

and seem to be an important part of the business of our lives, and a foreigner may be forgiven for supposing that we conceive the *ne plus ultra* of human happiness to consist in a well furnished table.—*Portfolio*.

EFFECTS OF AFFLICTIONS.—How different are summer storms from winter ones! In winter they rush over the earth with their violence, and if any poor remnants of foliage or flowers have lingered behind, these are swept behind at one gust. Nothing is left but desolation, and long after the rain has ceased, pools of water and mud bear tokens of what has been. But when the clouds have poured out their torrents in summer; when the winds have spent their fury, and the sun breaks forth again in glory, all things seem to rise with renewed loveliness from their refreshing bath. The flowers, glistening with rainbows, smell sweeter than before; the grass seems to have gained another brighter shade of green; and the young plants, which had hardly come into sight, have taken their place among their fellows in the borders, so quickly have they sprung among the showers. The air, too, which may previously have been oppressive, is become clear, and soft, and fresh. Such, too, is the difference when the storms of affliction fall on hearts unrenewed by Christian faith, and on those who abide in Christ. In the former, they bring out the dreariness and desolation, which may before have been unapparent. The gloom is not relieved by the prospect of any cheering ray to follow it; of any flowers or fruits to show its beneficence. But in the true Christian soul, "though weeping may endure for a night, joy cometh in the morning." A sweet smile of hope and love follows every tear; and tribulation itself is turned into the chief of blessings.

WHICH ARE THE REAL S. ANTHONY'S BONES?
—There is a French dispute which will astonish the civilized world. A solemn question is raised,—and archbishops, bishops, priests, monks, and people are in the deepest excitement about it, so that it is formally referred to the Holy See, not for the first time,—whether the genuine relics of St. Anthony, which have been offered to veneration for three hundred years in the Church of St. Julian at Arles, and guaranteed by a Papal bull; do not really repose at St. Anthony's own Church in Dauphiné? The Abbé Dussy declares it, and on Papal authority too! Was it not in Dauphiné that these relics, brought from the mountains by one of their barons in 1070, cured that diseased child known as St. Anthony's Fire? Has not a Pope before now declared the relics at Arles to be spurious? The Archbishop is enraged at the hypothesis, and the people of Arles are in a fever. A kind proposition, offered by meditators, that "they can point out two Anthonys,—him of the desert, and him of Lefins,"—is rejected with indignation. The Pope shall himself decide once more, and his decision shall (for his time) be binding! In the meantime the good people are urged to go on pilgrimage to the Holy Land, whose relics are not so profanely cavilled at. "Caravans" (if that be the fit name) from Paris and Vienna, are to take ship at Marseilles and Trieste forthwith, to arrive at Jerusalem by Holy Week.—*Literary Churchman*.

SALE OF JAPANESE GOODS.—A sale of a somewhat novel character (says the *N. Y. Herald* of the 10th inst.) took place yesterday at the auction rooms of Leavitt, Delisser & Co., Broadway. The articles disposed of were a portion of a cargo of Japanese goods, which was brought to this port some weeks since by Capt. Badger, of the schooner "General Pierce." Those put up at auction and exposed to view in the saleroom were exquisite specimens of workmanship. One table was particularly deserving of notice. Its value is estimated at one thousand dollars, and the top is inlaid with a silver border, while the centre is intended to represent the sea, with numerous varieties of the fishy tribes swimming about in its transparent depths. The fishes are made of pearl and every fin and scale is as clearly defined as in a steel engraving. Another specimen of Japanese ingenuity was a sort of *gultum in parva* cabinet, with any number of drawers; a bottle formed of a peculiar kind of black wood, and several drinking glasses of the same material. On the top of the cabinet was a Japanese house, the doors of which, when opened, disclosed another set of drawers and various contrivances, the use of which would puzzle any one but a Japanese. We may hope, however, in course of time to arrive at a knowledge of these things, and a great many other curiosities which those people have hitherto endeavored to hold from the knowledge of the rest of the world. The sale commenced about ten o'clock, and there were some what over a hundred persons present, a large number of whom were ladies.

CONFISCATION OF CHURCH PROPERTY IN MEXICO.

Our readers, we presume, are already aware of the confiscation of the property of the Roman Church in Mexico. It is impossible to say what is the exact or even approximate value of the property thus confiscated. Some authorities set down the whole ecclesiastical property of Mexico as high as four hundred millions of dollars—although it is said that one-fourth of the whole is unproductive. This vast wealth yields the clergy an annual income of about \$12,000,000. The Church establishment thus supported consists of the Archbishop of Mexico and nine Bishops, whose aggregate income amounts to \$239,000. The number of parochial clergy is 3,677. There are also ten cathedrals, having 168 canons and other dignitaries, and one collegiate church. The regular clergy comprise 1,878 monks, chiefly Franciscan, and there are 166 convents.

Ecclesiastical property in Mexico has hitherto been free from taxation, and the management of all property bequeathed to the Church for pious uses, such for instance as raising chapels and saying masses for the souls of the donors, has always been in the hands of the clergy. It is more especially this last species of Church property, estimated by Baron Humboldt, some fifty years ago, to be worth \$40,000,000, which it is intended at present to confiscate. The greater part of this vast property is administered by chaplains who perform no parochial duties whatever. Dr. Jose More one of the most intelligent men in Mexico, thought that Humboldt had underrated the extent of these donations, which he estimated at near eighty millions of dollars.

In the year 1804, the King of Spain ordered the funds of these religious donations to be seized and confiscated. Of course, the clergy protested against this measure, but without avail. At that time the estimated value of the property in question was between forty and fifty millions of dollars. The Government contented itself with only seven millions, and left the remainder untouched. The war of independence which followed greatly diminished the value of these funds, but subsequent endowments and the careful administration of the clergy repaired the loss, so that in 1831 the sum total of that kind of property had become worth nearly \$80,000,000, and of course is worth more valuable now.

This property is entirely distinct from that possessed by the regular clergy, and if we estimate it at \$100,000,000, and the unproductive property of the Mexican Church at another \$100,000,000, it would leave \$200,000,000 of property in the hands of the regular clergy, upon the supposition that the whole ecclesiastical property of the republic amounts to \$400,000,000. Of this \$200,000,000, a large proportion consists of the rich monasteries and convents with which the country abounds.

William George Stewart, a corner in the Insolvent Court, aged 24, applied last week to the Insolvent Court, to be discharged from prison. The young man, it appeared, joined his regiment in 1853, receiving 8s. a-day pay; his father also allowed him £300 a-year; with these means he came before the court £5,548 in debt, of which sum £3,250 was without consideration, incurred by bill transactions, many of them being with Lord Forth, of Crimmon notoriety, some time since outlawed. A host of West-end tailors, outfitters, and hosiers were creditors. Judgment was deferred.

Under the title of *Rendlesham v. Roberts*, the great Thelluson will case has again come before the public. Mr. Thelluson, it may be remembered, the son of a Genevese minister in Paris, acquired a large fortune as a merchant in London, which he left by will, dated 1796, to his descendants in tail male, but so that it could not fall into possession till about the year 1808, by which time it is calculated the property will amount to £2,000,000. In this will Thelluson particularly required that the Legislature would not alter the charter of his bequest, but would allow the money which he had earned by his industry and earned honestly "to accumulate so as to make his family, when the accumulations came into possession, one of the richest in Europe. From the time of the testator's death up to the present day continued litigation has resulted from his eccentric directions, and the cases now principally entitled are the eldest branch of Lord Rendlesham's family, as to whose relays claims Mr. Roundell Palmer was about to reap the case in the Rolls' Court on Wednesday morn'g, when he was interrupted by his Honor the later, who declined to go further into it than to make such a formal decree as would enable the whole question to be carried on appeal to the House of Lords, where alone it was likely to be effectually and finally disposed of.

The widow of the late Vicar Swindon, Mrs. Crooby, left in her will, among other bequests to religious societies "carried on London," a sum of two thousand pounds to "the Clergy Society." Four societies have claimed the bequest, the "Friends of the Clergy," the Incorporation of the Sons of the Clergy, the "Pious Clergy Society," and the "Clergy Charity within the diocese of Gloucester and Bristol, it be contended on the

part of the last named society that the words "carried on in London" were inserted by the person who drew up the will without authority. The matter came before Vice-Chancellor Sir W. P. Wood on Saturday for settlement. Various affidavits were read on behalf of the several claimants for the purpose of endeavouring to show the intentions of the testatrix by the words "the Clergy Society," but the evidence was not, in the Vice-Chancellor's mind sufficiently strong to enable the Court to assign the legacy to any one in particular, and his Honour ultimately decided to direct a scheme in favor of the clergymen of the Church of England in a distressed state in London, feeling bound, he said, by the testatrix in the first part of the bequest, to limit the locality and confirm the benefit to London.

We are glad to find that we were justified last week in withholding the name of the gentleman mentioned by the *Weekly Register* as a recent convert to the Roman Catholic Church. The announcement took the following form, and was printed among the leading articles in the usual prominent type:—

"Catholics will recognise the fruits of the Church's devotion to the month of Mary in the recent conversion of the Rev. F. Temple, late head of the Government Training College at Knellerhall, referred in his own affecting words in his last moments to her intercession."

Mr. Temple has contradicted the statement, adding—"I have not the slightest inclination to become a Roman Catholic." The *Register* now says it copied the statement from the *Armonia*, a Turin paper, and is very glad to find Mr. Temple is not dead.—*Guardian*, June 11.

The Emperor Napoleon has sent a Bill before the legislative Senate, endowing the three married daughters of Louis Philippe with the annual sum of 800,000 francs. The preamble uses the word *benivolence* as expressing the motive of the act—a word that has called forth an indignant protest from the three brothers of the Princesses, which is published in the *Indépendance Belge*, as follows:—
Claremont, June 25.

"Having been informed some time since that a bill was under preparation with a view to modify the decrees of confiscation of the 22d January, 1852, we confined ourselves by requesting our friends to decline in an absolute manner taking any steps that make us participators in this feeble attempt at reparation. Reasons of delicacy and affection for foreign but, on reading the *Indépendance Belge*, which has been submitted to us, we found therein a word which our respect for the memory of our father, and our own self esteem, could not allow us to leave without a reply. It is the word *benivolence*. Benevolence can only be exercised where there is no rightful claim. Now, our claims are founded on the authority of the law, and the justice of the country confirmed it, until the day when justice itself had to cede to force. Benevolence, then, which denies a right, is, therefore, a new attack on the memory of our father, and we must repel it. In 1852, a policy, accustomed to look upon money as an instrument of revolution, tried to take precautions against us by confiscating the property of our family. It endeavoured to give a colouring to the injustice and violence of its proceedings by considerations revolting to the public conscience, and against which we protested at the time. To-day the word 'benevolence' applied to the proposed measure, implies the same idea as those considerations, and this is why we renew our protest. Perhaps by so doing we may be obeying a sentiment of exaggerated susceptibility; when so much remains to France of the blessings of the government of our father, who dare say that he reigns only for narrow family interests? The Frenchman ever devoted to his country, who in 1792 fought as soldier to repel foreign invasion; the King who, for eighteen years, knew how to make France free as well as prosperous; the King who gave it that army, the heroism of which has just covered our flags with new glory; that King is for ever above the attacks of calumny.

"P. D'ORLEANS, Duke of Nemours.

"F. D'ORLEANS, Prince de Joinville.

"H. D'ORLEANS, Duke of Aumale."

In a case heard before Vice-Chancellor Wood last week, the plaintiff named *Gough*, was a man who had been sentenced to death in 1812, transported for life in commutation, and finally pardoned unconditionally. Since then he had become entitled under a will to participate in a sum of 7,000l. stock. The Crown, however, opposed his claim to participate, on the ground that he had forfeited ordinary civil rights. The Vice-Chancellor decided in favour of the plaintiff, holding that his rights were restored to him by the pardon.