

centre of the wall at one end of the room, with a small table covered with red cloth in front of it (a disposition injudiciously adopted by a former chaplain—a Low Churchman—in lieu of the one in existence when the room was used alternately by both Protestants and Lutherans) had declared that he should not countenance by his presence so heterodox an arrangement, and that he had, as a consequence, preferred to attend the Romish Church of the place. But the story, to my knowledge, was never reported otherwise than as a mere rumour in two or three quarters, and then not at all authenticated by any one who knew it to be "a fact."

In reference to this part of the question, it should be further remarked that in the course of the twelve years during which I have regularly visited Kissingen in a professional capacity for the two summer months, I have known more than one pious or orthodox clergyman of the Church of England to abstain from attending at the house of prayer alluded to—preferring to read the service in their own apartment, or in that of some one of the English visitors, to a small number of friends and neighbours, whose state of health or the directions of their physician or their inclination induced them to remain at home; and Mr. Bennett, without being suspected of Romanism, might well have been supposed to be of that number.

Mr. Bennett removed from the Hotel de Russie to the Hotel Schlatter, where he remained until his departure from Kissingen. My visits to the latter hotel were daily during the whole of that period, for I had several patients to see in public with Mr. Bennett—viz., his son, Sir John and Lady Harrington and another lady—assembled in one of their own apartments to read prayers, I never heard either from the residents in the hotel, or from its proprietor or from any of the servants aught which could be construed into an opinion that Mr. Bennett was a "notorious Romanist." Nor can I understand why the waiters at the Hotel de Russie, where Mr. Bennett first resided, should have taken such special notice (as stated in the letter read by Mr. Horsman to the House) of a guest habited not very unlike one of the many Lutheran Clergymen seen there—even supposing him, by any action of his, to have betrayed indications of his being a Roman Catholic priest; inasmuch as both English and Irish Roman Catholic priests have visited Kissingen before, and one of them, a most respectable person, the Rev. Mr. Elwes has been a frequent visitor.

I think then that on balancing the evidence which charges Mr. Bennett with a certain course of conduct at Kissingen last summer that which I now tender in explanation, your impartial readers will be disposed to think the latter the most preponderating, although it does not go to the length of flatly contradicting the former on positive personal knowledge.

I have not the honour of a personal acquaintance with Mr. Bennett; nor have I during the several weeks we were at Kissingen together, exchanged a word with him, albeit he was constantly under my notice. He had already been some days in Kissingen when I arrived in July, on my usual professional visit at that Spa, where I attended the largest number of English patients, but I did not attend him. My testimony, therefore, on the present occasion, given unsolicited and unknown to the Rev. gentleman, cannot be suspected of partiality. Neither am I likely to be urged to give it by any sympathy between us on religious principles and doctrines, if his be such he is charged with entertaining. It is love of fair play that has moved me to put forward the preceding series of circumstances and observations, which a judging public may be inclined to consider as of fully equal value to those of a contrary tendency contained in the letter read to the House by the hon. member for Cocker-mouth.

I have the honour to be, your obedient servant,
A. B. GRANVILLE, M. D.
No. 1, Curzon-street, May Fair April 29.

[We know Dr. Granville to be a man of standing and character, and are glad that he has been able to give such good testimony on Mr. Bennett's behalf. Charity should have induced Mr. Horsman and his confederates to have rejoiced in Mr. Bennett's return to duty, and taken his last acts as a declaration of faith.]

IRELAND.

CONVERSION FROM POPEERY.—On Sunday week last six persons under the spiritual guidance of the Rev. T. Scott, a Priest converted from Romanism, abjured the errors of Popery, and received the Holy Communion in St. Thomas's Church, Dublin. One of the converts had been a candidate for the Romish Priesthood, and two were schoolmasters. The *Chronicle* contains an eloquent letter from the Rev. R. Wall, Roman Catholic Curate of Sackville, to his Bishop, Dr. Foran, of Waterford, in which he renounces his appointment as Priest, on the ground of objections to the Church of Rome, which he supports throughout by reference to Holy Scripture.

SCOTLAND.

LAY REPRESENTATION.—The Episcopal Synod of the Church of Scotland has decided to recommend to the Diocesan Synods to admit the Laity to a share in their deliberations. On the 20th of April last the College of Bishops assembled in Synod at Edinburgh, passed the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the admission of the Laity into Ecclesiastical Synods, under certain conditions, and to speak and vote therein, on a large class of ecclesiastical questions, is not inconsistent with the Word of God, and is not contrary to that pure Constitution of the Church, to which it has been the special privilege of the Church in Scotland to bear testimony."

ENGLAND.

DOMESTIC.

The latest intelligence from the Cape of Good Hope, received on Saturday, informs us that highly successful attacks had been made upon Macomo's principal retreats in the Waterkloof. In one of these, we regret to state, the Hon. Lieutenant H. Wrottesley, of the 43d Regiment, second son of Lord Wrottesley, lost his life, and two privates of the 91st were wounded. No details of the action are given. Lieutenant Wrottesley was struck by a ball above the hip, and died in about four hours afterwards, from hemorrhage, surrounded by his brother officers. Lord Wrottesley received a letter from him by the same post that brought the intelligence of his death, written within six days before his decease, when in good health and spirits. Sir Harry Smith wrote to Colonel Wrottesley, Lord Wrottesley's brother, communicating the sad intelligence.—*Wolverhampton Chronicle*.

A letter writer at Hong Kong confides in the safety of Sir John Franklin. The following is an extract from a letter dated March 28th:—"There have been

here no less than thirty-seven whalers from the Arctic seas. It may interest you to know that they almost all believe that Sir John Franklin is safe, and that he has got through the ice barrier into inner waters, where he will not be reached until a mild season arrives, which they say the present will be. Most of them have now departed. They say Franklin will not suffer for want of food. They give strange accounts of the Esquimaux vibrating from the Asiatic to the American continent, and back again, carrying their boats, made of skins and walrusbone, over the ice, and launching them when they meet with open water. They all confirm the fact that the whales found in the Behring's Straits and in Baffin's Bay are the same species—proving the existence of a passage; for a whale of the Arctic species, they say, has never been seen to the south of 22° of latitude; so they cannot have doubled either of the Capes, (of Good Hope or Cape Horn,) as the whale is under the necessity of making his presence known by coming to the surface to blow."

HER MAJESTY AND THE LATE ACCIDENT AT SALFORD.—We understand that Her Majesty has liberally subscribed the sum of £10, through Col. Phipps, to the fund now being raised for the widow and children of Mr. Gibbons, late the head gardener at the Peel Park, Salford, who was accidentally drowned a fortnight ago while endeavouring to save the life of a female who had fallen into the river Irwell.

NEW ASYLUM FOR FATHERLESS CHILDREN.—On Tuesday the eighth anniversary of this asylum, at Stamford-hill, was celebrated at the London Tavern by a festival, at which Mr. Peto, M.P., presided. About 80 friends and supporters of the institution dined together. The Chairman stated that the Prince of Wales was a contributor of 250 guineas. A list of subscriptions amounting to £962 was read, including a donation of 250 guineas from the Chairman, and one of 100 guineas from Baron Lionel Rothschild, Treasurer of the institution.

DEATH OF SIR CHARLES ROWAN, K.C.B.—This gentleman, who held the office of Chief Commissioner of the Metropolitan Police, from its establishment in 1829 down to about two years since, died on Saturday last, at his residence in Norfolk-street, Park Lane. The deceased gentleman was a native of Antrim, and had served long in the army. He held a medal, two clasps, and the order of C.B. for his military services. He also held a medal for Waterloo. In 1848 he received the civil order of Knight Commander of the Bath.

Sir John Pakington moved the second reading of the New Zealand Constitution bill, which was opposed by Sir W. Milesworth. Mr. Adair supported the bill, maintaining that the Constitution which it proposed was entirely in accordance with the wishes of the people of the colony, and was earnestly desired and anxiously expected by them.

IRELAND.

POLITICAL.

IRISH DIFFICULTIES.

The London Evening Journal thus sums up the difficulties which threaten the new Viceroy of Ireland.—After enumerating the complications of the Education Question, the editor continues:

Nor is the Education question by any means the only perplexity which is likely to tax the statesmanship of the untried and inexperienced nobleman to whom Lord Derby's political poverty has compelled him to confide the Irish vice-royalty. We cannot forget that Dr. Cullen will probably, in a few weeks, sit in the chair of the lamented Murray; that the versatile author of the theory of "development" will perhaps, in a few months, be delivering lectures, facetious or otherwise, in the new "Catholic University;" that the Ultramontane party are goaded to fury by the mischievous and useless ecclesiastical Titles Act, and by the more tangible loss of the thirty thousand souls who have entered the pale of our Church in Connaught; that the silly cry for the repeal of the Maynooth endowment is raised in some parts of that country, as if for the purpose of embarrassing, at one and the same moment, the true friends of Ireland and the Prime Minister, whose name is scarcely less identified with that measure than that of Sir Robert Peel; that Mr. Wilberforce's bulletins are not unlikely to return to the next Parliament some scores of clever and thorough-going men—the very puritans of Romanism; and that the shooting of landlords and agents may not improbably recommence at an early season. We might add a hundred other elements of difficulty, any one of which were sufficient to exhaust the resources and embarrass the astuteness of a Clarendon. We sincerely wish the Earl of Eglinton all possible success in an enterprise, the acceptance of which says at least as much for his Lordship's "chivalry" as the famous tournament itself; but we greatly doubt whether any amount of medieval virtues and accomplishments affords an adequate guarantee for the political wisdom and capacity required in a statesman of the nineteenth century.

Foreign Countries.

AUSTRIA.—Accounts from Vienna of the 10th inst. state that a *fete* had taken place upon that day, when 17,000 troops were reviewed by the young Emperor, who was accompanied by the Emperor of Russia, each attended by a brilliant staff. Both Emperors were to visit the theatre in the evening.

An Imperial patent appears in the *Gazette* of the 11th, fixing the stipulations and the penalties attached to the crime of seducing, or attempting to seduce, soldiers from their duty.

RUSSIA.—According to the last accounts from St. Petersburg, dated the 6th, the cold continued so severe that the Neva was still frozen over. Nevertheless steam navigation between Stettin and Cronstadt commenced on the 15th inst.

ENGLISH CHURCH CONGREGATIONS IN ITALY.—A correspondent of the *Times* gives the following account of English Churches and services in the principal cities of Italy:—

The building at Rome is situated a few doors without the Porta del Popolo on the road to Florence, in immediate and convenient vicinity to the Strangers' Quarter. There is no external indication whatever of a place of worship. The apartment used as Church occupies the top of a large house, literally in the roof, the beams of which appear in several places. There is a small inclosure for the altar, and the pulpit and reading desk are placed beside it. The congregation are seated on chairs, which are pretty closely packed. The congregation is generally large, often exceeding 700 persons, and there are great complaints of want of ventilation, and excessive heat from the roof. In consequence of the dispute between the Bishop of Gibraltar and the Committee, his Lordship, during his last visit,

did not enter "the room known as the English chapel," but had Divine service performed in a house in the Corso occupied by another Clergyman.

It seems a principle throughout Italy that there shall be no external indications of an ecclesiastical character in connexion with Protestant Churches. The condition is insisted upon at Nice, Genoa, Pisa, Naples, and Florence. At Nice the building was expressly erected for the purpose, on condition that it should not look like a Church. The pulpit is over the communion table, and is entered by a door from a staircase in the vestry. The congregation is large in the winter season. At Genoa the arrangements are of the humblest kind. The Church is a room on the one pair floor of a house in a bye street. The congregation is small. At Pisa a large house has recently been built, half of which forms the dwelling for the Clergyman and the other half the Church. At Naples the Church is a very large and handsome room in the Consul's house, conveniently arranged and paved. The Chaplain, who is appointed by the Embassy, is at variance with the committee, and the school in it is entirely without his control. The congregation is large and respectable. The services are never attended by the Ambassador, though the Foreign Office claims the patronage. At Florence the Church is large and elegant. The altar is placed in a circular recess, with the pulpit and reading desk on either side. The roof is arched, and there is a very handsome organ loft. In all cases it appears the rule, that whatever is raised by subscription or donation of the visitors and residents for the support of worship according to the Church of England, is doubled by the Foreign Office.

Miscellaneous.

THE ICEBOUND SHIPS SEEN BY THE RENOVATION.—Mr. Vincent Pappalardo, Consul, &c., at Portsmouth, has given the details of the examination of Captain Coward, of the *Renovation*, before the Venetian authorities on the 4th inst. Capt. Coward fully corroborates the statement made by the other parties who were on board the *Renovation*, but states that the two vessels seen looked like whalers.

THE ARCTIC EXPEDITION.—By the return of the *Basilik* and *Desperate* steamers, letters have been received from the Arctic Squadron, under Sir Edward Belcher. They record a succession of favouring circumstances, with the exception of a gale of wind, which for a time dispersed the squadron, and occasioned some injury to the *North Star*, unhappily washing away one of her best boats. The steamers left the squadron May 8th, in lat. 60° 10 min., long. 23° 30 min. W. All well and in high spirits.

CHARLES THE SECOND'S WATCH.—Dr. Hume, of Liverpool, mentioned at the meeting of the Historic Society of Lancashire and Cheshire last week as a curious fact, that a gentleman in Liverpool was now wearing the watch worn by King Charles II. in 1645.

A few days ago, as some workmen were making repairs in the parish church, Crowle, they found in the organ a nest of young redbreasts nearly fledged. This circumstance may be considered somewhat singular when it is known that the organ is used every Sunday for Divine service.—*Doncaster Chronicle*.

Spirit of the Press.

THE CATECHISM.

A letter from Lord Lyttelton, which we printed last week, respecting the compulsory use of the Catechism in Church schools, has brought down upon us a shower of correspondence, a selection from which will be found in the columns of to-day's paper, and which seems to require some remarks from us.

First, as to Lord Lyttelton's letter. He does not put forward any positive opinion of his own; but asks the question whether the children of Dissenters ought, or ought not to be received into our schools? There is something in the tone of his letter which would seem to indicate that, in his opinion, they ought. But he puts forward, with apparent approval, a line of argument from which it appears inevitably to follow that either the religious teaching must be excluded. If we understand Lord Lyttelton aright, that to teach the whole Catechism to Dissenting children would involve a species of profanation—to teach them that part only which concerned them, omitting to assert their claim to Church privileges would be invidious, and therefore in the long run impracticable—to teach them the religion of the Catechism without its words would be a disingenuous blind—while to teach them such a modified Christianity as would suit the views of their parents, would be a vicious latitudinarianism. The alternative would seem to remain between teaching them no religion at all, and excluding them from Church schools altogether.

We believe Lord Lyttelton would concur with us in thinking it simply useless to admit Dissenters to our schools, if we refrained from giving that knowledge which alone gives true value to education. In fact, we should be guilty of enticing them away from their own schools (if they had any) and giving them a much worse education than they would get there. It only remains, therefore, that they should be peremptorily excluded from our schools; and we are puzzled, because we are equally unable to believe that Lord Lyttelton adopts this conclusion or to see how he avoids it.

The principle, however, of excluding all Dissenting children is unhesitatingly put forward by some of our correspondents, while others state that they find no difficulty in working the system which Lord Lyttelton considers as impracticable, of withholding those parts of the Catechism which (like the second question and answer) they consider inapplicable to Dissenters, or which, like the doctrine of the Sacraments, they imagine distasteful to them.

Now for ourselves. We must in the first place repudiate the view that the Church is bound to repel from her schools Dissenting children, meaning by that phrase not merely the children of Dissenters, but those children, whether baptized or not, whose home is a Dissenting one, and whose habits are presumably Dissenting also, excepting only that they are allowed by their parents or guardians to attend and conform to the rules of a Church school.

We believe the office of the Church to be not only that of a mother to her children, but of a missionary to those who are without, and we believe schools are, in our own day, among the main instruments of the missionary. To say this, is to say at once that Church should embrace other than Church children. We cannot think, with Archdeacon Denison, that to teach such children is in any degree inconsistent with the duties of a priest; or, with another correspondent, that they fall within the scope of St. Paul's command to "mark them which cause division among us and avoid them." Dissenters though they be, we would more than admit them—we would welcome them to our school, if they will conform to its regulations. But there, unhappily, arises the claim that our regulations should be made to conform to them.

Now, this claim is very loudly, generally, and pertinaciously put forward. It embodies itself in the cry against the Catechism. But is not confined to that.—It attacks dogmatical teaching in general—something in another. But in all its varieties it amounts to a demand that the Church shall in some degree sacrifice the completeness of her teaching to increase the number of her hearers. No doubt, some persons urge this demand with a sincere desire to extend her sphere of religious influence. But it is impossible not to feel that the great pressure in this direction is from those who consider the distinctive tenets of the Church of England, perhaps of Christianity itself, as mere troublesome impediments which prevent them from using the machinery of a State Church as freely as they could wish for humanizing the people by a disseminating of secular instruction and the inculcation of moral truth. And this is a strong reason—not of course for taking a false position, or adhering obstinately to what is inconvenient or impracticable—but for viewing with considerable jealousy proposals which are likely, under such circumstances, to be made in one spirit and worked in another, introduced with the best intentions by our friends, but developed with the worst intentions by the pressure of our enemies.

A general rule, broad and intelligible, has a special value as a barrier against inroads of this kind, and such a value attaches to the general rule that the Catechism shall be taught in all schools assisted National Society.

In parishes where any considerable proportion of the population belongs to the Church, we can see great evil and no proportionate good in departing from the strict rule. The children of Churchmen are obviously injured by having before their eyes a broken, floating, and indecisive system of religious teaching; and, on the other hand, nothing is gained. Catechism or no Catechism, we believe that Dissenters who are not in earnest on those points which separate them from the Church will send their children to the school, if it is a good one, perfectly knowing what will be taught them, and willing to take their chance of its effect. And this, we consider, places the Church teacher in about the most advantageous position which he can hold with regard to the children of Dissenters. He is at full liberty, without circuity or disingenuousness, to teach them the whole truth. Nor can we think that the structure of the Catechism imposes on him any difficulty beyond this, that he should explain to certain children the qualifications under which alone some two or three questions are, or can become, applicable to them. The expedient adopted by one of our correspondents, of refraining from putting those questions to Dissenting children, appears to us to be no unreasonable mode (unless unkindly done) of enforcing this, and to involve no violation in spirit of the rules of the National Society.

In these cases the position of the Church is primarily that of instructress to her own children, and only incidentally that of missionary. But sometimes the case may be reversed. A clergyman may find that his work is practically not to serve those who compose his congregation, but to convert those who do not. In such cases we must fairly own that it does not appear to us that any rigid rule can be unflinchingly enforced. Much must be left, we should imagine, to the discretion of the clergyman, who must, in a great measure, judge for himself by what expedients he may best acquire influence over those for whose souls he is, in spite of himself, responsible. The power of giving instruction,—be it even mere secular instruction—"useful and entertaining knowledge,"—is one of the weapons in his armoury. Like words of gentleness, and acts of charity, it is among the means which God has given him of drawing men towards touching services and holy thoughts. In such cases, we fully grant that a liberty is desirable. We only say, let it be clearly exceptionable, and let it not be made a reason for introducing an unnecessary and mischievous confusion of teaching into those schools where no corresponding advantage is to be gained.—*Guardian*.

OXFORD.

The Report of the Oxford University Commission, which has so long been feared or desired, was published yesterday, and now lies before us. For the benefit of the numerous persons interested in this report, but not likely to see it till their annual visit to Oxford or the metropolis, we may as well describe the outward features of a document which has hitherto been anticipated in some quarters as a spectral bugbear rather than as a solid reality. It is a bulky volume, running to nearly 800 folio pages, of which more than 250 are devoted to the report itself, arranged under the several heads of the state, the discipline, the studies, and the revenues of the University and the several Colleges and Halls, summed up with a very compendious "conclusion." The remainder of the volume consists of some legal and historical statements, correspondence, tables of fees and other documents, and the evidence of ninety Prelates, dignitaries, professors, distinguished men, and University and College officials; the so-called evidence assuming in some instances the character of considerable pamphlets, and in others being confined to the formal receipts of the circulars issued by the Commissioners. This superficial account of the volume will satisfy the most sceptical member of the University that the Commissioners have made a report, and that they have not been entirely paralysed by the scruples which led so many respectable men to withhold the information at their command. The Commissioners express their regret that, owing to these scruples, the report is not quite so complete as might have been desired, but no one can turn over the leaves without perceiving that there is quite enough, not merely to satisfy a large curiosity, but also to supply the necessary materials for legislative discussion. After all, those palpable facts of the case that are before the eyes of the whole world, and which constitute the operation and results of the University system, are the most important, and, as far as we can see, they are fully brought out in the pages before us. As it is, the Commissioners feel it necessary to apologize for the length of their report.

Though it is the object of many of the recommendations rather to emancipate the University and Colleges, and enable them to extend their utility themselves, and though it is rather a beginning than a complete system which is suggested, yet the Commissioners have gone quite as far as was desirable, or perhaps possible, in filling up a scheme of reform.—That proposed reform is serious, extensive, and particular. Indeed, there is not an office or an institution, or a practice in the University, from the appointment of the Vice-Chancellor to the debts of the Under graduates—from the government of the University to the time of the Long Vacation, which is not affected. The mere summary of the proposed alterations extends to forty-seven heads. The careful attention which has been given to every point fully explains the increasing assiduity with which the Commission has held its sittings from Oct. 18, 1850, to April 23, 1852, seldom