

THE IRISH ESTABLISHMENT.—Canon McNeill, of Liverpool notoriety, still smarting under the remembrance of his humiliating discomfiture at the late great Church Meeting in Manchester, where he had the ill-luck to provoke an encounter with the Bishop of Oxford. It appears that there is in Liverpool a branch of a Society existing for upwards of forty years, but of which we never before heard the least mention, which devotes itself to the extraordinary work of teaching the Irish-speaking people of Ireland to read in the Irish language, in the hope that when they have mastered the difficulties of the Irish Reading-Made-Easy, and Irish Spelling-Book, they will be able to peruse the Annals of the Four Masters and the historical and legendary Irish publications of the Hibernian, Celtic, and Ossianic Societies. The practical working of this Society is most skilfully contrived to admit of the appropriation of the funds by the Irish agents without the possibility of detection, and we can well believe that whatever may have been the number of the agents employed they were not wanting in the exercise of their inventive faculties when making returns of the extent and success of their purely imaginary labours. Now, the annual meeting of the Liverpool branch of this Society took place on Monday evening, and Canon McNeill took the opportunity afforded him by presiding at it to give an explanation of what he said at Manchester, when his self-complacency was so ruffled by being put upon the defensive by the Bishop of Oxford. And yet it is noteworthy how powerless the Canon felt himself to give the explanation, under the terrifying consciousness that what he was going to say would be published in the newspapers—that the able and acute Prelate would read it—and that the possible consequence might be the getting himself involved in a literary controversy with the Bishop in which he would be sure to get the worst of it. He evidently spoke on Monday evening under a sort of haunting impression that the eyes of the Bishop were upon him; and the consequence was that his speech was virtually a surrendering of the Parliamentary defence of the Established Church in Ireland. Here is the gist of the Rev. Canon's explanatory speech at Liverpool:—

“I believe the very root of the question lies in this—What is the established Church for? If the Church in Ireland be for the minority of the people—arrogantly and permanently for the minority—and if the majority possess saving Christianity without it, then I must candidly confess, I do not think any adequate reason can be assigned for maintaining it, because the very best it could do, supposing it entirely successful through the whole country, would be to change one form of saving Christianity for another form of saving Christianity—and that I do not think it would be an adequate reason for maintaining the source of such vexation and irritation in the country. It is very irritating, especially to educated men, solicitors, barristers, physicians, surgeons, and artists. Many of these are men of talent and industry, and consequently men of influence, and they feel keenly the position they are placed in by men of the Established Church, not merely as a matter of creed, but as a matter of caste. They feel that the Established Church gives a higher social status to its ministers and its members than they can attain to, and this is a matter of deep and serious vexation to such gentlemen. It is not perceived how close this has come upon them. So long as these gentlemen were kept by the penal laws from the power of exercising any place or influence in the State, their antagonism was to the Imperial legislature. The Church no doubt was a grievance even then, but it was secondary, and they scarcely felt it because of the oppression of the laws; but now that those laws are repealed, and social equality is established, as far as the law can do it, they are mortified, and naturally mortified, at the aristocracy of gentility—if I may say it—the aristocracy of gentility which the Church maintains in the country. Well, why maintain all that? Why persevere in such an aggravation as this? Thus the question arises and is forced back upon us. In Romanism saving Christianity, or is it not? If it be, I protest I think that the Established Church in Ireland ought to be removed out of its way. If it be not, then I say at any risk, any amount of irritation, it becomes our duty, calmly and steadily to maintain that Church, and to strengthen and increase it. Well now, the question comes back upon us—Is Romanism saving Christianity? If it be, then the Irish Society has no business in the world at all, and the Irish Catholic Mission has no business in the world.”

This is very fairly put, and it is clearly and unmistakably a surrendering of the political and Parliamentary ground for maintaining the Established Church in Ireland. Parliament never dreamt of upholding the Established Church as a necessary piece of machinery for enabling the Irish peasantry to ascend to heaven. Noble lords and right honourable gentlemen—in any Session of Parliament since the reign of Queen Anne—would have voted the Irish peasantry legal lease to go to the devil by any road they pleased, provided, in the interim, they engaged to pay rack-rents regularly, and maintained the Established Church as an institution for providing the means of living for younger sons, and for supplying daughters with dowries in the shape of presentations to their husbands to lucrative Church preferments. What enamoured the Irish Parliament was the abundant supply of loaves and fishes. The Established Church in Ireland was upheld as a State engine—as the Institution round which the Government could assemble its forces to keep the garrison for keeping the Irish people in subjection. Ostensibly the Irish Church was supported by the State as being more favourable to the diffusion of the principles of Civil and Religious Liberty. I was not with the State a question of Heaven or Hell, or Christianity pure or unadulterated, but it was simply a question of Civil Liberty; and mixed up with that was the maintaining a State Church supposed to be essential to the imparting the security of a religious sanction to late and extensive confiscations. But these are purposes for which the Established Church in Ireland is no longer required. Catholics are as much interested as Protestants in resisting all attempts to revive claims to confiscated estates, inasmuch as they have been for half-a-century, and with the full sanction of the Catholic Bishops, large purchasers of such property. In fact, the progress of events, with regard to the possession of, and succession to, landed property in France, in Spain, and in Italy, within the last thirty years has perfectly satisfied Parliament that Changes of tenure, produced by revolutions and conquests, are fully and unequivocally accepted in Catholic as in Protestant countries, and that no Bishop in France, the Bishop of Orleans not excepted, would dream of advancing claims to any Church lands confiscated even so late as the first French Revolution. We accept, therefore, as quite fair the ground taken by Canon McNeill, and we call upon the Government to deal with the Irish Church question from that point of view. Whatever oaths Lord Palmerston and his colleagues may have taken, or whatever articles of subscription they may have signed, we feel very confident that they neither believe, nor will they venture to say, that the Catholic Church, so governed and represented by the Pope, is not a salvific Church in all the fullness for which they claim education for the various Protestant churches throughout Christendom. We are very sure that no Government in this country, in these days, would have the hardihood to apply to legislation any such test of unfitness for equality as Dr. McNeill's only could warrant the longer continuance of the present Irish Church Establishment. Therefore, the Canon's speech is a surrender of all the political ascendancy pretensions of the Established Church in Ireland, and also a surrender of the Irish Church Mission's right to exist in any part of the world.—Hall's Advertiser.

A SUMMONS TO DEATH.—The propriety of Irish men resident in the Northern States existing in the Federal army is a question on which we have hesitated to deliver an opinion. We have often lamented the vast effusion of Irish blood in the struggle; but we have always felt that it was for Irish-Americans themselves to decide whether they were bound or not by the ties of duty and loyalty to their adopted country to take up arms on behalf of the Federal Government. But even for those who are willing to concede most to arguments founded on appeals to patriotism and fidelity, it is impossible to read without indignation many of the paragraphs which are published by the Northern press for the purpose of inducing our countrymen to enlist. Take, for instance, the following which appeared lately in a journal which circulates principally amongst the Irish-American population of the North:—

“WILL UP THE BATTLE!”  
“The inducements to enlist are extraordinary; for with the seven hundred and seventy-seven dollars which the volunteer receives he can buy a farm out West for his family, stock it, and locate them comfortably. And this with the almost certainty that he himself will be spared to enjoy it, for it is not probable that any of the men now volunteering will ever see active service. The present call once filled up, the rebels will acknowledge the uselessness of further resistance. To persevere longer would be to doom themselves and their families to hopeless beggary, if not to extinction.”

Here are pretty inducements. It will be observed that none of the usual arguments about fealty to one's adopted country, the necessity of preserving the Union, &c., are employed. The reader is recommended to enlist, because a bribe of seven hundred and seventy-seven dollars is offered, with which the volunteer could purchase “a farm out West, stock it, and locate his family on it comfortably, with the almost certainty that he himself will be spared to enjoy it.” A farm out West! God bless us! The farms which thousands of the same race as that to which the journal we refer to now addresses its exhortations have found are comprised in six feet of reddened Virginia soil. They, too, had been told of the large bounty and full pay, and though we are convinced that motives far nobler animated them the picture of the snug farm “out West” may have shone brightly before their eyes. The hardships of war, before which they never shrunk, came in all their dreary reality; but the comfortable location, the farm, and the stock—they remained “out West,” we suppose, where the Irish volunteers never reached them, for the only fields they stamped their names on have been the fields of battle, where corpses were piled in the hard-fought contest, and the only harvest they reaped in have been the bloody harvests of death. In their time, too, just as in the present day, the story was put forward that the “rebels were just about to discontinue their efforts.” This call was always to be the last—the uselessness of further resistance was always just about to be acknowledged by the rebels. It is bad enough to find writings such as these in the organs of fanatical abolitionists, but it is surely saddening to find them in papers supposed to have the Irish interests at heart. It is bad enough to find arguments so false and mercenary put forward, even in the hired organs of President Lincoln's Government; but it is far worse to find them used in journals which we must assume to be independent; and we, who have long since become convinced of the futility of publicly interfering with or discussing, at this side of the Atlantic a question which we cannot hope to influence by our opinion or advice, are unable to avoid expressing our sentiments on paragraphs such as the one we have quoted, and declaring our astonishment at the fact that journals which affect so much zeal for the Irish interest, and denounce so strenuously and persistently Beecher, Greeley, and the Abolitionists, should still be found abandoning so completely the one, and performing so readily and unscrupulously the dirtiest work of the other.—Dublin Nation.

CATHOLIC EDUCATION.—The Mixed System.—“Omnibus Omnia,” writing to the Globe in reference to the mixed system of education forced on Catholics in England, says,—“The difficulty which you labor under, as well as other Protestants who interest themselves with regard to Catholic education is this—namely, that you do not see why the Catholics cannot submit to a mixed education, ‘as well as other religious communities.’ The simple fact is that, with Catholics there is a dogmatic teaching, whilst with Protestants of every persuasion there is nothing of the kind. With Catholics there is a positive, well-defined doctrine, with a legitimate, active ecclesiastical tribunal for defining and settling any misconception, to which every sincere, good Catholic would readily bow submission. With Protestants it is different; with them there is no dogmatic teaching. The very fundamental principle on which Protestantism is based abjures anything of the kind, and insists on the principle that every man is at liberty to set up for himself his own religious principle. With such a state of things how can it be expected to bring about a system of mixed education when the principles of religion so widely differ? The very tone and bearing even of a Catholic mathematical teacher differ from that of a Protestant professor. This tone and bearing has its influence on children. The social and moral atmosphere of separate schools, where children are trained on such adverse principles, must indeed be very marked. If Protestants disregard the mixing of their children with those of Catholics in schools, I cannot see why Catholics who do object to their scruples protected—why they should be compelled, default any education at all, to send their children to schools disapproved of by their Clergy, and so opposed to the principles of their Church! Referring to Dr. Doyle's letter you draw attention to the striking contrast between the Catholic Clergy of England and those of Ireland. In England, to use Dr. Doyle's expression, ‘gratitude would be indeed great if they had the same facilities and help extended to them as to their brethren in Ireland.’ But what does Dr. Doyle say besides? He says this of the school he alludes to:—‘The number of children is 500, and, with a few exceptions, the whole are children of poor Irish Catholics. Now, I have never been permitted to enter the school once, and am I not now to give religious instruction to these poor children?’ Indeed the Doctor has reason to say that ‘his gratitude would be great if the facilities and help were extended to him as to his brethren in Ireland. It is not to be inferred that the Doctor means that the Government scheme of mixed education is the *beau ideal* of an educational system for Catholic children. It means only, that bad as the Irish mixed education is, it is considerably better than what his 500 poor Irish children are subject to here in England. What fair pretence can be set up for not allowing Catholics to educate their own children? The Government contribute to the expense of their education in mixed schools. The Catholics only ask for the same quota of expense now paid for the education of their poor children, and to educate them under their own special care. The Government have established Catholic school inspectors; is this not a sufficient guarantee that the children are properly educated? Those Catholics who are able to pay for the education of their children can, without let or hindrance, send their children to a school taught on purely Catholic principles. Why should our less fortunate brethren not have the same religious liberty accorded to them? A Government, boasting of its principles of ‘civil and religious liberty,’ to be consistent, should hasten to rectify the anomaly that Catholics so loudly complain of in this compulsory mixed education of their children—which his Holiness and the Catholic Hierarchy have so universally condemned, as pernicious to the interests of the children of their poorer brethren, over whose welfare they have such a jealous care. Catholics certainly have ‘attained’ a certain amount of religious liberty in this kingdom.

But, why was there a necessity for such ‘attainment?’ Why has it not been fully and generously accorded to them without the many struggles they have had to undergo? A Catholic born within the precincts of this realm has, by birthright, a claim to equality with a child of the most distinguished Protestant parents, in regard to his civil and religious liberty. Why is it that he finds both the one and the other only in part, and accorded to him. Can it still be imagined, after so many years’ the schoolmaster has been abroad; that there can be anything in the doctrinal principles of Catholics subversive of the rights or privileges of Protestants. Perhaps there may be still a few persons who have not yet shook off the effects of nursery tales, but the generally educated Englishman, assuredly must by this time be convinced that Catholics, in every respect, are as good citizens as their Protestant brethren. I trust these last remnants of oppression which still darken Britain's fair escutcheon will soon disappear, and render it, indeed, a worthy object of admiration.

A confectioner at Limerick, Mr. Coggin, died a few days ago of hydrophobia, caused by the bite of a pet-monkey.  
On Monday an inquest was held on the body of the guard of a mineral train on the Dublin, Wicklow, and Wexford Railway, who came by his death by falling between the wheels of his train, while in motion, near Arklow, as he was attempting to pass along the side from wagon to wagon. Verdict:—‘Accidental death.’

A Queenstown correspondent informs us that the Government are still pursuing their investigations respecting the mysterious affair of the Kearsage.—As yet the inquiry is conducted in private, but the matter has been taken up in earnest, and is, doubtless, the subject of pending diplomatic correspondence, which in due time will see the light.

On the 19th ult., an Ennis correspondent writes—‘John O’Dea, who was in custody on a charge of firing at Daniel O’Dea and his wife, was again before the magistrates here, after investigating the case, and finding O’Dea's wife's evidence to differ widely from her own, dismissed the charge and discharged the prisoner; at the same time they had no doubt but a shot was fired, and also that it was a blank charge.’

Doubts having been expressed that the late Mr. F. M. Calcutt, M.P., had, shortly before his death, joined the Catholic communion, it may be well to state that all uncertainty is now removed, as a tablet has been erected in St. Mary's Catholic Cemetery, at Kenal Greene, to the memory of the deceased gentleman. Mr. Calcutt died in London, and his remains are interred in the catacombs of St. Mary's burial ground, which has lately been opened for the exclusive interment of deceased members of the Catholic Church.—Dublin Freeman.

Captain Henry, of county Kildare, late high-sheriff for the county of Antrim, has made a reduction of rent on his estate in the parish of Killead.—To a great number of his tenants he gave fifty per cent on the half year's rent payable at November last, and to the remainder twenty-five per cent. This is on account of the late disastrous years which have passed, and the present low price of grain.—Mr. Henry's father was one of the first in Ulster to reduce his rents 25 per cent, for many years, in the time of agricultural distress.—Ulster Observer.

The Tuam Board of Guardians has stopped outdoor relief to the poor of Headford. Since that was inserted on our first form, we (*Irish-American*) have received the *Connaught Patriot* of the 26th ult., which says—‘It is reported that the life of one of the poor of Headford has been sacrificed to the cruel and heartless economy of the Tuam Guardians. John Glynn is dead! The Guardians, taking an unfair advantage of the absence of Father Conway, had no sooner deprived poor Glynn of the miserable pittance he had been receiving for some previous time than the sick man became visibly worse, and sank rapidly. This is one of the poor for whom the relieving officer, acting under the advice of the Guardians, had nothing but a cart to remove him to the workhouse. Will these Guardians of the poor put their hands to their breasts, and examine their consciences on the state they had in the death of poor John Glynn.’

A very influential meeting was convened by requisition in Dublin a few days ago, for the purpose of organising a public subscription by which to indemnify Alderman John Reynolds for the expenses incurred by him in his successful efforts to provide for the Catholic poor of Ballinasloe the inestimable advantage of the ministrations of the Sisters of Charity in the Workhouse, and to mark their appreciation of his great services to the Liberal cause for the last forty years. The meeting was attended by several of the most eminent members of the Liberal party in Dublin, and very flattering speeches were delivered by Sir Colman O’Loghlin, Bart., M.P.; Mr. Charles Barry, Q.C.; Sir John Gray, Alderman Carroll, and others. Appropriate resolutions were passed, and a subscription list was opened which in a few moments exhibited a very handsome amount. There can be no question of Alderman Reynolds's services to the popular cause in Ireland. He was an active member of the Catholic Association; he has taken a prominent and useful part in promoting all the valuable local reforms and improvements in Dublin since 1830, and of his services in the Ballinasloe affair it is impossible to speak in too commendatory terms. For six years he fought the battle of the poor and religion against the Earl of Clancarty and his bigoted adherents in and about Ballinasloe, and it was not without immense trouble and labor, and very considerable pecuniary expenditure, that he at last succeeded, almost against hope, in breaking down the barriers of religious intolerance and lordly influence which obstructed his path.—Weekly Register.

THE NATIONAL EDUCATION BOARD IN IRELAND.—The Presbyterians of the North, if we are to believe their organs, are trembling for the fate of their cherished Board. The 3,000 Catholic priests and 26 Catholic Bishops of Ireland are, after all, to be a power in the State. The ‘clerical interference’ is working wonders at the Board. The handful of Presbyterians in Ulster, where the Catholics number two to one, are really very much put about by the idea that the Catholics of the other Provinces, where no other denomination has a standing, should object to have infidel and anti-Catholic doctrines diffused among them. To the utter disgust of their infidel advisers and friends, the Catholics of Ireland still place unlimited confidence in the wisdom and guidance of their venerated and beloved pastors.

GREAT BRITAIN.

CONVERSION.—We have been requested to state that the Rev. Henry Anderson Dance, B.A., of Queen's College, Oxon, was received into the Catholic Church of St. Anne's, Spicer street, Spinkfields, on Saturday.—London Tablet.

THE ARCHBISHOP OF WESTMINSTER.—A paragraph has appeared in some of the papers stating that Cardinal Wiseman's health is so bad that he is likely to be removed from the position he holds, and to be succeeded by Dr. Manning. The best commentary on the report is that the Cardinal has undertaken to preach at St. Mary's, Moorfields, to-morrow (Christmas) morning.—Times, 24th ult.

THE CONFEDERATE CRUISE.—The Government employes at the dockyard, Sheerness, who volunteered to fit out and equip the Rappahannock as a war ship for the Confederates, have been discharged for violating the neutrality laws of the country. It is understood, also, that the names of those at the crews of the Alabama, Georgia, and Florida, who belonged to the Royal Naval Reserve, have been stricken from the list with the loss of all pay and pensions, and are not to be allowed to re-enter the service.—Liverpool Daily Post.

MATRIMONIAL BLISS IN ENGLAND.—An English paper deprecating in relation to the various qualities of conjugal bliss, states that in the city of London the official records for the last year stands thus:—Runaway wives, 1,132; runaway husbands, 2,848; married persons legally divorced, 4,175; living in open warfare, 17,345; living in private misunderstanding 13,340; mutually indifferent, 55,175; regarded as happy, 3,175; nearly happy, 127; perfectly happy, 13.

THE CRIME OF INCENDIARISM.—At the various assize courts held throughout the country the judges expressed their astonishment and regret at the increase of the crime of incendiarism, which seems to have manifested itself simultaneously at different points. There were no fewer than six of these cases before Mr. Baron Martin at Chelmsford this week. Some of these crimes are apparently committed by young children, but in other cases the perpetrators are persons of mature age, who appear to be actuated by diabolical malice only.—Standard.

A man without religion who has raised himself to power in England has no reason to dislike the national religion, but every reason to respect and favor it. It is a most decent, decorous, well conducted, and well connected member of society. It is useful in supplying subjects of interest to thousands of respectable men, and millions of women and children. It is politically useful. It gives a harmless vent to one of the strongest principles of human nature, and so saves a world of trouble which might otherwise be occasioned by fanaticism. Its establishment is one of the most important parts of the public patronage, and is the means of concealing the material interests of many thousand families with the established order of things. All these things influence an English statesman on behalf of the national religion; even if he deliberately and consciously disbelieves both it and Christianity as a whole. But in truth he is not very likely to do this, if there is nothing to bring the subject strongly before his mind and compel him to come to a conclusion. If any one doctrine of the Establishment disgusts him, he may openly reject that one, and yet continue to be a good Church of England layman. For only the Clergy are required to profess any particular creed, and as the whole national religion avowedly rests on the private judgment of each individual, the authority of any point of it which he is inclined to adopt is not shaken by his rejecting others which he does not like. The result is that an irreligious Protestant who rises to political power in England usually continues not only to profess the national religion, but, in a general and a vague way, to believe it. Meaning there is nothing in it to annoy or disturb him. If he likes to go to church once on Sundays, he is exemplary; if he does not, it makes no great difference. Anyhow, he need do no more. In a Catholic country, on the other hand, the Church touches some sensitive part of an irreligious man at every turn. It is always annoying him. It has its own laws and institutions, and these come in collision with the measures he would like to carry out. It is ten to one that some member of his family or some near friend believes the Catholic religion to be the one thing on earth worth living for. Cases arise in which even his wife finds herself compelled either to oppose him or to offend God, and if she is a Catholic, her choice is made. Questions about divorce, about education about burials, bring him into sharp collision with the Church or constituted society, which has laws of its own older than the laws of the land, and superior to them in authority. The result is, that an irreligious man who rises to political power in a Catholic country—even if he still chooses to call himself a Catholic—is under a perpetual temptation to a quarrel with the Church.—Weekly Register.

A LADY LAWYER FOR THE DIVORCE COURT.—It was prognosticated by most thinking men, and, no doubt, by most thinking women too, that the Divorce Court would be productive of a world of mischief, and their prognostications have proved too correct. A ruthless destroyer of domestic happiness, making void and null the most sacred and most binding of contracts—contracts sanctioned, prescribed, ratified, and pronounced indissoluble by Heaven itself—the Divorce Court summarily dissolves a partnership entered into for better or worse for the term of their natural lives of the contracting parties. The process by which this solemn bond is legally broken is as swift and simple as it is scandalous and unprincipled, and the preliminaries to it, in nine cases out of ten, more scandalous still. We do not intend to pander to the depraved taste which is gratified by such details of the Court's proceedings as are almost daily to be found in the public journals in England. The incessant gratification of that vitiated and prurient taste is, however, only one of the many moral diseases which the new Divorce Law has engendered. Take for instance the following announcement, in a public journal, from one of the gentle sex:—

“DIVORCE.—A lady, thoroughly conversant with the routine and practice of this Court, can be consulted from eleven to three daily. All communications strictly confidential. Eminent counsel provided. Letters enclosed, with stamped directed envelopes, Mrs. —, of — street, — road.”

It must be remembered that the advertiser makes no reservation as to the sex of the clients who may feel desirous of consulting her. Like the ‘Knight of the Hammer’ she indiscriminately invites ladies and gentlemen to ‘walk in’ and purchase the commodity she has to dispose of. The people who have been so much at a loss to find employment for women must have been errand boys not to have long ago discovered what an admirable field the mysteries of the Divorce Court had opened to them. What relief must a fair dame, bent on severing the marriage tie, derive from pouring her conjugal griefs into the sympathetic bosom of a lady thoroughly conversant with the routine and practice of the Court that can do the needful so well and so expeditiously? Or suppose the client a gentleman anxious to be off with an old love and on with a new one, how delightful to be able to pour his vexations into an ear so admirably attuned to such ‘romances of real life’! True, he might feel somewhat embarrassed at first, and somewhat anxious to know how a ‘Lady’ had become so thoroughly conversant with the routine and practice of the Court. Had she been more sinned against than sinning? Was she quite removed from matrimonial trammels, or had she ever been bound by any? Was she a victim of some brutal Benedict, or the reverse? What could have induced her to become a *jurisconsultus* in matters so delicate? What, indeed! what but the wide-spread demoralization which the law administered in that Court had produced. Mothers and daughters had become so familiar with it; the world around them has been brought to regard it as such an ordinary and everyday occurrence, and so much a matter of course. There, either the husband or the wife, or both together, seemed to vie with each other in giving the greatest publicity to acts and accusations that even the most abandoned and shameless would rather see concealed than exposed. Complaints are continually rung in our ears about the spread of the social evil, and we see now and then a knot of well-dressed men, striving to check it by gathering round them as many as they can of the frail creatures who minister to it. Preaching and praying, counsel and confectation, are used, and trust, and trust, are liberally distributed amongst them, as a means of rectifying them from their scandalous lives. But what avails all this when a single newspaper report of a case in the Divorce Court does more to disseminate the germs of evil than all the preachments and persuasions of such philanthropists can effect towards its diminution. Ladies have, from time immemorial been distinguished for their skill and address in match-making but it is something new to find them offering their services as match-breakers. Had any one of the sex undertaken her services in the capacity of match-maker in such matters there would be a simultaneous appearance of propriety in the announcement. But it certainly shews that strong minded women have arrived at such a pitch of strong mindedness

that they might not inaptly be called female iron-clads, wholly impenetrable to the feeling of shame and delicacy which were wont to distinguish the gentler sex.—Dublin Telegraph.

CANADIAN EMIGRATION FROM FAISLEY.—The members of the Paisley Emigration Society are about to send circulars to gentlemen in the town and neighbourhood, soliciting subscriptions to enable them to emigrate to Canada in the spring. The most of them understand, are handloom weavers of good character, who are anxious to emigrate to our Canadian colony with the view of being able to provide a more comfortable maintenance for themselves and families.—Glasgow Mail Dec. 25th.

A CHRISTMAS SUMMER.—In Yorkshire the mildness of the season is unusual. The gardens, many of them retain the scarlet geraniums and stocks of summer yet in bloom, and roses still keep their foliage. Gooseberries are in leaf partly, and about scaggle-thorpe, in full south positions, have actually flowered; and rhubarb is pushing in the open ground. Altogether there have not been more than 12 hours of slight frost. In the fields the wheat crops are remarkably forward—‘proud,’ as the farmers say, and the breadth of wheat sown, thanks to the open weather, is very large. Turnips have hardly ceased growing yet; the season, indeed is more like Michaelmas than Christmas.

THE STOCKPORT POISONING CASE.—At the Cheshire assizes, before Mr. Justice Wille, on Tuesday Alice Hewitt, alias Holt, 27, was charged with poisoning her mother, Mary Bailey, at Stockport. Mr. McIntyre and Mr. H. Lloyd appeared for the prosecution, and Mr. Swettenham defended. Mr. McIntyre, in stating the case, said the prisoner had lived with a woman named Holt, and was the main support of her mother, the deceased. Some time ago the prisoner proposed to insure her own life and that of her mother in an insurance society, but this project fell through for a time. In February last, however, the prisoner asked a woman named Ann Bailey, to personate her (prisoner's) mother before the doctor for a life policy Bailey refused. The prisoner then procured a woman named Betty Wood to personate Mary Bailey, who was at that time lying ill, and a certificate of acceptance of the insurance was issued. Mrs. Bailey became ill, and was attended by the parish doctor, who was surprised to find his remedies fail. On three occasions pork pies were purchased and partaken of by the mother, who was sick afterwards. The deceased got worse, and prisoner called in Mr. Barker, who never met the parish doctor, so that each prescribed in ignorance of the other's visits. A nurse called Ryle was in attendance on her, and was repeatedly asked by the prisoner, ‘Is my mother dying?’ On the 25th of March she purchased some arsenic and on that evening the prisoner bought some more, and when she came home put it in a jug with water. Before deceased died the prisoner bought some brandy for her mother, who drank it and then said, ‘There are some grounds at the bottom.’ The prisoner said, ‘You ought to have drunk it, grounds and all.’ During the night the deceased was worse, and she died in the morning. The prisoner subsequently said to Ann Bailey, ‘Well, I'm very glad my mother died, for all my clothes were fast. I wanted to get them out.’ The insurance Society paid the amount of the policy, but after a time suspicion was aroused, and the body was exhumed, when it was found, on a post mortem examination, to be saturated with arsenic. Several witnesses having been examined in support of this statement, the court adjourned. The prisoner was brought up on Wednesday, and Mr. Swettenham having addressed the jury, his lordship summed up, and the jury returned a verdict of ‘Guilty.’ The prisoner was sentenced to death in the usual manner.

The execution of the wretched woman Alice Hewitt alias Holt, now lying in the condemned cell at Chester Castle, convicted for the murder of her mother, by poison, at Stockport, is fixed to take place on the 28th instant. The jury's recommendation to mercy has been forwarded to her Majesty's advisers, but the circumstances of the murder are such as to leave very little ground for hope that the sentence will be commuted. We do not learn that any other steps have been taken in her behalf, either in Chester or Stockport. The culprit would have been tried at the last summer assizes but for her pregnancy. She has since been delivered of a child, which was taken away from her on Thursday. Since her conviction she has been very restless, exhibiting great remorse of conscience, and at times she becomes much excited particularly about her child.—Manchester Guardian.

The *Dover Chronicle* points out to its readers the strange notions of a bishop, and says that:—‘The Bishop of Oxford, in his late charge at Aylesbury, made some remarks which have excited much attention, especially amongst those who value the religious freedom and independence secured to us by the Reformation. In the first place, the Bishop laid down, in the broadest manner, that the authority of the Anglican Church is superior to that of the Bible. ‘We should be unable,’ said the Bishop, ‘to maintain the divine authority of the Scriptures, if we gave up the authority of the Church.’ The two are absolute correlative. In the Church's sense of the word, we could have no Bible, if we had no Church; for the Church was its witness and keeper. The Church was and must be the Bible. It must receive the Bible; it must propound the Bible to each separate soul as the Word of God.’ The Bishop in the same charge, enumerates, as the special graces the Church had to contend with, bad cottages, hearse-shops, and ‘the presence of Dissent in their parishes;’ the Rev. Prelate adding, ‘In some parts of the diocese a hindrance had been experienced, owing to the intrusion of the neighboring clergy associating with Dissenters in holding religious meetings.’ This practice the Bishop denounced in no very measured terms as a breach of implied contracts, the violation of a divine command, and as ‘tending to dishonor the common ministry.’ Some of the Bishop of Oxford's associates on the Episcopal bench must share these heavy denunciations with the offending clergy of his diocese; for only a week or two ago the Bishop of Lichfield publicly stated that he was glad to associate with Dissenters in works of piety and usefulness.’

The position of affairs throughout Lancashire still presents a dreary aspect, and it is feared that to many the coming winter will be a time of much suffering. On this matter, Mr. Farnoll reports that on the 5th inst. there was a small increase of 228 in the twenty-seven unions in the cotton manufacturing districts, as compared with the number so relieved in the previous week. We do not think, however, that this increase is to be altogether attributed to cotton failure, for at this season of the year there are large numbers of persons connected with agriculture, building, &c., who fall out of work.

Who is N. H. Downes?—He is, or, rather, was a public benefactor, a philanthropist. He is now dead, but he has left behind him a monument more lasting than brass or marble. His memory is enshrined in the hearts of a grateful people, and his Balaclava Bixie is so ought to be a household treasure in every family. It is a certain cure for coughs and colds. See advertisement in another column.

John F. Henry & Co. Proprietors, 233 St. Paul St. Montreal, C. E.

THIS WILL TELL.—Yes that is the euro test. That which does not appear plain to-day, may be thoroughly cleared up in a short time. Our certainties and uncertainties are all to be decided by time, which never fails to bring out the truth or falsity of any matter. For five years the Vermont Liniment has been before the public and their verdict has always been steadily in its favor. Use it for pains both internally and externally. It is warranted.

John F. Henry & Co. Proprietors, 233 St. Paul St. Montreal, C. E.