

The Freeman's Journal gives the following summary of the report of the Endowed Schools Commissioners...

The report extends over 287 closely printed pages of blue-book, and we can hardly hope, in giving a summary of the results arrived at, to do more than put our readers in possession of the more remarkable of the conclusions forced on the minds of the commissioners...

"We are of opinion that the art of reading is in general very imperfectly taught. We rarely met with a pupil whose elocution evinced an intelligent comprehension of the subject."

"Under the head 'writing,' nearly similar observations are made, with this addition, that the commissioners show the remarkable contrast that exists between the efficiency of the pupils in the Christian Brothers' Schools and in the Endowed Schools, dwelling with great satisfaction on the superior method of teaching adopted by the former community."

"History," the commissioners tell us, "is rarely taught." "Arithmetic" is not understood by the so-called teachers, and in some schools we even found an ignorance of enumeration—a subject which, however, receives due attention in the schools of the Christian Brothers and those of the National Board.

"The entire amount of endowments belonging to the Christian Brothers' Schools is very moderate. Several of them were inspected by our assistant commissioners, and are returned in the tables of schools and endowments. In their general reports some of our assistant commissioners notice the state of instruction in these schools."

Thus Mr. Crawford says,—"The most efficient schools in my opinion, are those managed by the community of Christian Brothers; and I attribute this efficiency to the excellence of their system, the training of the teachers, and their zeal in the cause of education."

Mr. Pennafather says,—"In the school under the management of the community of the Christian Brothers, which I was directed to visit, I found the teaching efficient and the masters zealously devoted to their work."

Doctor McBlain says,—"I was much impressed with the general aspect presented by these schools, and particularly with their discipline and order, combined with the cheerfulness and docility of the pupils. The boys educated in the Christian Brothers' schools have in general attained an unusual degree of proficiency in the different branches of learning in which they are instructed."

The superiority of these schools is, doubtless, in a great measure to be ascribed to the extraordinary personal influence exerted by the teachers over the pupils—an influence based on the distinction that these teachers have devoted their lives to the cause of education for no private or personal gain or reward, but solely in the discharge of a sacred and self-imposed duty."

of non-exclusive, and they recommend that these, together with a great many other lesser foundations, be placed under a general board, which is to regulate the present Education Board, and that the grammar schools and higher class schools constitute, in connection with the primary schools, now under the Board, a series of progressive schools for united secular education, and that the exhibitions in connection with Trinity College, now given to pupils of the Royal Schools, be increased and opened to all classes. Mr. Stephens, dissenting from this report, without stating his reasons. Mr. Hughes, the late Solicitor-General, dissented, and stated his reasons in a long and a very able letter, which is appended to the report. He objects to the principle of mixed education because he believes that religious education should form a portion of every system of education. The mixed system—that is, the system of mixing youth for the purpose of excluding religion—has been condemned by the Roman Catholic bishops and repudiated by the Protestant bishops; and on these grounds Mr. Hughes objects to the 'mixed' and prefers the separate systems. The separate system has been adopted by the Privy Council in England—it is the system that prevails in the only schools in Ireland—the schools of the Christian Brothers—which met the unqualified approval of the three Protestant commissioners, and, therefore, Mr. Hughes argues that the practical experience of the commissioners themselves, as well as the authoritative judgment of the heads of the two churches, demand that the separate system be the system of reform applied to these institutions.

The *Moniteur* contains an imperial decree granting a silver medal of honour of the first class to James Doyle, master of a pilot-boat, and Robert Byrne, master of a fishing-boat, of Kingstown, for saving the lives of three sailors of the crew of the French merchant-ship, France and Brazil.

GREAT BRITAIN.

CONVERSION.—We are able to state that the Rev. Robert Wilson, M.A., of Brighton, and formerly of Stapleford, near Crawley, Sussex, has been received into the Catholic Church. Mr. Wilson was at one time we are informed, Secretary of St. Nicholas's College, Shoreham; and took an active interest in the educational schemes of Mr. Woodard.—*Weekly Register*.

"Popish Conversion."—The *London Watchman* says: "The folly of looking mere education as a sure preservative from Popery is demonstrated by the events of every day. Such is the fact, independently of Protestant paragon and ecclesiastical connection. Church and Dissent, Independency and Presbytery, are alike humbled and mortified in the matter of Popish conversion. Where now is the son of the late celebrated Mr. Gunn, congregational pastor of Christ Church, Hants? Where the son of Dr. Henry Foster Burder? Having withdrawn from the community of his honored fathers to the Church of England, he at length succeeded to that of Rome; and to the great grief of his venerable parent, he now occupies an exalted place in the Eternal City."

THE DERIVIVES AND THE CONSPIRACY BILL.—We (Globe) have unquestionable authority for stating that the French ambassador, Count Persigny, was assured, both by Lord Derby and Mr. Disraeli, that they would give their strongest support to the measure introduced by Lord Palmerston for amending the law relating to conspiracies to murder, and that Mr. Disraeli further volunteered his opinion that the bill was not half strong enough. We shall be curious to see how the matter will be treated by those gentlemen who will find themselves next week mounted on the British lion for the edification of their constituents, or how they will explain the violation of their pledge to the French government, with which they are so anxious to establish relations of cordiality and confidence.

Lord Palmerston's government did more to turn the heart of the Irish people against English rule than even that of Lord John Russell, who talked himself out of office on the "mummy-of-superstition" key. The people now say—"There can be no faith placed in any section of the Whigs. They are all alike deaf to our cries—hardened against our complaints—reckless in their legislation." Thus have they exasperated the entire nation. There is no slight, no cruelty, no injury, no insult to our creed or country that they do not seem to laugh at.—The result is, that every Irishman, whether Protestant or Catholic, is beginning to see that nothing need be expected in the shape of just measures for Ireland from any English cabinet.—*Mayo Telegraph*.

Parliamentary reform will be postponed until 1859, if Lord Derby has his way. It was mooted in 1858, when the Whigs talked of considering it. It is mooted in 1859, and the considering cap is placed on a Tory head. Impatient and unpopular assemblies are traditionally said to be capricious; they have been docile enough in this matter. Lord John had a bill in view in 1851, it was postponed; Lord Derby in 1853, although sworn to resist the Deluge, was prepared to go into the question, though not just then; Lord Aberdeen, in 1853, actually presided over the introduction of a measure, but the Russian war intervened; Lord Palmerston, obtaining delay until 1857, promised to propose something next year; next year he is overthrown, and Lord Derby begs that the discussion may be deferred until 1859; early in 1859, in all human probability, he will return to opposition, if not earlier. Then, is a new Premier to come in, "totally unprepared," and ask for a year in which to mature his project? Upon this calculation we may have a Reform Bill in 1860.—*Leader*.

The unquenchable Spooner has given notice of his annual anti-Maynooth farce. It is truly sad to think that a statesman like Lord Derby should allow himself to be hampered by men of the Spooner and Beresford clique. Are they worth the discredit they bring upon him? and are their votes (by no means to be relied on) worth a thought in comparison with the support of a Gladstone, a Sidney Herbert, or a Duke of Newcastle?—*Union*.

Lord Naas, Chief Secretary for Ireland, in his election speech at Cockermonth, said that in Ireland there was much to be changed, much that needed reform. There was considerable skill required to prevent party spirit taking the place of sound and sober judgment, and there was ample opportunity for any one wishing to do so to serve his country well.

There seems a curious sort of retributive justice in the particular matter which caused Lord Palmerston's downfall. "His sport to see the engineer hoist with his own petard," and certainly the saying was never more amusingly realized than in the case of the judicious bottle-holder of Continental conspirators, censured and dismissed for supineness, or cowardice in the cause of revolutionary Liberalism. This, however, is taking the less serious side of the question, because it is by no means clear that the charge preferred against the Whig Minister of betraying, through cowardice, the honor of the country, it is not founded on literal fact. It may seem strange to suppose the confidant and patron of Mazzini should have been wanting in zeal for the cause of revolution, and, still more, that the Minister who sent a British fleet to threaten Athens with a bombardment, and who has been ready any day these two years to utterly annihilate the King of Naples, should have failed in showing a proper spirit on receiving what the *Times* calls "an outrageously insolent despatch." The explanation, however, is easy. The old Roman maxim, "parcere subjectis et debellare superbis," is exactly reversed in the policy of the model British Minister. It is easy to bully Greece and Naples, but it would be dangerous to try that game with France. Bullying of the weak and trucking to the strong has been the leading idea of Lord Palmerston's foreign policy, and, perhaps, that of the Minister of Louis Napoleon asserted that England countenanced and favored political assassinations, the noble Premier's conscience informed him that, to some extent, the charge was only too true.—*Tablet*.

THE DUKEDOM OF DEVONSHIRE.—There is (so we hear) a claimant to the dukedom and its magnificent appurtenances in the person of a son of the late duke, by a lady to whom it is positively asserted, that his grace was privately married, by a Roman Catholic Oligarchy, the lady being a member of that Church. Such a marriage, though it might have been attended with illegality, would not be necessarily null or void, and the issue thereof might, undoubtedly, be the heir-at-law of his father, and therefore of the Duke of Devonshire, if the late duke had really been the rightful possessor of that exalted title. The claim, if formally advanced, will necessarily raise two important questions:—1st, whether the claimant is or is not the legitimate son of the late duke; and 2nd (supposing this point established in the affirmative), whether the late duke was or was not the legitimate son of his father, the fifth duke. The first question will, however, be the most serious; for, if the claimant should establish his own legitimacy, the Earl of Burlington will find it a rather difficult task, in the teeth of notorious facts and circumstances, to successfully maintain his own right to the title and estates of the Duke of Devonshire.—Everybody knows that the late duke's title was publicly recognised by the House of Lords and by all the members of his own family; and it would be rather awkward in the latter now, at the end of nearly fifty years since his grace's accession to the peerage, to come forward with a plea of illegitimacy in bar of his legitimate son's rights, such plea being founded upon evidence which, if it exists at all, must have been in their possession since 1811, and has been allowed to remain dormant all the time.—The establishment of such a plea would indeed be a serious offence against the constitution of parliament and in the event of its turning out that the late Duke of Devonshire has left a male heir, born in wedlock, as we are informed is the case, we more than doubt whether his right to succeed to the title will be disputed on the ground that the late duke was illegitimate. We understand there is no doubt at all as to the late duke having left sons who succeeded to very considerable property by his grace's death, and that the claim of one of these to the patrimonial honours and estates is now going through the preliminary stages necessary to a legal investigation.—*Court Circular*.

PROTESTANT INJUSTICE.—A very interesting Parliamentary return relating to the allowances granted by the State for the maintenance of religious services in Her Majesty's Army at home and abroad, during the years 1853, 4, 5, and 6, was printed this morning. It is gratifying to perceive that the Governments of late years appear better disposed to recognize the value of religious ministrations to the troops who fight our battles and maintain, at all hazards, the national honor. The disproportion between the amount allowed for Catholic Chaplains and for those of the Established Church is, however, sufficiently glaring to call for especial comment.—Deducting the soldiers of Scotch regiments who profess the Presbyterian Faith, the largest portion of the rank and file of the army is Catholic. Notwithstanding this fact, the allowance for Catholic worship in the year 1856 was within 28 per cent. of the amount granted to the few Presbyterian regiments in Her Majesty's Service. It appears that the total amount paid to officiating Clergymen of the Church of England in Great Britain, Ireland, and abroad, in the year 1856, was £30,440; to Catholic Clergymen, £6,375; and to Presbyterian Ministers, £5,592. The Protestant Chaplains, it would therefore seem, get five times as large an allowance as the Catholic Chaplains, while the Presbyterian Chaplains get nearly as much as the Catholic. The allowance to Catholic Chaplains officiating in Ireland is beggarly in the extreme. The total amount allowed for Ireland in 1856 was £6,206; and of this sum the Protestants took upwards of two-thirds, or £4,035, the Catholics £1,559, and the Presbyterians £612. The stipends paid to the Catholic Chaplains vary from £5 per annum to £150; but even in the most Catholic parts of Ireland an absurd and insulting superiority is maintained in favor of the Protestant Church. Thus in Cork the Protestant Chaplains get £200, while the Catholics get £25; in Dublin the Protestants get £500, and the Catholics £130; in Mullingar the Protestants get £120, and the Catholics nothing; in Athlone the Protestants get £100, and the Catholics £30; at the Curragh (where the vast majority of the troops are Catholic) the Protestants get £300, while the Catholics get £50; at Charlemont the Protestant Chaplains get £80, while the Catholics get £5; at Newbridge the Protestants get £168, and the Catholic £18; and at Templemore the Protestants get £122, and the Catholic £64. Notwithstanding these unjust and insulting distinctions, it is but candid to admit that the grants for religious purposes have increased nearly 100 per cent. during the last four years. The total amount voted for Ireland in 1853 was £3,702; in 1854, £3,954; in 1855, £4,196; and in 1856, £6,206. The sum granted for foreign stations in 1857 was £9,196, of which only £1,080 was paid to Catholic Chaplains. The discrepancy between the respective allowances at home and abroad is even more glaring than in the instances to which I have already referred. At Quebec, for instance, the Protestant Chaplains get £365, and the Catholic £40.—At Kingston, (Canada) the Protestant gets £290, and the Catholic nothing; at Cape Town the Protestant gets £250, and the Catholic £26; at King William's Town the Protestant gets £250, and the Catholic £26; at Gibraltar the Protestant gets £250, and the Catholic £26; at Cephalonia the Protestant gets £240, and the Catholic £26; at Malta the Protestant gets £230 and an allowance of £10 for a Clerk, and the Catholic £20; at the Mauritius the Protestant gets £400, and the Catholic nothing; at Halifax the Protestant gets £546, and the Catholic £50; at St. Helena the Protestant gets £300, and the Catholic £75; at Dominica the Protestant gets £128, and the Catholic £131. The allowance to Protestant Chaplains in the Crimea in the year 1856 was £8,250; to Presbyterians, £3,122; and to Catholics, £2,850. It would seem by this return that prior to 1854 (the period of the Crimean war) it was not considered necessary to provide Catholic Bibles or Prayer-books for the use of Catholic soldiers. In that year, however, the Government provided 993 Douay Bibles, and in the following year 1,814; and in the year 1856 the number was increased, 9,378 Bibles: as against 26,072 of the Protestant version. The total expenditure on religious books for the use of the army in 1856 was £4,917 6s. 9d. The ground on which the distinction between the pay of Protestant and Catholic Chaplains is sought to be justified is the most fallacious and irrational that can be well imagined—namely, that the former may be married, and that the latter are notoriously not so. What on earth has this to do with the question? The money is voted by Parliament for a distinct service, and wages are granted by the State, as by private employers, for work and labor done. If the work and labor be done, it is the extreme of impertinence in the employer to inquire whether his servant be married or single. There are hundreds upon hundreds of unmarried Clergymen in the Church of England, and, no doubt, many unmarried Protestant Chaplains in the army; but no Vicars, Curates, or Chaplains of the Protestant Faith receive, by reason of their celibacy, smaller pay than their married colleagues in the Ministry. Not a bit of it!—*Dublin Freeman*.

It is rumored that in the investigations connected with the Orin trial, some curious disclosures have been made as to the means by which Mazzini visited Milan two years ago, as a courier in the family of a leading M.P. who has lately made himself conspicuous by the overthrow of Lord Palmerston's Government. The wife of a Catholic soldier of the 95th Regiment, named Nelson, was obliged to risk the loss of her allowance of six shillings a week from the Patriotic Fund, by withdrawing her three children from a Protestant school, in which the scrupulous and impartial Commissioners had placed them.

The Queen has announced her intention of visiting Birmingham to inaugurate the People's Park in the course of the present year—an act which shows the interest which Her Majesty takes in every movement that contributes to the health and comfort of the humbler classes. Good taste and a judicious appreciation of the circumstances of the times are visible in all the Queen's appearances in public in the great towns, where her visits form an event in the local history. The intended visit to Birmingham is a proof of this healthy feeling.

A FANCY SKETCH.—Let us venture on the venial fault of rejoicing that we are not in all respects like model republicans. We have just had an exciting struggle in the English House of Commons, involving a complete transfer of political power, and stimulating ancient grudges and recent passions into extraordinary vitality. Suppose that an episode of the party contest on the Conspiracy to Murder Bill had been described in the following manner:—About 4 in the morning Mr. Disraeli crossed the House to speak with Lord John Russell, and something occurred during his stay which induced him to object to the address of a Ministerial speaker on a point of order. Upon this Mr. M. T. Baines called out, "Why don't you go over to your own side, hang you, if you want to object?" What business have you on this side anyhow?" Mr. Disraeli retorted that the floor was free, and was returning to his seat, when the "gentleman from Leeds" met him, and asked, in a ruffianly tone, what he meant by that answer, adding, "I'll show you, you d—d Conservative puppy." The representative of Buckinghamshire answered, "You may think what you like, but let me tell you no beggarly lawyer shall come here to bully me as he does his witnesses." "We'll see about that," said Baines, and seized him by the throat. A short and ineffectual round was terminated by the interference of friends; but presently Mr. Baines rushed at Disraeli again, and seized him a second time, when he received from the successor of John Hampden a well-planted blow under the left ear, which fairly sprawled him on the floor. A dozen Ministerialists ran towards the combatants, some, doubtless, to keep the peace, others to have a hand in the fight. Grey, of Morpeth, Williams, of Kars, Wilson, of the Treasury, and the Ellices, father and son, were prominent in the scrimmage. The anti-Ministerial men sprang in a body to the rescue. Foremost came Mr. Bright, of Birmingham, a very athletic compact man, who bounded into the centre of the excited group, striking right and left with tremendous vigour. Pakington, of Droitwich, and Samuel Warren, of the northern bar, were equally ready for action. Roebuck kicked wildly at the shins of the veteran Premier; and Akroyd, of Huddersfield, appeared to have lost his head in the confusion, and taken the wrong side by mistake. For a moment or two it seemed as though we were to have a Kilkenny fight on a magnificent scale. Turner, of Manchester, had hold of Disraeli, when Bright struck him a severe blow, supposing that he was hurting that gentleman. Turner supposing it was Graham who struck him, dropped Disraeli and struck out at the baronet from Carlisle. The Lennoxes (Henry and Alexander) found themselves rather too closely engaged with Alfred Paget, of Lichfield, and his brother Clarence, of Sandwich, General Thompson caught up a heavy stoneware spittoon, with which to brain any one who might seem to deserve it; but, fortunately, did not get far enough into the crowd to find a fitting object for his vengeance. The Speaker yelled and rapped in vain; and the sergeant-at-arms marched to the scene of action, mace in hand, with no greater effect. The melee was not quelled until Fox, of Oldham, clutching the hair of Mr. —, apparently for the purpose of drawing him into chancery and pommeling him to greater satisfaction, found that the luxuriant wig of his antagonist came off in his left hand, while his right fist expended itself with tremendous force against the resisting air. The laughter excited by this incident terminated the battle. Change both the names, the facts are true. Everything that we have here set down from an imagination which may seem to have been indulged in the wildest extravagance, is related to have actually happened in the House of Representatives, at Washington, on the night of the 5th of February. The subject of discussion was the constitution that is to be given to the new State of Kansas; in other words, the policy of the Union in regard to the great question of the extension of slavery. The hostile parties, whose mutual relation we have compared to that of Ministerialists and the Opposition in the late division, are those which respectively designate themselves Democratic and Republican.—*Manchester Guardian*.

It appears now that the Sepoys were commanded by European, even by English officers, and unfortunately names are given. But then hereafter the story may be contradicted or explained, so uncertain is the whole Indian mythology. Should it prove true that European or English officers have deserted to the mutineers, perhaps fomented the sedition, we shall have a clue to the horrors of the campaign, and an adequate explanation of the atrocities committed, as well as the denial of them afterwards so authoritatively made. If English soldiers have adopted Hindoo or Mussulman habits, renouncing that outward profession of Christianity in which they had been nurtured, we have at once a solution of the enigmas. We see into the deep possibilities of wickedness to which such men would fall, and the cruel ferocity which would of necessity govern their lives. Men of sensual habits are always cruel, and only a sensualist could assume the religion of Mahomet, or plunge into the superstitions of the Hindoos. Such men as these, once in power, would turn round with a fury utterly indescribable upon those who are less wicked than themselves; neither would it surprise us to learn that the most exaggerated stories were true, if these apostates had anything to do with the facts on which they are based. It is said that an English officer had given his daughters in marriage to infidels, and had himself adopted their mode of life. If this officer can be traced, as it is alleged he can, among the rebel Sepoys, it is beyond all doubt certain that he must have been a cruel enemy to his countrymen. At once traitor, deserter, and apostate, triple chains of evil, he must have been a veritable fiend, a man whom no conscience could check nor law subdue. So much has been said of the Indian cruelties that it becomes a sort of obligation now to trace them to their source. Let us know the truth, whatever it may be, for even Sepoys do not deserve to be condemned unheard. If they are guilty of the acts attributed to them, let us know whether they were not urged on by others who once knew better. If apostates were in the rebel ranks, let us know who they were, how they came there, and what counsel they gave to the enemy, what evil they wrought against the race they abandoned. If the sours of the Indian Government are festering and incurable, let us know the truth, for it may be necessary to cut off gangrened limbs, to tear away dead flesh from the body, lest the whole should perish of corruption. The far East is a mysterious land, and men change their characters when they get far from home; it is, therefore, possible that the Anglo-Saxon, the Celt, and the Scot, when they settle down in India, assume something of the character of that population, which is of necessity cruel, because it is so profoundly corrupt. The knowledge of the truth about the Indian rebellion will enable us to judge more correctly what the India House may have been, and what the Board of Control is at this day. Corruption may have become a normal state of that immense Government, perhaps an incurable evil; and that Eastern habit, perhaps an incurable evil, and perhaps an element in the general degradation of the East, may have done all that has been done in India, on the one hand, and supporting the national superstitions, on the other, robbing the people of what national virtues were left in them by the schools; it has founded, and the instruction it has furnished.—*Tablet*.

ANGLICAN SQUABBLES.—The following statement has appeared in all the morning papers:—"The Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol has refused to consecrate a new church just completed in the parish of Horfield, a couple of miles from Bristol, by the Rev. Henry Richards, the incumbent. His Lordship states that some time before the death of the late Bishop, Mr. Richards consented to the formation of a new district for the parish of Horfield, which was to be liberally endowed by the Horfield trustees, and of which the Bishop for the time being was to be the patron. Shortly after the appointment of his Lordship Mr. Richards withdrew his consent, alleging that he could not allow a person holding the religious views of his Lordship to nominate a Clergyman. Mr. Richards afterwards built a church, offering to endow it with 40l. a year if he should have the presentation; but to this the Bishop would not consent for upon the first vacancy in the living of Horfield the new district will be amply endowed by the trustees and the patronage preserved to the see. The Bishop says that the church can be used for Divine Worship, and that it can be consecrated and the district formed whenever Mr. Richards carries out his original agreement."

TWO SOLICITORS CHARGED WITH FORGERY.—On Saturday morning James and Charles Mellor, father and son, solicitors, recently in business at Ashton-under-Lyne, were brought before the magistrates that borough charged with forgery. Mr. Marriott, solicitor of Manchester, said the prisoners were captured in America, and brought to this country on two charges of forgery. One of these charges was the altering the word "one" to "four" in a receipt given to the Mellors by Simon Fothergill, of Manchester, whose wife was a legatee under the will of the late Mr. Hart, the administration of whose affairs had been placed in the hands of the elder prisoner.—The receipt had thus been passed off as £450.—When the prisoner had, in reality, only paid £150.—The second charge was for creating and passing off, as for value, a deed of conveyance, which purported to convey to a person named Prestwich certain property at Saddleworth, the name used as that of the conveyer being that of a clerk in Mellor's office.—The elder prisoner was charged with uttering these forgeries, and the son Charles with having engrossed the fictitious conveyance, asked the clerk to sign it, and that he had, as for himself, witnessed the signature. Evidence of a *prima facie* character only, upon which to ask for a remand, was given, and the magistrates then remanded the prisoners until Wednesday. It appears the prisoners were captured by Mr. Buckley of the Manchester detective police, who started in pursuit on January 15th last, with warrants for their apprehension, by the Canada steamer from Liverpool to Boston. From Boston he went to Portland, thence to Island Pond, Montreal, Toronto, Detroit, Chicago, and Sandwick. At the last place he hired a wagon and proceeded to the prairie land of Illinois about thirty miles from St. Louis, where he arrived on February 6th. Here he found the prisoners staying at a farmhouse occupied by Mr. E. Heaps. He was introduced as a countryman, and did not disclose his errand until he had satisfied himself by conversation with them that they were the men he was in search of. He brought them home by the Edinburgh steamer from New York, and arrived at Ashton on Saturday, having travelled altogether between 3,000 and 10,000 miles. It was expected that the prisoners would have a large sum of money with them, the result of the heavy forgeries they committed, but Buckley only recovered £140 and some deeds. The prisoners held a highly respectable position at Ashton.

A most affecting incident took place at the War Office a day or two ago, which proves that ministers after all are but human. Lord Pamure met General Peel to hand over the records and explain to him all that had been done—which took a very short time—and all that had not been done, which was rather a tedious detail. General Peel listened with polite attention to all that the departing Secretary of State had to say for himself, and seemed deeply to sympathize in the sorrow which reddened his face and agitated his waistcoat. When the business of the interview was over, General Peel, with a degree of kindness that will never be forgotten, grasped the hand of the sobbing "Out," and in a tone worthy of the ordinary of Negvato when addressing a malefactor on the scaffold, or of a second in a duel, who sees it all up with his principal, said, "Tell me, tell me, my good lord, is there anything I can do to mitigate the affliction which bears you down?" The generosity of the appeal quite overcame the ex-captain of the 70th. Bursting into a torrent of grief, he exclaimed, "Oh, general, this is true humanity—my heart must speak. Take—take—oh, do take—care of Dowd!—*United Service Journal*."

THE DOCTRINE OF ASSASSINATION.—The *Morning Post* of Saturday insists that M. Walewski was right when he asserted that "assassination is erected into a doctrine and openly preached in England." In proof of this, our contemporary cites several extracts from, and promises to publish in full, a pamphlet entitled "Letter to Parliament and the Press," signed by Felix Pyat, Bossou, and A. Taluadit, on behalf of the Committee of the Revolutionary Commune, and dated London, Feb. 24th, 1858. The pamphlet extends over fifteen pages, and, according to our contemporary, "It defends the right of assassination, and vindicates the late attempt in London having killed the ruffian, every citizen is bound to reply to force by force, to bullets by grenades, to caution by revolvers, to grape by fulminating powders, to the Imperial Guard by infernal machines. 'What is the Imperial Guard but an infernal machine with a hundred thousand caps?' As for regicide, these gentlemen will not argue the question. They say, with those who executed Stuart, 'It is a right not to be discussed'; but they will not even admit the word 'regicide' in an attempt upon 'this person.' It is too good for him. He is a monster to be killed, assassinated, got rid of; and in such a praiseworthy attempt they say—alluding to the massacre of the Rue Lepelletier—'What does it signify that his paid and decorated accomplices, and five or six of his gendarmes and sbirri, should fall by his side and pick up pensions?' Human life is truly as nothing in the hands of these sanguinary and ferocious philanthropists. 'The Italian patriots—for this is how they term the villains—are not assassins, they are combatants, they die for their country.' As far as we are concerned, unhappily, we can pretend to nothing in the merits of their deed; we had not the honour of participating in their enterprise! After this frightful avowal, blasphemous steps in to render the thing more devilish—the cock would crow thrice if French voices did not acknowledge them."

BEGGING PARDON.—Rowland Hill was always annoyed when there happened to be any noise in the chapel, or when anything happened to divert the attention of his hearers from what he was saying.—On one occasion, a few days before his death, he was treated to one of the most crowded congregations that ever assembled to hear him:—in the middle of his discourse he observed, with commotion in the gallery for some time he took no notice of it, but finding it increasing, he paused in his sermon, and looking in the direction in which the confusion prevailed, he exclaimed,—"What is the matter? The devil seems to have got among you." A plain country looking man immediately started to his feet, and addressing Hill in reply, said:—"No, sir; it aren't the devil's agents doing it; it's a fat lady, your wife, and she is a fat un, and don't seem likely to come out again in a hurry." "Oh! that's all," observed Mr. Hill drawing his hand across his chin, "then I beg the lady's pardon—and the devil's, too."