

would do under circumstances parallel to those of Ireland; for we see what they have done. The English do not really renounce the presumption that they are the governing part of the empire. So they are considering and taking advice, and receiving plenty of advice as to what they ought to do about Ireland. But we have no right to answer the question without consulting Ireland—its five million Catholics as well as its seven hundred thousand members of our Church. The government of this empire, and the disposal of its interest, is lodged in the hands of several millions of electors. They claim the right, and they have the power, to exercise the franchise on broad principles of equity and common sense. It would be impossible to persuade any portion of the electors that they must abstain from touching this or that point received from our ancestors as fixed for ever. All such attempts to bind posterity have failed. We have had Catholic emancipation, and two successive reconstructions of the electoral body; we have seen the departure of millions across the seas, where, with the power of making their own laws, choosing their own rulers, and framing their own policy, they exchange political influences with this country. In our own countries we have seen millions of Englishmen, Scotchmen, and Irishmen associate on terms of complete civil and religious equality. We have seen the growth of immense cities and ports within our own shores, in which religious ascendancy has become a name, and the Establishment a bondage, rather than a privilege, to its own members, and neither one thing nor the other to anybody else. We have seen that portion of the electors most deeply affected by the injustice before us, weighing their weight into party conflicts with telling effect, obtaining their full share of the public patronage, becoming one with us, and a portion of the great national unity. To talk of repealing the Union is to talk of reverting to the state of things existing when the Union was made, and which it was intended to extinguish, as for the most part, it has happily done. What do people mean when they say they wish to maintain the Irish Church? All they ask is to keep things as they are. It is a modest petition, they think. Modest to ask to keep five millions in a state of mistaken Christianity unrecognized, in the face of a small fraction of their countrymen enjoying the wealth and dignity, and position once their own?

The free discussion of the Irish Church question illustrates in various ways the steady progress of opinion in the direction of reform and the liberation of educated minds from the fetters of early associations. Party and social ties, which often restrain the action of an enlightened judgment, are severed by the force of more earnest convictions, and a keener sense of duty, and the most attached friends now take opposite sides on this question with resolute independence. Among the recent pamphlets which have attracted attention is one by the Rev. E. A. Litton, M. A., rector of Naunton, and examining chaplain of the Bishop of Durham, 'The Connexion of Church and State, with a particular reference to the Question of the Irish Church.' It derives additional interest for Irish readers from the circumstance that the reviewer is a relative of Master Litton, a veteran defender of the Irish Church. The 'brochure' is characterized by a depth of thought and an argumentative power not always to be found in such publications. He shows with discriminating clearness the points in which the Church and the State resemble each other, and those in which they differ, presenting them in an interesting, if not novel aspect. He takes a lofty view of the mission of the State as more than an institution for the protection of property, and thinks that a severance between Church and State would be an evil if it were possible, but that it is an impossibility. But in adjusting the conditions of the alliance it is necessary that there should be a really national Church. He repudiates the notion of a compact between the State and some local Christian society within its limits, by virtue of which the society assumes the character of a national Church. As to the probable effect of the change, he entertains a strong conviction that the interests of Protestantism will not substantially suffer. He regards as chimerical the fear that 'Romanism will sweep over the land with a flood,' is sanguine in anticipating that the Roman Catholic laity will resist Ultramontanism, but even should it 'freely attempt to encroach upon our liberties,' he asks, 'will the strength of the Empire be less available than it is now to crush the serpent?' With respect to the Church of England he cannot see how it can be affected by the change any more than that of Scotland. 'The fact is each Church must stand upon its own merits. He shows that there is no analogy in the cases of English and Welsh Dissenters, because the secession from the national Church has been voluntary, and left no traces of degradation. In Ireland the dissident body is the bulk of the nation. He looks forward hopefully to the effect of the change in converting Ireland into a contented and loyal nation—a vast accession of strength to England instead of a source of weakness. The expression of this opinion is not confined to Mr. Litton. In the Church in Ireland ministers are beginning to give utterance to similar sentiments. One of the most remarkable conversions to the policy of Mr. Gladstone is that of the Rev. F. F. French, M. A., rector of Newtown, county of Meath, who has written an earnest pamphlet on the subject. He thinks that 'Protestant ascendancy has been religiously injurious to members of his own Church.' He regards the report of the Church Commission as an anachronism the question now relating 'not to more or less, the removal of this or that anomaly, but to whether a Protestant Church Establishment in a country situated as Ireland is not in itself an anomaly which ought to be removed as soon as possible.' These, however, are not the only signs of the times which we may expect to witness. A movement in the direction of disestablishment and disendowment is on foot in the Church, which has not yet assumed, and perhaps may never assume, an open form, but which is real and active. What renders it the more remarkable is that it is under the guidance of a dignitary whose name has been identified with the defence of the Establishment, but who, it is right to say has always strenuously laboured for internal reform.—[Times Correspondent.

The Daily News finds no comfort in the assurance of Lord Stanley that the Irish Church will die hard, and that it will cost Parliament three years of herculean labor to entomb her. A contest which is not to end next year, nor the year after, supplies but a poor prospect for the suffering but impatient Church Establishment. To be kept year after year—not in uncertainty, but—in suspense, waiting wearily for the inevitable, while its name and honor are made subservient to the needs of a political gamester; to see public feeling exasperated by trickery and delay until the disposition to deal indignantly with a large institution had disappeared, is a dismal lot indeed. One does not exactly see why Lord Stanley thinks that the disestablishment of the Irish Church cannot take place before 1871, but may become possible in that year. Is that the date by which it is calculated? Mr. Disraeli will have evoked his party and disorganized Mr. Gladstone's majority? Or is it supposed that the House of Lords will be able to resist the will of the nation for just two sessions? Whoever may be the reckoning of politicians, it is certain that the Irish Church cannot afford to wait three years for the only possible settlement of its status. Still less can it afford to be manipulated by political thaumaturgists as Mr. Disraeli manipulated the question of Reform. Its best friends should desire that its affairs should be dealt with by Mr. Gladstone, and that specially.

The following magnificent donations are acknowledged as having been received from Thomas Looby, Esq., of Salem, Mass., for the benefit of the poor of his native place, Clonmel, Ireland:—£100 sterling to

the poor of St. Peter and Paul's Parish; £50 for the poor of the same parish, under the charge of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul; £50 for the poor of the Parish of St. Mary's, under the same Society; £50 to the Sisters of Charity, Clonmel.—[Tipperary Free Press, Nov. 20.

GREAT BRITAIN.

The Roman Catholics in Great Britain must not doubt be reckoned by millions, and a single member to put matters at the best must be considered as a most inadequate representation of them. The cause of such a result is readily understood. Though so many in the aggregate, they are everywhere, probably, in a minority of the population, and the general feeling of Englishmen is out of harmony with the system to which they belong. The names of the two unsuccessful candidates are alone sufficient to indicate that the Roman Catholics of England possess all the claims to public regard that ancestry, wealth, and ability can bestow; and when to these qualifications we add that of numbers, it is clear they must constitute an important element in English life. Could they be set apart like the metropolis, they might claim a very considerable representation. But because they are everywhere a minority, they are nowhere to be seen in the political microcosm. Such anomalies as these are more and more engaging the attention of every friend of representative government. An assembly like the House of Commons ought simply to be England in a nutshell. Every considerable constituent in the life of the country should contribute its share, and its proportionate share to the composition of the House. The design of the House is not only to execute the national will, but to ascertain it; and unless it be ascertained truly, the greater the power developed the greater is the mischief done. The solution of fair representation, however, is not even approximate when such a body as the English Roman Catholic cannot obtain a voice in Parliament. The only scheme which proposes to deal with the difficulty comprehensively and with completeness is that of Mr. Hare, who would open up the way for personal as well as for local representation. It is, of course, a matter for discussion whether such a scheme could ever be practically carried out; but it cannot be doubted that its aim is the right one, and that, at least in theory, it is well designed to effect its object. The present system inflicts an injustice on those who are unrepresented, while it is an injury to the community to be without the means of fully understanding the feelings and interests of all its constituent members.—[Tablet.

LONDON, Dec. 2.—Prime Minister Disraeli has published an address announcing and defending the resignation of the Ministry. He reviewed the progress of the revolution in favor of the disestablishment of the Irish Church, believing the country would not sanction such a measure. The Government awaited the elections for the holding of which all expedition was used. The result shows that the Ministry cannot command the respect of the New House of Commons; therefore they feel it due to their own honor and to the policy supported by them, not to continue unnecessarily in office a single day deeming it more consistent with the attitude they hold, the convenience of public business, and the influence of their party, to resign at once, instead of awaiting the meeting of a Parliament in which they may be a minority. While taking this course they do not modify their opinions, and are more than ever convinced that Mr. Gladstone's proposition is wrong in principle, and one which, even if practicable, would be disastrous to the nation. They are ready to support reform in the Church of Ireland, but will still offer uncompromising resistance to the policy enunciated by Mr. Gladstone.

DISRAELI'S SPEECH ON IRELAND AT THE ELECTION OF BUCKINGHAMSHIRE.—Now, gentlemen, I wish to say one word on the condition of Ireland. Twenty-five years ago the condition of Ireland was deplorable. It was this. There were more inhabitants upon a square mile in Ireland—not only more than in any European country, but in an Asiatic one; yet, I believe, China. Well, this immense population sustained itself mainly by sticking by a single root, and that of a very precarious nature, and therefore they were, as a population, as miserable as millions herding together could be. They were scarcely clothed, their dwellings were not fit for the lower animals, and their sustenance was of the simple and precarious kind I have mentioned. It is not at all wonderful that a people in such a state should be a discontented people. What reason had they to be content? Had they not everything to make them miserable—no clothing, no shelter, and insufficient food? Is it surprising that they should be dissatisfied with the institutions of the country and with the form of their government? Why, in such circumstances men would be discontented with any form of government, although it would not do the least for them for the economic condition in which they found themselves. But what is the condition of Ireland now? Years and years before the period of 1845—for eight or ten years—the policy of England by both parties in the state had been a sympathizing policy—a just and a kind policy to Ireland; but as it dealt only, and could deal only, with political causes and circumstances, it produced no effect upon the economic condition of the people. But a greater power than man produced an effect upon the condition of Ireland. That happened in Ireland which was infinitely greater in its effects than any political or social revolution which has occurred in any country in the world. The population of Ireland became so reduced that that state of affairs to which I have referred, namely, that the population of a square mile was greater than in any European, nay, Asiatic, country, save China, ceased. And what has happened in Ireland during the last quarter of a century? The people are no longer in that condition of which I have spoken. They are better clothed, they have better dwellings, and are better fed. (A Voice.—Three cheers for the famine!) Well, well, you have given three cheers for things before this that have not done so much good as the famine. I was saying, when I was interrupted by a voice that I think is familiar to me, that the progress of Ireland, certainly during the last 20 years, had been more rapid than the progress of England. That is a subject which has been examined into by men most competent, and that is a conclusion which I believe is founded upon most ample data. Well, if that be the case, if we find a country that has made this progress, if we find that that was occurring in Ireland which was most necessary for her complete redemption, namely, the entrance of British capital to a great extent (hear, hear)—if we find such a state of circumstances, how can we say with justice that the condition of Ireland—which economically is a condition of immense importance—can justify a violent political measure such as was brought forward at the end of the session of an expiring parliament? (Hear, hear.) I want to state the case fairly, and I think I have done so. Well, but this is alleged. The Fenian conspiracy, they say, proves that the country is not in that state of prosperity which you describe. I will meet that with the utmost candour, I have no wish upon this subject but that the soundest opinions shall prevail (hear, hear). What is the Fenian conspiracy? That happened in America which happened in the great Thirty Years' War in Europe. After that immense struggle—of which we can form really but a very imperfect idea, even with all our information and all our special correspondences—it was as if it had been after the great thirty years' war in Germany two centuries ago. Military adventurers, when the war came to a conclusion, were discontented with the prospects of tranquility, and black bands broke over and disordered all Europe, and you had those military adventurers turning their attention to the countries where they could find property and plunder. A great many of those who were disordered after the war in America were Irishmen. The Irish are a gallant and military people; they had acquired in the American

strains both skill and experience, and they knew very well that if they acted upon Ireland there was always a certain degree there—from a variety of circumstances—of morbid discontent, which they believed they might fan into a flame, and which might lead to the revolutionary results which they desired. I admit that there is a certain degree of morbid discontent in Ireland. But we must look to the cause, and that may probably afford a solution of the matter. The Irishman is a very imaginative being. He lives in an island with a damp climate, and contiguous to a melancholy ocean. With extraordinary talents, he has no variety of pursuits. There is no nation on the earth which leads so monotonous a life as the Irish, because they have only the cultivation of the soil before them. Well, these men are discontented because they are not amused. But the Irishman in a country where there is a fair field for his various talents in various occupations is not only the equal but the superior of most other races (hear). Well, but it is not the fault of the English government that there is not that variety of occupation in Ireland. I should say, speaking with frankness, that it is rather the fault of the Irish themselves. If they led that life which would encourage the entrance of capital into the country, all that ability might be utilized and not wasted—(hear, hear)—and instead of those morbid feelings which they have acquired by the monotony of their pursuits and imaginations brooding over the past history of their country—a great deal of which is 'traditional'—(hear, hear, and laughter)—you would find them exerting their great abilities—making fortunes and arriving at conclusions in politics and other subjects entirely different from those which they now favor (cheers). This Fenian conspiracy arose from foreign circumstances. It was the result of foreign causes acting upon the morbid feelings of a very limited portion of the population, and revolutionary remedies will certainly not encourage the entrance of capital into Ireland, and not increase affection between the Protestants and Roman Catholics (hear, hear). The business of the Government was to put down that Fenian conspiracy, and to administer Ireland in a manner favourable to the development of the industry of the country. I ask you if Mr. Gladstone's Government during that trying period were found wanting in energy, determination, and justice? (Cries of 'No!') I say the policy which was proposed to disestablish the Church in Ireland, in order to put an end to Fenianism, was wrong in its conception. Without entering into the merits of touching the Church at all, it was a remedy which was not necessary to put down Fenianism, as it has no connection whatever with it. We opposed the policy otherwise on grounds very grave—grounds which I think the people of this country ought well to consider. I believe that it is a policy ripe with consequences most injurious to this country (cheers).

Mr. Disraeli has done his utmost to pour contempt upon the party among the 'Unionists' in the Established Church which for some time past has done its best to force upon him a support which he would rather wade than have. There has been a split between the 'Church papers' on this subject. The Church News (edited by the outgoing secretary of the society which is pleased to call itself the A. P. U. C.) has put itself prominently forward in support, not only of the Conservatives, but of Mr. Disraeli personally. We should like to know how the editor feels just now. Only last week he wrote: 'With reference to the Primacy, we can but again declare that neither Erastian Whigs nor High Church Radicals will be gratified by the appointment of their leaders. Some persons have had the extreme bad taste to suggest the names of Archbishop Thompson and Dr. Tait to Mr. Disraeli—apparently forgetting that these Bishops are both Erastians and Whigs in one. The Church is sick unto death of Whig Bishops—our most noxious foes—a fact of which our high-principled Premier should not only have moved Dr. Tait to Canterbury, but at the same time made Dr. Jackson, a specimen of the regular do-nothing and say-nothing school, his successor at Fulham Palace; while he places on the consecrated throne of the glorious cathedral, where once sat the Catholic bishop of Lincoln, an extreme no-Papery Protestant of the Anglican school, Archdeacon Wardlaw.' Mr. Disraeli could hardly have done more, if his sole object had been to insult the Unionist school. Of course no one imagined that a Unionist would have lambasted. That would have been a little too much for John Bull. But Dr. Tait's appointment is directly opposite to the unbroken precedent of not taking any one whose appointment would give offence to any school or party. Personally, as far as he is anything he is a Presbyterian; for the time has long been passed when Presbyterians felt any scruple about driving in a handsome coach, even although it had a mitre painted on its panels, or eating off silver plate on which it is engraved. There are, as all the world knows, the only uses for which Protestant prelates have any occasion for mitres. To be sure we once saw them serve another purpose at the table of a rising prelate, who had the handles of his silver side dishes made in that shape. But really that need hardly cause scruples strong enough to make a Scotchman reject fifteen thousand a year. Dr. Tait is entirely above such scruples. We are inclined also to think that no prejudices against Prelacy, with which his Presbyterian home may have inspired him, have ever made him show a dislike to power exercised by himself. Punch long ago drew him and the London clergy as a schoolmaster and a class of naughty boys. Perhaps the resemblance was too real to be amusing to himself.—[Tablet.

The Morning Summary, a new Conservative daily paper, thus speaks of the translation of the Bishop of London to the Archbishopric of Canterbury:—'In future, High Churchmen will for ever taunt Conservatives with having placed at Canterbury a Prelate who, whatever his personal merits, is an Erastian of the worst type, an almost open sympathizer with Bishop Colenso, and who has all along been known as one of the warmest supporters of the Liberal party. At home the new Archbishop will be comparatively harmless. The Church party will be too strong for him; but in questions affecting the Colonial Church, all the good which the late Archbishop effected by the Pac-Anglican Synod, and other means, will be at an end. The spirits of Bishop Colenso and his friends will be raised; whilst those of the Bishop of Capetown will indeed be depressed. To the Colonial Church it is a fearful blow, and it is meant to be.' But who has dealt the blow? That the recommendation is Mr. Disraeli's is too preposterous a proposition to be even suggested by any one not blinded by partisan bitterness. That the Prime Minister should deliberately choose a political opponent, a Broad Churchman, and a very unpopular man, for the Archbishopric of Canterbury, and pass over the undoubted claims of at least four Prelates is inconceivable. The Queen must personally nominate to every office in the State. The Church alone must not be treated exceptively, while courtly flatterers say that the Government must take the blame.

Mr. Balfour, whose name we (Tablet) have had occasion to record as having sacrificed position and emolument for conscience sake, is to give a reading on Wednesday, November 25th, at St. George's Hall, Langham-place. Even before Mr. Balfour submitted to the Church he was in the habit of aiding Catholic charities by giving readings for their benefit. The Daily News says of him, 'As an eloquist Mr. Balfour is probably unrivalled; his voice, of unusual force and power, is capable of the softest modulations, and is at all times clear, ringing and impressive; his fluent taste, also most useful adjuncts, and the combination of all these advantages in the reader results in the reading being not merely a very interesting but a highly profitable manner of spending a couple of hours.' The Daily Telegraph says:—'More

finished art in declaiming we have never perceived among the many eloquisticians who have come before the public on grounds now occupied by Mr. Balfour.

To the Editor of the London Times.

Sir,—At Bridgnorth last Tuesday the Rev. Mr. Ward, a clergyman of the Church of England and master of the Grammar School of the town had the courage to second the nomination of the Liberal candidate, Sir John Acton. This seems to be a grave ecclesiastical crime in the code of Bridgnorth. The parishioners of St. Leonard's in which church Mr. Ward has for the last 12 years been in the habit of officiating from time to time, lending his aid in a friendly way whenever help was needed, have warned the incumbent, the Rev. G. Bellett, that they will leave the church if Mr. Ward officiates any more. Mr. Ward, on being informed of this by the incumbent, volunteered to stay away for one Sunday, but no more, except at Mr. Bellett's own request. Mr. Bellett owns that there is no other complaint against Mr. Ward than his public support of a Catholic and Liberal.

In the Court of Common Pleas this week a Mr. Phillips sued Governor Eyre, of Jamaica celebrity, for having on the 24th of October, 1885, in the island of Jamaica, caused him to be dragged fifty miles from his home and then sent by sea to Morant Bay, a proclaimed district, where he was flogged and tortured for crimes of which he was innocent, to the permanent injury of his health. He claimed £10,000 damages. The ex-Governor's defence was that he used no more force than was required to crush a rebellion in the island, and that he was covered by an Act of Indemnity. The Judges took time to consider their judgment.—[Tablet.

There are two returns from the election battlefield which deserve more notice than they might receive amid a long list of casualties. Lord Edward Howard has been defeated for Preston, and Sir John Acton for Bridgnorth. With the exception of Sir John Acton, who stands for the Isle of Wight, these two candidates happen to be the only members of the Roman Catholic communion who have sought the suffrages of electors in Great Britain. Roman Catholic members will, of course, be returned for Ireland; but neither in England nor in Scotland will the Roman faith obtain a single representative. The result is the more observable as the two candidates in question possessed great personal claims. Lord Edward Howard belongs to one of the most ancient and most noble of English families, whose fame is only enhanced by the staunchness with which they have adhered to their ancestral faith.—[Times.

One of the most singular incidents of the Scotch Elections is the return of Mr. McCombie, a tenant-farmer and well-known breeder of stock, for West Aberdeenshire. Although the honour of representing one of the divisions of this great county was no doubt much coveted, the success of Mr. McCombie's canvass was so complete that no competitor thought worth while to address the constituency. The event is reported to day. One tenant-farmer nominated Mr. McCombie, another tenant-farmer seconded him, and he was duly returned without opposition.

It is worthy of remark that the claim of working men to sit in Parliament has never been heard of in Scotland. The shrewd practical common sense of the Scotch Liberals has detected the fallacy of the demands made in the South. 'It is a fallacy,' says the Scotsman 'in principle to assume that, in order to the representation of any political opinions in this country, it is requisite to select representatives from any one social class; and it is a mistake in fact to assume the practicability of selecting persons to do the work of legislators from the class dependent for the day's bread on the day's work.'

PROTESTANT POOR-LAWS.—On Friday last an inquest was held on the body of James Bridges, of 5, Turville buildings, Bethnal Green, who died of starvation. This poor man was fifty-one years of age, and had a wife and three children. It was proved that he had not tasted flesh-meat for five months, that he had been walking three days in search of work, and subsisted on one halfpenny loaf and a little cold water. When he was in a dying state his wife went to the workhouse to obtain relief, and the Times reports the colloquy between her and the workhouse official as follows:—'Woman: 'We have neither food nor fire.' The gentleman spoke very loud, and said, 'We have plenty of these tales; I shall not give you anything. There is the door.' 'Give me a loaf of bread.' 'No; I shall not give you anything there is the door.' The woman went home, and on the third day after her husband died—literally of hunger. Now, the fearful feature in this case is the utter insensibility which it manifests on the part of this poor family as to the existence of any religious agency through whom either physical or spiritual assistance might be obtained for the dying man. In no Catholic country in the world could such a death as this have taken place. No Catholic woman could see her husband perish before her eyes without at once sending for the priest to prepare him for death, and thus ensuring his preservation.—[Tablet.

PANTHEON AND BARRINGTON LEGAL.—The Law Times refers to the increasing disregard for the law of the land in respect to blasphemous libels. A prosecution for this offence has just taken place at Southampton. The Act dealing with this subject is 9 and 10 Wm. III. c. 32, which enacts 'That if any person or persons, having been educated in or at any time having made profession of the Christian religion within the realm, shall by writing, printing, teaching, or advised speaking . . . assert or maintain there are more gods than one, or shall deny the Christian religion to be true, or the Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testament to be of divine authority, and shall . . . be thereof lawfully convicted by the oath of two or more credible witnesses such persons for the first offence shall be adjudged incapable and disabled in law to all intents and purposes whatsoever to have or enjoy any office or office, employment, ecclesiastical, civil, or military, or any part in them, or any profit or advantage appertaining to them or any of them. . . . And if such person or persons shall be a second time lawfully convicted as aforesaid of all or any of the aforesaid crime or crimes, that then he or they shall from henceforth be disabled to sue, prosecute, plead or use any action or information in any court of law or equity, or to be guardian of any child, or executor or administrator of any person, or capable of any legacy, or deed of gift, or to bear any civil or military office, or benefice ecclesiastical, for ever within this realm, and shall also suffer imprisonment for the space of three years without bail or mainprize from the time of such conviction.'

WESTERN SUPERSTITION.—The child of a Devonshire laborer died from scalds caused by its turning over a soappan. At the inquest the following strange evidence was given by Ann Manley, a witness:—'I am the wife of James Manley, labourer. I met Sarah Sheppard about 9 o'clock on Thursday coming on the road with the child in her arms, wrapped in the tail of her frock. She said her child was scalded; then I charmed it as I charmed it before, when a stone hopped out of the fire last Houlton fair and scalded its eye. I charmed it by saying to myself, 'There was two angels come from the north, one of them bring fire and the other frost; in frost, out fire, &c.; I repeat this three times; this is good for a scald.' I can't say it's good for anything else. Old John Sparway told me this charm many years ago. A man may tell a woman the charm, or a woman may tell a man, but if a woman tells a woman or a man a man I consider it won't do any good at all.'

WITCHCRAFT IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.—On Saturday last, an elderly woman, named Head, a native of the fashionable town of Tunbridge Wells, was convicted and sent to Maidstone Gaol for two months hard labor by the Hon. F. G. Molyneux, magistrate, on the charge of professing and pretending to tell fortunes. A respectable woman, named White, was

jealous of her husband being too intimate with another woman, and going to the old woman Head, who was pretty generally known in the neighbourhood as a fortune teller, she inquired if her fears were true. The old woman said they were, but in a few days she would bewitch the other woman, as by burning a chemical compound, which she could obtain only at one shop, and which would cost her, she would cause her to have the most excruciating pains. The woman White went home, but being taken suddenly ill with severe pains, she rushed to the old woman's house and told her she must have been bewitched the wrong woman. Head said she had not then commenced the operation, so White went home but in a short time she became delirious, and still continues in that state.—[English paper.

An East India paper publishes a matrimonial advertisement from a young lady in England, in which she offers herself to an Indian prince. She has lost her papa and mama, is living with a Wesleyan minister, is 21, has some property, and would like to marry a king. She has seen the Maharajah well-spoken of, and would be glad to hear if the potentate is willing, and if he will name the day. The Wesleyan minister attaches a testimonial, pronouncing her a very nice amiable, kind, and excellent young lady, who would make an excellent wife. She is piously disposed, which is supposed to particularly fit a young lady for an Oriental baram.

HEAT FROM PETROLEUM.—Mr. Edward Dorset has proved, in the presence of a great number of witnesses, that a steam ship of 500 tons, and provided with an engine of eighty horse power, can be moved by means of liquid fire, that is to say, by the heat produced by the combustion of petroleum.

UNITED STATES.

It seems that American Protestants have begun to suspect that a religion which produces in the young of both sexes genuine piety and healthy self-restraint, while it augments in the same proportion peace, cheerfulness, and gaiety, is likely to be a blessing to their own riotous, unloving, and immoral offspring. No wonder that already one-third of the children in the convent schools of the United States (no Protestants, nor that as the reviewer reports, probably seven of the Protestant pupils out of ten become Catholics sooner or later.) But the influence of religious education, powerful as it is, is only one of many causes tending harmoniously to the same auspicious result, and full of the promise of a glorious future for the great American Republic. Everything appears to conspire in a truly providential order, to the same end. Even the terrible civil war in which both sides displayed so many noble qualities, has been overruled for good to this favored people.—'Conversions to the Catholic faith,' we are told in the Atlantic Monthly, 'have been more numerous since the war than before.' Eighty persons were received into the Church in a single church at New York during the month of November, and 'the quality of the converts,' we are assured by our Protestant informant, has been hitherto far more striking than their number. 'I am informed that a few educated persons in most city parishes are inquiring, with more or less earnestness, into the Catholic faith, and I am further assured that these inquiries generally end in conversion.' Many causes are assigned for this movement besides the special one arising out of certain facts noticed during the war. 'The gloom of the Sabbatarian Sunday; the ban placed by many sectarians upon innocent pleasures, which tends to drive young people into guilty pleasures; the frenzies of the camp meeting, the painful uncertainty which many persons feel, all their lives, whether their souls are saved or not; the dulness and barrenness of the public service; these, and many other evils of a purely human religion, which can only augment the evils it professes to cure,—the blighting stigma under which the Episcopal Church rests of being the rich people's Church; and the spiritual riot of the Methodists,—are but the reproduction in America of the odious phenomena which are beginning at last to attract attention even in England, and to suggest on both sides of the Atlantic at once, that the so-called Reformation has been, in its influence upon spiritual character and eternal destinies, the most appalling calamity which ever befallen the human race.—London Tablet.

FORT LAFAYETTE.—Of the history of this fort the New York World says:—Fort Lafayette was built subsequent to the close of our war with England, for the purpose of more effectually guarding the ocean entrance to the metropolis. It stands on the Long Island side of the bay, about six miles below the city, and almost directly opposite to Fort Wadsworth, on Staten Island. It was built on a reef about three hundred yards from the shore at the low tide it is surrounded by about six feet of water. The structure was quaint in appearance (from the outside as well as within. The inner wall is diamond shaped, and rises five or six feet higher than the wall surrounding it. The top surface of the inner wall slopes towards the centre, and it is upon this strong rampart that the heavy guns of the fort were mounted. For a long series of years this fort has stood like a sturdy sentinel guarding the gates to the Empire City, without once having had the satisfaction of discharging a hundred pounder across the bow of a hostile man-of-war. But it has done other service. During the late civil war it was made to help Secretary Stanton to disgrace the land it was made to protect, and the name of the distinguished soldier under whose name it was christened. During these four years of strife, hundreds of men who had been granted a fair trial before any tribunal, could have been found guilty of nothing, suffered confinement for months and years in its dungeons. There will be many victims who will rejoice when they hear of the demolition by fire of this American bastille. About forty-four years ago Fort Lafayette presented a very different appearance than it does to day. The gallant Lafayette, from whom it subsequently took its name, was revisiting the country for whose liberties he had fought, when its government was in course of inception. Then its walls and cannon had changed for a time their warlike aspect, and were decked with wreaths of flowers and French and American flags, and mottoes that were typical of freedom of speech and thought, a part of the grand old principles upon which the new Republic had but recently been founded. On that glorious occasion, when Lafayette, in presenting to Washington the key of the bastille as a token of that tyranny and intolerance which he hoped would never disgrace this fair land, gave utterance to the following words: 'Permit me, my dear general, to offer you a picture representing the Bastille, such as it was some days after I had given orders for its demolition. I make you homage also, of the principle key of this fortress of despotism.' The historian relates the Washington received the key with reverence as 'a token of the victory gained by liberty over despotism.' The friend of Washington little dreamed at that time that the very fort, which it was intended should commemorate and honor his name, should at last become itself a bastille, the thing which he held in such utter abhorrence.

The New York papers contain the announcement of a sad case of suicide, the result of 'kleptomania.' It appears that a lady, well connected and formerly well-off, has lately acquired the habit of visiting different stores on Broadway, and purloining valuable dresses, laces, &c., which she afterwards disposed of. Although not a rich woman, it does appear that she was driven by want to commit these crimes. On Tuesday last she was arrested and taken to the police station. While there she obtained permission to retire for a few moments, and not returning so soon as was expected, one of the officers went into the room, and found her lying on the floor in a pool of blood, with her throat cut, and quite dead. The disgrace of her position was more than she could bear, and having managed to obtain possession of a razor she had in this way put an end to her shame.