Legislative Council. Your latter correspondent indirectly gives him the lie, and says there is but one. Both may be wrong—A COMMISSIONER certainly is; for there are at least two large land proprietors in the Legislative Council—the Hons. Messrs. McDonald and Worthy; and I am informed that the Hon. W. W. Irving is one also. It may be probable that CURTIUS had forgotten that the Hon. C. Worrell had lately resigned, and included him. At any rate, the mistake is not very great. As to the next charge, I conceive that CURTIUS' statement can be fully sustained; and A COMMISSIONER'S assertion, that the family connection only embraces three members of the Council, is glaringly false. In addition to the Hons. Messrs. Hodgson, Haviland, Brecken and Peake—who are very intimately connected—the Hon. A. Lane is related by the Hon. J. S. Smith to the Hon. the Attorney-General, and the Hon. J. S. Macdonald is related by his cousin, the Hon. D. Macdonald, to the Hons. Messrs. Brecken, Haviland and Peake. There remains, then, but the Hons. Messrs. Goodman, Pope and Palmer, who are unconnected with the family. The other two-thirds are related precisely in the way in which CURTIUS has said, they are "knit together in every variety of connection."

Your correspondent has complimented CURTIUS upon his "education," and taunted some of your "escheat correspondents" with bad grammar, &c. I can neither return the compliment, nor will I throw back the taunt. But he may as well be more modest in future, lest some of his marked blunders be pointed out. At present, "I spare him."

Yours, &c.,

PHILO-CURTIUS.

AN AUGUST EDITOR.—We have always considered Buonaparte rather a smart man, and we have lately been fully confirmed in that opinion by reading in Bourrienne's Memoirs the statement that he was capable of writing very fair editorials for a daily paper. When first consul he used sometimes to write the leaders and even small news paragraphs for the *Moniteur*, the organ of the administration. As the most patient compositor that ever held a stick could not have made out one of his villainous scrawls, he employed Bourrienne on these occasions as an amanuensis. The style of these effusions was rather abrupt and energetic than finished or elegant. They did not exactly indicate public opinion, but they certainly promulgated the first consul's opinions, or at least his intentions, and that was just the same thing. These articles, we may presume, were generally approved of by the French Press, and "extensively copied," inasmuch as it is more than probable that the Editor who had ventured to question the soundness of their arguments, or who might have refused to give them "the benefit of his circulation," would have been the next day sent to the galleys, or to the swamps and forests of French Guiana. For Napoleon's ideas respecting the liberty of the press were something of the narrowest; though he had a great notion of its potency when unrestrained. He used to say of the journals, "Should I give them the rein, my power would not continue three months." We might multiply anecdotes of his career as an editor, which would no doubt amuse and entertain our readers, but we have not space for them.—All the world laughed, for instance, at the fury into which he lashed himself in his contest with Peltier, a refugee Frenchman, who edited a scurrily little paper in London. Napoleon would answer Peltier's attacks in the *Moniteur*, and thus a cross fire of "paper bullets" was long kept up across the channel. But Peltier got the better of him, and at last Napoleon sought to end the war by prosecuting him for libel in the English Courts, where also the lively *feuilletonist* proved too strong for his mighty antagonist, at which the world laughed louder than ever. Peltier was indeed convicted, and that was all. He was never sentenced, and he pelted away as heartily as before.

FRIENDLY RELATIONS WITH CHINA.

The following extract from a recent official despatch from Sir H. Pottinger to the Earl of Aberdeen, from the familiar and almost domestic nature of its contents, will be considered as a curiosity in diplomatic correspondence, and enable the reader to judge of the good-will towards England and the English which pervades the Celestial Empire. Our troops, in fact, appear to be received by those children of the sun and moon as friends and brethren, and the British empire to be considered by them as a member of the fellowship of citizenship it is the pleasure, as well as the interest, of the Chinese empire to cultivate.—

(EXTRACT FROM AN OFFICIAL DESPATCH FROM SIR HENRY POTTINGER TO THE EARL OF ABERDEEN.)

"In the evening (says Sir Henry Pottinger) the Imperial High commissioner Keying came, according to his engagement, to dine with me, and after he and his two companions had made themselves comfortable, by laying aside their mandarin caps and upper dresses, which is the custom at such parties in China, we sat for a few minutes in the drawing room whilst dinner was being served. During this short period Keying's attention was attracted to the miniatures of my family, which happened to be on the table, and he desired Mr. Morrison to explain to me that he had no son himself, and therefore wished to adopt my eldest boy, and to know if I would allow him to come to China. To this I replied, that the lad's education must first be attended to, but that stranger things had happened than his seeing Keying hereafter; on which his excellency rejoined, 'Very well, he is my adopted son from this day. His name (which he had previously ascertained) shall henceforward be Frederick Keying Pottinger, and until you send him to me, after he is educated, you must allow me to keep his likeness.' To this proposal I could make no objection, and I accordingly gave him the picture. Immediately after his excellency expressed a strong wish to have Lady Pottinger's miniature also; but about giving it I made some little demur, and before the matter was either way settled, dinner was announced, and we went to table.

"I supposed the thing would be forgotten; but when dinner was partly over Keying again introduced his request, said that he would send me his wife's likeness in return, and that he wanted my whole family to take back with him when he went to Nankin, and eventually to show to his friends at Peking. I felt it was impossible to refuse this flattering request, and I had the miniature brought and put into his hands. He immediately rose and placed it on his head, which, I am told, is the highest token of respect and friendship, filled a glass of wine, held the picture in front of his face, muttered some words in a low voice, drank the wine, again placed the picture on his head, and then sat down. The whole of this extraordinary action was performed without apparent reference to any one being present, and formed quite a scene. He then delivered the miniature to his principal attendant, who was standing behind him, and directed him to send it home in his state chair, in which his excellency had come to dinner with his official suite. Afterwards he expressed his deep obligation to me for the gift I had bestowed on him, and enquired through Mr. Morrison what present he could send to Lady Pottinger that would be acceptable. I wished to evade giving an answer to this inquiry, and said I should think of it, and let him know next morning; on which he asked, 'What! am I the Governor General of the Two Kiang, and cannot get my order obeyed?' At last, to satisfy him, I told him some pieces of embroidery would be, as his gift, highly prized, and he had a memorandum made of it.

"Soon after he proposed to sing a Tartar song, which I am told is customary at their convivial friendly parties—and on my saying that I should be delighted to hear it, he began with a very animated and loud voice. The couplets he sang, I have been since informed, were allusive to the peace that had been concluded between the two countries, and likewise to his great personal friendship for me; and, at the close of it, he took a rich golden bracelet, made in the form of a puzzle, with two clasped hands, off his own arm, and put it on mine.—He then explained to me that this bracelet and its fellow had belonged to his father, who gave them to him when he was 11 years of age—that he had worn this one for upwards of 40 years, and had left the other with his wife at Peking, and that it contained his name in the palm of one of the hands in mystic characters, and that he had some friends in every part of China, who would, on my producing it, receive me as his brother. In the course of the evening he told me that he expected to go to Peking in three or four years—that he would then send for me—that in the mean time, I must correspond with him, whether I remained in China or returned to England—that if Taoukevang (the Emperor) saw me, he would give me a two-eyed peacock's feather, the highest order in China—and that I had gained a great reputation and much distinction, not only in my own country, but in every part of this empire. After we rose from table and retired to the drawing room again, I presented his excellency with a handsome sword and belt, which I had commissioned by Lieut. Col. Malcolm from England, for the purpose of sending to him, and with which he was highly pleased. He immediately buckled it on, and though it was a very warm night, and I begged him to lay it aside, he sat with it on whilst he staid, and went to his chair of state to go home. Just before he went away he put on my shoulder his own upper dress, which, he said, was made of silk that had been given by the Emperor Kieulong to his (Keying's) father when he was prime minister.

"On the evening of the 26th the whole of the troops were out, and after the exchange of the ratifications they fired a *feu de joie* and marched round, the officers saluting the imperial commissioner, who seemed greatly struck with the whole ceremony, and expressed his admiration of the appearance and regularity of the men, as to their dresses, movements, &c. We afterwards sat down to dinner, a very large party, at which the Chinese high officers entered with great spirit and good feeling into the conviviality. Keying himself asked many officers to drink wine, and was asked by many; and as his excellency had been complaining of a cutaneous disorder, it was hinted to him, by Mr. Morrison's desire, that he ought to be careful; to which he answered, 'To-morrow must take care of itself: I am too happy tonight.' Then turning to me, he was about to address me in a whisper, when he suddenly seemed to recollect that I could not understand him; on which he expressed his claim that he could not tell me his secrets, and desired Mr. Morrison to explain to me, that if he got tipsy, in the joy of his heart, I must find him a bed for the night. When the dinner was over, I proposed a bumper toast, with all the honours, to 'The Healths of the Queen of England and Emperor of China, and that the peace which had that day been ratified between their Majesties might be eternal'—in drinking which the Chinese officers most warmly joined. I discovered in the course of the evening that Keying was a great proficient, or at least amateur, in music, and whenever the band played any particular tune, he fashioned it to some of his own native airs, and sung to it in a low voice. This led to a proposal to his excellency to favor the company with a song, which he did immediately with great good humour; and as Kwang and Hienling (assistants to the imperial commissioner) followed their chief's example, and they all three called on different officers to sing in return, the evening passed away most jovially and agreeably; and we did not separate till a late hour. Just before we did so, the commissioner and two Chinese officers gratified the company by playing one of their favourite games at convivial parties, by one party rapidly throwing out his fingers whilst the other guesses at the numbers they are supposed to represent, and whoever loses drinks a glass of wine—a forfeit which they most scrupulously enforced. On one occasion, when Keying was playing with Hienling, and the latter lost the game, he was about to have a glass, already half-full, replenished, on which Keying taunted him with evading his proper forfeit, and called on him to fill a bumper."

Dr. Kalley, a Scotch physician, in the Island of Madeira, has been thrown into prison for attempting to convert the natives to Protestantism, by preaching to such of them as chose to attend on his sermons, in his own house, and in the Portuguese language.

THE LETTERS OF "PHILALETHES."—The editor of the *Banner of Ulster*, a Tory paper, characterizes the statements contained in the two letters of Philalethes, published in the *Morning Chronicle*, to the effect that the country is on the verge of a rebellion, and that the Protestants of the north and the Catholics of the south are panting for war with each other, and eagerly seeking a cause of offence, as "utterly, recklessly, and scandalously false," and describes other statements of the writer as worthy of little or no reliance. In support of these opinions he publishes a letter from the Rev. Mr. Godkin, in answer to these statements of Philalethes, and observes that the authority of Mr. Godkin is perfectly unexceptionable, he being a person most obnoxious to the Roman Catholics on religious grounds. From this letter we quote a few extracts. The testimony of the writer is most important:—

"You are aware," says he, "that I must be well acquainted with the state of feeling in the south. During the last six months I have travelled through twelve counties, and conversed with people of all sects and parties. I have made the condition of the people my special study in town and country, and have availed myself of every source of authentic information. My opportunities of knowing them are very different from those enjoyed by an English tourist, who is liable to be imposed on by every wag who stands jesting in the market-place, uttering the most extravagant things, just that his wit may raise a laugh, and that he may enjoy the stranger's astonishment. How long shall the caricatures of all that is wild and outrageous among the ill-drest of our population be taken by England as a true representation? One might look on these ludicrous libels on the national character with indifference or contempt, if they were not inflicting on us the deepest injury. Knowing this, I confess they have often excited my own indignation, and, therefore, I have long ceased to read the fictitious trash that is published about us so profusely in the magazines.

"But, to the object of this letter. You know I am an earnest protestant, and no repealer. Mine is no partial testimony; nor, as I said, is it founded on a hasty glance at the surface of Irish society.

"First, then, I can assure you that, in most parts of the south and west, the peasantry, and the town population too, are deeply discontented. The former are, to a great extent, unemployed, rack-rented, half-naked, and half-starved, while the latter are universally complaining of the want of business. The blame of this state of things is partly laid on the Government, but chiefly, and in my opinion justly, on the landlords. Their neglect of their tenantry is almost incredible. I was lately among the mountains of Clare, and my heart was saddened with the information I received from a Protestant gentleman, and with what I saw around me. Their absenteeism is a curse, but their residence is seldom a blessing.

"In utter hopelessness of any relief from landlord or legislator, and sinking under intolerable burdens, the poor people have, I admit, thrown their whole souls into the repeal movement. This is certainly the fact, and a painful fact it is; but remove the cause, and you remove the effect. The priests go with them—some of them reluctantly—but many heartily, enthusiastically. They look for the separation of the church from the state as a *sine qua non*; and should the establishment be obstinately maintained, they are not without hopes that some lucky turn in the affairs of Europe will transfer the temporalities to themselves as the national priesthood.

I am, however, persuaded that the policy of peaceful agitation is deeply rooted as a first principle in the Roman Catholic mind of Ireland. They are a patient people. Can Roman Catholics who send some buttermilk eight or ten miles to market, in order to pay tithes to an absentee rector, be blamed for sometimes complaining over the dinner of 'dry lumpers?' Yet, except the very lowest and most ignorant (who will be always led by those above them), no one thinks of insurrection, rebellion, or massacre, unless he be to laugh at it as a dream of a madman. They allude, indeed, to war—use martial language—and talk of their military resources; but the design of this is to raise the spirit of the people—to give them the feeling of conscious strength—and to make their rulers uneasy. Further they have not the slightest intention of going. The priests are not for rebellion; they know it would be impolitic—ruinous to their cause. Nor are the people for massacre. Let no one dread a Bartholomew in Ireland. No; I believe a gracious Providence is over-ruling this agitation for good, fraught as it may be with present evil. The benign principles of peace are inculcated and warmly cherished; temperance and self-control are established in the national character; nor do I think it is in vain that the leaders of the repeal movement urge the suppression of religious animosity. Certainly toleration is fast gaining ground among the people; and I am assured by Protestants thinly scattered among Roman Catholics, that they find them more civil and neighbourly than formerly. In a large parish in Clare there are only thirty Protestants. I asked one of them lately, an intelligent young farmer, whether he was annoyed on account of his religion. He assured me he was not in the least—that 'the people made no more difference with him than if he were one of themselves.' In this same county, I was rowed nearly three miles on a lake, on a dark and stormy night, by Roman Catholics, after preaching a controversial sermon, to which several ventured to listen, though under the surveillance of a repeal warden. Surely if any man should dread a religious war—a massacre of Protestants—I ought! And yet, so thoroughly am I acquainted with the feelings of the people, and so great is my confidence in them, that I travel as securely and sleep as soundly among the wildest mountains and in the loneliest habitations as if I were in London.

"For the sake of my country's character, which has been vilified beyond any other on the face of the earth, and in order, if possible, to quiet the fears of Protestants, who I know are in many places labouring under distressing alarm, I have felt called on to give you thus candidly my impressions, which I hope will be found more in accordance with facts than the nervous apprehensions of 'Philalethes.' Let not Protestant Ulster, therefore, draw the sword against the Catholic South, but let its comparatively happy population generously petition Parliament for a redress of practical grievances, and our beloved country shall ere long have peace and prosperity within her borders.

I am, &c.

J. GODKIN,
Independent Minister."

October 23, 1843.

INEQUALITIES OF REPRESENTATION.—Among the greater grievances of Ireland, that which seems to be most closely interwoven with the legislative union is, the inequality of her representation in parliament. In the House of Commons, England, with a population close on fifteen millions, has 500 representatives, being one to every 30,000. Ireland, with a population of 8,179,359 has 105 representatives, or one to every 77,908. In this view, England is nearly three times as well, or rather as much, represented as Ireland. Then take the proportion of the electors to the population. The whole electors of the kingdom amount to about a million, being about one to every twenty-seven inhabitants. Of these, England has (or had by the last return we can command, which dates 1839,) within a very few of 800,000, or about one to every 19 inhabitants. Ireland has a fraction above 100,000, or about one to every 80 of the population. If Ireland were represented on the same scale as England, she would have 250 members instead of 105. In England there are upwards of 80 represented boroughs, the population of which is under 10,000. Of these there are 56 which each return two members; and taking the average population of these at 6,000, a population of 342,000 return more members to parliament than the eight millions of Ireland.—*Tait's Magazine.*

REMOVED EMPLOYMENT OF HANOVERIAN TROOPS IN IRELAND.—We can give an explicit and unqualified denial to a statement, which has appeared in some of the Irish papers, that ministers intend to engage the services of Hanoverian troops in Ireland. Ministers never contemplated such a policy; on the contrary, they are too well convinced of the ability of the British troops, and the loyalty of the Irish Pro-