

THE TRUE-WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE. MARCH-25, 1859.

future time, may re-enact outside their own country the same character of aggression which distinguished the career of the first Napoleon. Instructed by sad. experience, there is no fear that a second Russian campaign will be planned, a second Moscow approached, or a second Beresina crossed : Napoleon the Third can, and may imitate the succesful early scenes of his relative, and leave out his latter disastrons passages; and in these enterprises, there can be no doubt that, under certain given circumstances, in the presence of future probable premises, the universal French army and an overwhelming majority of the French nation will unbesitatingly hang on the will, and joyously obey the command of the nephew of the hero of Marengo.

2 - Construction of the second s

It may be argued that the views of the great Nepoleon could not now be realized in our days-firstly, because the French are at present different in point cal feeling from their ancestors of 'S9; and secondly, because the neighoring kingdoms do not present the same causes for national aggression; nor the same field for military achievements as in former times .--These two objections are notoriously false, both in fact and in philosophy. Generals, orators and poets may dwarf and fade in one century more than in another; but the general people are always the same in similar circumstances; while, again, the causes strong in number and in moral weight; and hence for the aggression referred to, are far and away more defensible in the nineteenth than in the eighteenth contury. And secondly, the path of strategic fame is far more inviting and much less dangerous for the Second Emperor in 1852 than for the First Emperor in 1806. When the elder Napoleon ascended the Imperial throne, commenced the Peninsular War, and advancing in his programme of crumbling old thrones, and raising up new dynasties, he had not one friend in Europe. The countries, too, to which he commissioned his new-born kings, and from which he expected allegiance and gratitude to his appointed monarchs, looked on the new crowns as a degradation and a curse. In Naples the people abhorred the vain arrogance of his brother-in-law, Murat; in Spain they despised the valgar stupidity of his brother Joseph; and in Holland they laughed at the good-natured folly of his brother Louis. He had other and deeper sources of unhappiness, too, hesi les his new kings. His second and new wife, on the cruel, heartless, sinfal, and wicked expulsion of Josephine, rendered the connection with Austria a torture rather than a consolation to his otherwise unfeeling heart; so that neither at home nor abroad, within or without the Tuileries, had he one private or public friend. His history in later years was like the character of a polar sun, vanishing, brilliant and co'd ; and he ruled his army and his tributary new thrones and untions by his unaided individual will, his single flashing sword. This order of things could not, and did not hold long; and his fall was a result which mankind might expect, with the same certainty of the fast, as the obling of the tide, or the decline of the seasons.

How different the antecedents, the career, the prestize of the present Emperor of France ! He was called to the supreme office of the Republic by seven millions of voters-that is, seven millions of grown Frenchmen; he ascended the Imperial throne with the consent, and by the aid of the whole French army; he rules the nation by protecting order, morality, and religion, and he bows in humble, learned ebedience before the authority of the French Church. His marriage, the romantic contract of a muturel choice, is without a taint before God and man : neither selfishness nor deceit gave one ingredient of fault or remorse to that model pledge; and the Empress is not only the unrivalled ornament of her sex, and the pride of her glorious nation, she is, too, the example of every exulted virtue, which proves the purity of faith and adds lustre to Imperial royalty. Within the sacred enclosure of his own royalty. Within the sacred enclosure of his own palace, Napoleon the Third is, perhaps, the happiest monarch in Europe And he has few enemies among the crowned heads of the surrounding countries; on the contrary, he has many friends, firm, lasting flicnds, on the European thrones.

Spain, though ruled by a Bourbon, has already sought his friendship; and has thanked him for his late military rendezvous at Bayonne for his protection. England never ceases calling him her "august ally :" and she even fatigues her Senate and people applauding his official prudence and his private worth. Surdinia has cemented a matrimonial allinuce with his family, and offers to him the key of her fortresses, and the command of her armies.-Portugal, notwithstanding some recent unpleasantness, wishes an alliance with France instead of Engby several evidence has expressed land ; and Turk her admiration of the generosity, the truth, and the sourage of France. Russia, too, strange as it may appear, has made successful advances towards a eloser connection with the Tuilleries; and the marriage of Prince Napoleon with the Princess Clotilda has, without doubt, been encouraged and carried on through the diplomacy of St. Petersburg. And how grateful to him must it be that all Christendom knows with pride, and is rejuiced to say, that the sword of France, which imprisoned Pius the Screnth at Fontainbleau, now protects Pio Nono at Rome against the English cut-throats. France, therefore, is now, as she ought to be, the eldest child and friend of the Church. Hence Napoleon the Third stands before heaven and earth in a position of honor, public respect, and religion, higher than his Uncle had ever held; and, therefore, in whatever enterprise he nusy, in future time, be engaged, he carries with bim into the cabinet or the field an amount of military power at home, and public confidence and support abroad, far and away beyond anything that his fincle could have ever command in the palmiest days of his Imperial glory. The Uncle's career was entirely made up of the sword and personal ambition ; while the Nepnew seems to soften the harshness of his character by an expressed desire to check in the other States what he considers national tyranny ; and to relieve the oppressed by what he believes to he national justice. Considering the aggregate of the favourable circamstances which surround the present Imperial throne of France, it might be supposed that Napoleon would content himself within his dominions, promoting the internal policy of the kingdom, and cultivating, in still closer bonds, the amicable relations of the surrounding countries. If the first Napcleon had followed this policy, France would have been saved the rivers of blood spilled beyond the Rhine, and the terrific disasters of the Russian campaign. Taught by these lessons, and warned by a voice from St. Helena, one should think that the present Ruler would prefer any sacrifice of diplomacy sooner than re-suact the career which has proved so crushing to his great predecessor. All those who pretend to know France best, and who seem to comprehend the views of the Emperor with more accurate knowledge, have maintained, during the last six months, that the Gallican armaments, on these pre-mises, were only intended to protect the country from the flame of foreign revolution, in the event of a collision between Austria and the Italian States .-Guided by the correspondents on the Continent who seemed most accurately informed on this important subject, the writer of this article followed these authorities and maintained these views. But new facts having transpired through a source which can admit of no doubt, that, besides making preparations against the eventualities of foreign revolution, Napoleon had, besides, conceived and matured the design (and which he has not as yet abandoned) of remodelling Italy on the plan of his Uncle's policy, and hence of expelling the Austrians from the Lombardo-Venetian territory. The hostile feeling which England has often expressed towards the policy of Naples and of the Papal States: the vituperative language which she has uttered in reference to the rule of Austria on the Italian Peninsula, and the angry remonstrance which she attempted to make on this subject at the Conference of Paris, had led Napoleon to hope, and believe, that in his war-policy he would not only secure the neutrality, but even the active co-operation of Great Britain. He was mis- therefore, on a basis of less security than the port.

taken; or rather he was deceived ! If he live much longer, he will understand England much better; and he will learn (if he do not known the fact al-ready) that the greatest enemy to his throne, and to his name, and to his power, is Great Britain. Yet, in the case before us, he did, without doubt, calculate on the concurrence of England. He also anticipated, at least, the neutrality of Russia; and the Muscovite, though proverbially perfidious, has not in this instance broken faith with the Frenchman.

The war feeling which has absorbed the whole mind of Napoleon, this some time past seems to have its origin in the fear that a large army at home, without even the prospect of employment abroad must soon produce public dissatisfaction from its enormous expenses, and must therefore be ultimately disbanded or reduced. The gigantic war marine, too, which has been put in commission by such pecuniary sacrifice, cannot much longer be equipped, manned, and kept afloat, without raising a cry of indignation from the universal civilian population of France. Napoleon is well aware, too, that he is the very creature of the army and navy; and hence that his very existence depends on the power and the predominance of both. The Legitimists, too, and the Orleanists, and the Republican party are still on all hands a standing army and a navy in full commission are as essential (at least for some years to come) to the throne of Napoleon as the air he breathes is to his vigor and life. It is no wonder, therefore, that he seizes any occasion in which, with out dishonor, he can keep his overwhelming military force in permanence. Hence, having, as he fancied secured the neutrality of England, with the concurrence of Russia; knowing the devotion of Sardinia and of the majority of the populations of the Italian Peninsula, and persuading himself that Austria had violated treatics by the number and the advanced posts of her armies on the frontiers of Sardinia, he resolved, as it now appears, to strike the decisive blow for the stability of his own throne, and for what he believes to be the liberation of Italy. The conduct of England has diverted him from his purpose : and he is now, it is said, deeply impressed with the unforgiving feeling that England has deceived him. In this feeling he is joined by Sardinia, where Count Cavour makes no secret that England first encouraged their war policy, and then not only hetrayed Victor Emmanuel, but even joined Austria. Victor Emmanuel and Count Cavour must have read the politics of Europe with little advantage, indeed, when they relied on the word of England in any measure where her own interest was not intimately concerned. And they must have completely forgotten the history of St Helenn, when they were made to believe that Great Britain could at the heart feel any sentiment towards the descendant of their enchained and fallen captive except fear and hatred. Napoleon will soon understand the real value of the entente cordiale, and djust his future measures with more judicious anticipations. England seems to understand that she has irritated the French menarch, since she is engaged at this moment in preparing her Channel Fleet on

the largest scale of efficiency : sending training war ships to all her ports, changing her sailing men-ofwar into steam and screw line-of-battle ships, and giving plans for constructing fortresses all along the entire coast opposite France. These are omnious facts which cannot be overlooked, and prove that France is the point from which England dreads her most perilous attack, and against which she is preparing her most gigantic military and naval armaments.

But in the event of Napoleon giving up, on mature reflection his war policy for the present, still his mighty military force, placed as it is in the centre of Europe, mus produce, by its presence and its organization, a moral reform, perhaps even more advantageous than the most sanguine results of an armed victory. Dreading a repetition of Napoleon's decision, the abuses complained of may be probably remedied; and the terrors of a French campaign on the other side of the Alps may bring to the recollection of the living Austrians the disasters of 1796 and the succeeding years. We, too, in Ireland, derive some benefit and relief from this French standing camp : and as our armies and our navy will require hands to fight, and hearts to face the enemy, we may hope that our poor faithful and brave countrymen may not be exterminated by the landlords, buried alive in the proselytising poorhouse, or banished in exile to some foreign country. France may thus compel England to spare our lives, and to give us, at home, the shelter and the protection which she freely

common bargains of a village fair, and is otherwise coupled with degradation and vice, which render sisters, wives, and mothers the shame of their families, the pest of society, and the scandal of religion. Not the least immoral consequence of these courts is the inevitable suspicion which the trials with all their details awakens in the minds of married persons. The first acquaintance, the scheme, the guilty consent, the assignations of the parties, brought out by the awyers with such disgusting evidence on the cross-examination of the witnesses, are so many lessons published on the art of seduction, and which have already in several *recorded* instances laid the foundation of adulterous intimacy, taught crime to many an otherwise pure heart, divided family ties, and ultimately ended in crime, shame, frenzy, poverty, misfortune and death. What father of the Protestant faith in England can give his daughter in marriage in the present system of easy separation without feeling that her | life interest in £10,000, given to her after his death, temporary husband in a moment of anger or dissatisfaction or dislike may lay a plan for her ruin and separation, encourage her seduction (sec trials), place witnesses in concealment, surprise her in quiet, prove his case, and dissolve the marriage. These Courts, then, are levelled at the peace of the parent, the honor of the child, and the morality of society. This law corrupts the heart, teaches perjury, betrays vows, entraps the innocent, and is the school of infamy. In place of punishing the wicked, it perhaps oftener pun- In September, 1855, they accidentally made the acishes the innocent; and in place of rewarding the good, it confers its favors on the profligate. I have made extracts from the sittings in this court, of only two days. 'The reader will see how numerous are the cases; how painful the position of the parties. I have omitted the pleadings of the Barristers, as unfit for publication; and I have merely enumerated the causes, and and quoted the final judgments of the Bench .---These extracts are as follow, and they furnish a demonstrative proof of the evils, not only in faith but also in discipline and morality, which the hideous novelties in the Gospel have inflicted on society :---

COURT OF PROBATE AND DIVORCE, FEB. 16. (Before the Judge Ordinary).

STOATE V. STOATE.

The petitioner, Mrs. Stoate, prayed for a judicial separation on the ground of her husband's cruelty aud desertion.

Mr. Stoate now moved in person for a rule for a new trial, on the ground that many witnesses whom he wished to call, resided at Bristol, and were not in attendance when the trial took place. He repeated the statements which he had made on previous occasions of the misconduct of various kinds of which his wife had been guilty.

Sir C. Cresswell refused the rule. The respondent was charged with cruelty, and he did not raise the question of his wife's adultery on the pleadings .---Even if it had been raised be was at a loss to know how it could be an answer to a petition for a judicial

separation on the ground of crucity. On the motion of Dr. Swabey for the petitioner, His Lordship decreed a judicial separation, and condemned the respondent in costs. JONAS V. JONAS.

This was a petition by a husband for a dissolution of marriage on the ground of his wife's adultery.

Mr. Cooper applied for leave to proceed without s co-respondent. It appeared that the petitioner had been abroad for two or three years, and on his return found that his wife had had a child, but had been unable to discover the father.

Sir C. Cresswel thought there was reasonable ground for granting the application.

THE BARL OF DEVON V. THE COUNTESS OF DEVON. Dr. Phillimore, Q.C., said that the petitioner prayed for a judicial separation on the ground of his wife's cruelty. His age was nearly double that of his wife, and the object of the present application was to allow his case to be proved by affidavit.

The Oourt decreed a dissolution of the marriage. with costs.

KHATS V. KBATS AND MONTEZUMA.

The petitioner is a gentleman of considerable property, and the principal partner in the firm of Fort-num and Mason. He prayed for a dissolution of marriage, on the ground that his wife had been guilty of adultery with the corespondent, who is a Spa-niard, named Pedro de Montezuma. Mrs. Keats pleaded a denial of the adultery and condonation .---On the trial of these issues before the Judge-Ordinary and a special jury, the fact of the adultery was not disputed, but a great deal of evidence was given in support of the plea of condonation. It appeared that Mrs. Keats, after leaving her husband, had lived in Dublin with Don Pedro for several weeks in the early part of last year. When Mr. Keats discovered her presented the present petition.

The Court decreed the dissolution of the marriage, and ordered that Mr. Keats should settle £150 a-year upon the respondent, during his life, upon her giving up the power of disposing of £2,000 at his death sccured to her by her marriage settlements, and that the settlement should remain in operation as to the in case of her surviving him. The £150 a-year to be paid during the respondent's good behaviour, but not to cease in the event of marrying again. The £1,000 damages awarded against the co-respondent to be applied to the payment first of the costs of the respondent, and then of those of Mr. Kents.

BEALS V. BEALE AND WHIFFEN.

Dr. Phillimore, Q.C., and Mr. Macqueen conducted the petitioner's case

The petitioner was a medical man residing at Paddington. He married the respondent in October, 1852, and cohabited with her until the end of 1955. quaintance of the co-respondent, who then passed by the name of Spinner, at a ten party at the house of a friend. An intimacy commenced between Mrs. Beale and the co-respondent, which resulted in their adulterous intercourse.

The Court decreed a dissolution of the marriage. and condemued the co-respondent in costs.

ASTROPE V. ASTROPE.

Mr. Digby Seymour and Mr. Tidswell were counsel for the petitioner.

This was a petition by a wife for dissolution of marriage on the ground of adultery and desertion .---The petitioner had been a housekeeper in a private family, and the respondent a shopman, and they were married in 1847. Evidence was given of the adul-tery, and the date fixed for the desertion was from October, 1854, to November, 1856. The respondent is now undergoing a sentence of penal servitude, to which he was sentenced in the end of 1856. He had been in the prison for debt previous to October, 1854 and it was not proved to the satisfaction of the Court that his absence from his wife at that time was voluntary.

The case was accordingly adjourned for further evidence.

SMITH V. SMITH.

Dr. Spinks appeared for the petitioner. The parties in this case are in very humble circumstances: they were married in 1848 and cohabited until 1852, when the husband went away from his wife. He left her destitute, cohabited with other women, and she now asked for a decree of dissolution.

The Lord Chancellor said, the Court were not satisfied that the husband went away against the will of the wife ; on the contrary, it appeared very probable that they had parted by mutual consent. The Court would not, therefore, dissolve the marriage, but they would decree a judicial separation, and condemn the husband in costs.

PARNELL V. PARNELL AND HARDWOOD.

Dr. Spinks appeared for the petitioner. The petitioner, a working man, was married to the respondent in 1850. The respondent contracted habits of intoxication, which obliged the petitioner to live apart from her. She went to lodge in a house at Nine-elms, where she formed the acquaintance of the co-respondent, a kilman, with whom she was proved to have cohabited.

The Court dissolved the marriage vith costs against the co-respondent.

I have been induced to take up this subject on reading the remarks of the Protestant Convocation of the Provence of Canterbury, published within the last fortnight. In this Convocation, composed of Bishops, Deans, Chancellors, Proc-

Majesty will be graciously pleased to grant her licenses to the bishops and clergy in convocation as.

sembled to draw up for the use of the Church on two Sundays in each year, to be hereafter specified, a form of prayer and thanksgiving for the mercies vouch-safed to this Church and people; and another form of prayer and humiliation for the sins of this Church and people."

The Rev. Canon Selwyn moved that the report of the committee appointed to inquire into the nature and operation of the provisions of an Act of the 20th and 21st of Victoria, entitled "The Divorce and Matrimonial Causes Act," be read.

The report was read accordingly, which concluded with these words :--"The committee are of opinion that since the Act

of the 20th and 21st of Victoria was passed, it has materially changed the law of the Church, making it press hardly upon the clergy, and ought therefore, to be amended. The committee, while fully recog-nising the power of Parliament to legislate for all classes of men in the community, is nevertheless of opinion, when changes are proposed affecting the ritual of the Church and the duties of the clergy, that the advice of the clergy should be taken upon it.

The Rev. Canon Selwyn presented this as a grara-men, and moved that the report be adopted by the House and turned into a resolution as an articulus cleri, and that the Prolocutor take it to the Upper House on their lordships again assembling together, He did not dispute the right of Parliament to alter the law of the church, but by the present Act the Legislature had placed the law of the State at variance with the law of the church, and Convocation

had, therefore, a right to present this as a gravamen. The Rev. F. C. Massingbred was of opiniou that Parliament had not a right to alter the law of the church without the assent of the Church. It had never been conceded that that should be the doctrine of the Church of England which the two Houses of Parliament, apart from the spirituality, chose to say was so. If the Church accepted this law in regard to divorce, what might they not expect to be the result as regarded other measures affecting the doctrine and discipline of the Church? If Parliament could alter the doctrine on the subject of divorce, it could alter the Prayer Book and the Articles of their common faith. Surely they were not prepared for such a result. It seemed, therefore, to him, to be the time when the church should make a stand. After some further remarks the rev. gentleman said he had an amendment to propose. Instead of saying that the Act of Victoria had materially changed the law of the Church, he would substitute these words :-

" That the Act is felt by a very large body of the clergy to have placed the law of the Church at variance with that of the State."

The amendment having been seconded,

Archdeacon Randall was of opinion that it was the duty of Parliament to consult the clergy before making any alteration in the doctrines of the Church. but he could not agree with the reverend gentleman who spoke last, that Parliament had not the power to make what alteration it pleased in any law, whether civil of ecclesiastical. The legislatorial power of Parliament could not be disputed. If Parliament thought fit to set aside a canon, then that canon was no longer a part of the law of the Church.

The Dean of Ely said it was at the option of the clergymen whether he would or not celebrate such objectionable second marriages.

The Rev. Canon Wordsworth said the very rererend dean was in error in stating that the clergy were not obliged to perform the ceremony of a second marriage in the case of a divorce. The option given to the clergymen had reference only to the guilty unrty : and even in the case of that party he was obliged to open his church, if required to do so, for the performance of the ceremony by another clergyman

The Rev. Mr. M'Caul observed that it was not the fact, as alleged in the amondment, that Parliament had placed the law of the State in antagonism with the law of the Church, because, as soon as the alteration of the law was made, the canon which had been quoted was entirely repealed.

Archdescon Denison observed that this had been called a clergyman's grievance, but he would ask whether anything had more seriously affected the morals of the people of England than this divorce law. During the fourteen months it had been in operation had done more to say the morals of the people than anything within his recollection. It was not only for themselves, therefore, but for the people of England (many of whom, though favorable to the law ound and detested an go, now turned abhorred it), that they were bound to do all they could to force upon the Legislature the necessity of re-considering what they had done, and to amend the law upon this most momentous question. The amendment was then put to a show of hands, when it was declared by the Prolocutor that the numbers appeared to him to be equal.

stends by law to the fores, the fishes, the game an the very shrubs of our country. D. W. C. Thursday, Feb. 17.

REV DR. CAHILL

ON THE ENGLISH DIVORCE BILL.

(From the Dublin Catholic Telegraph.) The shocking immoralities brought to light by the working of this bill are without a parallel in the Christian world. It would even inflict a serious wound on the moral purity of society to publish the thrilling details of crime which are revealed in the Divorce Court during the numerous trials on this subject. The court is now so pressed and choked with increasing cases that a second judge is about to be appointed in order to meet the demands of the plaintiffs. In the Protestant Cathedrals the bishops and their clergy appear in their robes to unite their followers in blessed matrimony, as they call it, in the church : and in the Court of Probate and Divorce the English judges and their officials preside, clothed in ermine, to annul the same adulterous marriage, as they designate it, on the bench. What the bishop joins, the judge separates: what the prelate calls holy, the Chief Justice brands as infamous; while both parties assure the public that their mutual conduct and decisions are strictly conformable to the wisdom and perfection ot English law, and to the divine inspiration of the reformed Gospel! Up to this period of Christian novelty in Great Britain this court was entirely devoted to the relief of the aristocracy, for the removal of unrighteous wives, and for the more sanctified spouses! But at present the costs as to the co-respondent. charitable provisions of the Legislature have established this court to meet the necessities of the poor unhappy husbands and wives in the humblest walks of the reformation, and to untie the scriptural laborer as well as the Christian duke. This grand considerate extension of moral liberty seems fully appreciated by the Protestant public, since the Court of Divorce is now so overcrowded with applicants that a second judge must be appointed to hear and decide the multiplied causes of complaint. Now I firmly believe that if the Legislature

established in Smithfield market two such courts -first confirming, and again dissolving the contracts of buyers and sellers in reference to hay, butter, and black cattle, no man could be found after some time to sell a pig in such market !---No prudent farmer could be induced to offer his sale. The contract, in fact, by which women

A commission was accordingly granted, and the case was ordered to be tried by oral evidence before the Court.

REED V. REED AND DAVIS. This was a petition for a dissolution of marriage, presented by a husband on the ground of his wife's adultery. The petitioner also prayed for damages. and they were assessed by a jury in November last. Their Lordships were ultimately satisfied with the proof, and pronounced the decree for a dissolution of marriage.

WHERR V. WHEER AND PYRE

This was also a petition by a husband for a dissolution of marriage, on the ground of his wife's adultery. The respondent and the co-respondent denied the adultery, and a jury in December last returned a verdict for them upon that issue.

COULTHART V. COULTHART AND GOUTHWAITE. Mr. Edward James, Q.C., and Dr. Swabey conducted the netitioner's case.

The petitioner prayed for a dissolution of marriage on the ground of his wife's adultery. The respondentdid not appear, but the co-respondent pleaded in substance that Mrs. Coulthart had lived a life of prostitution before her marriage, that after her marriage she was deserted by her husband, and that she them resumed her former course of life. The petitioner denied these allegations, and, no evidence being given in support of them when issue was joined before a jury, a verdict was entered in his favor.

VICARS V. VICARS.

In this case a jury had found that the respondent (Mr. Vicars) had been guilty of incestuous adultery. On the motion of Dr. Addams, Q.C., for Mrs. Vi

The Court decreed a dissolution of marriage with costs.

LENTGE V. LENTGE AND BOPSON. A jury having found a verdict for the respondent on the issues of connivance and condonation, the Court, on the motion of Mr. Mondell, assented to by Mr. J. P. Murphy, for the co-respondent, dismissed resumption of holy wedlock with younger and the petition with costs as to the wife, but without

> FOWLER V. FOWLER AND NEWCOMEN. Mr. A. Liddell and Mr. Patteson conducted the pe

titioner's case; the respondents did not appear. Mr. Fowler is a barrister, and in February, 1858. he went the Northern Circuit, and was absent until April. He noticed nothing unusual in the demeanour of his wife upon his return, but on the 20th of May, while he was engaged in his professional duties before a committee of the House of Commons, she left the house with Mr. Newcomen. Apartments had been taken for her at 25, Montague-street, Russell-square, and she there lived with Mr. Newcomen as man and wife, under an assumed name.

These facts having been proved to the satisfaction of the Court, A dissolution of the marriage was decreed, and the co-respondent was condemned in costs.

JACKSON. V. JACKSON.

CRSO.

Dr. Phillimore, Q.C., conducted the petitioner's

The parties were married in Decomber, 1833, at Aston, in Warwickshire. They cohabited until 1835, property for purchase in such a place, where it and had two children. In December, 1835, the re-could be returned for faults contracted after the spondent left his wife in England without any means of subsistence and went to Australia. He has since cohabited with other women, both there and in Engare now joined in matrimony in England rests, land, and has contributed nothing to his wife's sup-

tors, Rectors, Fellows, and beneficed Ministers, &c., the Catholic is astounded at the facts developed in this whole case. The Convocation admits that the law and Court of Divorce " saps the foundation of morality and religion;" and yet it states that the Protestant Church has no power to alter the decision of Parliament, or remedy the admitted evil! The Convocation acknowledges that Parliament is the Supreme Council in matters of religion; that it can frame faith, and canons, and discipline ; and that the Protestant Church, assembled in public meeting, have no powers whatever with the final adjudication of the Senate, except the power or the privilege of advice and remonstrance. How pitiable to see the law, on which depends the salvation of the soul, made by a majority of votes in the English House of Commons! How monstrous to observe the Religion in England is passed like any other Bill of the Session ; that their present creed is the accidental decision of a cabal: that there is no better authority for their present form of belief than the authority of a Cotton Commission or a Railroad Committee; and that new Articles of Faith may be introduced in the next Session of Parliament, decided by Unitarians, Methodists, Presbyterians, Independents, and all the other varying sectaries who fill the English House of Commons. How strange would it appear if St. Paul put it to the vote of the Athenians to know whether Christ was God I or if he sought a majority of votes in the Roman Senate to learn if His death on the Cross was a sufficient atonement for the sons of man !

The following extracts from the report of the late Protestant Convocation will demonstrate that the Faith of their Church rests entirely on decisions of Parliament; will prove their own avowal of their official impotence; will show that their Ritual and Articles of belief are as changeable as the Cabinets; and will place on record for the readers of the Catholic Telcgraph that whether the Protestant Church be Lutheran, Calvinistic, or Puseyite, it is such another kind of party accident and political manœuvre as a Whig or Tory Ministry :--

THE LOWER HOUSE.

The deans, archdencons, and proctors constituting the Lower House assembled in the Jerusalem-chamber, adjacent to Westminster Abbey. The Very Rev. Gilbert Elliott, Dean of Bristol, presided; and there Archdeacon Denison, Archdeacon Hony, Archdeacon Randall, Archdeacon Allen, Chancellor Martin, &c. Mr. George Burchett, of Doctors'-commons, ac-tuary, read the minutes of the last session, which were present the Dean of Norwich, the Dean of Ely, were confirmed.

Archdeacon Denison gave notice of a motion-"That the standing orders be suspended, with the view of requesting the concurrence of the Upper House in an address to the Grown, praying that her these paradoxes are not half so strange as to see

A division was then called for, when the numbers were---

For the amendment	28
Against it	33
Majority	-5

The original motion was then put and agreed to. With these and other similar premises guiding and accompanying the faith and the morality of the English Church Establishment, is it any wonder that hundreds of reflecting persons have abandoned this incongruous creed, and have joined the ancient unvarying profession of the Catholic Church ? The most eminent for learning and piety in the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge; and several ministers distinguished as rectors in the discharge of parochial duties throughout the country, are now found in our ranks, adding purity and ornament to their exalted position, and edifying society by their piely and their zeal. The idea of the Church of God, not being able to define its own faith, to make laws for its discipline, to appoint officers for its management ; and requiring the aid of a foreign body of members of Parliament (without, perhaps, morality, or Christian knowledge, or a fixed or any faith) in order to carry on the work of the Gospel, to encourage the gifts of grace, and to teach the mysteries of human redemption, is a Protestant paradox ; it is a reformed contradiction : a palpable incongruity. If we did not see it daily proclaimed in England one could never believe that such an insane sentiment could have ever entered the mind of any set of men in the world. It is, beyond all doubt, a system infinitely more ridiculous than to behold a town council make laws for the attraction of the moon, settle the elevation of the tides, regulate the passage of the lightning, and change the duration of the eclipses. Such a solemn farce, done by a town corporation, by a paving board, or a meeting of harbor commissioners, would have even a claim to sense and reality when compared to the system where a drunken member of Parliament changes at pleasure the laws for the resurrection of the body, where an infidel in the House of Commons remodels the Revelation of Christ with every new Ministry; where a masettles the doctrines whether hell is eternal, who ther the soul is immortal, and whether there are three or only one person in the Godhead. But