

ENAGHY PETTY SESSIONS.

"Born to good luck—or an Irishman's Fortune."—Mary Kealy, a stately, dignified woman, summoned Paddy Murphy of rhetorical notoriety, in the classic regions of Carraghban, in the classic regions of a poet, a scholar, and a lawyer.

"Down to the vile dust from whence you sprang, Unwept, unconsol'd, and unscann'd." (laughter.) If your honors listen to me, I will tell you all about this preposterous and vexatious prosecution.

"I am one of those unfortunates, (laughter) one of those unhappy wights that has got, like an us-industrial wife, without a fortune—(sighing.) Ah, Paddy Murphy, it was a woful day that you first met Kitty Kealy. She paralyz'd my faculties, and blinded my eyes."

"In a chase of ill hopes and fears, Begone with folly, and closed with tears." I can bear mournful testimony to the undebatable truth of these verses.

"Paddy Murphy (laying down his hat, and folding his arms) shall you the whole case of this case, bad luck to it—I got married, as you might conceive by the opening statement, to Kitty Kealy, and I was to get a bed—yes, (indignantly) a bed for a fortune (laughter). I came for this necessary piece of furniture."

"For Kitty Kealy's feather bed, Wherein I thought to lay my head. (loud laughter) when her sister, this amazon here to my left, your honours, stood up, and with the left hand shut, and the right hand brandishing a stool, and with

KILRUSH PETTY SESSIONS.

A MAN OF LETTERS.

"I—A—W, Law!" Has my chink and law."

"Paddy O'Leary, are you there?" "Indeed that I am, Mither Brew, 'tis as well you know I am. Sure you're staring me in the face for the last half hour; but, worse, I suppose, you're bound to ax for form's sake;—and so replying to the crier's query, up came Paddy, his countenance in one hand, and a whip more remarkable for its neck—low dimensions, as regarded the handle, than its elegance of finish in the other. From the breast of his coat projected the end of a narrow strip of wood, some fifteen inches long, on which were traced in white paint a medley of characters, intended, doubtless, for letters, but as peering, at first sight, as a Chaldean manuscript."

"You are a car-man, I believe?" said his worship. "I do be doing a trifle that way, sir," returned Mr. O'Leary, laconically; and laying down his whip and tiler, he rubbed his horny hand across his mouth.

"Magistrate—"Brew charges you with not having your name placed properly on your cart." "Paddy—"He do, sir? Dear me! Well, well, you're a droll man, ar'nt you, Mither Brew, for an officer of the court?—Hess me now!—did you ever lar your name—read—easy? Eh? Did you again?"

"No, sir, I do not know the letters, and holding it close to the functionary's nose—"Isn't that PADDY O'LEARY GAR-NONIANAVALL?" he said, in a bantering tone;—"Isn't it, now? Look at him, now, gentlemen. Bad cess to him, but he appears as puzzled as if he was either being tried at like the Queen, eh? Dusen't he though. (Grea laughter.)"

"On throwing our eye over the slip in question, we were by no means of opinion that those who ran might read the letters, being of various dimensions, the point indistinct, capitals carefully excluded, and Mr. O'Leary's name and the unpronounceable townland, closely joined, in defiance of all the rules of punctuation."

"Well, what now you say now?" inquired Paddy, after a short pause. "I have to say your worship," returned the crier, "that it would puzzle the judge, so it would—because for fear twasn't read, he had it read by fair means." (Grea laughter.)

"O'Leary—"Oh, tat, gentlemen, that was only accident. You see I was named on at nightfall, an' indeed I'm no great scholar;—howsoever there's the O, an' the A, an' the E, an' the A, an' the R, an' the Y, an' the—"

"Magistrate—"But you upset a poor woman's herring-barrel in the street, and Brew could not get you to stop to find out your name." "Paddy smiled deprecatingly. "Oh, then we settled about the herrings," he said, "an' sure enough this man (tapping the crier's shoulder) followed me but fat, bawlin' after me as if all belonging to him, was dead, an' that I kill'd him. 'Stop this horse honest man,' says he. 'For what would you stop an honest man's horse?' says I. 'Oh, I can't read your name, because 'tis upset, somehow,' says he. Stand on your head, then, says I, and may be you'll perseid." (Grea laughter.)

"Magistrate—"Go about your business now, and be more regular in future." "Oh, wialm' no thousand blessings on you sir," exclaimed O'Leary; and as he went out the street, the crack of his whip was heard at intervals. "The gort," he shouted triumphantly, "O'Connell boasts he's driven a coach an' four through an Act of Parliament, but sure I bet him hollow, for I driv an' sold horse an' car though I'd not worth tity shillings."

After recent examination of girls in Cheshire for the rite of confirmation, in answer to the question "What is our outward and visible sign and form in baptism?" the reply was, "The baby, sir."

RELIGIOUS LIBERTY—MARKS OF PROGRESS.

Who that has watched the progress of the great principle of religious liberty, can doubt its final consummation? First it was developed in toleration, which was received as a boon; then it expanded, until toleration was regarded as a right; and now it has brought us to such a position, that we despise toleration as an insult. See the effects of the progress of this principle upon our Parliament: first it was a parliament of churches; then its basis was changed, and it became a parliament of Protestants; and now, they who will give to its religious designation, are compelled to use the most comprehensive term, and call it a parliament of Christians. The advocates of Church and State begin to fear, that it will soon be impossible to describe it at all.

Hierarchical pretensions, year by year, have diminished, and finally, the advancing wave of liberty, and never has intolerance been able to stay its progress.—J. H. Tillotson.

FROM THE MONTREAL TRANSCRIPT.

PHRENOLOGY.—No. VIII.

It is the opinion of certain writers on the "natural history of mankind," that there is a genealogical relationship between all the members, families, species and genera of the animal kingdom—of which man is the ultimate and noblest development. They maintain that, in the form of the skull, the colour of the skin, as well as in their moral and intellectual condition, there is a greater difference between the Bushmen of Southern Africa, and the enlightened Caucasian, than there is between the former, and the Chimpanzee or the Orang Outang. Other writers consider the above doctrine as a daring invasion of orthodox philosophy, and impudently derogatory to the dignity of the human character. In my humble opinion, the tendency of such a doctrine is to diminish the respectability of the human race, and to degrade the noblest of our kind.

Those who believe that the whole human race has descended from one noble created pair maintain, that climate, and other physical influences, are sufficient to account for all the varieties of mankind, that are found on the face of the earth. This position it would be difficult to support, however, were it not for the striking differences discoverable between tame and wild animals of the same stock; and descended from the same stock. Hogs and cattle were taken by Columbus to St. Domingo, in the year 1493, whence they were afterwards carried to the main land. Herds of their offspring are now running wild in the forests of the South America, remarkably different in appearance from their European progenitors. The heads of both kinds of animals are very much altered in form, from those of the tame stock; and they possess a uniformity of colour, which does not belong to domesticated animals of the same race.

When dogs have been allowed to run wild for two or three generations, they lose their original form and colour, and the varieties in form and colour, which they assume, and to a great degree, the appearance of wolves. They altogether forget the "honest bark," which is the language of our canine companion, but they utter a sharp cry, or long melancholy howl, that is the signal of war.

It is also a well known fact, that it does not take many generations to alter the characteristics of sheep, in accordance with the peculiarities of the climate to which they are transported. These animals, taken from Europe to the West Indies, soon lose their covering of wool, and receive, in its stead, a coat of fine hair; so that, in many cases, it is difficult to distinguish them from the goats of the same region.

These, and many other facts of the same nature, are adduced to prove that climate and other circumstances are sufficient to account for the different tribes of mankind, in opposition to the heretical notion of distinct origins amongst inferior animals. I refer to them for the purpose of showing that whatever our opinions of the origin of man may be, we cannot deny the fact, that man, physically and mentally, is under the same physiological laws as the lower animals are; although being endowed by his Creator with higher capacities, he is enabled to study these laws, and adapt himself to their requirements—by which, his responsibilities are proportionally enhanced—because the means of his improvement to an indefinite extent are placed in his own hands. G. R.

FROM THE LONDON TIMES.

PROSPECTS—IMPENDING JUDGMENTS.

We have spoken of the past. Let us now turn to the future. Does hope or fear predominate in our views? Alas! the first object that presents themselves to us are the symptoms of the same indelible which has already twice taxed our charity and our labour. The fool of four millions of human beings is again doomed. Again Ireland will be crying to England for food; but if we relieve her necessities again, though we confess that we know not whence the money is to come, things cannot be so bad as they were before. There must be an economy practised this time in the dispensation of charity which experience has taught both the necessity and facilities. There must be no more squandering the public money by irresponsible boards among sturdy and well-to-do beggars. Neither will there be such a general lack of grain as was complained of in 1846. The deficiency of the harvest will be partially made up by the importation of grain from the world with little or no competition. Nor will the experience of the last famine have been in vain, since it overcame the prejudice of the poorest and most suffering class against the cheapest and most available sort of food.

So far the prospects is of a mixed kind. We are threatened with famine and with war. As of old, it is better to fall into the hands of God than man. The worst, so far as we can see, of the famine, is better than anything we can yet conjecture of the war. For the former we are better provided than we were two years ago; but what extent of provision can take in all the casualties of a general outbreak of hostilities? In the face of these contingencies, our expenditure becomes a question of serious importance. We have no business to spend one farthing beyond what we require. We know not how soon we may be called on to incur a larger outlay, and therefore a larger taxation, than we have borne for many years. It is therefore, our business to curtail our superfluities in order to meet our necessities. The Ministry seems to have decided on this in the way of saving—£200,000 is a good sum to knock off from the estimates of one year. They should see what more can be done safely and without detriment to the public service. We are sorry that an intelligence like Mr. Cubitt's should have been the cause of such a sacrifice as those of dismissed or reduced land and sea forces. Had it not been for this, we should have hailed him as a valuable labourer in the field of practical and practical economy. Unfortunately, his notions of *laissez faire* on all questions of national expenditure make him not only an inefficient but a suspected and dangerous ally in such matters.

We must therefore content ourselves with insisting on the curtailment of all unnecessary expenses, and protesting against the stinginess which would impair the real strength of the country. It may be a question whether or not the horse artillery are to be increased, or whether the African coast might not be given up, or whether the governmental expenses of such places as the Bahamas and Hong Kong are not on a scale utterly disproportionate to their uses and purposes. But it can be no question whether or not we should sacrifice the West Indies, and sell Australia. As long as she has strength, money, and courage, she is bound also by every consideration of policy, to maintain her position in the West Indies, and to retain countries and continents which have been won by the blood of her bravest, and may become the homes of her most enterprising sons. These she cannot part with on a question of expediency, and she must therefore be prepared to defend them with the material strength we possess at the moment of intervention. If we had all the wealth of the world, and no army or navy, our interference would be only a child's babbling. To insure peace, we must be prepared for war. The maxim is antiquated, but so is human nature. We have the best navy in the world. Don't let us throw away a great opportunity by crippling it on the eve of an European crisis. We have, for the present, the strongest army. Let us not weaken or impair it.

THE LONDON DISTRICT BUILDING SOCIETY. SHARES £50 EACH. Monthly subscriptions 5s. 6d. per share; 3d. per month for expenses of management; entrance fee 1s. 3d. per share; transfer fee 7d. per share; mortgage fee, 1s. 3d.

The principles on which Building Societies have been established in this country are now sufficiently known to render an elaborate explanation entirely unnecessary. The London District Building Society does not in its essential principles differ from those previously established in this country, and from the London Building Society—having £50 Shares. This peculiarity had been previously adopted in other parts of the province; it being generally admitted that it would accommodate a greater number of persons by allowing £50 shares; while it prevented any one from holding as many as he might think proper. But it was from an opinion prevalent that the object of Building Societies was that of Mutual Benefit, and that the idea of Mutual Benefit implied a special regard to economical management, a subject of great importance. This gave rise to the formation of this society; it was considered that all legs and remuneration for services should be at the lowest for which it was possible to accomplish the objects of the society; in particular it was desirable to insure popularity to Building Societies and the permanence of their principles, that those who sought the benefit of them by taking loans, should have as little burden upon them as possible in addition to the unavoidable expenses to which the operations subject them.

The Schedule of Fees herewith given will show that the greatest regard has been paid to economy. The following scheme will further illustrate the value and operations of the society, and the comparative advantage between the two modes of borrowing money; the one, an ordinary mortgage security; the other through the medium of Building Societies. It is necessary to encumber this statement with a long series of figures showing what the period of winding up will be under a variety of changes in the amount of premium; suffice it to say, that were the premiums to average 2½ per cent, every £50 share, the operations of the Society would close in eight years as near as possible:

labour. The fool of four millions of human beings is again doomed. Again Ireland will be crying to England for food; but if we relieve her necessities again, though we confess that we know not whence the money is to come, things cannot be so bad as they were before. There must be an economy practised this time in the dispensation of charity which experience has taught both the necessity and facilities. There must be no more squandering the public money by irresponsible boards among sturdy and well-to-do beggars. Neither will there be such a general lack of grain as was complained of in 1846. The deficiency of the harvest will be partially made up by the importation of grain from the world with little or no competition. Nor will the experience of the last famine have been in vain, since it overcame the prejudice of the poorest and most suffering class against the cheapest and most available sort of food.

So far the prospects is of a mixed kind. We are threatened with famine and with war. As of old, it is better to fall into the hands of God than man. The worst, so far as we can see, of the famine, is better than anything we can yet conjecture of the war. For the former we are better provided than we were two years ago; but what extent of provision can take in all the casualties of a general outbreak of hostilities? In the face of these contingencies, our expenditure becomes a question of serious importance. We have no business to spend one farthing beyond what we require. We know not how soon we may be called on to incur a larger outlay, and therefore a larger taxation, than we have borne for many years. It is therefore, our business to curtail our superfluities in order to meet our necessities. The Ministry seems to have decided on this in the way of saving—£200,000 is a good sum to knock off from the estimates of one year. They should see what more can be done safely and without detriment to the public service. We are sorry that an intelligence like Mr. Cubitt's should have been the cause of such a sacrifice as those of dismissed or reduced land and sea forces. Had it not been for this, we should have hailed him as a valuable labourer in the field of practical and practical economy. Unfortunately, his notions of *laissez faire* on all questions of national expenditure make him not only an inefficient but a suspected and dangerous ally in such matters.

We must therefore content ourselves with insisting on the curtailment of all unnecessary expenses, and protesting against the stinginess which would impair the real strength of the country. It may be a question whether or not the horse artillery are to be increased, or whether the African coast might not be given up, or whether the governmental expenses of such places as the Bahamas and Hong Kong are not on a scale utterly disproportionate to their uses and purposes. But it can be no question whether or not we should sacrifice the West Indies, and sell Australia. As long as she has strength, money, and courage, she is bound also by every consideration of policy, to maintain her position in the West Indies, and to retain countries and continents which have been won by the blood of her bravest, and may become the homes of her most enterprising sons. These she cannot part with on a question of expediency, and she must therefore be prepared to defend them with the material strength we possess at the moment of intervention. If we had all the wealth of the world, and no army or navy, our interference would be only a child's babbling. To insure peace, we must be prepared for war. The maxim is antiquated, but so is human nature. We have the best navy in the world. Don't let us throw away a great opportunity by crippling it on the eve of an European crisis. We have, for the present, the strongest army. Let us not weaken or impair it.

THE LONDON DISTRICT BUILDING SOCIETY. SHARES £50 EACH. Monthly subscriptions 5s. 6d. per share; 3d. per month for expenses of management; entrance fee 1s. 3d. per share; transfer fee 7d. per share; mortgage fee, 1s. 3d.

The principles on which Building Societies have been established in this country are now sufficiently known to render an elaborate explanation entirely unnecessary. The London District Building Society does not in its essential principles differ from those previously established in this country, and from the London Building Society—having £50 Shares. This peculiarity had been previously adopted in other parts of the province; it being generally admitted that it would accommodate a greater number of persons by allowing £50 shares; while it prevented any one from holding as many as he might think proper. But it was from an opinion prevalent that the object of Building Societies was that of Mutual Benefit, and that the idea of Mutual Benefit implied a special regard to economical management, a subject of great importance. This gave rise to the formation of this society; it was considered that all legs and remuneration for services should be at the lowest for which it was possible to accomplish the objects of the society; in particular it was desirable to insure popularity to Building Societies and the permanence of their principles, that those who sought the benefit of them by taking loans, should have as little burden upon them as possible in addition to the unavoidable expenses to which the operations subject them.

The Schedule of Fees herewith given will show that the greatest regard has been paid to economy. The following scheme will further illustrate the value and operations of the society, and the comparative advantage between the two modes of borrowing money; the one, an ordinary mortgage security; the other through the medium of Building Societies. It is necessary to encumber this statement with a long series of figures showing what the period of winding up will be under a variety of changes in the amount of premium; suffice it to say, that were the premiums to average 2½ per cent, every £50 share, the operations of the Society would close in eight years as near as possible:

labour. The fool of four millions of human beings is again doomed. Again Ireland will be crying to England for food; but if we relieve her necessities again, though we confess that we know not whence the money is to come, things cannot be so bad as they were before. There must be an economy practised this time in the dispensation of charity which experience has taught both the necessity and facilities. There must be no more squandering the public money by irresponsible boards among sturdy and well-to-do beggars. Neither will there be such a general lack of grain as was complained of in 1846. The deficiency of the harvest will be partially made up by the importation of grain from the world with little or no competition. Nor will the experience of the last famine have been in vain, since it overcame the prejudice of the poorest and most suffering class against the cheapest and most available sort of food.

So far the prospects is of a mixed kind. We are threatened with famine and with war. As of old, it is better to fall into the hands of God than man. The worst, so far as we can see, of the famine, is better than anything we can yet conjecture of the war. For the former we are better provided than we were two years ago; but what extent of provision can take in all the casualties of a general outbreak of hostilities? In the face of these contingencies, our expenditure becomes a question of serious importance. We have no business to spend one farthing beyond what we require. We know not how soon we may be called on to incur a larger outlay, and therefore a larger taxation, than we have borne for many years. It is therefore, our business to curtail our superfluities in order to meet our necessities. The Ministry seems to have decided on this in the way of saving—£200,000 is a good sum to knock off from the estimates of one year. They should see what more can be done safely and without detriment to the public service. We are sorry that an intelligence like Mr. Cubitt's should have been the cause of such a sacrifice as those of dismissed or reduced land and sea forces. Had it not been for this, we should have hailed him as a valuable labourer in the field of practical and practical economy. Unfortunately, his notions of *laissez faire* on all questions of national expenditure make him not only an inefficient but a suspected and dangerous ally in such matters.

We must therefore content ourselves with insisting on the curtailment of all unnecessary expenses, and protesting against the stinginess which would impair the real strength of the country. It may be a question whether or not the horse artillery are to be increased, or whether the African coast might not be given up, or whether the governmental expenses of such places as the Bahamas and Hong Kong are not on a scale utterly disproportionate to their uses and purposes. But it can be no question whether or not we should sacrifice the West Indies, and sell Australia. As long as she has strength, money, and courage, she is bound also by every consideration of policy, to maintain her position in the West Indies, and to retain countries and continents which have been won by the blood of her bravest, and may become the homes of her most enterprising sons. These she cannot part with on a question of expediency, and she must therefore be prepared to defend them with the material strength we possess at the moment of intervention. If we had all the wealth of the world, and no army or navy, our interference would be only a child's babbling. To insure peace, we must be prepared for war. The maxim is antiquated, but so is human nature. We have the best navy in the world. Don't let us throw away a great opportunity by crippling it on the eve of an European crisis. We have, for the present, the strongest army. Let us not weaken or impair it.

THE LONDON DISTRICT BUILDING SOCIETY. SHARES £50 EACH. Monthly subscriptions 5s. 6d. per share; 3d. per month for expenses of management; entrance fee 1s. 3d. per share; transfer fee 7d. per share; mortgage fee, 1s. 3d.

The principles on which Building Societies have been established in this country are now sufficiently known to render an elaborate explanation entirely unnecessary. The London District Building Society does not in its essential principles differ from those previously established in this country, and from the London Building Society—having £50 Shares. This peculiarity had been previously adopted in other parts of the province; it being generally admitted that it would accommodate a greater number of persons by allowing £50 shares; while it prevented any one from holding as many as he might think proper. But it was from an opinion prevalent that the object of Building Societies was that of Mutual Benefit, and that the idea of Mutual Benefit implied a special regard to economical management, a subject of great importance. This gave rise to the formation of this society; it was considered that all legs and remuneration for services should be at the lowest for which it was possible to accomplish the objects of the society; in particular it was desirable to insure popularity to Building Societies and the permanence of their principles, that those who sought the benefit of them by taking loans, should have as little burden upon them as possible in addition to the unavoidable expenses to which the operations subject them.

The Schedule of Fees herewith given will show that the greatest regard has been paid to economy. The following scheme will further illustrate the value and operations of the society, and the comparative advantage between the two modes of borrowing money; the one, an ordinary mortgage security; the other through the medium of Building Societies. It is necessary to encumber this statement with a long series of figures showing what the period of winding up will be under a variety of changes in the amount of premium; suffice it to say, that were the premiums to average 2½ per cent, every £50 share, the operations of the Society would close in eight years as near as possible:

labour. The fool of four millions of human beings is again doomed. Again Ireland will be crying to England for food; but if we relieve her necessities again, though we confess that we know not whence the money is to come, things cannot be so bad as they were before. There must be an economy practised this time in the dispensation of charity which experience has taught both the necessity and facilities. There must be no more squandering the public money by irresponsible boards among sturdy and well-to-do beggars. Neither will there be such a general lack of grain as was complained of in 1846. The deficiency of the harvest will be partially made up by the importation of grain from the world with little or no competition. Nor will the experience of the last famine have been in vain, since it overcame the prejudice of the poorest and most suffering class against the cheapest and most available sort of food.

So far the prospects is of a mixed kind. We are threatened with famine and with war. As of old, it is better to fall into the hands of God than man. The worst, so far as we can see, of the famine, is better than anything we can yet conjecture of the war. For the former we are better provided than we were two years ago; but what extent of provision can take in all the casualties of a general outbreak of hostilities? In the face of these contingencies, our expenditure becomes a question of serious importance. We have no business to spend one farthing beyond what we require. We know not how soon we may be called on to incur a larger outlay, and therefore a larger taxation, than we have borne for many years. It is therefore, our business to curtail our superfluities in order to meet our necessities. The Ministry seems to have decided on this in the way of saving—£200,000 is a good sum to knock off from the estimates of one year. They should see what more can be done safely and without detriment to the public service. We are sorry that an intelligence like Mr. Cubitt's should have been the cause of such a sacrifice as those of dismissed or reduced land and sea forces. Had it not been for this, we should have hailed him as a valuable labourer in the field of practical and practical economy. Unfortunately, his notions of *laissez faire* on all questions of national expenditure make him not only an inefficient but a suspected and dangerous ally in such matters.

We must therefore content ourselves with insisting on the curtailment of all unnecessary expenses, and protesting against the stinginess which would impair the real strength of the country. It may be a question whether or not the horse artillery are to be increased, or whether the African coast might not be given up, or whether the governmental expenses of such places as the Bahamas and Hong Kong are not on a scale utterly disproportionate to their uses and purposes. But it can be no question whether or not we should sacrifice the West Indies, and sell Australia. As long as she has strength, money, and courage, she is bound also by every consideration of policy, to maintain her position in the West Indies, and to retain countries and continents which have been won by the blood of her bravest, and may become the homes of her most enterprising sons. These she cannot part with on a question of expediency, and she must therefore be prepared to defend them with the material strength we possess at the moment of intervention. If we had all the wealth of the world, and no army or navy, our interference would be only a child's babbling. To insure peace, we must be prepared for war. The maxim is antiquated, but so is human nature. We have the best navy in the world. Don't let us throw away a great opportunity by crippling it on the eve of an European crisis. We have, for the present, the strongest army. Let us not weaken or impair it.

THE LONDON DISTRICT BUILDING SOCIETY. SHARES £50 EACH. Monthly subscriptions 5s. 6d. per share; 3d. per month for expenses of management; entrance fee 1s. 3d. per share; transfer fee 7d. per share; mortgage fee, 1s. 3d.

The principles on which Building Societies have been established in this country are now sufficiently known to render an elaborate explanation entirely unnecessary. The London District Building Society does not in its essential principles differ from those previously established in this country, and from the London Building Society—having £50 Shares. This peculiarity had been previously adopted in other parts of the province; it being generally admitted that it would accommodate a greater number of persons by allowing £50 shares; while it prevented any one from holding as many as he might think proper. But it was from an opinion prevalent that the object of Building Societies was that of Mutual Benefit, and that the idea of Mutual Benefit implied a special regard to economical management, a subject of great importance. This gave rise to the formation of this society; it was considered that all legs and remuneration for services should be at the lowest for which it was possible to accomplish the objects of the society; in particular it was desirable to insure popularity to Building Societies and the permanence of their principles, that those who sought the benefit of them by taking loans, should have as little burden upon them as possible in addition to the unavoidable expenses to which the operations subject them.

the premium being higher or lower will extend or shorten the time accordingly, while the uncertain additions to the stock by fines, will have the same effect on a small scale. In eight years—for we shall reckon that period exactly—the fraction of a year is not worth notice in the way of argument and illustration. To that period the holder of a £50 share will have paid one dollar per month for 96 months. . . . £24 0 0 Entrance fee, . . . . . 1 3 Expenses of management 96 months, 1 4 0

At the expiration of that period he will receive £50, because the accumulations in that time have amounted to as many sums of £50 as there are shares held, and the Society ends because the borrowers have nothing more to pay—having paid up all their instalments with interest on the shares borrowed. The interest of their own money, the premiums paid by borrowers, and the ever rising accumulations of each monthly amount loaned, the amount being swelled by fines and entrance fees, its produce realises to each person £50.

The person taking a loan at a premium of £15 for a share of £50 is in a different position. Should he take a loan the first year he will have to pay, first his instalments as before stated. . . . £25 5 3 Interest on £50 for 8 years, . . . . 24 0 0

This sum he will have paid exclusive of the charges for valuing, mortgage and registry, which as he would pay these expenses for the other mode of borrowing on mortgage security, ought not to be reckoned as a peculiar charge attending the loan through a Building Society. This he will have the use of £35 for eight years, and receive back the mortgage deed at the end of the term, and the probability of paying law expenses in recovering; while through the operation of the Building Society everything is kept and certain. If there are 100 shareholders of £50 shares each, in eight years the fund will be 100x50, £5000. Part of this will be in cash, and part in 200x250 security of the full value of £50. The borrower will be paid his share by handing him his deed, the lender by handing him £50, and the society becomes extinct.

There is another peculiarity; this society has rejected the absurd system of having a plurality of votes—being fully convinced that the value of a vote consisted in the judgment and ability of the individual elected to the office of Director, not in the shares owned, that he may hold.

Interest will be allowed for all sums paid three or more months in advance at the rate of 6 per cent per annum.

HURON SIGNAL.

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 29, 1848.

FIRE AND PROBABLE LOSS OF LIFE ON LAKE HURON.

There has been great excitement during these few days past, from Goderich Northward, along the coast, occasioned by the shore being strewn with the wreck of what must have been a vessel of considerable size. At Pine Point on the 20th inst., the upper works of what appeared to be a schooner, were washed upon the beach, and which seem to have sustained much damage by fire—Upwards of 200 barrels of Flour and Indian corn, a considerable number of boxes of candles and raisins, also an immense quantity of lucifer matches, a large quantity of dried apples, also considerably injured by the fire—and a vast number of other articles which have literally strewed the shore at various points, have been picked up. Mr. McGregor, of Ashfield, is now in possession of what appears to have been the Yawl of the ill-fated vessel, which he found at Pine Point. It has 18 feet keel, is painted white, with a green stripe outside, and of a few oar whistles,—but without a name. It has sustained no injury from fire. From a box containing 7 kegs of blasting powder, and many of the barrels marked "City Mills, D. Harvey," and other goods marked "Delaware to the Salt Ste. Mary, and the Midea Bay Mining Company," it is presumed that the wrecked vessel was on a voyage North to the Mining Districts. None of the bodies of those on board have been heard of, and consequently the mind is left to its worst fears in reference to their fate.

We learn that the Magistrates have with praiseworthy zeal, sent constables along the beach in order to secure the property that has been saved, and we feel confident that the farmers along the shore will give all assistance in this laudable undertaking.

We are in hopes that before we go to press again, we shall receive some light upon this present painful conjecture, and in our next be obliged to lay before our readers an account of loss of property, alone, and not of life.

HERESY OF MR. MACQUEEN'S TEMPERANCE LECTURE.

The opposition arising from these sources, however, would be easily overcome only for the sacred sanctity which religion is supposed to bring around the drinking practices of society,—or at least around the opposition given to our principle of total abstinence. And as I have no sympathy with shams, and no intention of keeping back anything which I believe to be truth, and which may have a tendency to promote the cause of virtue, I will here give my own views of the general tenor of Christianity as taught by its Great Author, and as contained in the Christian volume. I believe it to be a religion of universal love, of forbearance, of mercy, of self-denial, and of charity,—requiring all its professors to love even their enemies, simply because they are the workmanship of the same God, and to hate them would be to despise their Creator; to require us to forgive each other's offences; to require our deepest desires and inclinations, and to exert every possible influence for the moral and spiritual welfare of our race; to live at peace with all men; to avoid the very appearance of evil; to avoid temptation, or being the means of tempting others; to live soberly, righteously, and godly in the world, and to do good unto all men as we have opportunity. This I believe to be the substance of the moral teach-

ings of Jesus, and I am persuaded that if out of 600,000 inhabitants of Upper Canada, we could find one thousand men who would willingly unite to carry out these principles, or to put them into practice, these thousand men would produce the moral regeneration of the Province. Yes, 100 real, practical Christians would do more good than ten thousand, yes, ten hundred thousand nominal ones, who profess to believe all these precepts and principles, and yet regulate every action of their lives by exclusive selfishness, except those few selfish actions which are punished by the civil law, and for those they are in some charitable purpose, to make some worldly sacrifice for the good of others, or for the advancement of general knowledge, or request them to restrain their appetites for the promotion of virtue in others, and in many, many cases you will be met with the language of the first murderer, "Am I my brother's keeper?" Nay, some will even meet you with an argument about Christian liberty, and quote certain sentences from scripture to prove that they are free to act just as they please. Where, then, is the love of Christian morality? Where, is the love and the charity, and the self-denial, that constitute the superiority of Christian practice? My opinion is that Christianity, to such men, is nothing more than a beautiful, impracticable theory. I hate shams of every description, and in every department, but I hate them with a ten-fold hatred when they dare to show their unholiness in connection with the solemnities of religion. We may shun each other, we may even sham ourselves, but our attempts to sham our Creator by cloaking our selfish desires under the sanction of his word will be the most fatal sham system that we have ever adopted. If a man were to tell me that he could not conscientiously enter his public protest against the drinking customs of society because he really loved drink, because it had become a habit, and he lacked firmness to overcome it, or because our total abstinence was not popular; if he would tell me that so soon as we could prevail on all the sober, and respectable, and intelligent, and fashionable portion of the community to join us, then he would soon be a teetotaler. I could then listen to any of all these excuses with pity and while I regretted his weakness, I could believe in his sincerity. But when he offers to fortify his position with scripture; when he tries to defend his practice by boasting of his Christian liberty, I at once put him down as one who is still in the clasp of bitterness, and in the bond of impurity; who either does not know or does not want to know the real spirit of Christianity.—In short, I at once conclude that his profession of religion is a mere sham. I do not intend to enter into a scriptural view of the matter simply because I think we do not believe the scriptures on this subject. You must not be startled or alarmed at this assertion. I have never been and never will be in the habit of speaking and writing my convictions, regardless of fear or favour from men. And my conviction, in this instance, is founded on the universal fact, that our nature compels us to act in harmony with our belief in every instance where we have the power of acting, and when the action involves our happiness or misery. Now, certainly every man has the power not to get drunk. I mean he has the power at some period of life,—hundreds, thousands, yes, millions of men and women have proven to the world that they have power, to abstain from intoxicating drinks entirely, that they can live and enjoy health and prosperity without touching these liquors. There is not a man in this meeting that would not consider himself insulted were I to tell him that he had not power to abstain from liquor. Now, the scriptures say—"Woe unto him that giveth his neighbour drink." They say farther that "no drunkard shall inherit the kingdom of God." Do we believe these declarations? I think not. I think I do believe these two sentences, we would neither have a grog dealer nor a grog drinker in the community! We have the power to abstain both; and if we actually and firmly believe that we have the power, we have power, to abstain from intoxicating drinks entirely, that they can live and enjoy health and prosperity without touching these liquors. There is not a man in this meeting that would not consider himself insulted were I to tell him that he had not power to abstain from liquor. Now, the scriptures say—"Woe unto him that giveth his neighbour drink." They say farther that "no drunkard shall inherit the kingdom of God." Do we believe these declarations? I think not. I think I do believe these two sentences, we would neither have a grog dealer nor a grog drinker in the community! We have the power to abstain both; and if we actually and firmly believe that we have the power, we have power, to abstain from intoxicating drinks entirely, that they can live and enjoy health and prosperity without touching these liquors. There is not a man in this meeting that would not consider himself insulted were I to tell him that he had not power to abstain from liquor. Now, the scriptures say—"Woe unto him that giveth his neighbour drink." They say farther that "no drunkard shall inherit the kingdom of God." Do we believe these declarations? I think not. I think I do believe these two sentences, we would neither have a grog dealer nor a grog drinker in the community! We have the power to abstain both; and if we actually and firmly believe that we have the power, we have power, to abstain from intoxicating drinks entirely, that they can live and enjoy health and prosperity without touching these liquors. There is not a man in this meeting that would not consider himself insulted were I to tell him that he had not power to abstain from liquor. Now, the scriptures say—"Woe unto him that giveth his neighbour drink." They say farther that "no drunkard shall inherit the kingdom of God." Do we believe these declarations? I think not. I think I do believe these two sentences, we would neither have a grog dealer nor a grog drinker in the community! We have the power to abstain both; and if we actually and firmly believe that we have the power, we have power, to abstain from intoxicating drinks entirely, that they can live and enjoy health and prosperity without touching these liquors. There is not a man in this meeting that would not consider himself insulted were I to tell him that he had not power to abstain from liquor. Now, the scriptures say—"Woe unto him that giveth his neighbour drink." They say farther that "no drunkard shall inherit the kingdom of God." Do we believe these declarations? I think not. I think I do believe these two sentences, we would neither have a grog dealer nor a grog drinker in the community! We have the power to abstain both; and if we actually and firmly believe that we have the power, we have power, to abstain from intoxicating drinks entirely, that they can live and enjoy health and prosperity without touching these liquors. There is not