

MORE ORANGE OUTRAGES.—The Orangemen in the neighborhood of Portadown seem determined not to let their hands out of the practice of doing mischief. On last Thursday night, about the hour of midnight, a number of them, shouting, "To hell with the Pope," and using other like expressions, marched to attack the houses of some of the Catholics in the parish of Seago. They commenced at the house of an humble, unoffending man, a weaver named Terence McKewen, in Edenderry, and, having smashed his windows and doors, they proceeded inward a distance of nearly two miles, to the house of another humble, and inoffensive man, named John Hillen, a weaver, and who also holds the office of sexton to the Catholic chapel of Loyola. Here also they commenced the work of demolition, not leaving a whole pane of glass in the house, and smashing in the door which had been well protected, by a strong iron bar, but the ruffians used very large stones in their nefarious attack, many of which were found inside afterwards, some of them weighing even up to fourteen pounds. —[Correspondent of Freeman.]

It must sorely disgust men of the fiery stamp of Mr. Johnson of Ballykillbeg to observe how rapidly the most cherished Orange festivals are losing political significance and descending to the level of mere popular holidays. This degeneracy was painfully apparent in the celebration of the anniversary of the relief of Derry on Wednesday. The "Prentice Boys" performed their part to the letter, but not in the spirit of their ancestors. There were the usual processions, the prescribed number of guns were fired from the ramparts, the proper thanksgiving was rendered in church, and the Bishop of Derry preached an appropriate sermon, after which the Prentices assembled to hear more exciting discourses in the Corporation Hall, where Mr. Johnson was the orator of the day. But an air of levity—an unworthy holiday-making spirit—prevailing the performance and utterly destroyed its effect as a solemn political demonstration. It was a protest against Popery only in an incidental and casual sort of way. It was painfully evident that the principal object of the masses in the streets was simple amusement, and that the ringing of the bells and the firing of the cannons were but empty sounds of defiance, the mere faint echo of the exploded Protestant thunder. Mr. Johnson seemed to be the only man who carried anything of earnestness into the performance. His speech certainly denoted a determination to do something effective against Popery, but unfortunately he did not seem to know exactly what to do and had to content himself with vague declarations of a determination never to surrender under any circumstances to anybody. This, no doubt, is an extremely important fact, and it is all the meaning we have been able to extract out of the entire celebration.

Scully is, according to the latest accounts, progressing more rapidly than from the nature of his wounds, could have been expected. He is now able to walk a short distance, but the ball which was lodged in his neck has not yet been extracted. So far from repenting of his evil deeds, he is, it appears, about to thank God for his escape from a violent death by making another raid on his unfortunate tenantry. The "Waterford Mail" states that on Saturday he was engaged cleaning his arms, so that it is not unlikely that before long we shall hear of another affair upon his property. The "Waterford Citizen," "Kilkenny Journal," and other papers, are publishing particulars of the past life of this wretched man. His brother, James Scully, was murdered at Kilsale, near Tipperary, several years ago, and William Scully succeeded to his property. The murderer of his brother was never brought to justice, although popular opinion attributed the crime to one upon whom the police could have easily laid hands. Since then William Scully has proved himself a tyrant of the worst type, and has on more than one occasion stood in the front of the law. In 1849 he was tried at the Criminal Assizes for shooting the Bergins. No doubt he was entertained of his guilt; but, fortunately for him, he was tried by a jury of landlords of the time Cromwellian stamp, and they acquitted him. In 1866 he was tried for a brutal and cowardly assault committed on a Mrs. Toban, at Gurtanag, near Ballingarry, in the county Tipperary. He was less fortunate than on the former occasion, and, having been found guilty, was sentenced to twelve months imprisonment, with hard labor, together with being fined £100. Fearful stories are told of his cruelty and dishonesty to his tenants, and of the misery which he has caused by his evictions. But William Scully although a tyrant and a knave, and, possibly, something worse than either, is a pious man, and doctrinally sound. About eight years ago he became a member of the Established Church, of which he still continues a staunch supporter. The reason of his change of religion is said to be that whilst he remained a "Papist" he could not receive as much assistance in the work of extermination from the police, as he has since been able to command. He is no credit to any church.—*Irishman.*

A GOOD LANDLORD.—I do not know a greater earthly blessing than a good landlord, a man who acts on the principle of living and let live according to the rule of doing to others as one would be done unto. Such is the Earl of Caryfort. During the late thunder-storm, three milch cows belonging to the widow Wolham, of Ballykillbeg, one of his lordship's tenants, were killed by lightning, and when he heard of it he sent her £33, the gift of himself and his son, the Hon. W. Proby, to enable her to replace them. This act is only in keeping with his uniform treatment of his tenants. In 1849 he wiped away all arrears accumulated during the famine years, and gave leases to all his tenants according to the government valuation, excepting his Roman Catholic tenants from the payment of tithe-rent charge. He keeps a highly intelligent and respectable agricultural instructor on the estate to improve the stock of his tenants and to enable them to drain their bogs and wet fields with the least expense and the utmost benefit to themselves. He gives timber and slaves to those who wish to build.—[Correspondent of Freeman.]

THE ESTABLISHED CHURCH IN IRELAND.—Archdeacon Denison has addressed to a contemporary a letter in reference to the difficulties connected with the use of the words "United Church of England and Ireland," in the recent address to the Crown. He defends the use of the expression on the following grounds:—1. Because it expresses the oneness of the churches. 2. Because it has so long formed a part of the title page of the book of common prayer. If we had used any other expression, I think we should have justly been open to great exception, and have put very considerable difficulties in our way. "I am unable," continues the venerable archdeacon, "to see that the expression implies that there was a time when the churches were not one. It is true that the form of expression was adopted by the act of the Legislature, without concurrence of the assemblies of the spirituality; but the fault is not in such non-concurrence, but in the fact that those assemblies were at that time, I think, an absence—the blame of which must, I think, be shared between Church and State. I trust this may appear to you a sufficient answer to your difficulty. It would be a great misfortune if difficulties of this kind were allowed to operate against the signature of those who are as one with us in respect of the substance of the address. What we want to do is, so far as we may, to poll the clergy and the people of the United Kingdom against disestablishment and disendowment, and I may perhaps be allowed to express my earnest hope that this great object may be generally grasped, and not be allowed to be interfered with by this or that difficulty of detail which, after all, does not affect its substance."—[Daily News.]

On the recommendation of Lord Carew, the Lord Chancellor has been pleased to appoint Francis Rowell, of Badminton Castle, Esq., a Justice of the Peace for the County Wexford.

GREAT BRITAIN.

LIVERPOOL, Sept. 4.—At the coroner's inquest on the bodies of the victims of the "Aberglwyb" Railway disaster, concluded to-day, the jury brought in a verdict of manslaughter against Williams and Jones, the brakemen on the goods train, for criminal negligence.

LONDON, Sept. 9.—On Thursday night the police arrested a man named August Byrne, at his lodgings in this city, on suspicion of connection with the Fenians. He was arraigned for preliminary examination, and the policemen who made the arrest testified to finding a large quantity of small arms, &c., secreted on the premises. The prisoner was remanded for trial.

It is semi-officially announced that Parliament will be dissolved on Monday, November 9, and that the borough elections will take place on the fourth and the county elections on the seventh day after that date.

THE PROTESTANT REFORMATION.—A clergyman of the Church of England, the Rev. F. G. Lee, from whose letter to Mr. Gathorne Hardy the Tory journals are culled new stories of Mr. Gladstone's secret negotiations with the Church of Rome, thus writes of the Protestant Reformation in England:—"The religious changes of the sixteenth century were commenced by a monarch who had murdered his wives, overthrown a statesman who had murdered his brother, and completed by a queen who had murdered her guest."—[Daily News.]

The Public Peace! Does Mr. Murphy know so much as what the Public Peace is? Does he know that the industry and the trade of the country hang upon its maintenance, and that if it is broken, nay, if it is so much as threatened and threatened money ceases from its wholesome activity, and withdraws itself within the hidden coffers of those who possess it? That withdrawal is followed by stagnation of enterprise and speculation; employment is checked, and thousands who depend upon weekly earnings find themselves without means, and curse the preaching of reckless fanatics who have converted centres of industry into battle fields, in order that they may revel in the debauchery of destruction, and satisfy the cravings of the Devil of Secularism, whom they mistake for a God and worship. Does it not suggest itself even to the mind of Mr. Murphy that the man who does this, or aids in doing it, may chance to be beaten some day with many stripes of a character far less tolerable than those which we suggested as the fitting punishment for the ruffians who threw up their caps at Ashton in his honor? But, says Mr. Murphy in his defence, and by way of self-justification, the dignitaries and the priests of the Roman Church have been as bad or worse than I have; and Mr. Murphy adduces instances of violent language, and of outrageous and even diabolical expressions, on the part of journals under the influence of Romanist prelates, and on the part of individual priests. We will not dispute the accuracy of these statements; correct or incorrect, they are not to the purpose. The language of the persons, if it was used, has not provoked any action, as Mr. Murphy's has, neither has it been brought under our notice by any consequent outbreak of violence, of plunder, and of murderous onslaughts. Had such been the case, we should have dealt with the conduct of the offenders as we have dealt with that of Mr. Murphy. Language is a great weapon, wonderfully effective for good or for evil, and those who have the gift of it have a serious trust which they are bound to exercise most carefully. Mr. Murphy has abused that gift grossly and maliciously. That is why we, although we are, as he professes himself, Protestants, and worship, as he rightly says, in the same churches, have held him up to reprobation. It was our duty. Mr. Murphy, by the fact of his addressing us shows that he is not insensible to public opinion. We trust the conviction that it is against him will prevent a repetition of the conduct which has provoked his adverse expression, and that he will have had his eyes opened to the truth that if your enemy teach you a lesson in wickedness it is not consistent with Christianity to attempt to better the instruction.—[Post.]

ADAPTING INSTITUTIONS TO FACTS—THE CHURCH YESTERDAY AND TO-DAY.—The speakers at the Crystal Palace on Monday would be set down by regular polemicists as a rather motley assemblage, but in one respect they were neither better nor worse than the bulk of the learned and sharp-witted gentlemen figuring in the Irish Church controversy. They indulged in the widest latitude of expression as to the essential idea, the thing, the institution, the doctrine, or the polity for which they are supposed to be contending. Sufficiently aware that the terms of a challenge thrown down, not to this country alone, but to the whole civilized world should be intelligible, distinct, and even emphatic, they offer us a variety of phrases which even in the mouth of one man, are seldom harmonized or compatible. Sometimes it is the Protestant sovereign, sometimes the sovereign is bound to maintain the Church of England and Ireland. Sometimes it is the Protestant constitution, sometimes the Protestant Church, sometimes Protestantism, or the Protestant religion in the wider sense, sometimes the union of Church and State, sometimes simply the Act of Settlement. Then it is the great and glorious constitution, as it has existed for the 300 years—this is since the tenth year of Elizabeth's reign. Then we find combined in the same resolution an alliance between Church and State, the spirit of Christianity and the union of the State with the Church of the Reformation. Now, deign to introduce some new varieties of definition. He stands up for the union of the State with the Church in England, which naturally brings him to the Bill of Rights. He further explains that his union is that which exists between the Protestant Church and the Protestant State of England, and to the full understanding and enjoyment of which Protestant Christianity is necessary. Then he insists upon it that freedom and Protestantism are inseparable, and that neither can hold its ground without the other so that ours is the only free Church, ours the only free constitution, because they are happily both Protestant. The speaker who followed conceived the object of the demonstration to be none of these things, and to have nothing to do with sovereigns, churches, and States, but to be simply that England should maintain her position among the nations of the earth as pre-eminently honoring God and upholding His pure Gospel. Under all this variety of principle and phrase there was one proposal common to all the speakers as being the very object of the demonstration and the actual bond of agreement for the day. It is to maintain things as they are. A demonstration which denounces all change, except, perhaps, some trifling matter of internal arrangement and domestic convenience, is, in fact, a protest in favor of the status quo. It amounts to an allegation that the existing State, with all its inconsistencies and defects, has supreme claims on our reason, our justice and our reverence. It means that we are as bound to maintain it as we will suppose, "the Jews were to maintain their theocracy or any living or inanimate symbol of the Divine government." Though lords, gentlemen and ministers of religion, collected from all parts of England, Ireland, and the colonies, would of course, express themselves somewhat differently, here was a common ground, the substratum of all their argument and harangues, and the one point to be defended against many millions of their countrymen; it was against many millions of things in these islands and in the whole of Her Majesty's dominions, for the colonies had their representatives. This is something tangible. If we cannot always understand it we can see it and believe it. This is no abstract principle, no theory, none of our moonshine, but things just as they are. Use your eyes and you will see it. But included in this actual state of things is the living policy of the country, which is continually adapting institutions to the facts. We are a self-

governing country, and we make laws to suit our selves, as far as the several sections into which we are divided have power to overcome or to persuade the rest. The Church of England cannot help having only about half the population of England, only an eighth of Ireland, and hardly a percentage of Scotland. If the course of legislation is to go by the proportion of figures she cannot expect much exceptional kindness in future. She will probably find, what is best for all of us, a fair, field and no favour, and have no reason to regret it. But this course of legislation was part of the actual state of things. Do the good Protestants who met at the Crystal Palace include this national habit and characteristic, or do they wish to put them out of their thoughts? When they are defending these happy islands from a supposed spiritual invader, ready to rob us of our best hopes and our liberty, do they feel that they are defending our right to govern ourselves upon our own notions of equity? Protestantism they regard as inseparable from freedom; and the free, they think, cannot be Protestant. But in what does freedom consist, unless in the power of a people to govern themselves, and to make laws for themselves, in conformity with their own opinions and feelings? If the five million Roman Catholics have to deal with a continental nation bent on repeating the Norman invasion, and compelling us to accept their temporal and spiritual rule, then a crusade and a rally at the Crystal Palace would be a most reasonable movement. The object would be to destroy the enemy as fast as they landed, or even before they could put foot on our shores. But the present case is very different. The supposed foe are part of our selves, with equal rights in the same constitution, under the same sovereign and the same laws, and animated by that spirit of independence and self-government on which we justly pride ourselves. We can no longer invoke against them the supposed spirit of a constitution united as one man against the errors and pretensions of Popery. In respect of these five millions the constitution is no longer Protestant, the Legislature is no longer Protestant, the laws are no longer Protestant, and the British empire is no longer Protestant. Were anybody to say that the religion of England was the Church of England, he would be immediately brought to the book and confronted with returns, showing that the Church can hardly claim more than half the population. So, also, when anybody chooses to describe this united realm as Protestant. Either the statement has no meaning at all or it has to be qualified with a distinct recognition of five millions in Ireland under the same sovereign, constitution, and laws, but who are Roman Catholics, animated with all our English spirit of freedom, and also with an intense hatred of our religion.—*Times.*

SAINT CRAMER.—When the *Saturday Review* applies the lash it is always usurping, whether or not the punishments be justly deserved. It has latterly made some rich exposures concerning the private lives and domestic manners of some of the venerable Fathers of the Reformation, and in so doing it has done good service to the cause of truth. In spite (it says) of the danger we incur of ecclesiastical censure from the authorities of Exeter Hall, and the imminent risk of being turned out of the Church of England in company with the impulsive gentleman who designated Edward VI. as a young tiger, we proceed to give an estimate of another reformer whose name and character for sanctity stands higher among Protestants than that of the Bishop who ran away with a butcher's wife, and was condemned to pay damages to the butcher for the injury he had done him. As for the Reformation, of the English Church, if it is to be judged by the character of Dr. John Poynter or of Dr. Thomas Cramer! Still, as we trust there are many who will appreciate the blessings of the Reformation who do not think it necessary to close their eyes or shut their ears against historical evidence, let us detail a few of the facts of Cramer's life. The connection between the two names is obvious, for Poynter was Cramer's chaplain, and Cramer was Poynter's patron, and we have before now known of a defence instituted for Poynter in the unfortunate affair of the butcher's wife, on the ground that, if he had been guilty, so good a man as Cramer would never have been present, a few months after the divorce, at the marriage of Poynter to his second or third wife (we pretend not to determine which it was) Maria Heywood. We have no sort of wish to press a weak style of argument as rests on the principle of *Nocuius sociis*, but we may be permitted to observe that any weight that attaches to Cramer's upholding Poynter, in case of there being any doubt of the guilt of the latter, must be allowed exactly the same force against Cramer in case of the guilt of Poynter being, as it has been, satisfactorily established. At Cambridge, we are told, he lost his fellowship through the barmaid of the Dolphin, but afterwards made chaplain to the Boleyn family—just the very post for which he was fitted. We need not repeat the story we have already told of Cramer's writing a book, and inventing a new theory of affinity, to cover the disgrace of Henry's attempt to marry Anne Boleyn after he had kept her sister Mary as a mistress, but at least they prove that Cramer was willing to defend the marriage of a daughter with the man who had committed adultery with her mother if it had been necessary, on the same ground precisely as that on which he defended the marrying Anne Boleyn. Again the same writer tells us that: "On the case of the oath taken by Cramer at his consecration, there is no loophole for escape. It was what in a court of justice of the present day would be called perjury. It was neither more nor less than this, that he privately professed before certain witnesses that he would not be bound by the oath which, in his name and with his entire acquiescence, was made by his deputy at Rome to the Pope, who was in utter ignorance of the whole transaction, which did not, indeed, take place till after the oath had been tendered at Rome. The Pope's Bull, dated February 23, 1533, suspends both him and his consecrators from all ecclesiastical dignity in case he does not personally take the oath of obedience to himself. Of course Cramer would have much preferred to dispense with the oath altogether and of course his three consecrators would have made no facious opposition to such a proceeding if the King would for a moment have countenanced such a departure from the ordinary routine. But on March 30th, the day of his consecration, he publicly took the oath, and privately protested beforehand that he would not be bound by its provisions. It has been disputed whether this protest was repeated after the consecration, but this point is unimportant to the charge of perjury, which consists in obtaining the Bull from Rome under false pretences. On this point Dr. Lingard says:—'Oaths cease to offer any security if their meaning may be qualified by previous protestations made without the knowledge of the party who is principally interested. Cramer's ideas of justice receive further illustration from his letter to Cromwell of May 17, 1533, in which he urges the King and his Vicar General to secrecy. Let the Queen should put in an appearance at Dunstable, after she had been pronounced contumacious for not appearing at the trial at which it had been previously arranged between the King and the Archbishop that the sentence for the divorce was to be pronounced. We are then regaled with the manner in which he carried his second wife about with him in a chest on his progress and visitations, and of his skillful letter to the King, whilst the subject of the guilt of Anne Boleyn was pending. As far as diplomacy goes it is perfect; as to its consistency with Christian charity, we will only observe that we have always been taught to believe that the utmost abhorrence of the sin is perfectly compatible with the utmost tenderness towards the sinner. But the Archbishop of Canterbury was of a different opinion. His words are:—'So if she be proved culpable, there is not one that loveth God and his Gospel that ever favors her, but must hate her above all other; and the more they favor Gospel the more they

will hate her.' For, then, there was never creature in our time that much slandered the Gospel. The same furore was acted again, *mutatis mutandis*, in the case of Anne of Cleves, and Catherine Howard. And the charge of hypocrisy, as shown in Cramer's abject servility in complying with everything that Henry commanded, is so completely established that it becomes unnecessary to inquire into the real changes or his religious convictions. But the day of retribution came. In the reign of Queen Mary he was (says the *Saturday Review*) tried for high treason and sentenced to be hanged, but was reserved for the more dreadful punishment of burning, on the charge of heresy. The statute under which he was condemned was never meant to apply to any but an obstinate heretic. And certainly, if Cramer was a heretic, he was entirely exempt from the charge of obstinacy. He unquestionably merited his pardon by complying with every request of his enemies, and six successive times signed recantations which he did not in his heart believe. He had earned the right to live, and if his judges only allowed him to live, the remainder of his life would, in all probability, have been harmless, and his name would have come down to posterity coupled with the exonerations of Catholics and Protestants alike.—[London Universe.]

The Crystal Palace Protestant demonstration, took place under the auspices of the 'Protestant Union,' and the proceedings were worthy of the originators and patrons of the demonstration. The committee expected one hundred thousand attendants. The Crystal Palace authorities calculated on thirty thousand, and the *Times* says that the audience fluctuated between 1,000 and 1,500. Lord Fitzwater took the chair, and opened the proceedings, but although the meeting was summoned in defence of the Throne, Church, and Constitution, and described on the tickets as 'a demonstration in support of the Established Church in Ireland, and our other national Protestant institutions,' his lordship's energy was almost exclusively expended upon the Ritualists. 'An election is coming on. Let it be a Protestant election. Return no Ritualist to Parliament. Tell the Government of the country that you will support them in putting down Ritualism; tell the Government of the country that you insist on their introducing legislative measures which shall enable churchwardens and the inhabitants of the poor parts of the country to bring to account those who attempt to imitate Roman Catholic ceremonies in our churches.' Mr. Foster (representing the Grand Orange Lodge of Ireland) went so far in defence of the throne as to say (if the *Times* report be trustworthy), 'If the Act of Union were good and valid the Imperial Parliament was unable to touch the Irish Church, and if it were not good and valid the members of the House of Commons were not the representatives of the Irish nation. If the Imperial Parliament arrogated to itself this power and usurped this authority—if an intolerant majority should rob a portion of the people of the United Kingdom, and if the crown loyal fellow-subjects, in honesty of purpose, resolved to raise arms in self defence—if 20,000 or 30,000 men did this, then would the standing army of Great Britain be allowed to be the mere tool of an arbitrary majority? (great cheering.) He said, 'Let the Parliament of Great Britain consider these things, and take his word that the Protestants of Ireland had this determination, and that he believed they would carry it out' (prolonged cheering.) If Mr. Foster, representing the Grand Orange Lodge of Ireland, does not mind what he is about, her Majesty's Attorney-General will be asking to have a word with him. To defend the Throne by suggesting doubts as to what the standing army would do, or to be allowed to do, if twenty or thirty thousand Protestants were to rise in arms against the Imperial Parliament, is venturing rather far upon grounds which better men than Mr. Foster have found dangerous. Another speaker paid the Archbishop of Westminster the compliment of intimating that he had found brains and arguments for all the advocates of disestablishment and disendowment in the House of Lords. And Mr. Holden said:—'Let the robber be ever so high, he should not be allowed to plunder them with impunity. He did not wish to use harsh language, but after all that a certain gentleman from South Lancashire—(his name)—had said and written, Judas Iscariot was a gentleman to him (laughter and cheers). The one betrayed the Head of Church, the other tried to betray the Church itself.' Even the *Standard* is scandalized at the language used and sentiments uttered and the great demonstration has brought discredit upon all concerned in it.—[London Tablet.]

Lord Amberley, the son and heir of Earl Russell, occupies a high place in the political and social circles of England. There exists, it seems in that blessed land a society called by the somewhat affected name of 'Dialectical' for the consideration of 'delicate topics not generally made the subject of discussion.' At one of these precious meetings the hopeful son of the great Whig house appealed to his audience to consider how best married women could be prevented from having large families! To Irish men and Irish women there is something so amenable in the very discussion that we fear we will be blamed for ever letting them know that such things are gravely made the subject of deliberation, not in the low haunts of the profligate and the dissolute, but in the intellectual and polished meetings of science in which Lord Amberley appears. The 'Globe' has copied from the 'Medical Times and Gazette' the nauseating and filthy nonsense which an English nobleman did not hesitate to utter and an English scientific journal to print. Probably most of our readers know that any attempt to stay the growth of an unborn child is a crime which the law justly and properly visits with the severest punishment. The sanctions of religion brand it as one of the blackest offences against the law of God. The instincts of nature revolt against it. Lord Amberley proposed in this Dialectical Society, to the medical men of England, that they should employ themselves in devising means by which this could be done without injury to the wretched mother's health. The advice has been printed in the chief medical journal. We take this on the credit of the 'Globe,' as we have not seen, and we confess we do not wish ever to see the 'Medical Times and Gazette.' Thus spoke to the medical body of England the accomplished stripling who has gone to other countries to learn the secret:—'He objected to celibacy. Well, then, the only remaining alternative seemed to him to be small families and, after all, it turned out to be a medical question how far this could best be accomplished without injury to the health. He wished much he could hear the proposals of the medical men in the room as to the best means of limiting numbers. In America, ladies were in the habit of keeping back their families, but the means they employed seemed to him to be dangerous to health. Hence he would much like to hear a discussion as to whether some innocuous measure might not be discovered.' We presume we shall presently have Lord Amberley's patent advertised.—[Dublin Irishman.]

RITUALISM.—The unfortunate results which have a ready followed the introduction of Ritualism into the Church seem only to act as an encouragement to the clergy to avow themselves Ritualists. The Wesleyans cry out that the Episcopalians are tampering with Popery, and even quite church-going people cannot quite understand what the new 'spiritual movement' is to end in. Whenever the great issue of the maintenance of the Church Establishment is raised it will be urged that the State is not even pledged to support a Church which is half in alliance with Rome. In the present unsettled condition of public feeling, the rector of St. Mary le Strand has applied for a faculty to alter the interior of his church so as to render it more suitable for ritualist observances. The vestry is about to oppose the rector. 'Meanwhile the church is closed.' Is this a state of affairs which Ritualists themselves can regard without re-

gret? Is there not some justice in the argument of Mr. Mail and others that the Church of England is not so much threatened by foes without as by foes within?—[Pall Mall Gazette.]

AN APPROPRIATE DEATH.—A fearful accident occurred on Tuesday at the coal depot of Mr. W. Liddell, Sunderland. The victim was a man named Bernard McGuinness, a coal cartman, aged 74 years. About breakfast time he went up to the landsale to try a horse he was about to take to Newcastle for sale, and attached it to a laden coal waggon, which he endeavored to make the animal draw into the coal depot. But the brute, being either restive or unwilling, refused. McGuinness thereupon struck the animal with his whip until the pain caused it to start forward, and he, unable to get out of the way, was knocked down with his head across the rail. The start of the horse set the coal waggon in motion, and before the bystanders could move a step to save the unfortunate man the wheel of the waggon passed over his neck and killed him on the spot. When the people picked up the lifeless corpse they were horrified to find that the head was nearly severed from the body. The fatal termination of the deceased's life had often been foretold by his neighbors. It was no unusual thing for him to lock the stable door and beat the animals until the cries aroused those who lived near him. Few dared to interfere owing to the blasphemous language they received from him. Many, however, prophesied that his cruelty to the dumb animals would some day cause his death.—[Express.]

UNITED STATES.

REV. ROBERT B. TILLOTSON.—A genial and lovable gentleman, a devoted and fervent Catholic, and a Priest that, as such, won many hearts to virtue, has ended a life of suffering by a pious death. Dr. John Henry Newman, the illustrious convert to the Catholic Church in England, many years ago, in a private letter to us, spoke of having received him into the Catholic Church, and in terms of great personal affection for him. Father Tillotson returned to his native New York, and exercised the priesthood at the church of St. Paul the Apostle, in Fifty-ninth street, along with Father Becker and his associates. The very slight personal acquaintance we had with him makes us understand how severe a blow his death has proved to those that knew him more intimately. A fuller notice of him, from one that knew him well, appears on the third page of this number of our paper.—[N. Y. Times.]

A RADICAL'S OPINION OF GRANT.—The Danbury (Conn.) *Times*, whose editor was a Union soldier, so that this year a Radical, has this item in regard to the General of the Army and the Radical candidate for the Presidency, General Grant. 'Where has his name won a single victory? Not in New Hampshire, nor in Connecticut. His named never caused any enthusiasm in the army until the army's work was done; and the prospect of being led into another slaughter-pen was obliterated, and his name in politics has not one convert to the cause which he has seen fit to shoulder. Silence is his statesmanship, obduracy is his firmness, deceit is his patriotism, and horses his ability. He has lived in smoke and will end in smoke.'

The New York 'Express' calls those queer religious papers, the Independent, Methodist, Evangelist, and Examiner, 'religious men of war,' for the reason that they have ceased to preach the gospel, and are chieftain in politics. These political Parsons are nothing without an adversary to pitch into, and now that slavery is extinct, they must needs have another 'painted devil' to exorcise. They have found it, and it is one the country has been long looking for. One of them sounds the note of charge in this line: 'Our next war will be between Liberty and Romanism.' So they must have another war, and new reserves of conscriptions, fat army contracts, and as the South is out of the way, the pious and aged Pope will serve their purpose. We agree with the Express, and can whisper in the ear of these puritanical gentlemen that if they are really intending to fight it out on that line, the sooner they open the ball the better—because as things are going on, Romanism, abjuring politics, and minding its own business, is spreading so fast that it soon will be too powerful to be taken in hand—especially as Puritanism, so rationalized now, and so interwoven with and demoralized by partisan politics, is rapidly ceasing to have any positive, distinctive power to grapple with anything or anybody.—[Mobile Register.]

The Director of the Bureau of Statistics furnishes the following information relative to immigration to the United States during the fiscal year ending June 30th.—The total number of passengers arrived is 323,649, of which 44,948 were citizens of the United States, and 5,126 foreigners not intending to remain in the United States, thus leaving the actual immigrants 293,677. These immigration returns, compared with those of 1866 and 1867, show a heavy falling off.

SOLITARY CONFINEMENT.—The Philadelphia penitentiary, being an institution designed for separate and solitary confinement, there are no large machine or workshops, no factories, no moving gangs of workmen convicts. The labor is all performed in the cells. Those engaged in chairmaking, shoemaking, weaving, jobbing, or what not, work in their own cells—eat there, drink there, sleep there. They never move out of them. Their day labor over, the dirt, scraps and shavings are swept in barrels and baskets, and removed by carriers. Of the poor fellows you see nothing. Outside workmen are employed to do what ever is required about the place. The prisoners are sedulously secluded in their rooms, and the visitor is not permitted even to view them. They are shut off from the outside world as completely as if dead. Their names are obliterated; they are known only by numbers. That is the extent of their individuality. Or relatives or friends they see but little. Once in a period of three months an inspector's pass admits a wife or a mother to a conference with her criminal though loved one, and even then such are the precautions of the prison discipline, that they meet and talk only through the bars of a cell-door and in the presence of an officer of the institution. Poor satisfaction for the lips that moan for a kiss—for the heart that yearningly throbs for an embrace! Fifteen or twenty minutes also is the brief time allowed for the meeting. There are in the institution at the present time somewhat over 600 convicts.

The Newburyport, Mass., *Herald* (Republican) says: 'Shipbuilding has not entirely ceased in Maine. There are a dozen or more large vessels building on the Kennebec, and occasionally the launch of a ship is elsewhere reported. It is however, sad to think of the destruction of American commerce that has already taken place, and the poor prospect of the future. Before 1860 American shipping was our pride and boast, and if there was anything in which we excelled other nations, it was in ship building and ship sailing; but, unless proper steps are taken, we shall soon be limited to the coastwise commerce.'

A letter in the Rome (Ga) *Courier* thus described the proceedings in the colored church in that city recently. 'At a recent attendance on this admirable mockery of religious service, we heard a white voice sing out, "I'm gwine to heben on a white horse." Another jumped up and echoed, "Bless de Lord, here's a poor sister gwine to heben on a black mule." One raised her hands, and, with eyes fixed on the ceiling, screamed, "I see Jesus a looking at me." Another replied, "I see him too, a looking out de window at me." Another cried out, "Bless de Lord, I see Jesus to send down a rope and I'll climb up to heben." This last idea struck a dozen or more with force, and they jumped up and down, shouting, "Send de rope, and we'll all climb to heben."'

'Surprise weddings' are the latest novelty at Cleveland, Ohio. They take at picnics, camp meetings, excursions, and the like.