

carried to excess, is prohibited as far as Prince Alfred is concerned, and upon one occasion, we believe, his Royal Highness had his leave stopped for a fortnight for being detected in the act of "blowing a cloud."

The effects of the strike in the building trades have entered as an important item into the Registrar-General's report—important and sad. As the strike went on the mortality rose. Men, women, and children, died off of sheer hunger. As long as there was bread, the children had it; "until weakened, cold, ill-clad, they at last died in unusual numbers as the severe weather came on towards the close of the year." As an indication of the privations endured, we are told that the takings of the small shopkeepers from the families of the workmen fell from £6 or £10 to £2 or £3. With such a retrospect before them, the promoters of the strike had waited for the moment, to defeat the "odious document." In this melancholy case there are some fine points. Parents give way to their children, and starve themselves to feed them. This devotion is not new. Nor is the following, but both are noble.—"The wives evidently thought their husbands in the right, and suffered with them the pangs of hunger. A relieving officer thus writes on the 1st of September:—'I visited this man's lodging. He was out, but his wife was in bed, with scarcely a rag to cover her, evidently sinking from want. The room contained scarcely an article of furniture, and presented a most desolate, neglected, and dirty appearance. She said, 'We are starving, Sir; we have neither fire nor food.' 'Why,' I replied, 'does not your husband go to work?' 'What?' she exclaimed, 'with considerable energy, to become worse than a slave?'—*Tablet*.

CONFESSION AND EVIDENCE.—A question which has long been considered a most important point in the English law was raised the other day before Mr. Justice Hill, on the Northern Circuit. A Roman Catholic priest refused to give evidence respecting a confession supposed to have been made to him in spiritual capacity by a man charged with stealing a watch. The priest, after an interview with the prisoner, had handed over the stolen watch to the police, who naturally drew the inference that a confession had been made. However, the gentleman in question, Mr. Kelly, when called as a witness, refused to be sworn to tell the whole truth, and would not state from whom he received the watch, or what was said on the occasion. He was accordingly committed to prison for contempt of court, the learned Judge adding some strong observations on the conduct of "a clergyman who was found dealing with stolen property, and refused to tell how he came by it." With all deference to Mr. Justice Hill we can only regard this commentary on the proceedings made under the seal of confession should be privileged, it is monstrous to say that a clergyman is excluding himself from the operation of such a rule because he urges the penitent to make restitution, or even undertakes himself to be the instrument of such restitution. However, the result will probably be to clear up this long doubtful point. Hitherto it has generally been understood in our courts that the law does not excuse clergymen from giving evidence in such cases, although there has been no very authoritative decision on the subject. But Chief Justice Best stated on one occasion that he for one should never compel a clergyman to disclose communications made to him by a prisoner, although he should not refuse to hear his evidence. Most of our judges, we should think, would take the same course. As regards Scotland, too, Baron Hume, one of the text writers on Scottish law, after speaking of the law on the subject as doubtful, adds that probably no call will even be made on a clergyman to disclose confessions made to him as such. A similar doubt in the United States was solved by an Act of the New York Legislature, which provides that "No minister of the Gospel or priest of any denomination whatever shall be allowed to disclose any confessions made to him in his professional character in the course of discipline enjoined by the rules or practice of such denomination. The example of New York has been followed by some other States, and these statutes also extend the privilege to communications made to duly authorized medical attendants. We suppose our own Legislature, if appealed to, would scarcely refuse to extend both to the case of the spiritual and medical adviser the same confidential character which it already recognises in communications made to a counsel or an attorney. The matter of course more deeply concerns the Roman Catholic priesthood who are bound under the most stringent warnings to respect the seal of confession, than our own clergy, whose canons simply enjoin that they are to do so "under pain of irregularity." But it is in some degree or other a question of importance to all religious bodies, and not less so in its connexion with public justice, to the country at large.—*John Bull*.

Many and obvious considerations of taste, propriety, and good feeling, make us, as Catholics, unwilling to discuss or to examine into the troubles and disputes in which the High Church Party in the Anglican Establishment are now involved. There is so much danger of wounding Christian Charity, or incurring misconstruction, or harming those whom we would fain not injure, that, as a general rule, we prefer to abstain from meddling with the internal affairs of the Established Church, in regard of which we have no responsibility. But the weekly scandals at the Protestant Church of St. George's-in-the-East are matters of such public importance as to constitute an exception. It would be a dereliction of duty if we, as Catholics and loyal subjects of the Queen, were to have no opinion and no voice on matters which involve the preservation of order, the security of property, and the respect due to the laws. And it would be unmanly and cowardly if we, as Englishmen, had no sympathy with their rights. The Protestant Rector of St. George's-in-the-East, his assistants and friends are the victims of a base and brutal persecution. They have to contend against a ruffianly mob, a partial police, and a timid magistracy. They have a claim upon us and upon everybody in the land. They suffer wrong, and Justice is denied them. Because their cause is unpopular, their acknowledged rights are disregarded. There is practical impunity for every violation of the law, if only it be committed against them.—Parliament and the press, the police and the magistracy, are all alike culpable. Justice is mocked, the mob triumphs, and Lynch law prevails. Is it not a mockery that after all the scenes of riot, desecration, and violence which have been reported after the entire failure of the law and the legislature, the police and the magistracy, to restrain the excesses of the lawless villains who for so many weeks have been guilty of insult, outrage, and assault, we should now find the victims of all this persecution treated as the wrongdoers and summoned to defend themselves, as if they were the aggressors. We used to hear of a traditional generosity which made Englishmen help the weaker side because it was the weaker. We used to hear of a traditional sympathy for sincerity and pluck which made every Englishman eager to give fair play, even to an enemy. We used to hear of a traditional reverence for the law which Englishmen withdraw their countenance even from the champions of a popular cause, if they resorted to illegality or violence. But no trace of these finer attributes is discernible in the history of the troubles at St. George's-in-the-East. Certain it is that if they have any existence we Catholics never experienced the benefit of them. Not at the Reformation, not during the persecutions of Elizabeth and James, not during the Civil Wars, not at the time of the Popish Plot, not at the epoch of the Revolution, not at or since the restoration of our Hierarchy. These unfortunate High Church Anglicans at St. George's-in-the-East are undergoing on a small scale what Catholics suffered, for many generations on a large scale from the brutal bigotry of

ignorant and prejudiced Protestant fanatics. Our sympathy can do them little good, but they have a right to it, and it is theirs. We regret the injustice and the persecution to which they are exposed as much as if it were inflicted on ourselves.—*Tablet*.

RESTITUTION THROUGH THE CONFESSORIAL.—To the Editor of the *Tablet*.—Sir—I cannot help viewing with satisfaction the remarks made by you in the case of Father Kelly, with respect to the injustice done to him and the good results accruing to society from the influence of the Confessorial; in corroboration of what you state in your article, I beg to communicate the particulars of a case which came under my notice a few days ago, for the correctness of which I can vouch. In the year 1832 two gentlemen, brothers, carrying on business together, were robbed of a considerable sum of money, and about a week or two since a son of one of the parties (they being both dead and he their only representative) received the amount of the money taken from his relatives, with interest from the year 1832 to the present time; the money was enclosed in a letter from an Irish clergyman, who stated what it was for, and that it had been received by him in the exercise of his duties at the Confessorial, and requesting that no enquiries might be made respecting it. There can be scarcely any doubt that had it not been for the wholesome influence which the approach to the Sacrament of Confession has upon the Catholic mind, this restitution would never have been made, and I might almost say the same had the pilferers not been Catholics. In Catholic countries I dare say instances of the nature I have stated are anything but uncommon, and it would surely therefore seem that when the authorities of this country imprison the faithful guardians of the Confessorial for refusing to divulge what has taken place between their penitents, when by the exertion of their influence, restitution, which would otherwise never have been made, has taken place, they go the very way to frustrate the interests of society. I enclose my name and address, though not for publication, and remain, Sir, your obedient servant,
London, March 14, 1860. S. L.

LIBERATION OF THE REV. MR. KELLY.—The Rev. Father Kelly, of the Fellingis, who committed by Mr. Justice Hill on Monday last, for contempt of court, was, by his lordship's order, liberated on Wednesday morning, at ten o'clock. Long before the hour at which it was understood he would be liberated a number of women and children assembled in front of the prison to meet him, and as soon as he made his appearance greeted him with a cheer—feeble but still enthusiastic—and a waving of little banners. The whole then surrounded Mr. Kelly, and showed great eagerness to have the honor of shaking hands with him, as he walked in the midst of the little band to the Catholic chapel. They all entered the chapel, where they remained a short time. After giving the Father a hearty salute, he made his exit, accompanied by two friends. The company then quietly dispersed.—*Newcastle Chronicle*.

In all Catholic countries there are to be found Liberals; and, wherever there are Liberals, war is waged against the Church under the pretence of distinguishing between temporal and spiritual, and confining the Church's action to the latter. We have long known, and long labored to spread the knowledge, that in the union between the Catholics of these kingdoms and the Liberal party there were involved consequences far more important than any retardation of legislative remedies for acknowledging grievances, or than any extra share in the emoluments of public office. The union of the Catholics with the Whigs and Liberals of these kingdoms necessarily and inevitably implies the adoption by Catholics of the ideas and theories of the Whigs and Liberals. The process may in some be slow, and in others rapid; in some conscious and deliberate, in others unconscious and involuntary; in some it may be perfect and complete, in others imperfect and inchoate; but it was from the first certain that they would not be able to adopt, support, and advocate, the interests, the measures, and the policy of Whigs and Liberals without adopting their theories and embracing their creed. As a matter of fact, an influential and a growing party among Catholics have done so, and as the great majority of the wealthier classes of the Catholic laity are Whigs and Liberals, and identified with the Whig and Liberal party, so long will the theories and maxims of the Whigs and Liberals spread and flourish amongst us. The evil is now done and will not be cured for a century; but the great question is, how long will men who hold these views find help, countenance, and support, from the Bishops and Priests of Ireland. We are sometimes told that people have a difficulty in seeing the ultimate goal to which our efforts tend. They say that they want to know in what it is to end. And that if we have a definite purpose, they would like to know it before they start towards it. Well, we acknowledge that we are but at the beginning—say, that in all likelihood we shall all be in our graves before the construction of the edifice which we wish to see raised has got far above the foundation. But as we are warned by the motto over the Richmond Penitentiary: "Cease to do evil, learn to do well," the negative and destructive part of the work must be accomplished first. Our aim is to assist in forming a Catholic party imbued with sound principles, filled with the spirit of the teaching of the Church, and ready to join in that great work of social reconstruction which will one day be accomplished under the direction of the Church. But before this can be begun, before even we can begin to collect the materials, it will be necessary to clear the ground. Before men can adopt and carry out Catholic principles, they must have ceased to hold and to defend Whig Liberal principles; and before they cease to hold and to defend Whig Liberal principles, they must cease to be allied to and identified with the Whig Liberal party. There are many Catholics who maintain that in these kingdoms Catholics are bound to be Whigs or Liberals; others, who insist that it is advisable for them to be Whigs or Liberals; others, who argue that there is no harm in their being Whigs or Liberals. We have to contend against each and all of these three classes of disputants, and we expect to derive material assistance from Mr. Deasy's open and advised profession of the great principle which he says has triumphed at Cork, viz., the absolute and entire independence of the laity in temporal, with the right to decide for themselves as to the limits between the spiritual and the temporal domains.—*Tablet*.

THESE BE THE MEN.—The "clergy" of Britain have been seized upon by the most character-eating malady. They have gone mad with immorality.—We allude especially to the English Church, and more especially to that portion of them called "evangelical." Every mail from the Old Country brings us tidings of a new case of clerical scandal. One day it is the curate of the parish who runs away with his pastor's wife; the next day it is the pastor who leaves his wife and family to wallow in sin and jollity with the poor curate's "maid servant." Now it is a pious preacher who has willfully got into a debtor's prison—then it is a more pious preacher, who, to avoid the debtor's crib, embezzled the charity moneys of the parish and ran into the criminal's cell. Again, we have a very reverend parson taking unto himself three wives in that un-Mormon Church of which he is the pillar; and, as a set-off, the wife of another parson takes unto herself two living husbands. This, serious reader, this is all too painfully true. The sad condition of morality which has at length visited the evangelical portion of the Established Church is appalling. Cheating, in all its most wicked guises—seductions practiced under the most shameful pretences—wife desertions—charity thieving and all other crimes cast in the way of clerical ruffianism, appear to have fallen nowadays on the evangelical of Britain. We have had no file of papers for the few latest arrivals which do not bear most painful testimony to this woful fact. There

was the Rev. Mr. Bickerstaff, then whom Exeter Hall held no stouter champion—he has fallen into the arms of a third wife, all still living. There was the Rev. Mr. Green, for whose piety Gavazzi, Achilli and Lord Shaftsbury would have sworn one thousand gospel oaths, he has "run off" with his rector's wife and two thousand pounds a year. There was the Rev. Henry Phillips, in whose name all the Con-nemara "Souper Missions" had songs of praise—he stole from the bed of his own wife to form an adulterous connexion with "maid Martha," the agreeable kitchen help of the parish squire. There was the Rev. Mr. Haggerty; he thought it just as well to use the collected charity of the rectory for his special benefit as for any other, and knowing that there was a text which spoke about beginning charity at home, he had no care for the law, which had some suggestions of embezzlement. There was the Reverend—but why prolong the catalogue? It is only one—and an alarming lone one—of the vilest crimes by men who are supposed to teach their fellows virtue. Alas! what a commentary it is on the character of the clergy who to-day in England follow the political lead of men like Anthony Lord Shaftsbury. It is the evangelicals of this stamp who collected for a few years from deluded Protestants of Britain, money to convert the Connaught Irish by souping them. It is from this body that, the men spring up who assail our own country, and especially our institutions at the South. It is they who are the backbone of England's bigotry—who rant and roar at "Yankeeedom" and Popedom. One loses all patience in regarding them. Go to, ye hypocrites! see to the sins of your own shoulders, and then think of your neighbors.—*New York Daily News* [Protestant].

UNITED STATES.

AN IRISH BOY IMPRISONED EIGHT MONTHS FOR BEING A STRANGER IN NEW YORK.—Some eight months since a poor Irish lad arrived in Brooklyn from Connecticut, in search of work. He had a small valise with him, which contained all his property, consisting of a few articles of clothing. While wandering about the Tenth Ward, he enquired of two young fellows, Edward Tracey and Daniel Grogan, where he could obtain work. They, perceiving that he had something which they might steal, decoyed him into a bye place, and there fell upon him, and beat and robbed him of his valise. The boy's cries attracted the attention of the police, who succeeded in arresting the scoundrels and recovering the property. They were taken before a magistrate and committed to await the action of the Grand Jury.—The boy, as he had no friends who would be responsible for his appearance when wanted as a witness, was committed to the House of Detention in White street. The Grand Jury indicted Tracey and Grogan for highway robbery, but notwithstanding the urgency of the case, they were not brought to trial. Tracey was admitted to bail, and last fall figured quite extensively in political primary meetings and county conventions. He was too valuable a partisan to be tried on the indictment against him, and notwithstanding the attention of the public and of the authorities was frequently called to, he was suffered to trial. Lately these highwaymen were brought up in the Court of Sessions for trial on the indictment of highway robbery. The District Attorney, instead of placing them upon their defence, and convicting them, as could have been done, at the complaint and all other witnesses were at his command, permitted them to plead guilty to an assault and battery, upon which Tracey was sentenced to the Penitentiary for ninety days, and Grogan to the same institution for sixty days. The complaining witness has during the last eight months been confined a prisoner in the House of Detention.—*Boston Pilot*.

YANKEE COMMON SCHOOLS.—The following uncontradicted statement, we commend as an example of the treatment to which the children of Catholics are exposed in Yankee "common schools."—

"THE HOLY NAME OF JESUS.—We have seen the following facts in at least three or four Catholic papers, and have waited a week or two, but in vain, for some word of contradiction or explanation. The consequence is that they must be lamentably true.—One day in the early part of last month, a young Catholic girl, pupil in a Boston Common School, while listening to some exercise of the class, in which the name of Jesus occurred, bowed her head, in accordance with Catholic practice, at the sound of that Holy Name. The teacher who saw her do it peremptorily forbade her ever to repeat such bowing. But a few days after the same sacred name fell from the lips of another reader, and the Catholic girl, under a feeling of either actual or habitual veneration, again bowed her head. Whereupon the teacher seized and whipped her, so unmercifully, that the marks of her punishment were visible on her return home and attracted the attention of her mother.—The latter went next day to the school to remonstrate with the teacher on the cruelty and injustice of the punishment. It was, she said, the custom of Catholics, and she herself had taught and trained her child to bow the head, whenever that holy name was pronounced. But the school-mistress would hear no such excuse. With an indignant toss of the head, and imperious tone, she replied, that the child might do so in church or at home, if she pleased, but that in school the offence should not escape punishment. It would seem incredible that in this nineteenth century, in a Christian school, a child should be punished for rendering to Christ our Saviour, such a trivial sign of outward reverence. But the facts are undeniable. The place was the Boston East-street Primary School; the name of the child, only eight years old, Anna Dowd; of the teacher, Miss Beteice. Nowhere else could such a thing have happened but in our "Northern Athens. We learn from Scripture, that the Apostles went their way rejoicing because they had been found worthy to suffer scourging and contumely for the name of Jesus at the hands of his enemies. Here is a child just emerged from infancy, who in our own day, imitates their example, and shares their privilege! But with this difference, that her scourging comes from Christian hands! What is there in this practice, that should stir Protestant zeal and indignation? All do not partake of it; for English Episcopalians have no scruple to follow the custom of their Catholic forefathers in this respect; and we have seen them often in the churches of Southern Europe bowing their heads devoutly every time his holy name was uttered from the pulpit. One, who was inspired by God, once said (and it was command as well as prophecy) that in the name of Jesus every knee should bend, whether in heaven, on earth, or in hell. But Puritan freedom is bound by no such restraints.—They, happy men! are exempt from the law, which Angels, men and devils must obey. Be it so! But let them beware of imposing it on others by the scourge. The fallen spirits, if we may trust the sentiments of the Christian world, are beside themselves with rage, whenever they hear this name devoutly pronounced and honored; for its sound recalls their shame and defeat. Yet they cannot harm him, who utters it with reverence; they can only gnash their teeth in impotent frenzy. But our Yankee school-mistress takes their place, and fulfills their desires. She can and will punish with whip and scourge the offending Christian who dares do reverence to this august name, outside of which there is no other, wherein we can be saved!—*Catholic Miscellany*.

REPUBLICAN INTOLERANCE.—An exchange says, that under the laws of 1847, in Rhode Island, all the property devoted to church, religious and educational pursuits, is exempt from taxation, except when the same belong to the Catholic Church. All such property belonging to that Church is taxed. An effort has been made in the present legislature to amend the law, so as to place the property of all denominations upon the same footing. What consistency is there in making such a distinction against the Catholic Church? Why not place all churches

upon an equality? Either tax all or none. Let it not be said of the free North that such ridiculous folly exists, where the people are so very free. Wipe out the law. It is a disgrace to your State; it is a disgrace to any people, and borders on the insanity that prevailed in the days of witchcraft in the New England States.—*Freeport (Ill) Bulletin*.

The discussion of the Utah abominations has been up in the House of Representatives during the week past. The desire is manifested to find how Congress can strike the desired blow at Mormon institutions, without transgressing the limited powers delegated to the Federal Government. There was an easy way to have disposed of the question. The Mormons most of them aliens, and all of them declared enemies of the government and the people of the United States, were two years ago in rebellion. Their settlement had been the refuge of manufacturers of every grade, and a den of horrible crime. At great expense an army was sent out to put an end to the difficulty. As we urged at the time, martial law ought to have been proclaimed as soon as the troops reached Utah; Congress ought to have taken the advice of Douglas, in 1837, and revoked the act organizing the Territory, and the gallant Col. Johnson ought to have been left to do the rest—with instructions to the purpose that the more Mormon men be put to death the fewer murderers and felons would be left to trouble society elsewhere. All this was prevented by the administration. The army after all its toil and suffering, was turned into a guard and means of profit for Mr. Buchanan's Mormon friends, and the evil has grown more embarrassing, instead of being ended, by the expensive military expedition. The question then recurs, what should Congress do now? The best way, beyond doubt, is now to act on the suggestion of Judge Douglas's Springfield speech in 1857, and to revoke the Territorial organization of Utah. So long as Territorial Government is sanctioned by Congress, the Federal Government has no authority to interfere with its jurisdiction in matters strictly local. So soon as that Territorial Government is abolished—which Congress, in erecting the Territory reserved to itself the right to do—the evil comes within the reach of legal remedy.—*N. Y. Freeman*.

THE LATE YANKEE OUTRAGE AGAINST MEXICO.—Outrages are sometimes committed, which so outrage us by their enormity, that we cannot contemplate them in their full bearing until the lapse of time has softened down their more revolting features. To this class belongs the feat before Vera Cruz. That officer, acting on doubt under the instructions of our virtuous administration, attacked the steamers belonging to the Mexican Government, and brought them, as prizes, into New Orleans. The particulars of the transaction, as given in the *Nashville Gazette*, of the 21st inst., shows that the American commander, from the first, was determined to make an attack. He placed detachments from his ships on Juarez's steamers, the *Indimola* and *Wave*, and sent these with the *Saratoga* to meet Commodore Marin. The latter was well aware that these steamers belonged to Juarez, and therefore, very properly returned their fire. The American man-of-war, the *Saratoga* by the command of Captain Turner, then attacked and captured the Mexican vessels, killing fifteen and wounding thirty of their men. The act of Captain Jarvis is approved by the Administration, and not only that, but with matchless effrontery it raises a cry against Spain, for permitting Marin to fit up at Havana. Although during the three years of its existence, it has continually fostered filibusters, and aided them in their designs upon our weak neighbors, it can now coolly ask a neutral nation for explanations concerning the selling of stores to Miramon, the President acknowledged by every European power except England. Even now, while this disgraceful farce is being acted, bends of armed American citizens are organized to march into Mexico, and take part in the war raging in that country; and federal troops are occupied in Mexican towns far beyond the Rio Grande. One would expect that this act of our officer and this approval of our government would call forth the indignation of those exponents of public opinion—the press. But unhappily to such an extent does party allegiance weaken the sentiments of honor and virtue which are implanted in the mind of man, that the sad spectacle is now witnessed of influential journals misrepresenting and distorting facts, to palliate an outrage, which is without parallel in the history of any nation, ancient or modern, civilized or barbarous. On what grounds can the interference of Captain Jarvis be justified? He, as well as the English, French and Spanish commanders, was well aware of the character of the steamers, and also of their perfect right, according to the law of nations, to aid Miramon in his attack on Vera Cruz. His position before that city was strictly neutral, because the fact that the Juarez government is recognized by the United States does not necessarily oblige us to aid him with men and ships. The adoption of such a doctrine by our government would be a declaration of war against France and Spain, who have recognized Miramon, and on the same view are bound to assist him by armed force. An influential journal complains, that in allowing the expedition to go forth from Havana, "Spain is plainly interfering at the expense of what we deem our interests in Mexico." Now, this is decidedly cool. Has no nation any interest there except ours? Must England, with her trade of 9,000,000 per annum, be silent; must Spain the mother of Spanish-America, stand aloof, while the fate of her eldest child is being settled? By reading only our journals one would be led to suppose that we have a divine right of protection over every country on this continent, and that no other power has any right to interfere! Indeed, we are told that "European powers must not interfere on the American continent, for it is contrary to the Monroe doctrine." We might ask, at what time were the opinions of President Monroe embodied into international law; or if that has not been done, by what right to arrogate to ourselves a practical protectorate over nations differing from us, in language, in laws, and in race? It surely cannot be on account of our power, because other nations, at least as powerful as we, possess American territory; and that it cannot be, because of the extent of our country is evident from a comparison of size of the principal political divisions of the continent. According to McNally's Geography published in New York in 1857

The British Provinces and British Guiana contain..... 3,010,318 square miles.

The United States contain..... 2,988,892 square miles.

Brazil contains..... 2,744,000 square miles.

Besides these, large tracts are possessed by Russia, France, Denmark and Holland. Now, as our position towards Mexico cannot be justified on any honest grounds, we must seek for a frank statement of the truth, that our President, wiser in his generation than the statesmen who framed our constitution, conceives it necessary to increase our territory, and is prepared to use any means to compass his design.—*Western Banner*.

DECIDEDLY PERSONAL.—We find the following under the "Personal" heading in an exchange paper: The State of Indiana has recently lost by death one of its citizens—Mr. James Banks. We find an obituary notice of him in a Hoosier paper:—"Mistur Editor,—Jem bangs, we are sorry to stait, has desized. He departed this Life last mundy. Jem was generally considered a gud feller. He dide at the age of 23 years old. He went 4th with-out any struggle; and such is life. Tu Da we are as pepper grass—mitty smart—to Murrer we are put down like a cowmber of the grownd. Jem kept a nice store, which his yf now wates on. His vurchews was numerous. Menny is the things we bot at his growcery, and we are happy to state that he never cheeted, spehully in the wate of Mackrel which was nice and smelt swit, and his survivin yf

is the same wa. We never knew him to put hand in his shugar, he had a big sand bar in front of his house; nor water in his Likers, the Ohio River run past his dors. Pieces to his remains!"

AUGMENTED LIQUORS.—Dr. Hiram Cox, the Cincinnati inspector, has published many deeply interesting facts of his experience in testing liquors sold in that city. In 700 inspections of stores and lots of liquors of every variety, he found that 90 per cent were impregnated with the most pernicious and poisonous ingredients. Nineteen young men, all sons of respectable citizens, were killed outright by only three months drinking of these poisoned liquors. Many older men, who were only moderate drinkers, died within the same period of delirium tremens, brought on in one-quarter of the time usual even with confirmed drunkards, by drinking this same poison. Of 490 insane patients, he found that two thirds had lost their reason from that cause.—Many of them were boys under age. One boy of 17 was made insane by the poison from being drunk only once. Seeing two men drinking in grog-shop, and that the whiskey was so strong that it actually caused tears to flow from the eyes of one of them, the Dr. obtained some of it and applied his tests.—He found it to contain only 17 per cent of alcohol, when it should have contained 40, and that the difference was supplied by sulphuric acid, red pepper, caustic potassa, and strychnine. A pint of this liquor contained enough poison to kill the strongest man. The man who had manufactured it had grown wealthy by it.

CUPIDITY VERSUS CUPID.—Joe Perry is a negro living in a state of freedom in or near the village of Winchester, where he has accumulated some money,—indeed sufficient to have enabled him some time ago to buy a lady of like color with himself, as his slave and wife. The honeymoon had passed and the path of roses was duly trod. At last, however, the hour of repentance came, and Joe determined to put his sweetheart up at the auction block, being an entirely new way of getting rid of those troublesome creatures. With this purpose in view he visited Lexington, where unfortunately he made some of his colored brethren acquainted with his design, which, to their unsophisticated hearts, was treason to the sex and a violation of the laws of gallantry and human nature. They determined to defeat Joe's project. A fine day having arrived, they invited him to take a ride in the country, and having got him at last to a secluded spot, they seized him, and despite of all his cries and entreaties, tied him to a tree and administered a severe lashing. They then left him, and he was at last released by a passer-by. It is sufficient to say in conclusion, that Joe hurried back to Lexington, took his wife, giving up the idea of selling her, and has settled down quietly to the sober realities of married life. The above is a statement of facts, and the occurrence took place but a few days ago.—*Covington (Ky) Journal*.

A ROCAN DESCRIPTION OF MINNESOTA.—An attorney in Minnesota who had received from another State an account for collection, after acknowledging the receipt of the letter of instructions, replied as follows:—"Now I am perfectly astonished at you for sending a claim out here for collection in these times. You might as well cast your net into the 'Lake of Fire and Brimstone,' expecting to catch a snailfish, or into the celebrated Stygian pool to catch pickled trout, as to try to collect money here. Money! I have a faint recollection of having seen it when I was a small boy. I believe it was given to me by my uncle to buy candy with. (The candy I do remember). But it has been so long since I have seen any, that I almost forget whether it is made of corn or mustard, or silver or white onions or fish scales. Why sir, we live without money. You're behind the times. It is a relic of barbarism—of ages past. We live by eating, sir—we do. Hoot, man, the millennium is coming, the year of jubilee has come, and all debts are paid over as much as they will be, unless you take 'piggies.' The word 'money' is not in our vocabulary; in the latest Webster (revised for this meridian), it is marked 'obsolete,' formerly a coin representing money, and used as a medium of commerce." A few small pieces can be seen in our Historical Society's collection, where they are exhibited as curiosities, along with the skeleton of the 'mastodon,' Noah's old boots, and Adam's apple.

YANKEE BRIDAL TROUBLE.—A young couple were lately married in San Joaquin County, Cal., and concluded that they must have a wedding tour; but they were frugal folks, and did not like the expense. Not to lose time or money in the trip, they took their bath, for pie, to sell on their visit to Sacramento, and brought back salmon to sell on their return.

FOR SALE LOW, TO CLOSE A CONCERN.—The Goddess of Liberty, being about to retire from business, begs leave to offer the entire stock in trade of her establishment for sale.

The G. of L. would offer, at the same time, the "good will" of the concern, but unhappily it is a long while since her once excellent supporters and customers have exhibited any good will towards her. The attention of distant nationalities, who may be thinking about a revolution, Hungarians, Poles, or Irishmen, is specially invited to this great sale.

Among the articles for which she has no further use, and which will be disposed of, without reserve, to the highest bidder, are the following materials in a slightly damaged condition:

Lot No. 1.—Will comprise that most respectable fowl, the American Eagle, of the single headed species, with his claws full of sheet lightning and thunderbolts. Warranted genuine. Any nation in need of an Emblem will be treated with one on the most liberal terms.

Lot No. 2.—A fine assortment of Liberty Poles, with caps to match. The attention of L. N. who is said to have a curious collection of similar articles in his private cabinet in the Tuilleries, is particularly requested to these worthless commodities.

Lot No. 3.—The beautiful motto of E. Pluribus Unum, which rendered important services in times past, but is no longer available for national purposes. The attention of the Argentine Confederation and the Mexican people is respectfully invited to this very excellent article. The G. of L. is sorry to part with what she has heretofore regarded as one of the most precious jewels in her regalia, but the change in her circumstances compels the sacrifice.

Lot No. 4.—The Stars and Stripes, which she would prefer to wrap around her, like the late Mr. Kirby of the National Theatre, and die as would become a Goddess retiring from the business; but she hopes, after the next Presidential election to be on her feet again, and therefore she will not entertain the idea of tying just now.

Lot No. 5.—Will consist of a lot of fine sentiments not at all worse for wear, among which will be found "The Memory of Washington," "The Declaration of Independence, the Rights of Man, United we stand, Divided we fall, Sic Semper Tyrannis, Give me Liberty, or give me death, and Governor Wise's beautiful sentiment, The Union of the Whigs for the sake of the Union. A large lot of Fourth of July orations and Bankum speeches will be thrown in gratis, if the purchaser of this lot should desire it.

Lot No. 6.—A large lot of national melodies, songs, anthems and choruses—an entire invoice, consisting of Hail Columbia, Yankee Doodle, Adams and Liberty, The Star Spangled Banner.

Lot No. 7.—That lovely eidolon called Uncle Sam, or Brother Jonathan, which has been found so very valuable for the purposes of burlesque and comic illustrations.

The Goddess of Liberty begs leave to refer to the following named gentlemen, for further particulars, who have been appointed the assignees for her estate:—

References—Robert Toombs, of Geo., Jeff. Davis, of Miss., James Gordon Bennett, of New York, William Lloyd Garrison, of Boston, Horace Greeley, late of New Hampshire.

Terms.—Indefinite credit.—*Vanly Fair*.