

An extensive emigration to the Cape is about to commence. By the last accounts from the colony we learn that the emigration offices have been filled. The sum of £25,000 has been voted to defray the passage of emigrants from Great Britain to the Cape. *Civil Service Gazette.*

The *Weekly Dispatch* speaks of the ugly rumours of coming bankruptcies and a general crash which hang like fog over the City. The manufacturing countries in England and Scotland are in a very doubtful state. Should we be in a position to be driven to close mills and throw the working-classes out of work, we may revive the memory of the Chartist mobs. With the large crop of cotton this year, we should hope such a result not very likely; but an eminent City merchant assures us that all orders for goods are countermanded, and that retailers buy only from hand to mouth. Some recommend an issue of £1 notes to relieve the immediate pressure, but we fear that would only lead to the export of specie. Meanwhile, it is certain that merchants entertain very serious apprehensions of the coming state of affairs.

Intelligence has been received from Captain McIntock, the gallant commander of Lady Franklin's expedition. The "poor little Fox" was off Cape Cranstoun, lat. 71 deg., on the 6th August, all well. The captain describes himself as most fortunate in his officers and crew all deserve his praise alike.

The *Morning Advertiser* publishes a form of a Memorial to be presented to the Queen, setting forth that the provisions of the Divorce and Matrimonial Causes Act are in open contradiction to the law of the United Church of England and Ireland, in the Book of Common Prayer, and made to be the law of the land by the Act of Uniformity, and praying that her Majesty will be pleased to withhold her Order in Council, "until such time shall have been given to Parliament to amend the said Divorce and Matrimonial Causes Act, that the confusion and inconvenience and scandal which must arise from a state of the law contradictory to itself may be avoided; and that, in the event of Parliament seeing fit to abide by so much of the said Act, as however it be at variance with the law of marriage as received by this Church of England, and as sanctioned and established by statute, provides for the dissolution 'a vinculo' by process of law of marriages lawfully contracted, care at least be taken that no violence be done to the plain language of the Prayer-book, the consciences of the Clergy and laity of the United Church of England and Ireland, and to her law, as this has been identified in and by the said Act of Uniformity of the law with the State."

LEVITIAN STRAKER.—As might have been anticipated, the most vague and contradictory rumors are afloat as to the cause which led to Tuesday's failure. Only two of these are sufficiently probable to demand notice. The first states that in consequence of the immense pressure and friction the iron transverse bars which cross the bottom of the cradles have cut into the railway metals, and so fixed the whole that it will be impossible unless the entire vessel can be raised up from the launching ways and started afresh. For this report we are glad to say the result of a close inspection of the bars leaves no foundation. In fact the friction, considering the amount of pressure on the cradles and bars, seems to have been marvellously slight. The second report avers most positively that the launching ways themselves have settled down under the weight of the ship's stern and fixed it as it were in a hole. This also is incorrect, for the ways remain as firm and rigid as on the first day of their construction, and up to the present they have received no cause to be otherwise, since the vessel is still in its original foundations. But the ways have been so constructed as to allow for a sinking. Each "way" of 120 feet wide is formed by three spans of 40 feet each—the spans resting each upon rows of piles, and rising in the centre 1½ in., so that a considerable depression is provided against. The real cause of the failure on Tuesday was the accident which took place at the windlass, and which made the whole mass of workmen so timid and suspicious that it was actually unsafe to trust them with the execution of details which pre-eminently demanded coolness and judgment. From the same timidity, also and from prudential motives, it was considered better after the accident to remove the men from the barges which were moored in the river, and worked the hauling tackle upon the midships of the vessel. These four barges were capable of applying a downward strain on the Leviathan of 250 tons, which strain was chiefly depended upon to move her in the case of the hitch which did take place. When the second attempt was made without the aid of these barges an undue strain came upon the chains which, fastened at the bow and stern, pulled towards the river, and at last the former broke. This, coupled with the accident to the pin of the hydraulic press, stopped the launch. The Leviathan at present rests exactly six inches lower than formerly, and, taking the mean of her progress force and aft, about four feet down the launching ways. According to the incline of these ways, the actual lowering of the vessel since she moved is only four inches, but when the cradles were fixed under her and the last supports removed she settled down two inches in the cradles themselves. From the levels taken it appears that the deflection in the whole length of the ship since she was left to support herself in the two cradles is so slight as to be almost imperceptible. From the forward cradle to the bows the deflection is some fractional part of an inch; between the two cradles amidships none whatever is perceptible; and from the aftermost cradle to the sternpost, where more than 200 feet of the heaviest parts of the vessel hang entirely without support from the ground, the deflection is only half an inch. From the deck the entire deflection from stem to stern, nearly 700 feet, is only one inch. We believe that the arrangements for finally launching the colossal structure on the 2d of December will not differ in any essential particular from the method pursued on Tuesday last, but we can speak more positively as to this in the course of another day. During yesterday Mr. Branel and the great ship's great captain, the most indefatigable and zealous of all commanders (Captain Harrison), were down at Millwall, inspecting the ship, and ascertained that she was neither strained nor twisted even to the extent of the most fractional portion of an inch. The men injured by the accident at the windlass are all progressing slowly, though still no hope exists of the recovery of Donovan, and Stacey remains in a precarious state. Some idea of the frightful violence with which these poor men were struck may be formed from the fact that one of the massive handles of the windlass, of solid iron 1½ inches in diameter, which struck the men, is bent and twisted as if it was formed of lead.—*Times.*

RELIGIOUS LIBERTY IN ENGLAND.—Why are we free? Do our Protestant countrymen feel that we have a right to our own religion, and not desire to meddle with it? The very contrary is notorious and undeniable. They are continually trying whether they cannot in any way or the other lay their hands on our religion. To say nothing of the monstrous practical injustice of the Irish Establishment, the remains of the penal laws are enough to show this. Why are our Sovereigns (whatever their personal convictions) forbidden by law to profess the Catholic religion, or to marry a Catholic? Why are Catholics forbidden by law to hold the great seal, and in England only (where it no doubt gives the power of exercising Church patronage), but in Ireland, where the Chancellor is not alive in his gift, and where the Catholics have as many distinguished lawyers as the Protestants? Why are Catholic Ecclesiastics alone of all men forbidden by law publicly to wear their own clothes, or to show themselves before the face of day in any religious function? Above all, why are men who hurt or offend no one liable by law to transportation for belonging to Religious Orders, the existence of which is essential to the well-being, if not to the being, of our religion? All these are attempts, futile no doubt, but most sincere, to put down the Catholic religion by

the arm of the law. But observe why they are futile: because they are so utterly abhorrent to the principles of English law, that it affords no machinery for carrying them into execution. In most Continental States, whether Catholic, Protestant, or of no religion at all, even when it is the rage to profess the broadest liberalism, and not merely to copy but to caricature the political system of England, Government interferes with all the details of life.—The passport system is only one instance. Englishmen are astonished that any civilised nation can endure it, because it is the only part of this continual system which personally affects us. The wildest democrat upon the Continent stares at the proposal to dispense with it. It is no breach of his notions of "liberty and equality" that the police should desire to know whenever he leaves home, where he goes, and how long he stays. There is no Continental city in which a hundred or two of men could meet for any purpose whatever once or twice a week without being watched by them. The question is whether they are to make their report to a monarch, an oligarchy, or a democracy—not whether they are to leave the matter alone. Above all, the education of the people is a Government department; the teacher is a public functionary, what is taught is a matter of Government inspection. It is plain that under such a system, religious liberty, as we understand it, would be something strange and anomalous—indeed, hardly possible; for Englishmen would justly feel that it was violated not merely by being refused permission to worship or teach as they please, but by having to ask for it. Our notion is that Government and Law should be like the air we breathe, always around us, essential to our being, but unseen and forgotten. The perfection of English Government would be one which did nothing, because there was nothing to do. As long as a man pays his debts, and leaves alone the persons and property of his neighbors, we hold that the Government and the police have no more to do with him than the doctor has, with a healthy man who chances to live next door to him. When the attempt is made to engraft into such a system as his Continental meddling with religion, it simply breaks down, because there is no machinery by which it can be carried out. For example, the law against the Religious Orders. The Canon of Zurich, as we last week saw, forbids the Community of Rheinau to take novices—a gross injustice and oppression, no doubt; unluckily, it is practically efficient. What makes our state different? The law of England forbids any man to become a professed member of any Religious Order. Yet nothing is more common than to hear in Catholic society that So-and-so has gone to the Jesuits, or the Passionists, or the Redemptorists, or the Order of Charity. We should laugh if any one suggested that Government might interfere, and cautioned us to speak under our breath. And the reason is, that England must give up the first principles of those glorious laws which are our richest inheritance from our Catholic forefathers, before she can practically interfere at all in the matter. As long as "men are not to be compelled to criminate themselves," as long as "the Englishman's house is his castle," who shall prevent Jesuits from living together like other men, and making or receiving religious professions when the time comes for it? Who shall prove that they do, or can interfere with them? The yet remaining laws against Catholics, with few exceptions, are either bishyish, like that which forbids a man to wear his own clothes, or futile, like that which forbids him to make a religious profession. And this solely against the will of our Protestant countrymen, and because they cannot practically hurt us without sweeping away the British Constitution. When Archbishop Laurence wrested the Great Charter from the tyrant John, he felt that he had secured religious liberty by the enactment with which it begins, and which declares "the Church of England free"; but he did not know that the civil liberty of which he was laying the foundation would secure substantial liberty to the Church after three centuries of poverty, pillage, and persecution, and when the very name of the Church of England should be given to a Society of man's invention—a mere creature of law, without Bishops, without Priests, without doctrine.—*Weekly Register.*

EVANGELICAL SWINDLERS.—The religious and commercial circles of Hull have been intensely and most painfully excited this week by the examination in the police-court of Mr. H. S. Bright, of the now bankrupt firm of Taylor and Bright, corn merchants, on a series of charges of forgery. Up to a recent period Mr. Bright enjoyed the reputation of being not only a prosperous merchant, but of being worthy to take—as he was allowed to do—precedence of the whole mercantile body in the championship of the educational and preaching institutions of the Established Church. Being a person of good address, winning manners, and a fluent, agreeable speaker, it was natural that he should acquire a certain influence over the Clergy, seeing that to the manifestation of an active orthodox zeal he united a capacity for business which was supposed to have the effect of enriching such of his Ecclesiastical friends as were not averse to experiencing the thrilling vigils procurable by an indulgence in moderate speculations. But there is no uniting the worship of God and Mammon. Bible-distributing and bill-discounting lead to ruin in the long run. In the case of Mr. Bright, the marvel is that so really clever a man should not have discovered long ago that he had entered upon a course which must inevitably bring destruction upon him. The very first glance which we get at his affairs in the course of this examination is sufficient to satisfy us that his case was then, in a commercial point of view, utterly hopeless. But he appears to have made up his mind not to sink alone, and the disclosures which he has compelled some of those to make who were called as witnesses in his prosecution reveal an appalling aspect of the commercial morality of Hull. Mr. Bright's imputed guilt is, we greatly fear, not the offence of a solitary merchant. At all events, he never could have put such quantities of paper afloat without earlier suspicions being entertained as to the real character of it. We have our fears that the world has not yet heard the worst of one of the most deplorable affairs that has happened in Hull for the last quarter of a century. For we class these forgeries, the stoppage of the bank, the insolvency of the Hull Flax and Cotton Mills, and Mr. Bright's own bankruptcy, as forming in the aggregate one local calamity. That the exposures now made must seriously damage the commercial reputation of Hull can admit of no dispute. It is a grievous aggravation of the offence charged against Mr. Bright, that there are men of business who regard it as not incompatible with an ordinary share of mercantile morality. It shows that the Sadderian system of commercial ethics is rife among us. Well, the sooner the whole extent of the evil is known the better. The veil has been partially raised; remove it altogether, and let us see the extent of the mischief for which it has become necessary to provide a remedy. Whatever may be the effect of the present disclosures in High-street and on 'Change we know that they produce a wonderful purification in the really religious and really moral atmosphere of Hull. The reign of cant and hypocrisy is over in this town. Gentlemen may load themselves with tracts, and prayerfully remonstrate with poor barbers on the sinfulness of smothering the chins of dock labourers on Sunday mornings, but neither their position as bank managers nor as corn merchants will henceforth be accepted as evidence of a divine mission on their part. Men who toil in the murky atmosphere of High-street have plenty to do to grope their own way to Heaven without assuming the functions of Ecclesiastics in pointing out the road to others. Though committed to take his trial at York for forgery, Mr. H. S. Bright, whatever he may be legally, is not morally much worse than scores of merchants and bank managers in England who occupy a proud position as most exemplary members of society. He made religion a chief part of his working capital in

trade; and there are several shipowners and merchants in Hull who do the very same, and who realise upon it a large per centage of their profits in cash and in social influence. But there is danger in such investments. God does not continue to prosper the making merchandise of the things of His kingdom.—*Hull Advertiser.*

MR. DRUMMOND, M.P. AND THE GOVERNMENT CHURCH.—A valuable piece of ecclesiastical preferment has fallen to the gift of the eccentric Mr. Henry Drummond, M.P. for West Surry. It is the family curacy of Albury, near Guildford, worth between £600 and £700 a year. The last time Mr. Drummond exercised the patronage was in 1834, prior to the time when he became a zealous adherent and "angel" of the Irvingite body. Some interest will be felt as to the sort of clergyman the hon. member will select to fill the vacant preferment.—*Evening paper.*

THE TRACTARIAN PARTY.—The curious phase of Anglicanism presented a year ago by the Union, is already changing. Its ablest writers have submitted to the Church, and the paper itself is taking an anti-Roman tone. It would no way surprise us if in another year we were to see it as sober, as orthodox as the Church of Englandists as the *Guardian* itself. It is far from the first time that we have witnessed such a process. The *Oxford Tracts*, indeed, remained to the last in the powerful hand which set them going, and the *British Critic* was snuffed out before it had time to turn down. The change there was all the other way—gradual growth from truth to truth, ever increasing with boldness; but the *Christian Remembrancer*, which succeeded it, and the *Guardian* itself, soon subsided into preternatural mildness, redeemed only by a spice of anti-Catholic acidity. We sincerely fear a like fate for the Union.—*Weekly Register.*

SPURGEONISM.—The Union says:—"Of the profanity, coarseness, and vulgarity of Mr. Spurgeon we have heard much; but we were not prepared for the following two anecdotes, which come to us on very respectable authority. On a late occasion he had been declaiming what he called a 'prayer to the Almighty' for the salvation of his auditors with more flippant familiarity and loud-tongued importunity than usual. In the discourse which followed he told them that 'Jesus Christ, after what He had promised, would behave very shabbily if He did not save all those who had heartily joined in those petitions.' It is not long since Spurgeon went down on a preaching expedition to Suffolk, we believe the place was Bectles. Three or four of his admirers competed for the honor of entertaining him. The matter was decided by lot in favor of a teetotaler. At dinner Mr. Spurgeon asked voraciously, and then asked for something to drink. The lady of the house pushed the water-bottle to him—'Thank you, madam,' was his polite rejoinder; 'I want something better than this; I use water to wash my feet.' So, accordingly, he was supplied with porter a discretion. After dinner he asked for a room to prepare himself for his sermon, which was found for him. 'Have you any cigars?' he asked; 'and some more of that porter, if you please.' So they supplied him with four bottles of porter and half a dozen cigars, all of which he had finished before he mounted the rostrum an hour afterwards."

It has long been our boast that farming leases are uncommon in England, not because landlords will not give them, but because tenants had rather not have them. Millions have no doubt been invested in English lands by tenants at will. Lord Stamford, however, is stated to have ejected from his Leicestershire estate, a tenant (Mr. Everard, of Groby Hall), who had expended £20,000 in improvements in five years on a farm held by his family for four generations. It would be as unequal to condemn the landlord without hearing why, as to eject the tenant. Never clearly was there a charge which more loudly demanded an answer. Lord Stamford is charged circumstantially, and by respectable names, with a crime almost beyond belief, and so much the greater because forbidden by no law. For why is it unlawful, except because (like adultery at Sparta) no one had ever contemplated its possibility? The real reason why no effectual remedy has yet been adopted for the same evil in Ireland is not (as our Irish contemporaries conclude, naturally enough) because Englishmen are indifferent to injustice on the other side of the water, but because they have regarded the stories they heard as simply impossible. We have for years repeated that in Ireland cases of injustice differing from that charged against Lord Stamford only in the scale upon which they are practised (a difference which only makes them more cruelly felt by the victims) have for years been, not the exception, but the law. Protestants, however, are slow to believe an Irish grievance on the word of a Catholic. Mr. Everard's case may probably do more for the Irish tenant than all the League agitation.—*Weekly Register.*

In the first year of the present century the population of Great Britain amounted to 10,942,616 souls. Fifty years later, that is to say, at the time of the last census, it amounted to 21,121,967 souls, so that the resources of the Empire in this respect have been nearly as possible doubled. In the year 1811 the numbers were found to be 12,592,803. That year and the two years following were years of sanguinary war, and yet, when the military establishments of the country for 1814 came to be settled, no difficulty whatever was anticipated or experienced in providing 237,000 men for the regular army, and 83,000 for the regular militia. It is needless to add a syllable to these simple figures in proof of the ability of England to maintain a competent army. The material exists in abundance—the work is one of purveyance and manufacture alone. The actual progress of recruiting at this moment is in one respect satisfactory enough. Men pour in rapidly; in some weeks from 1,500 to 2,000 soldiers have been added to the army, and the average rate would undoubtedly yield a body of 60,000 as the aggregate result of the year. It is affirmed, however, as the reader will observe in our correspondence, that the quality of the new levies is not always so good as it should be—that the recruits are young and undersized, that they do not resemble the recruits of former days, and that the pith and marrow of Britain are not to be found, as of old, among the aspirants to the profession of arms. To what extent these exceptions are sustainable we do not attempt to determine, but the subject deserves attentive consideration.—*Times.*

CREEL EVICTIONS.—The *Morning Star* of Tuesday has the following:—"A paragraph, which we copy from a paper published in the north of Scotland, represents a sorry state of things as between the peers and the peasants in that quarter of Her Majesty's dominions which so regularly enjoys the advantage of her own royal presence. The power of property is something wonderful in this land of ours, and the rights of humanity seem as nothing in the scale. The story we speak of is but one of a thousand, no doubt, all of the same character. On the estate of the Duke of Sutherland, Donald Murray, his sister, and two helpless babes were turned out of their huts, and but for the Christian charity of a minister of Christ, they might have had to resort to the schemes of the Red Indian. Advised that the Duke had no lawful right to eject them, and pending a legal action taken on his behalf by some good soul, Murray and his little one again re-entered the cottage; but what followed? A second caution took place, and to make it final, his Grace—what a title in such a case!—ordered it to be burnt down. The best was executed; the hut razed to the ground, and various articles of poor Donald's furniture destroyed. This is an event that makes not much noise in the papers, but is it not cruel? What law can sanctify it? And can the proud Duke of Sutherland suppose that God will forgive such wrongs, even though perpetrated in the name of law?" An "English Catholic" comments upon the above in the *Star* of Wednesday thus:—"Sir, In your summary to-day you call attention to a very grievous case of eviction of a Scotch tenant

of the Duke of Sutherland; in June last—a case which contrasts strangely with the philanthropic profession in regard to American slaves, for which the Sutherland family is tolerably well known. But, if this eviction of a single Scotch family be enough to rouse the indignation of every Englishman, who reads the account of it (and such will most certainly be the result), how loud should be the cry of execration at the Irish evictions, which are not of one family, nor of one Irishman, nor of ten thousand families, but of a good million of souls? Why, Sir, for five miles, as you enter the town of Castlebar, the road is walled on either side with the stones taken from the gable ends of the cottages of tenants evicted with more barbarous circumstances, in very many cases, than those of the Scotchman. You cannot ride five miles throughout the three southern provinces of Ireland without being struck by the number of roofless gables which tell similar tales of hardship, beggary, starvation, or emigration. And even more, the same system is being pursued in the very face of the most pressing want of men for the Indian army. Such a system may be legal, but most certain it is not politic. You remark that there is less dissatisfaction in Ireland than in the Ionian Islands towards the British Government. Surely, if this be true, in the face of such just cause for dissatisfaction on the part of the Irish, the fact ought to be a complete answer to the late ferocious attacks upon Catholics by the *Times*, which, while it bullies us on our religion, loses no opportunity of taunting the 'Irish Sepoys' with their want of success in exciting dissatisfaction. On the other hand, if you be mistaken, if hostility to England be widely felt in Ireland, what a comment is that upon the English rule there! It is calculated that the population of Ireland is decreasing at the rate of a quarter of a million per annum.

A TALE OF A TIGER.—A few days ago (the narrative is in all the journals) a Bengal tiger, on its way from the docks, where it had been landed, to the premises of Mr. Jamrach, an importer of such luxuries, broke loose, and, after running crouching along the street, sprang upon a poor child, and mangled him cruelly. Mr. Jamrach rushed to the rescue with a crowbar, and was dealing the savage animal a series of heavy blows, in order to deliver the boy, when the editor of a penny humanitarian paper came up, and begged Mr. Jamrach not to be hard on the poor beast, who knew no better than to mangle children, and had also a grievance in being restrained from his wild liberty. Mr. Jamrach rudely showed the mediator out of the way, and with a few more vigorous strokes discomfited the brute, and saved the child's life. The editor is virtuously indignant, and declares that Jamrach is no better than Havelock and Wilson.—*Punch.*

UNITED STATES.

THE MORMONS.—WASHINGTON, Nov. 17.—Advice has been received from Col. Alexander, substantially confirming the reports in the newspapers respecting the destruction of the contractor's trains by the Mormons. Brigham Young has issued a proclamation to the United States troops, defying the government, and counselling his people to hostilities in the most determined form, and ordering the troops to keep out of Utah. He says that if they desire to remain until spring, they may do so, provided they give up arms and ammunition. Col. Alexander, in reply, stated to Young that the troops were there by order of the President, and would be disposed of as the commanding General saw proper. The War Department has received some highly interesting official dispatches, including a proclamation of Brigham Young, declaring martial law in Utah. He claims the right to do so by virtue of his authority as Governor of the territory and Superintendent of Indian affairs, not having been suspended from exercising his functions, and by virtue of his power under the territorial organic act. He expressly forbids the United States troops entering the territory without his authority for doing so, and complains that the Mormons have not been treated as American citizens, and that the government of the United States has acted on misrepresentations—the object being to drive the Mormons from the territory. The language of the proclamation is emphatically in hostility to the authority of the United States, and is regarded here as a declaration of war.

WASHINGTON NOV. 19.—We learn from an intelligent gentleman who has spent two or three years among Salt Lake Mormons, a fact or two to confirm the suspicion that the recent horrible massacre of over 100 California emigrants by Santa Clara Indians was perpetrated under the influence of the Mormon leaders.

STEAMBOAT COLLISION ON THE MISSISSIPPI.—A terrible collision took place last Sunday night between two steamships on the Lower Mississippi. Twenty-five passengers were drowned, one of whom was Gen. Hamilton, formerly of South Carolina, now of Texas.

TORTURE IN THE UNITED STATES.—A Mrs. Decker of Staten Island having been indicted for manslaughter, in causing the death of a female apprentice by starvation and stripes, has brought a cross action, (or something in the nature of that), against the proprietors of a Sunday newspaper, who undertook to show that she had inflicted similar cruelties upon other little girls committed to her charge. The paper alluded to, printed the verdict of the Coroner's Jury, which found that "Anna Milton came to her death by being beaten in a brutal manner, and from exposure and want of food at the hands of Mrs. Matilda Decker." Anna the child in question, was sent from the benevolent institution of Mr. Pease, in the Five Points, to which the negligence of a drunken mother had consigned her, and her father was dead. The defence called the reverend gentleman, who swore that when the child left his custody on the 12th June, 1856, she was healthy and amiable; that she was apprenticed to Mrs. Decker, who showed herself to be a church-member; and that the next time he saw her she was dead in the house of her mistress, attired for the grave in the very clothes which he had provided for her, and bearing marks upon her person, which to his experienced eyes, plainly indicated corporal ill-usage before death. There was further evidence to show that Mrs. D. scolded, beat and whipped the child, ("if she got talking with her," said one witness, she never let her go without a whipping); that she poured hot water into her mouth; that she pursued the unfortunate, with a dog, when she ran away across the meadows; that she was found dead upon the carpet in the corner of the room; that she had before death been seen to hang her head and to groan moaningly; that when so sick that she could hardly walk she was obliged to perform menial offices, and was sent out of doors, and into the snow without stockings and shoes; that when she died she had only a bundle of skirts under her head for a pillow; that Mrs. Decker was a woman of a very violent and undisciplined temper, and was wont to beat her own son and stamp upon his head in a cruel and unusual manner. Other children, fortunately yet living, were put upon the stand who testified to the cruelties of this same mistress inflicted upon themselves. Sarah L. Townsend, aged 13 years to having been struck with a hatchet by Mrs. Decker, because she would not kill a cat; to having run away from her in cold weather in consequence of barbarous treatment; and to having been importuned by her mistress to tell a lie in order to explain certain bruises upon her head. Rachel Anderson, aged 14, testified that she was sent from a poor-house to live with Mrs. Decker: that she staid a week with her; that she was scourged with rods upon the back, feet and elsewhere, and that in the absence of Mrs. Decker she ran back to the poor-house from which she came.

HAS BEEN SOME CHANGES.—There is a clerk who has been in the New York post office forty years. He formerly carried the Southern mail in a bag under his arm across the river to Jersey City. The same mail now amounts to ten thousand pounds daily!

Large numbers of domestic servants in Buffalo are unable to find employment, although they offer to work for a mere trifle and their board.

From East to West, from Baltimore to Kansas, it is often as much as a man's life is worth to vote on the side opposed to the predominant faction, and from Maine to California tales of stuffing ballot boxes, fraudulent voting and all similar artifices are so current that men are losing faith in all election returns. Whether the reports are true or false, in particular cases we may not know. But the report itself proves that such things do exist, for none would accuse others falsely of these things but the men who practice them.—*Hoson Paper.*

CONVICTION OF PROTESTANTISM.—The last number of the *Mercersburgh Review* contains an able article of Dr. Schaff, in the course of which he says:—"The number of church-members, even if we include all the sects, hardly amounts to five millions, or about one fifth of the whole population, and even from these five millions must be deducted thousands who profess religion from impure mercenary motives, and are perhaps much worse at heart than many men of the world."

CRIME AND OUTRAGE.—Our community and country, in point of crime, present at the present time a sad and melancholy reality. The blackest and wickedest deed seem to be perpetrated with a facility and a frequency truly appalling. We cannot take up a paper that does not contain a minute detail of a burglary, a robbery, a murder in all their shocking and hideous forms. The policy of giving publicity to those deeds of human depravity is certainly very questionable; whilst, to us, under existing circumstances, it appears to be a course well calculated to produce a multiplicity of these evil doings, to be deprecated by every good member of society. Our Press, the palladium of our liberties, ought to know, that without morality, there can be no real liberty; and that the absence of the one will cause the other to degenerate into licentiousness. Society, in this state, would not exist, and if it did, it would not be worth the having. Giant-like, it would rise in its might and rid itself of the pestiferous incubus. But it would be by establishing itself on a different basis from that which it formerly existed. We need not appeal to history for proof of what we write. A certain amount of endurance will be submitted to; but proceed further and there will be no suffrance; on the contrary, there will be not an opposition in proportion to the previous grievance. The recollection of the past will bring up ideas, which will drive their subject to the adoption of schemes and views at the beginning not at all contemplated. To this, history testifies; and we are convinced that her lessons ought not to be lost on the press of our country. Their accountability is great before God, and before appreciating men too; and if, to make their journals popular, they have to pander to the morbid taste of their readers, by giving, *usque ad nauseam*, a detailed account of the deeds with which we have headed this article. Far better were it, if we had no journals and no readers, than to have generated by such means a vicious and corrupt state of society. Our youth are, it is well known, more precocious, more advanced for their years, than those probably of any other civilized country; they read the reports in the papers (they too are readers) of those things, which St. Paul says should not be mentioned among Christians, and the pernicious effects upon their tender minds, are as adherent as their very garments. They congregate together, and the aggregate evil knowledge of all, derived from polluted sources of information, is brought to bear upon the body, and plays itself with force in disseminating itself, making each one to have the cumulative experience and information of all. We do not deny that there are some children, whose parents endeavor to keep from "evil communications," but they often find it a difficult duty, especially in towns and cities; and in view of the constant application to business. Yet, thank God, they often succeed, chiefly in the Catholic Church, and outside it too, we often meet with a full recognition of parental duties and responsibilities. But, whilst we make this acknowledgement, none can deny that the majority of the youth of our country are fast degenerating. That it is the duty of every good citizen as far as in him lies, to apply the remedy; and especially of the press, to create nothing injurious to the morals of their readers. If this were adopted, we would not find recorded, as we now do, "crimes and outrages," which in the end would be the wreck and ruin of society, and of the established order of things. Every day's experience brings us the sad intelligence that crime is on the increase, and with a ratio as to be the well-spring of alarm even to the most apathetic. This increase stands in the same relation as any other cause to its effects; and if we look for its cause, we might find it in the system of education that is pursued throughout the country. Education without religion enables a person only to become the worse member of society, and when educated, or partially so, they have spread broadcast before them scenes and diagrams of vice and its horrors. And hence no wonder that we have now in the commission of lawless deeds an ingenuity displayed, which betrays the efficiency of adepts in crime.—*Pittsburgh Catholic.*

PRIVATE MORALS IN PUBLIC LIFE.—More than once in our day have we heard it urged in regard to public men, local and national, that their private morality had nothing to do with their public life, and that society had no business to discuss the former to the prejudice of the latter. We totally dissent from such a doctrine. The people, who make up the body politic, have a vast deal at stake on the question of the private as well as of the public morals of public men. The whole past life of these is, necessarily and justly made the test of how far they are entitled to public confidence and respect. After Demosthenes had been corrupted to betray Athens by the bribe of a golden cup, could Athens be expected longer to repose confidence in his virtue? Were Demosthenes thereafter up for Athenian suffrages, ought he to win them, though his eloquence were more than mortal, and his genius without compare? Or, should Athenians thereafter overlook, under any public circumstances, the corruption that had tarnished their orator's name and fame? No height of public place, no measure of genius, could save Lord Bacon from the public infamy due to his private and public misdeeds. He was justly execrated and overwhelmed by them.

The higher the position occupied or aspired to, in public as in private life, the closer and keener should be the scrutiny of those who grant or create the position. The press and public have everything to do with the lives and morals of men who seek to be their public representatives and servants. The character of the people and country is at stake in the matter, and their morals and intelligence may well be judged by those of their public favorites.

The man of vicious private life cannot be expected, whatever his talent, to be virtuous and patriotic, simply because elevated to public place and trust. He will, more or less, carry his private morals into public life. Caligula and Nero had talent enough, but it was devilish, especially when spurred on by their atrocious moral instincts and aptitudes. Murat was a man of tact and talent, but his moral nature made him a brute and a fiend.

The people are always safe when they elevate such men as Fabricius and Cincinnatus—men whose private lives are the guarantee of their public virtues. Men who are disreputable in private life, we would hold disreputable in public life. We abhor the too common notion that man may be anything, politically, without staining his private character. We no less abominate the doctrine that a man may be anything and everything in private life, without, politically speaking, losing his claim to public respect. We know but one kind of morals, and that kind makes the bad man bad everywhere, and the good man good everywhere.—*Catholic Herald.*