

had purchased any poison; she again answered in the negative. Sergeant Major Morton deposed he had some conversation with the prisoner before her arrest; he told her if she bought any poison she had better tell it, as they were determined to find out; she said she had not bought any; witness went in company with the last witness, to a shop in Bath-street, on returning and asking the accused the question, she replied no; he then asked her had she bought anything for cleaning gold lace, and if she had shown Gunter Temple any poison coming into barracks; she replied, "Fetch Gunter Temple here; I did nothing of the sort;" there was a police-constable outside the door on the stairs, and a non-commissioned officer in the room; she was under restraint at the time; witness desired the constable to take her in charge, as he was afraid she might do away with herself. Colonel William Saunders, Commander of the Royal Artillery at the Portobello Barracks, deposed that on the morning in question the prisoner was brought to him by his orders; he said to her, "Is it true this man has been drinking whisky in your quarters this morning?" she said, "Yes; he drank a pint;" witness then asked, "Who paid for the whisky?" she replied he paid for it himself; he then said, "You should not have let him drink; I cannot ask you any more questions, as you will have to answer for it before a magistrate." The accused was then generally remanded for a week.

CONSISTENCY OF THE "EVENING MAIL."—How differently reasoners look at different cases—their own, for instance, and that of others—is curiously illustrated by two articles in the Dublin Mail, the one following the other directly. The first of these is entitled "Discipline in the Church," and it is directed to the necessity of enforcing the authority of the Irish Church body, even to the extent of cutting off those clergymen who will not recognize the recent alterations—revisions they are called—in the Book of Common Prayer. The immediately succeeding article is entitled "Persecution, German and French," and the object of it is to show that it is persecution on the part of the Catholic Church to cut from its communion the schismatics who call themselves old Catholics—who deny dogmas that have been solemnly pronounced by an Ecumenical Council! When this is the way in which Protestants reason about Catholic affairs, is it any wonder that their notions should be a series of unmitigated blunders?—Cork Examiner.

CENSUS OF LEINSTER.—The Census returns are being dribbled out at a rate which promises that we will have all the results of the Census of '71 about the time the Census of '81 is upon us. The latest instalment of the Census returns reached us last night in the shape of the census of the province of Leinster, the records of whose separate counties have we believe, been previously printed. The province has not, we believe, suffered so much in population as the other divisions of the island. Its population stand at 1,973,731 in '41, at 1,672,738 in '51, at 1,457,635 in '61, and at 1,339,451 in '71. The urban population of the province is large, as it includes the metropolis, with 267,717 inhabitants; Drogheda, 16,165; Kilkenny, 15,748; Wexford, 12,077; Dundalk, 11,377; and other large towns. Eighty-nine persons in the province are returned as aged 100 and upwards but a recent writer has shown that in the majority of cases supposed centenarians have not really attained that age. There are over 465 barristers and twice as many attorneys residing in the province, almost all of whom are, we imagine, residents in Dublin. There are 1,600 physicians, surgeons, and medical students; while the number of "clergymen, church officers, and others connected with religion" amounts to over 3,000. The religious census of the province shows 1,145,000 Catholics, 164,858 Protestant Episcopalians, 12,556 Presbyterians, 6,530 Methodists, and 3,261 of "all other denominations." The "all other denominations" include the astounding number of 104 different sects. This includes 1,363 members of the Society of Friends, 218 Jews, 49 of "no denomination," and 7 Mormons. Four persons have returned themselves as Materialists, 3 as Secularists, 3 as Undetermined, 1 as a Buddhist, 1 as a Covenanter, 1 as an Idmiter, 1 as a Killyite, 1 as a Mussulman, 1 as a Believer in "Positivism, or Religion of Humanity," 1 as a "Protester against all Priestcraft," 1 as a True Moslem.—Freeman.

The Court of Queen's Bench gave judgment yesterday upon the special case submitted to it with respect to the conviction of Mr. Enkles, J.P., by the magistrates of Cork for a violation of the Ballot Act at the last election by disclosing the way in which an elector voted. Mr. Enkles was a supporter of Mr. Pim at the last election, and after a man named Delea had voted, he asked Mr. O'Connell, the agent of Mr. Ronayne, "why did you bring that man up? He voted against us!" Proceedings were instituted against him, and the magistrates twice dismissed the charge "without prejudice" in December, 1872. The prosecution, however, was taken up by the Attorney-General, and in April last the magistrates convicted him and sentenced him to 14 days' imprisonment. The decision was appealed against on the ground that the two dismissals should have barred any further prosecution; that the evidence given did not establish the offence charged, as there was no proof that Delea actually voted, and the observation attributed to the defendant was not sufficient of itself to establish the crime; and that the remark was made inadvertently, and was not such a deliberate disclosure as was necessary to make him liable to penal consequences. The Court was divided in opinion. Mr. Justice Barry, Mr. Justice Fitzgerald, and Mr. Justice O'Brien held that the conviction should be affirmed, and the Lord Chief Justice dissented from their view. The question principally turned upon the construction to be put upon the Petty Sessions Act of 1851, under which the proceedings were brought. In support of the appeal it was contended that the Petty Sessions Act did not apply to an offence created by the Ballot Act passed several years afterwards. Mr. Justice Barry said he had come to the conclusion, after some hesitation, that the Petty Sessions Act was general in its application, and applied equally to offences created after or before its passing. Mr. Justice Fitzgerald thought that the title and preamble of the Petty Sessions Act showed that it was large enough to embrace prospective cases, and that the Justices had power to dismiss without prejudice. He was also of opinion that the offence was satisfactorily proved, but he expressed a personal wish that having regard to the age and position of the defendant he might be spared the infliction of the sentence. Mr. Justice O'Brien concurred in the judgment. The Lord Chief Justice dissented.

INDICTMENT FOR LIBEL AT TRALEE.—At Tralee Quarter Sessions Mr. Richard O'Connell, B.L., applied to the Chairman, Mr. Hemphill, to send to the Grand Jury an indictment against the proprietor of the Nation, Mr. A. M. Sullivan, for publishing articles which Mr. O'Connell alleged were malicious libels, in connection with the late Tralee borough election. The Court refused to entertain Mr. O'Connell's indictment, leaving him to apply at the assizes or proceed by record.

A DAY'S DEALINGS.—The year 1873 was the first in which the imports of foreign and colonial merchandise into the United Kingdom exceeded the value of £1,000,000 a day. The total is stated at £370,380,742. The exports of British and Irish produce and manufactures averaged nearly £700,000 a day, the total being £255,973,386.

SIR GEORGE C. O'DONELL, BART., AND MAYO COUNTY.—We may state, on authority, that Sir George C. O'Donell, Bart., Newport House, will be a candidate at the next general election for the county Mayo; Sir George's absence from the Home Rule Conference was caused by the serious illness of his lady, who,

we are glad to say, is now restored to her usual health.—Frum News.

DEATH OF LORD DE ROS.—On Tuesday Lord de Ros died at his residence, Old Court, Stranford, county Down, after a very brief illness. The deceased nobleman was in his 77th year, and was the premier Baron of England. He will be succeeded in the peerage by his only son, the Hon. Dudley Charles Fitzgerald.

At a meeting of the Limerick Corporation on Monday, a vote of congratulation to Lord Emly on his elevation to the peerage, was, on the proposition of Alderman Quinlan, J.P., seconded by Mr. Robert McDonnell, J.P., unanimously adopted.

GREAT BRITAIN. CATHOLIC LOYALTY.

[At an anti-Ritualistic meeting recently held at York, presided over by Earl Fitzwilliam, Earl Cathcart in the course of his speech questioned the loyalty of the Catholics. The following vigorous poem signed "Catholicus," and "dedicated without permission, to the Right Hon. the Earl Cathcart," appeared in the Yorkshire Post of last Saturday, in reply to the noble Earl's slanderous remarks.]

Ye taunt us with disloyalty, ye say our creed denies The hero's lofty impulse, the patriot's sacrifice; Ye say we cringe to foreign power, we scorn our country's laws, And hold all truth and honor void to serve our Church's cause. What have you courage still to broach the three-reputed tale? And dream ye that your libel weak can naught 'gainst us prevail— 'Gainst men whose fathers braved the axe, the scold, and the knife, For that eternal, stainless faith they held more dear than life? Who joyfully poured forth their blood to win a martyr's crown, Whose memory, as our proudest boast, their children still hand down; Think ye to cast a stain on us, whose falchions eye flashed free O'er England's marshalled van, and charged foremost for loyalty? Gaze through the mist of backward years, whose barque is on the main Grappling in deadly battle with the tall galleons of Spain? Who vanquished the "Invincible?" Who won the deathless name? Who but the "Popish" Admiral Howard of Effingham? And view you glittering son of crests o'er Marston Heath that shines: Ride there no proud recusant lords in yonder fiery lines? Have their good brands been slack to reap the harvest of the fray, Or has the cross they signed ere fight unmanned their hearts to-day? Not honored by their generous souls they paused not for the thought ' Of the stern and ruthless penal code their downfall that had wrought; Their king was wronged! and forth they rode, from many a plundered hall, To share his fate, come weal or woe—by him to stand or fall, True Winchester, and Worcester staunch, and Arundell the brave; Dunbar, and Gascoigne, and O'Neill, rise from each honored grave; Tyllesley, and gallant Langdale, and stout Sir Henry Gage, Waved not your knightly pannonels o'er Nasby's wildest rage? Curmarvon! thou whose last high breath in glory's cause was given, And on whose hero pillow gazed the clear blue eye of heaven! And thou, devoted Aston, on Tredagh's walls that died, Talbot, whose lion banners wave o'er castled Malahide; Are ye, high-hearted brothers, whose truth was proved so well, When wandered Stuart's heir beneath the oak of Boscobel— Ye held the ancient faith we hold, your blood runs in our veins, And in the names ye left behind a heritage remains— A heritage of noble deeds, of fame that breeds decay— A glory of the olden years that ne'er shall pass away; Do not fair Raglan's ivied towers, and Wardour's ruined dome, Lutworth, and princely Arundell, the Howards' lordly home, Mosely and Winchester proclaim, yet through their tall green trees, The faith and valour of their lords, those voiceless witnesses? And might not each grey tower be named, as Basing was of yore, The fortress of "a loyalty" that dureth evermore? And since in many a conflict stern our honor hath been tried Where through the burning Indian sands rolls on the Ganges' tide; Where the broad cedar shades the lake, and o'er Savannah bright Rings the fierce Huron war-cry on the stillness of the night; Where through the lovely Spanish land the British host pressed on, Till France had veiled her haughty crest, and Orthes' field was won! There has our blood for England's right as water forth been poured, On every red and hard-fought plain where shone her lightning sword, Then dare ye not to cast a doubt on men as true as ye, Whose father's met at Runnymede, and conquered at Cressy, And who are ready as of yore to tread the onward way Of the ancestral chivalry of that old Norman day. Let but our country need our arms, and ye shall quickly know If we are cravens wont to flee before a foreign foe, Or would betray our own fair land, by saints and heroes trod, Because we hold our faith unchanged, untarnished before God.

At the next moment she is announcing her message once more to all who "have ears to hear." If Cesar jeers at her Chief Pontiff, and protests that he knows him not, Pius quietly replies that all the baptized belong to him. If the guides of modern English opinion jest at Ultramontaniam, the Archbishop of Westminster tells them that Ultramontaniam is Christianity. If unbelievers proclaim that there is no supreme authority, and that Peter can err like anybody else, the Vatican Council answers that the Vicar of Christ is infallible. This is the way of the Church. And the world is astonished at what it calls her "audacity." Will she never know when she is beaten? Infidels and sectaries marvel that in what they deem her hour of weakness, when her Pontiff is a captive, and the princes of the earth have become cowards or apostates, she should speak exactly as she did a thousand years ago. They thought she would be frightened, and abate her pretensions, and cease from her impotent anathemas. Yet the voice of Pius is as the voice of Gregory, and Innocent, and Leo; and, when he speaks, the hearts of countless millions vibrate at the sound, for they know that it is the voice of Peter. And Pius knows it too. He does not speak in his own name. When our modern Platons say to him, as he stands before their judgment-seat, "Knowest thou not that I have power to crucify thee?" he only replies, if he replies at all, "Thou shouldst not have any power against me, unless it were given thee from above." He is alarmed—not for himself, but for them. He knows what is coming upon them. But to his own he says, as Moses said before him, "The Egyptians, whom you see now, you shall see no more for ever. The Lord will fight for you, and you shall hold your peace." And both he and they know that the Egyptians will come to a bad end, in spite of their "chariots and horsemen."—Tabler.

HOME RULE CONFEDERATION OF GREAT BRITAIN AND THE BISHOP OF SALFORD.—The Home Rule Confederation of Great Britain have established their head quarters in Manchester. On Monday night a crowded meeting was held in the Free Trade Hall. The meeting was addressed by Mr. Butt, M.P., Mr. Martin, M.P., Professor Galbraith and others. Letters declining to attend the meeting were read from the members for Manchester, from the Bishop of Manchester, and the following from the Bishop of Salford:—The Bishop of Salford wrote:—"I beg to thank the Council of the Manchester Home Rule Association for the invitation which you have forwarded to me to attend the demonstration to take place in the Free Trade Hall on the 5th January. No one can desire the welfare of Ireland more heartily than I do, or feel more strongly how unequally she has been dealt with, and how unjustly she has been made to suffer for centuries. I believe the next Parliament, if not the present, will recognize the political wisdom and justice of extending to Ireland a larger measure of self-government than she enjoys at present. I feel, however, that I am not in a position to form an opinion as to what is the precise political measure that would be the most advantageous to the interests of Ireland, and that to enter upon a public discussion of such a subject would be to travel beyond the sphere of duty which is imposed upon me. You will, therefore, understand why it is not possible for me to accept the honour of the invitation to take part in the demonstration of the 5th of January.—Wishing you every blessing, I am, yours faithfully, Herbert, Bishop of Salford."—(The Times.)

THE CATHOLIC GIRL OF THE PERIOD.—Some time ago, the so-called "Girl of the Period" received a very hard, though well deserved castigation. She was called fast, forward, and masculine in her tastes and habits. In proportion as she suppressed her own nature, so she also declined in the moral scale. The "Girl of the Period" became a byword. She was painted, doubtless, with too strong colors, and in what we may call a very glaring and gaudy style. Yet there was some truth, some resemblance in the picture. It brought home, probably to many, their folly and their mistaken notions of life and position in society. It was sad to gaze on the canvas, and recognise in the painting many of the girls of England. We did not like it. We would gladly have wished that it had been otherwise. What was said and written then, has, to a certain extent been forgiven and forgotten. But the expression remains, and carries with it a bad sense. We are going to change it and make it good, noble, and glorious.—The work has already begun. A number of young Catholic ladies, of whom these islands should be proud, have mapped out for themselves and their sisters in the faith a great and generous work. Devoted, as they have been to our Holy Father the Pope, their gentle, loving hearts bleed for him in his present, cruel, and critical position. They have seen their brothers leave hearth and home, and rally round the Holy Father's standard—light and fall for him. They have remained at home, but not without prayer unceasing for the saintly Pius, and for the success of his cause—and that his soldiers' arms might be blessed. The arms were surely blessed, but not with success. And now that arms avail not, our generous sisters try to comfort their Father's heart, by lightening his heavy burden in his present difficulties. They wish to raise for him a sum worthy of his acceptance and well suited to his wants, as a testimony of love and heartfelt sympathy. Such is the "Catholic Girl of the Period," and we may well feel proud of her. She is self-defending, depriving herself of many pet objects, that she may secure the Holy Father—thereby showing her love and her faith. She is unsparing of herself when this noble work is to be done—for she bears about with her always and everywhere, a heart that beats in unison with that of Pius. We know the special love and affection which the successor of St. Peter has for the young Catholic ladies of every condition in life. He is well aware that they are his children, and the daughters of Mary Immaculate. He knows that upon them depends the piety, zeal, and sanctity of the coming race. It will gratify, therefore, his suffering heart when he sees in this noble work, his sympathy for him which animates the Catholic Girls of the Period in these islands, and the spirit of faith which has urged them on in this noble work. May every intended gift be doubled, for it will be returned with interest by Him, whom Pius represents.—Catholic Times.

A very interesting discovery has been made in Bute. A young boy, named George Lindsay, upon breaking up a piece of quartz, seams of which prevail in various parts of the island, found a substance which he had some idea was gold. The specimen was submitted to Dr. Peter White, President of the Archaeological and Physical Society of Bute, which he immediately pronounced to be gold in a native state, and called by experienced gold-diggers "heavy gold." This specimen was found in a vein of quartz which runs out below the Skeock plantation. It has been alleged by Australian diggers that, if properly searched for, gold, would be found in Bute; but whether in such quantities as would yield a remuneration is a question which can only be answered after an experiment has been made. Some time ago, Mr. James Cameron, watchmaker, Bridge-street Glasgow, also discovered gold in Bute, the various specimens of which he got made into a gold ring that was presented to the present Marchioness of Bute on the occasion of her marriage. The specimens were got in different localities, thus showing that the assertions of the diggers are not unfounded.

MR. JOHN O'CONNOR POWER ON "NATIONALITY."—A numerous and enthusiastic meeting of Irishmen was held at the Concert Hall, Lord Nelson-street, Liverpool, on Tuesday evening, to listen to Mr. John O'Connor Power (of St. Jarlath's College, Tuam) on "Nationality." Dr. Commins presided, and there were also present—Mr. Edwin Hughes, Mr. William

Hogan, Mr. Morgan, Mr. Egan, Mr. J. Denvir, &c. The chairman, in introducing the lecturer, referred to the speech of Mr. Gladstone at Meath, wherein he spoke in commendation of the Welsh people for so clinging to their old customs and traditions, and that therefore he (the chairman) thought the same ought to hold good with regard to Ireland, on whose past struggles and history the lecturer would on that evening inform them. The eloquent lecturer proceeded to picture the past glories of Ireland and what she had lost in losing her independence. He traced in powerful language how insidiously England had, under the guise of zeal for religion, first gained a footing in Ireland, and afterwards, on the introduction of Protestantism, there were added religious dissensions to the other evils which foreign rule had entailed upon the country. Mr. Power then in a strain of lofty eloquence which drew down frequent plaudits from the audience, described the heroic struggle of centuries which Ireland had ever waged against the invader; these struggles, he said, in one form or another, had up to our own times, been continued by the unconquerable Irish race, so that, powerful as England might be, she could never count on the final victory. In describing the period of parliamentary independence which Ireland enjoyed during the era of 1872, he said her flourishing condition was the very best argument in favour of Home Rule. Mr. Power, after an exhaustive description of the condition and hopes of Ireland, past and present, dwelt on the struggles which, in our own days, are still being carried on, and, from the examples of our past history, drew down powerful arguments why Irishmen should persevere in their endeavour to regain the independence of their native land. The proceedings, which were throughout most enthusiastic, concluded with a hearty vote of thanks to the lecturer and the chairman.

HOWEVER ignorant others may be of that fact, the readers of the Weekly Register are aware that a majority of the population of the commercial capital and chief city of Scotland are Catholics and Irishmen. Scotch capital—labour, have created Glasgow. But as men, and not money constitute the elective power of the Empire now, it is hardly necessary to observe that in Glasgow the Irish Catholics are in reality the constituency, if they will only use the right which the law has conferred upon them. Mr. Butt was aware of this when he left Dublin a few days ago for Glasgow, where, on Tuesday evening, he delivered a very able and effective speech before an immense number of sympathising countrymen on Home Rule. The arguments he used it is much easier to pool-pool than answer. In fact, the main argument for Home Rule nobody can answer; for the Imperial Parliament is morally and physically incapable of legislating upon the internal affairs of Ireland; morally through want of knowledge, physically through want of time.—Weekly Register.

THE QUEEN'S CHAPLAIN CHARGED WITH HERESY.—At the Glasgow Established Presbytery Mr. Wallace, an elder of the Kirk, gave notice that he would call the attention of the Presbytery to the doctrines and sentiments embodied in a sermon on the subject of unbelief, delivered by Principal Caird the Queen's chaplain, in a church at Govan, on the 21st December, and also given modified slightly, at the opening of the Rev. Mr. Knight's church last Sunday at Dundee. Mr. Wallace said he had written to Principal Caird asking whether the report of his sermon was correct, and whether he believed that man was not responsible for his religious belief. Principal Caird had replied that he did not hold the doctrine that man was not responsible for his belief. A committee was appointed to inquire whether the Presbytery had power over Dr. Caird, Principal of the Glasgow University.

An amateur hangman has appeared at Gloucester, and has been permitted by the authorities the privilege of putting several of his fellow creatures out of the world. His name is Anderson, and he is said to be a medical man. What are his motives? He takes no money, and says he struggles "for the love of the thing." This language is indeed and shocking, and we think the authorities should not allow any person to amuse himself in this gaudy way. It is likely, however, that Anderson wants to succeed Calcutt, who has grown rich, and was talking so far back as three years ago of retiring.

Odger is a candidate for Parliament in South-wark; his friends in large numbers entered the Hall where the Conservative meeting was in progress, took possession of the platform by force, and dispersed the assemblage; the Conservative candidate in Abingdon was mobbed and stoned.

UNITED STATES.

IRISH SERVANT GIRLS.—Mrs. HARRIET BACHER STOWE IN THEIR DEFENCE.—Some weeks ago, says the Boston Pilot, we wrote to this distinguished American lady, asking her to write for the Pilot a series of articles on "Servant Girls," and enclosing to her the following extracts from an article in the Boston Globe, entitled "The Tyranny of Bridget":—"Her leading sentiment is contempt and derision of the poor, whether the poor be genteel or vulgar. Go to a millionaire who has lost half his fortune in a fortnight, and you will find he has some heart and some pride left to sympathize with and aid the poor, but "Bridget" is inexorable in her exactions, and turns a deaf ear to all talk appropriate to the situation. Economy she hates; poverty she despises; and no continuation of her ridiculously high wages will make her condescend to treat her mistress with common civility. She hates and despises everybody who is moderately rich. If in the inevitable privations of the approaching winter, she happens to come under the attention of our many charitable societies, we doubt not that she will receive particular aid. Still, we believe that she will prove as false and ungrateful as a pouper as she has proved herself false and ungrateful as a potentate. The trouble with her is, that she will not do, as other people do, honest work for honest wages. Her male prototype can be trusted; she is thoroughly untrustworthy."

We regret that Mrs. Stowe's literary engagements will prevent her from writing this series for the Pilot; but she sends us the following generous tribute to the purity, industry, and faithfulness of Irish servant girls:—

TO THE EDITOR OF THE PILOT: DEAR SIR:—My engagements with other papers are such as will not allow me the time to furnish the series of articles for your paper which you request, though I should very much like to do it, as it is a subject in which I am deeply interested, and where I have some considerable experience. I have never sympathized with the popular murmurs against the Irish. What would our nation have done without them? They have brought to us strong hands and willing minds; they have built our roads, and bridges, and laid our railroads, and been everywhere at hand in our families to help. Of course, they are but human, subject to all the defects of imperfect humanity; but, notwithstanding that, I do not hesitate to say they have been a blessing to this country. I have always maintained that the very best, the safest, the most respectable, and (taking all things into account) the most really desirable situation for a working-woman was that of a family domestic. Through foolish pride and prejudice, the American woman has refused this position, and it has therefore fallen to the lot of the stranger. Thousands of young Irish girls have landed on our shores, utter strangers, far from the advice and protection of fathers and mothers, with no reliance but their priests and their church, and into their hands have been committed the life and health of our young children, the ministrations of our

substance, the care of luxurious homes and the maintenance of that order, neatness and economy on which depends the enjoyment of domestic life. Taking them as a class, considering the experience age at which they come, and often as young as the daughters of the family they serve, it seems to me that any sensible person would rather wonder to see how well they do their duties than rail at their shortcomings. Let a father and mother imagine their own daughter, sixteen or eighteen, landed in Ireland to seek support, and ask if young American families, if they tried, would do any better? Would they even so well? Certainly so far as I have observed, the American woman lacks that physical stamina and strength which belong to those who come over to us from the old country. There are many of the girls who come, who, have not only fine, healthy physical systems, but a good training in neatness, industry and economy. In my own family and those of my friends, I have observed many young women who brought to this country the best domestic training. There have been those who could write a handsome letter, who could cut and fit garments, and even do the finest needle-work. I can call to mind now families which have been from the very beginning carried on by the help of such girls, and who have valued them as they deserved, as real and true friends. I know an eminent clergyman of Boston who has often been heard to say, that the Irish nurses who have been helpers in his family, went beyond that of many saints in the calendar. In my own family, I have had every reason to speak well of the Irish. Better domestic service could not be than they have rendered me; and even after leaving they have remained true and constant friends. In my late tour through the West I was more than once sought out by those who, ten or fifteen years ago, were domestics in my house, now thriving mothers of families, and with children, growing up in our schools to take rank as educated American citizens. If I mistake not, from the sons of some of these girls who began their career in domestic service, will come some of the highest and best of our future citizens. One thing in regard to the Irish servant girls should not be omitted. Considering their youth, their inexperience, their coming strangers into the country, their separation from parental oversight—their uniform purity and propriety of conduct is certainly remarkable. Seldom in the course of my observations have I known an Irish girl to go astray, or conduct herself immorally; and it is a respect in which the watch and care of their Church is most especially marked. As to honesty, in estimating that trait of Irish servants, we must not expect superhuman virtues. We must not say that they are dishonest because they do not rise to a height of excellence above the average of our best educated and most respectable public men. With our newspapers full of trials for debauchery and frauds, in every department of public life, on the part of mature men, who have every advantage of training and position, let us not be too exacting of immature young persons, who are suddenly brought from poverty into what seems to them a most profuse and superfluous abundance. In nine cases out of ten ill-health, or love of ease, makes the mistress averse to the minutiae of superintendence. In some circumstances, there is on the part of the servants such a temptation to wastefulness and profusion, and the lapse into dishonesty seems so easy, that we rather wonder at the average trustworthiness of this class than rail at the instances of the reverse. A kind, consistent, watchful, careful mistress will keep her servants in the way of honesty; a careless or incompetent one tempts them to fall. It is true not merely of the Irish servants, but of all servants, that they need careful watchfulness to keep them in order. Even our public servants at Washington need this. But it is due to the class to state my own private observation, that among these girls I have known some of the most trustworthy, high principled, self-respecting people, some of the most practical, consistent Christians I have ever met with anywhere. As to charity to the poor, I think that the newspaper writer you quote could not have attacked the Irish character more unjustly than in representing Bridget as despising the poor. Never have I failed of earnest, hearty co-operation from my servants, at any expense of time or trouble, in relieving the sufferings of the poor, and I believe the door is never willingly shut in the face of any poor man by an Irish servant. These few hasty jottings of my opinion and observation on this subject are quite at your service, as it is a point on which I am most free to bear testimony.

HARRIET BACHER STOWE. BRITISH AND AMERICAN DEFICITS.—The estimate of the new year's expenditure is published, and here it is: \$319,193,730.81. The actual appropriations for 1873-4 were \$306,000,256. The total expenditure of Great Britain is in a round sum, £69,000,000, or \$315,000,000 about \$39,000,000 more than was appropriated in 1873-4, and only about \$26,000,000 more than is asked for by our officials for the expenditure for 1874-5. It may be interesting to compare the expenditures of the two nations. If we deduct from the English expenditure the interest on the debt, amounting in a round sum to \$135,000,000 there remains \$220,000,000 for all other expenses. And if we deduct the interest of the American debt, and allow fully \$194,000,000 there remained in 1873-4 \$202,000,000 and in 1874-5, if the estimates are appropriated \$215,000,000 to be applied for all other expenditures. It would not be fair to take special notice of the \$30,000,000 pensions in the United States and ignore the English Pensions, which, if the cost of the royal family is charged to this account, would more than make the \$30,000,000. Hence the two nations, after deducting the interest on their debts, stand fair. It remains to be shown what England has got for her money, and what the United States. For the \$219,000,000 expended in England, minus the interest on the debt, England has: 1st. A navy that, if no addition to the present navies of Russia, France and the United States, were made, could not only cope with all three, but might be able to vanquish them, on account of superiority in numbers and quality of ships, and in the numerical force of men. 2. England maintains an army fully five times as large as ours, with ordnance of the most approved and costly kind. 3. England has the most complete and costly diplomatic service, which she maintains spontaneously. 4. She has a judiciary that is the envy of all nations. 5. She is building annually immense additions to her fortifications, pier-heads, breakwaters, &c., &c. 6. The royal family and pension list we have set off against the pensions of the United States. Now, what have we to show for the \$202,000,000 expended in 1873-4? 1. A President, Cabinet, and three hundred and seventy four Senators and Congressmen. 2. A navy? Well, we had better say nothing about it, considering that the Spanish dispute is still pending and that the Virginians was not saluted. 3. We have a handful of soldiers. 4. We can show the shells of custom houses and post offices that will cost \$100,000,000 more to finish. 5. We can show 20,000 office-holders. 6. We can show a diplomatic corps that does not illuminate the name of the country. 7. We can show a judiciary, of course. Is the average tax-payer satisfied? Does he like the comparison? One thing seems perfectly sure. The Republicans of Europe cannot commend republicans on the score of economy in the light of our example. It looks, indeed, as though we would have to extend the protective principle to our form of government; for how can the law-givers, legislators, rulers, navies, armies, and public buildings of the United States, much longer compete with the pauper rulers, law-givers, navies, armies, and public buildings of Great Britain? Nor, on the other hand, would even Sir Charles Dilke or Mr. Herbert push the comparison on economic grounds.—N. Y. Work.