

FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE.

FRANCE.

PARIS, Feb. 4.—La Patrie says of my worded notes have recently been exchanged between the Governments of Germany and the United States. The subject of correspondence is not stated.

THE COMTE DE CHAMBORD.—PARIS, Jan. 24.—The Comte de Chambord has addressed a letter to the Editor of the Union thanking him for the zeal and ability displayed by that paper during the last 60 years in upholding his cause, and expressing a hope that the Almighty might prolong his life to enable him to witness its final triumph.

It would be useless to pretend that the German Government has had no part in this business. Our Correspondent explains that Prince Bismarck instructed Count Arnim to deliver to the Duc Decazes a message to the effect that "The French Press being under the absolute control of the French Government and strictly prohibited from extreme language on domestic matters, Prince Bismarck could not regard their constant attacks on the German Government and nation as licensed by the French authorities. The French Press sided with the avowed enemies of Germany, though the French Government was able to modify the language of the journals at a moment's notice. The German Government, leaving the French Government to act as it chose, found it impossible not to draw inferences from the provoking attitude of the French Press. This language is, no doubt, peremptory, and it accords very little with our ideas that one Government should demand of another general restrictions on the liberty of the Press."

SPAIN.

MADRID, Feb. 10.—The Imperial says that Government has agreed to exchange prisoners with the Carlists.

MADRID, Feb. 13.—The investment of Bilbao by the Carlist forces continues. Gen. Moriones is concentrating his troops on Santandere, and will soon advance to the relief of the city.

ITALY.

FREEDOM OF THE CHURCH IN ITALY.—It was said that when Rome became the capital of United Italy the connection between Church and State would cease, and an end be put to the persecutions and penalties directed against a State-paid clergy. But although Rome has been seized by Victor Emmanuel the union between Church and State has been retained, and the clergy are still fined and imprisoned, as if they were disobedient State functionaries. Thus in the month of December, 1873, the excellent Father Alberto Laguzzi was condemned at the Court of Assize at Rovigo to four months' incarceration and a heavy fine, for having in a sermon, censured the laws concerning Church property. And on the 12th of December last, the Assize Court of Verceil condemned Father Grotti to a month's imprisonment and a fine of 500 lire, for having introduced a picture of the Virgin into the Church of Villata, during a Mission, and for having induced a purchaser of Church goods to sign a paper promising restitution thereof. In the neighbourhood of Biella, a priest was arrested for having, from the pulpit, spoken offensively concerning the State and its institutions. Between the years 1848 and 1854, forty-nine penal processes against priests were instituted in the Courts of Turin, Chambery, Casale, and Genoa, but of these forty-nine only nine ended in conviction and condemnation, as was observed by Senator Sclopis in 1854. Since that year processes and convictions against the clergy have increased in consequence of the introduction of fresh laws. The Unia Cattolica gives a list of various offences which show how far the Church in Italy is from being free. Thus for refusal to sing Te Deum on the Feast of the Statuto or Constitution, prosecutions were issued against the Bishop of Faenza, who was condemned to three years' imprisonment and a fine of 4,000 lire; against the Vicar-General of Bologna, with imprisonment and a fine of 3,000 lire; against the Bishops and Canons of the Cathedral Church of Piacenza, who were fined and imprisoned still more heavily; against Cardinal Baluffi, Bishop of Imola; and against several other ecclesiastics for the same offence. Eleven persons—including the Bishops of Poggia, Saluzzo, Mondovi, Fano, Gualtalla, and Modigliana, and the Archbishops of Spoleto and Brindisi—were prosecuted for having published rescripts or briefs without the Royal Equitatur. For the crime of refusing Sacraments, twenty-six persons were prosecuted, and among these were Cardinal Morichini, Bishop of Jesi, Montepulciano, and Bergamo. Five ecclesiastics were prosecuted for refusing to accept as sponsors at baptism excommunicated persons. Six ecclesiastics were thrown into prison for expressions injurious to the Government, and among these were the Archbishop of Sassari, and the Bishop of Fossombrone. Nine clergymen were fined and imprisoned for saying that the purchasers of spoliated Church property are liable to excommunication. And four clergymen were condemned for refusing, in certain cases, burial according to the rites of the Church. There were various other offences which were punished. The Vicar-General of Manfredonia was found guilty of publishing a Pontifical indulgence. Cardinal Pecci admonished three priests. And the Archbishop of Otranto committed the crime of omitting the name of Victor Emmanuel in the prayers on Good Friday. From this it may be seen how the separation of Church and State is carried out in Italy, and how completely the Cavour idea of a "Free Church in a Free State" is ignored by the present rulers of United Italy.—Tablet.

THE CONSTITUTION 'APOSTOLICA SEDIS MURUS.' It is a remarkable fact that, whenever an election is coming off in Germany, some document, professing to proceed from the Holy See, is given to the public. On the eve of the elections to the Prussian Landtag, the now famous correspondence between the Pope and the Emperor appeared in the Berlin papers. Now, at the moment in which the whole of Germany is summoned to choose representatives for the Diet of the Empire, a Bull concerning a future Conclave is printed in the Cologne Gazette. We know what political capital was made out of the first of these publications, and the Liberalist press is now hard at work making what it can out of the second. We will not at present pronounce positively on the genuine or spurious character of the Constitution commencing Apostolica Sedis Murus. We will only observe, first, that the absence of a precise date is calculated to arouse suspicion; secondly, that if the document is genuine, the text has manifestly suffered here and there in its passage through the German translation; and lastly, that we have the authority of the Univers for the "certain" fact that "none of the Eminent personages to whom it could naturally be communicated in the first instance" have any knowledge of it.—Tablet.

GERMANY.

FRENCH IMPRISONMENTS.—The imprisonment of priests is beginning now to be realized in many places, slowly but steadily. In Posen, the new year has been celebrated by the imprisonment of the Vicar of Logo, in the district of Trausdetz, who has long been a victim of persecution and annoyance. He entered on his fourth month's captivity with the resignation of a true confessor, and his departure was solemnized by the tolling of the church bells, and the tears of the people. He will doubtless not have long to wait for companions in misfortune.

The Prussian Government, fearing that Prince Bishop Forster of Breslau will, when further proceedings are taken against him, withdraw to the

Austrian portion of his diocese, and thence continue to agitate, has applied to Vienna for assistance at the Vatican to obtain a re-arrangement of the diocese according to the territorial frontier of the two states. Austria being willing to grant this application, has instructed her envoy at the Vatican, Count Paar, accordingly. A similar request has been made to the French Government concerning the diocese of Nancy.

By all accounts the inhabitants of Berlin are assassinating one another at no ordinary rate. Murders are constantly reported. They form, it is said, the staple news of the city, and the first question asked when friends meet is, "Whose throat has been cut this morning?" The Standard's correspondent thinks there must be "something in the air" predisposing men to crime, or that "evil example is contagious." The correspondent of the Daily News, however, is a much better theorist, and attributes the numerous murders—which have evidently caused a panic in the Prussian capital—to the demoralizing effects of military service, and especially of war.

The Lower House of the Baden Diet, after two days' debate, has this evening adopted a Bill for supplementing the Ecclesiastical Laws. This measure requires a State examination to be passed to qualify for Church appointments or the exercise of ecclesiastical functions, and also contains provisions for protecting the right of voting against priestly influence.

Penal regulations are added to insure the execution of the law, and in accordance therewith a clergyman may be removed from his office after a second summons to appear before the appointed tribunals has been addressed to him by a joint decision of the Ministry and a Board of three judges.

A GERMAN VIEW OF THE MARRIAGE.—The following leading article was published by the Cologne Gazette of Wednesday:—

"The Crown Prince and the Crown Princess of the German Empire started yesterday immediately after the Ordensfest for St. Petersburg, where the Prince and Princess of Wales and other princely personages have already arrived, or are expected, for the purpose of attending the marriage festivities. The union of Prince Alfred, Duke of Edinburgh, second son of Queen Victoria (born August 6, 1844), with the Grand Princess Maria, only daughter of Alexander II., Emperor of Russia (born October 17, 1853), is turning the eyes of the whole world to Russia, this half-developed and mighty realm, of which Friedrich Wilhelm IV. once said:—'It is no country, it is a continent.'"

England and Russia, at present the two largest kingdoms of the world, whose royal families are now for the first time entering into a family union, have since 1553, when the first English ship sailed up the Dvina, had scarcely any other than peaceful and friendly relationship with one another. Russia produces hemp, flax, tallow, and many other raw stuffs which industrious England needs, while the latter sells in the broad Russian Empire the products of her diligence and skill. Indeed, Ivan the Terrible (who had even the intention of having himself separated from his seventh consort in order to marry a relative of Queen Elizabeth) had transactions with England, and the first Czar of the House of Romanow received English subsidies. English merchants were welcome and honoured guests in the Russian business towns. The good understanding lasted till towards the end of the last century, when Catherine II. saw herself obliged to establish an armed naval neutrality in order to protect herself. The Emperor Nikolai laid great weight upon the friendship of England, but he was the one whose impatience to enter upon the inheritance of the sick man brought about the Crimean War. England's concern for her Indian Empire lay for the most part at the ground of this war also.

"The Emperor Alexander I. concluded as soon as possible peace, and has followed since then a peaceful policy in his reign, which has now lasted nearly 20 years. It is only in Asia that he has widened the bounds of his Empire, and the expedition which had been proclaimed since 1872 against the rapacious Khan of Khiva give once more in England another opportunity for the old apprehension. In order to be beforehand with these the Emperor Alexander sent Count Schuwalow to England, who gave the most tranquillizing explanations. Russia did not wish to make any conquests, and was thoroughly agreed that between the possessions of the two Powers a neutral zone should be formed. Afghanistan was pointed out as a most essential component part of such a zone. We will not doubt the uprightness of the English and Russian statesmen, but things do not turn out in reality so smooth and neat as they stand on paper. When the columns of the Russian General Kaufmann had made their way through the wilderness more fortunately than Porowski in 1839, and had taken Khiva, he concluded with the Khan, who humbly retired in his capital, a covenant by which the latter made himself a vassal of the Emperor, and surrendered the right bank of the Amu. The Russians gave up, it is true, the strip of land to their faithful confederate, the Khan of Bokhara, and thus far they can say that they have fulfilled their promise and made no conquests. But confederate vassal and subject are ideas which pass over into one another among barbarous peoples, and it cannot be denied that the Russian power has again penetrated deeper into Asia, and that the English do not by any means look upon this extension of power with pleasure. No one knows, however, better than the English that in Asia a power may easily see itself obliged to make conquests against its will. The Press and the statesmen of England constantly declared themselves opposed to every further extension of the gigantic Indian Empire, but nevertheless revolts and wars in India seldom ended otherwise than with the extension of the English possessions, and the Princes who are allowed to reign longer are not more independent than the Khans of Khiva and Bokhara.

"The English view, therefore, the union of an English Prince (who moreover, will one day live in Germany as Duke of Coburg-Gotha) without special enthusiasm, and do not proceed in their interest beyond cool politeness. The dangers which they are apprehensive of from Russia are, however, still far distant."

INDIA.

We presume that speculation is now at an end as to whether or not rural Bengal is this year to suffer the extremities of hunger. Unhappily, the time for reasonable speculation is gone, and the famine is not merely at hand, but is upon us. Our Calcutta intelligence declares that "fifteen districts, containing 25,000,000 people, are now recognized as distressed, and eleven, containing 14,000,000, are partially affected." In addition to all this, "the food transport has partially broken down."—Times.

LECTURE OF REV. H. S. LAKE.

(Continued from 2nd Page.)

comforts of their homes, which would have contributed much to make their lives more agreeable, but which were sacrificed to the grand thought of providing for their children. For these children, in our schools, according to the information which I have from priests who have the largest schools, it costs, on an average, ten dollars each per annum. Now, here is something very suggestive. Of the hundred thousand children in the public schools, it is thought that sixty thousand are Catholics. Mind, I do not say positively that they are, but I have been told that it is no exaggeration to say that sixty thousand are Catholics. If, then, we could withdraw one hundred thousand children from these schools, and the State would permit us to educate them, we would do so at a saving, annually, of one million

two hundred thousand dollars! Here I throw down my gauntlet; I defy any person to refute that.

I ask, then, why are we not permitted to take our children and educate them, when we offer to do so, and pay back, yearly, into the treasury over a million of dollars? It is true that our school teachers do not wear silk dresses, costing a hundred or a hundred and fifty dollars, like some of the school mistresses in the public schools. They cannot afford to do it; they are mostly poor religious; but I think he would be a bold American who would say that the instruction was poorer on that account.—Neither, I imagine, will it be urged, as an objection to us, that we should teach the child the Ten Commandments as well as the multiplication table.—What in the world is the child made for, if he is not made for God, his eternal destiny? I think, then, that no sensible American will object, really, to our teaching our holy faith; teaching the child to pray as well as to read and write; teaching it to offer, sometimes, a sweet little prayer to the Blessed Virgin, as well as to know how many people live in London or in Paris. Surely we are fallen very low if we object to this. We have lost our reason if, owing to our prejudice, we are unwilling to yield Catholic children to Catholic teaching, simply because they teach something objectionable to us.—But, so far, except one person, hardly an American has dared to raise his voice in regard to this matter. There is, however, one person from whom I will read two or three lines, because he is, I think, honest—having no religious belief whatever, but a great deal of honesty. Speaking of the Roman Catholic Church [and this man, remember, speaks in this sense regarding our religion as a miserable superstition, without any truth or any possibility of truth, but he has been honest enough to speak in this way,] he says:—

"No wonder that the Roman Catholics feel themselves to be cruelly oppressed by the public schools. When the Roman Catholics of Ireland were compelled to support the English Church in addition to their own, all Americans sympathized with them.—But is not the oppression of our Roman Catholics the same in principle as was that? Ours set their hearts on training their children to be Catholics from infancy. Hence, they naturally desire to have their schools such as will promote this warmly cherished object. But how can they support their own schools at the same time that they are taxed to sustain the State schools? Here is a burden that presses heavily not upon their conscience only, but upon their property also—all the more heavily upon their property, since, as a people, they are not rich—certainly not so rich as the Protestants, whose children they are, with such flagrant injustice, compelled to educate. It is to mock the ignorance of a large share of Catholic parents, or, at least, what they humbly feel to be their ignorance, to tell that they can themselves, at their homes, teach enough religion to their children. Conscious of their little learning, they rely for help at this vital point not upon the priest only, but upon the schoolmaster.—And well would it be were Protestant parents more concerned to have the teachers of their children competent and desirous to impart religious instruction. Scarcely less unwise is it to exclude religion from the desk of the schoolmaster than from the pulpit of the pastor."

There are many other sentences in this letter which I should read; but I have talked so long that I am afraid to do so. I wish, now, simply to say what is the teaching of the Catholic Church in regard to this matter; and in this, of course, I do not expect that any Protestant will take the least interest. It is a matter in which Catholic parents and educators are interested; so far as Protestants are concerned, I have entirely finished what I had to say in regard to these schools. These are the propositions condemned in the "Syllabus":—

"The whole government of public schools in which the children of any Christian State are educated (Episcopal seminaries only being in some degree excepted), may and ought to be given up to the civil power, and in such sort that no right of interference by any other authority be recognized as to the management of the schools, the regulation of the studies, the conferring of degrees, and the choice or approbation of the teachers.

"The best constitution of civil society requires that popular schools which are open to the children of every class, and public institutions in general which are devoted to teaching literature and science, and providing for the education of youth, should be withdrawn from all authority of the Church, and from all her directing influence and interference, and subjected to the complete control of civil and political authority, so as to accord with the ideas of the rulers of the State, and the standard of opinions commonly adopted by the age.

"Catholics may approve of that method of instructing youth, which, while putting aside the Catholic faith, and the Church's authority, looks exclusively, or at least chiefly, to the knowledge of natural things, and the end of worldly social life."

And here comes the blessed letter of the Pope, which is the most important of all on this question. The infallible Vicar of Christ says:

"Surely, indeed, where, in whatsoever places and quarters, the very mischievous design of this sort should be either undertaken or accomplished (to wit) of excluding from the schools the authority of the Church, and youth should be unhappily exposed to harm in the matter of faith—there the Church not only ought to strive in every way with the most earnest zeal, and never spare any efforts in order that the same youth may have the necessary Christian instruction and training, but also should be compelled to warn all the faithful, and to declare to them, that schools of such a character being adverse to the Catholic Church, they must conscientiously abstain from frequenting them."

Now, here is a delicate question, and one must weigh his words when he speaks. The infallible Vicar of Christ teaching the Catholic Church—teaching it not simply in Baden, to which country this letter was written, but "in quibusvis locis regionibusque" in whatever places and quarters—says that the Catholic Church is compelled, *hogeretur*, not merely may do it, but he says the Catholic Church is compelled—to do what? Compelled to warn all the faithful, and to declare to them that such schools cannot with any conscience be frequented. This famous sentence of the Holy Father has given rise to much discussion; and I have taken great pains to have it correctly translated. I have sent it to a Professor of the New York College, a teacher of Latin for many years, and I have sent it to one who was formerly a Professor in Columbia College, who has taught Latin and Greek, to my own knowledge, for more than twenty years. They agree entirely about the meaning of this sentence. There were some clergymen who thought that one word of it might be twisted in such a way as to mean "scarcely" that he would *hard* could possibly mean "scarcely." Now, so far from that being true, it is true that *hard* is the strongest negative that the Holy Father could have used. It expresses not merely denial of a fact, but it expresses that we must do the very opposite. Therefore, in the translation which I read for you, I did not say, "you cannot go to these schools," but I said, "you must conscientiously abstain from going." For, this word *hard*, I will bring grammarians to prove, expresses far more than non.

There was also another objection made. It was this, that "in conscientiam" meant possibly a venial sin. In the reason of that, I claim that it is absurd, for this reason: the Pope could not begin a phrase with a solemn declaration—declaring it binding upon every creature of the globe—binding upon all the faithful; not only binding, but that pastors should immediately declare to their faithful that they cannot conscientiously go to these schools,

and yet intend to teach us that this was only a venial sin.

Now, I do not wish to enter too much into theology; this is not exactly the proper place, before a large congregation; and then I know I have kept you so long that you are tired listening to me. But this much I am determined to say: If what the Pope teaches be true, and we are bound to believe so if we remain Catholics; if there be any meaning whatever for that sentence, it means this: that not only the priest cannot absolve parents who send their children to public schools, but that Bishop, or Archbishop, or Primate or Cardinal cannot do so; that even the Holy Father himself, in the plenitude of his power is unable to give this absolution. Because it concerns a matter which is intrinsically evil, the Pope himself is as powerless as any priest. That is all I have to say about the doctrine.

I am afraid that sometimes to-night, I have spoken a little strongly for some of you;—that some would wish that I had drawn the matter more mildly. If it be so, remember what an interest I take in this question; for I confess to you all, it is the dearest one of my heart. Remember, too, what great interests are concerned here. First, the interests of the parents. Sometimes, in Europe, the traveller reposes beneath an old oak weighed down by long centuries. It is already crumbling to dust but nature has provided for its fall, as may be seen by its vigorous offshoots, full of life, and vigorous with its sap. So it is with the Christian parent. The tree, developed, awaits its downfall for centuries. Man is bowed down with his few and evil years; he lives still in his children, when he has seen the mysteries of the future world. Oh! Catholic parents—oh! Christians, you can well bid death defiance, as you can bid him defiance as he carves his wrinkles on your brow, you can bid him defiance, as he bows you down with years, and whitens your lips with the cold blast that comes from the grave,—for you possess immortality, you live again in your name long after you have gone. Strive, then, to be worthy of this dignity, let them bear it in love and in honor. Then there is the interest of the country. The State sees, in these little children, the hands that are to wield her destinies. She may, some day, have to call upon them to give up their life-blood in her defence; their voices will be heard in her legislative halls. Surely then, the State has the weightiest interests here. And the Church—how sacred is her interest. She sees, indeed, in the little child, her future Priest or Bishop, her Nun, her Sister of Charity, her Lady of the Sacred Heart, her pious layman, who will edify the world. But she sees something far more glorious than this. She sees in that little child its immortality; she wishes to guard it earliest steps, that one day, in heaven, she may place upon its brow an un fading diadem of everlasting life. And therefore is it that she guards them so jealously. Wisely, indeed, does she do it; wisely for us all, if we could only appreciate what greatness there is in the little child.

I leave the question to you, such as it is, knowing that I have done little in comparison with what I wish I had done, and what with better health I might have done. I leave it to you to consider calmly the arguments I have advanced. If I have offended in anything, be charitable to human frailty. Nevertheless, I will not conclude without saying one thing. I say it with all the sincerity of my whole nature, and these who know me best, say that I have always been sincere.—I say it from the very depths of my soul; I would say it if I knew I should leave this altar to go to my tomb.—I say that unless you suppress the public school system, as it is at present constituted, it will prove the damnation of this country.—Frisch American.

THE SACRED HEART.—It could scarcely be expected but that the world wide manifestations of increased love for the Sacred Heart of our Lord would work into ungovernable frenzy, the heretics and infidels of our generation. On the Continent the atheist journals of revolution and impiety have never wearied of insults to the memory of the humble Margaret Mary, the holy recluse of Paray-le-Monial. Here at home, too, we have seen and heard not a little of this spirit of outrage upon Catholic feeling and Catholic devotion. Since the glorious and memorable consecration of Ireland to the Sacred Heart, on the Passion Sunday of last Lent, most filthy ribaldry has been poured out upon our people because of the blessed deed of that day of great faith. Even still the bitterness is undiminished, and the devotion to the Sacred Heart is treated as a matter to be scoffed at and insulted. It was only on Christmas Eve that the London Telegraph spoke of the revelations to blessed Margaret Mary of Paray-le-Monial as "the nightmare dreams of a dyspeptic nun" and spoke with an offensive sneer of the noble project of the Cardinal Archbishop of Paris to erect at Montmartre, as a national tribute of prayer and reparation, a church in honor of the Sacred Heart. In face of such insults we have much pleasure in reproducing (and we do not think that any apology is needed from us for doing so in this place), some passages from an article by Louis Veullot, in a recent number of the Univers. A short time since one M. Desonny, a clever French litterateur, published an elaborate work against the devotion of the Sacred Heart, and assailed it as a novelty, and, therefore, an error in the Catholic Church. M. Veullot reviewed the book and made it the occasion of a splendid vindication of Catholic doctrine and practice on the sacred theme. We regret that it is not in our power to reprint the entire of the article, but our space will only allow us to make a couple of selections: "The symbolical homage," writes M. Veullot, "rendered to the Heart of the Saviour, is the adoration of the humanity of God made man to save us. We adore in His heart, the boundless love evinced to us in the Incarnation, the Cross, and the Eucharist. Behold the mystery which M. Desonny cannot comprehend. Does he find it scandalously assumed by our Lord, of this sacrifice on the cross, and of his real presence in St. Paul, in Bossuet, the Fathers and the Doctors with whom he pretends acquaintance; and in St. Augustine and St. Thomas, with whom he boasts of being familiar. Aye, St. Augustine is especially emphatic on the Sacred Heart, and St. Thomas shines with a peculiar lustre amongst those who urge devotion to it. He says that the heart of our Lord is the centre and the source of His love for men, and recommends it to our homage.

Before the time of the blessed Margaret Mary, devotion to the Sacred Heart existed in the Church, latent it may be, but not less certain. She only propagated it by her revelations, which she did not seek for, and which she submitted to the judgment of the Church. In the preceding century Brother Louis of Grenada, a Spanish Dominican, whose virtues, eloquence, and skill were universally admired, preached devotion to the Sacred Heart, not by revelations but as a doctrine. Nay, we have even a more ancient testimony. In 1839, at Antun, amidst the ruins of the famous Polyandron, a Christian cemetery dating back to the first ages of the Church, were discovered the fragments of a monumental stone bearing a Greek inscription, which has since become renowned in the annals of archeology. Monsignor Pitta, then Professor in the seminary, and now a Cardinal, had the good fortune of being the first to meet with this precious bit of stone. The inscription bore the date of the second century, and its opening lines contained an act of homage to the Sacred Heart of our Divine Redeemer. The inscription is given in full in the 7th volume of the Abbe Darraz, *Historie Generale de l'Eglise*. M. Desonny can read further, and it is even more simple, the Office of the Sacred Heart in the Roman Breviary. There he will find the thought of the Church, and it may help to convince him that this "new" devotion is as old as religion. The Church never invents—it remembers." M. Veullot apologizes for the

length of the article, and for treating such a subject in a newspaper, but before concluding, expresses a hope that "ignorant scoffers will form a juster idea of the elevated subjects about which they so slightly talk. They ought to comprehend that the Sacred Heart knows what it is saying and what it is doing, and that it proposes to them nothing that is not worthy of the glory of God and the intellect of man. From the moment that a devotion is authorized and spread throughout the world it would be nothing more than reasonable to ask that it be studied before it is condemned."

length of the article, and for treating such a subject in a newspaper, but before concluding, expresses a hope that "ignorant scoffers will form a juster idea of the elevated subjects about which they so slightly talk. They ought to comprehend that the Sacred Heart knows what it is saying and what it is doing, and that it proposes to them nothing that is not worthy of the glory of God and the intellect of man. From the moment that a devotion is authorized and spread throughout the world it would be nothing more than reasonable to ask that it be studied before it is condemned."

A SCENE FROM THE OLD WELL-KNOWN COMEDY, ENTITLED "THE BLESSED PROTESTANT REFORMATION," ENDING IN MARRIAGE.—In a recent issue of the Evening Star we find the following amusing details of the many amours of that great "Man of God," Wesley, the founder of Methodism. That he was a saint it would be blasphemy against the Holy Spirit to doubt; but that, like the elder, he often fell the victim of "widders," can be denied by no one:—

"In 1740 occurred an odd episode in Wesley's life. On one of his missionary journeys he had taken sick at Newcastle, where he was nursed by Grace Murray, one of his female "helpers," a handsome, clever widow of four-and-thirty, Wesley himself being twelve years older. He asked her to marry him. She seemed amazed, and replied, "This is too good a blessing. I can't tell how to believe it. This is all I could have wished for under heaven." Wesley, quite naturally, took this for a formal betrothal. But Grace had not long before married John Bennett, a Methodist preacher, of about her own age, and Wesley was soon astounded by a joint letter from Grace and John, asking his consent to their marriage. Then ensued a comedy lasting for months, the like of which no playwright has ventured to put upon the stage. Grace would have been quite content with either of her lovers, were it not for the other. But, contrary to all example, it was the absent one whom she wanted.

"When Wesley was with her she longed for Bennett; when Bennett was present she longed for Wesley. How many times she broke and renewed her engagement with each it would be hard to tell. "I love you," she said to Wesley, "a thousand times better than I ever loved John Bennett; but I am afraid if I don't marry him he will run mad." That very evening she promised herself again to Bennett. A week after she told Wesley that she was determined to live and die with him. She indeed wanted to be married at once; but Wesley wished for some delay. Grace said she would wait more than a year. A fortnight later she met Bennett, fell at his feet, and acknowledged that she had used him ill. They were married a week after. This strange marriage seems to have turned out a happy one. Bennett died in the triumphs of faith ten years later. Grace survived until 1803, dying at the age of 87. For years she was a bright light in the Methodist society."

THE BOGS OF IRELAND.—Whether these morasses were at first formed by the destruction of whole forests, or merely by the stagnation of water in places where its current was choked by the fall of a few trees, and by accumulation of branches and leaves, carried down from the surrounding hills, is a question never yet decided. In a Report of the Commissioners on the Bogs of Ireland, published some years since; it is stated that three distinct growths of timber, covered by three distinct masses of bog, are discovered on examination; and it was given as the opinion of Professor Davy, that in many places, where forests had grown undisturbed, the trees on the outside of the woods grew stronger than the rest, from their exposure to the air and sun; and that, when mankind attempted to establish themselves near these forests, they cut down the large trees on the borders, which opened the internal heart, where the trees were weak and slender, to the influence of the wind, which, as is commonly to be seen in such circumstances, had immediate power to sweep down the whole of the internal part of the forest. The large timber obstructed the passage of vegetable recreation, and of earth falling towards the rivers; the weak timber in the internal part of the forest, after it had fallen, soon decayed, and soon became the food of future vegetation. Mr. Kirwan, who wrote largely on the subject, observed, that whatever trees are found in those bogs, though the wood may be perfectly sound, the bark of the timber has uniformly disappeared, and the decomposition of this bark forms a considerable part of the nutritive substances of morasses; notwithstanding this circumstance, tan is not to be obtained in analysing bogs; their antiseptic quality is, however, indisputable, for animal and vegetable substances are frequently found at a great depth in bogs, without their seeming to have suffered any decay; these substances cannot have been deposited in them at a very remote period, because their form and texture is such as were common a few centuries ago. In 1786, there were found seventeen feet below the surface of a bog, in Mr. Kirwan's district, a woollen coat of coarse, but even net work, exactly in the form of what is now called a spenser. A razor, with a wooden handle, some iron heads of arrows, and large wooden bowls, some half made, were also found, with the remains of turning tools; these were obviously the wreck of a work-shop, which was probably situated on the borders of a forest. These circumstances countenance the supposition that the encroachments of men upon forests destroyed the first barriers against the force of the wind, and that afterwards, according to Sir H. Davy's suggestions, the trees of weaker growth, which had not room to expand, or air and sunshine to promote their increase, soon gave way, and added to the increase.

Lord Chief Justice Sir Alexander Cockburn, of England, has left the Reform Club in London. The club men of the city, as well as the members of the Reform, are excited over the matter, and attribute it to the conduct of Mr. Whalley, M.P., and Mr. Onslow, M.P., who have used the club house as a place for conference with the Tichborne claimant, Jenn Lutie, and other persons connected with the great trial. This act of the Chief Justice and the comments upon it are now evidences of the intimacy between social affairs in London and the circumstances of the Tichborne trial.

Mr. James Caird, of Scottish agricultural fame, writes to the Times upon "The Agricultural Labourer," accepting the deficiency of agricultural labour in England as a fact which must be met. He suggests three modes in which this deficiency may be supplemented by greater effectiveness:—(1) The conjunctive employment of machinery on a scale sufficiently large to be economical; (2) the substitution of piece work as much as possible for day work; and (3) the conversion of arable land into grass. The agricultural returns for the last year show a diminution in this direction of some 200,000 acres taken out of cultivation.

TUBERCULAR CONSUMPTION.

My health had been declining since 1858; during the whole time I was unable to attend to any work. In February, 1859, I was taken with a dreadful cough. The amount I raised in twenty-four hours was incredible to tell. The doctors only gave temporary relief. I was advised to use Fellew's Compound Syrup of Hypophosphites. I commenced using freely, and I can say, with a clear conscience, it has effected wonders. I am now able to work, which for eleven years I was incapable of.

HAMMOND RYAN, N.B. JAMES JOHNSON, "Fellew's Hypophosphites" must not be confused with other preparations of Hypophosphites. It differs from all others.