

those who avail themselves of it. But there is one passage in the *Times* article which, as usual, proves the utter ignorance of that public instructor, as regards matters belonging to Catholic doctrine, and the universal feeling of Catholics on all questions of a domestic character and religious observance. After stating, on its own authority, loosely and at random, that "a third of the Irish people are Protestants, and do not insist on the indissolubility of marriage any more than the English"—a statement which we leave our Protestant countrymen to endorse or refute as they may think fit—the delusive public instructor of England proceeds to say, that "even the Irish Roman Catholics would be ready to avail themselves of the Court for the purpose of obtaining judicial separations, and for prosecuting suits of nullity or jactitation of marriage, or for obtaining declaration of legitimacy." What the Protestants of Ireland may desire to do we cannot undertake to say, though we suspect there are few of them anxious to avail themselves of the facilities afforded in Sir C. Cresswell's Court for dissolving the solemn binding and sacred contract which they have entered into in the presence of Him who has ordained the marriage state. But Catholics who profess, practice, and desire to remain attached to their church, neither can nor will appeal to any such tribunal to annul and vitiate a solemn engagement declared by their Church, on Divine authority, to be a holy sacrament—a life-long union, indissoluble only by the hand of death. As regards the establishment, in the English Divorce Court, of a jurisdiction extending to Ireland, that is a question in which Catholics are but little concerned, save in cases of mixed marriages in Ireland, in which the Protestant party might seek the benefit of the Divorce Court's extension of jurisdiction to this country.—*Dublin Telegraph*.

It is once more proposed to extend to Ireland the new English law and practice of Divorce. The attempt has been made more than once before, and was defeated by the indignation of the Irish people. The experience of the working of the new law will certainly not have made that opposition less indignant. Before last August, there were more than 600 petitions for dissolutions of marriage. The complaint now is that Sir C. Cresswell cannot get through them as fast as they throng upon him. Those now pending will occupy him till the end of 1862, and new petitions are daily presented. The Divorce Court has created and multiplied the grievous evil on which it lives; and no man can foresee the end of our downward career. There is no denying that the present state of our marriage law is many respects most unsatisfactory. It is a great evil that the law of marriage and divorce should be different in England, Ireland, and Scotland—that the courts should come into conflict; for instance, a man legally divorced and pronounced able to marry again by the Scotch Court, has lately been sentenced to transportation for bigamy in England for marrying there! It is an evil that the means of deciding the legality of a marriage or the legitimacy of children should be more difficult and costly in Ireland than in England. Mrs. Yelverton, for instance, applied to Sir C. Cresswell for a declaration of the legality of her marriage, and was refused, on the ground that he has no jurisdiction in Ireland. But whatever is the remedy for these evils, the marriage law of Ireland (which, in the main, is still the same as the law of God, and which therefore declares that marriage can be dissolved only by death) must not be conformed to the new law of England, which declares that marriage joined by God may be dissolved by man. Nothing but the unanimous indignation of the Irish nation saved it from the passing of such a law in 1858, and it will be unanimous and indignant in 1861. Upon this one point all the Law-Lords agree with Lord Cranworth, who pathetically complains, "It is impossible to persuade the inhabitants of the sister isle that it is right to introduce such a measure." Thank God, it is impossible. Else, before now, we should have had a Divorce Court sitting in Dublin, and "putting asunder" in the name of Queen Victoria, those whom God pronounces to be one. The Irish people have often been insulted and trampled upon; but they have won here a great and glorious moral victory. On the other hand, it is urged by all the Lords (except Lord Montague) that there are Protestants in Ireland, and that it is hard that they should have less licence than Protestants elsewhere. Their numbers would not justify the erection of a Divorce Court in Dublin; but it is urged they ought to be allowed to get divorced in Westminster Hall. This goes upon the principle that those who have not the happiness to be Catholics, although they may live in Ireland, are only half Irishmen. There is something to say for that view, though we should have scrupled to urge it. Doubtless, if Irish Protestants will be divorced it had better be done in London than in Ireland. But there are grave objections to allowing Irish cases to come at all into Westminster Hall. It is a dangerous precedent. If one Judge in London is to try Irish Divorce cases, why should not another try any other class of civil or criminal suits? Upon this point the Irish people will naturally be jealous, and will demand that matters shall remain as they are. They will not have Parliament tamper either with their national judicature or their national morals. The new law in England was proposed to get rid of the disgusting trials, two or three of which disgrace the country every year. This very evil is now, as Lord Montague said, tenfold worse than before. In this matter, at least, Ireland is well as it is; by all means let us leave well alone. As for the other branches of Sir C. Cresswell's jurisdiction, such as that for which Mrs. Yelverton applied to him (declaration of the legality of marriage), or the declaration of legitimacy (the power under which Mrs. Shadden lately applied for relief), or again, the decision of will cases, there is no reason why Irish suitors should be forced and their country insulted by bringing such cases to London. Ireland has as good judges as she can desire, and the law may be modified so as to give them the needful jurisdiction, if they have it not already. One injustice we rejoice to see the Lord Chancellor has already introduced a Bill to remedy, that is, the shameful remnant of the penal laws, which makes a Catholic marriage void in law if either party to it has professed Protestantism within the year.—*Weekly Register*.

THE ORANGEMEN STRIVING TO OVERCOME THE LAW.—The Orangemen who rioted in blood at Derrynacash, and have paid the penalty of their murderous onslaught on unarmed women and children, are striving to overcome the law, and the punishment it inflicted upon them. The fraternity at length find that verdicts of "not guilty," in the face of the most convincing evidence of guilt, are not fashionable now; and it is amusing to observe the shifts, the stratagems, and devices they are resorting to, that the punishments inflicted on the convicted parties may be lessened or remitted altogether. Before the jury, when on their trial, the prisoners found none of their counsel able to offer any excuse for their conduct in the bloody affair. All Mr. Joy could do was to calumniate Catholics in general, and the Jesuits in particular, telling them that the principle, that "the end justifies the means," found protection from that order, and that the same principle was at work in the prosecution of the Orangemen. Mr. Moohan indulged in a ridiculous charge of conspiracy; stating that certain Catholics, amongst whom were Mr. Thomas McCann, Mr. Close, and Mr. Francis Vallio, had resolved to put Catholics on the jury! If an effort to purge the jury lists of the County Armagh, and put men on them who were fraudulently let off, and wipe out names that were not entitled to remain on the lists, be a conspiracy, then Mr. McCann and his friends were guilty. But what in reality, did they do? Nothing more than to join hearts and hands to destroy a real "conspiracy," which kept Catholics' names from the jury lists which were qualified to be there. This was what they did; and that is what the astute, logical, and learned Mr. Moohan called a "conspiracy." Another charge was made against the Catholics, which

recoiled with fearful force on its authors.—They insolently proclaimed that the indictments against the prisoners were proved by perjured witnesses! What an infamous calumny! Should not the authors of such language be ashamed to raise their heads before the faces of honest men? Perjury! The records of audacity can find nothing to equal this outrage on justice. A Protestant judge, Protestant jurors, five Protestant Crown counsel, and even the Protestant counsel for the prisoners, heard the evidence against them, and every one of them believed it true; and notwithstanding this, it was proclaimed in a crowded court, and before the entire country, that the prosecution rested on, and was sustained by perjured witnesses! And now the friends of the convicted Orangemen begin the work of endeavouring to defeat the labours of the judge and jurors. They look on themselves as an injured community, against whom wrong and injustice have been committed. Some of them met last week in the "Protestant Hall" of Armagh, and resolved to bring the case before parliament. The jurors, too, who have convicted Sam Tate, have relented, and have signed a petition for mitigating his punishment. The cause of this is, an assertion that Murphy, who died, had not stated in his dying declaration, that he had seen Tate fire a shot. But how, indeed, could he have seen him? His back was turned towards him when the shot was fired by Tate which inflicted the wounds that led to his death. We thought the Orangemen would have learned wisdom from the results of the recent trials. We imagined that they would have seen the folly of persisting in a course which will not be tolerated any longer. But here we find them at their insane proceedings again. Their efforts to upset justice will be vain. They have suffered defeat; they have been worsted where they thought, as in other times, they would be victorious, and if the law will not be able to tame their ferocity, and correct their insanity, they must be dealt with by other means. The Catholics of Ulster will not bear their insolence any longer, and they will take arms in their hands to protect their lives, if the Government does not give them proper protection from savages seeking to spill their blood. A greater proof could not be given of the audacious spirit which influences the Orange faction than the language they have addressed to the Rev. Mr. Morgan, the respected Parish Priest of Seagor, in which the district of Derrynacash is situated.—A milder or milder clergyman could not be found in Ireland; and yet they have exhibited towards the Rev. gentleman a spirit which could not be equalled in the wildest region of Africa. Men who could treat the mildest of clergymen in this manner are a disgrace to their country; and it is the duty of men of all creeds to hunt down such a ferocious banditti, till they are powerless for evil, and cry out for mercy.—*Dundalk Democrat*.

A PROTESTANT JOURNAL ON MISS AYLMER'S TREATMENT IN PRISON.—The accused spirit of party and sectarian rancour, which has so long reigned amongst the Protestants of Ireland would seem to stifle and enfeeble all the better and nobler feelings of our common nature. Save in such extraordinary instances as the Yelverton trial, this envenomed disposition is manifested in a form that cannot fail to excite the wonder and reprobation of other nations.—One of the most deplorable instances of the evil resulting from the indulgence in this spirit of partisanship and religious animosity is exhibited in the ungenerous and discourteous remarks of one of our Protestant contemporaries on the relaxations in the prison regulations at Grangegreen, in favor of Miss Aylmer, whose delicacy of health, as attested by the unquestionable certificates of her medical attendants imperatively require the indulgence which has so deeply offended our contemporary's impartial and justice-loving sensibilities. Had this lady even been guilty of some terrible crime, we conceive the dictates of humanity, the indulgence granted by universal consent to her sex and her position in life, should have enlisted the pious of every party and creed in favor of ameliorative treatment, under the circumstances. But all such considerations are to be ignored, because she is a Catholic, although the amelioration in the rigor of the ordinary prison rules has been ordered by one of the judges of the land, and although the entire Board of Superintendence, Protestant and Catholic, unanimously complied with his lordship's suggestions, never, we are persuaded, for a moment conceiving it possible that they would thereby draw upon themselves and him the unmeasured censure of any public journalist of whatever creed or party he might be.—*Dublin Telegraph*.

THE NATIONAL SYSTEM WORKING.—THE SHANTONAGH SCHOOL.—Since the Catholic Episcopacy took a position of decided hostility to the National System of Education, the public looking upon the system as finally condemned and only awaiting execution, have shown less interest than formerly in the mere details of its actual working. Thus it has happened that some recent cases of injustice and oppression towards Catholics employed under the Board have attracted less attention than they deserved, and amongst these we may mention that of the female teacher of the Shantonagh National School. It is not right, however, that cases of this sort should be quite overlooked. We notice in our valued contemporary the *Dundalk Democrat*, an address which has been presented to Miss McGuinness, as the testimony of the feeling her honest refusal to become the instrument of an insidious proselytism has excited amongst the laity and clergy of the locality, who must, from local knowledge, be the best judges of the whole case. After twenty-four years' service under the National Board, Miss McGuinness was dismissed without compensation for refusing to compel the children of her school, mostly Catholics, to read daily the Protestant version of the Scriptures. Let the Catholics of Ireland realise to themselves the character of the system of education calling itself "national," under which a long-tried and deserving teacher can be summarily dismissed for refusing to do an act which she regarded as a breach of religious duty, and which, certainly, if done, would expose her to the charge of scandalising the little ones entrusted to her care. It is nothing to say that this unjust and iniquitous proceeding did not directly emanate from the National Board; nay, that in point of fact Miss McGuinness was only carrying out a "fundamental rule" of the Board in refusing to compel Catholic girls to read the Protestant Bible. Our reply is that the system allows such tyrannous acts to be perpetrated with absolute impunity, and almost with the approval of its administrators. What do the Commissioners say, when representation is made to them that this injustice has been committed—why, that the manager who dismissed a Catholic teacher for refusing to become an instrument of Protestant proselytism "did nothing but what by virtue of the powers conferred upon him by the nature of his office he was entitled to do," thus adopting his act as done in accordance with the system which he administered.—But admitting that Mr. Rothwell had technically, under the Board's regulations, a right to dismiss the teacher for refusing to violate a "fundamental rule" of the system, surely we might suppose that the Commissioners would have regarded such a case as deserving of their special interference, and would have, in some way or other, sustained the teacher who had preferred her duty to her interest, and who had resisted the attempt to turn the National System into one of Proselytism. Nothing of the sort has, however, been done by the Board, who on the contrary, have rejected her claim for compensation on the ground of long, and, as it would seem, too faithful service. The Commissioners consider Miss McGuinness too young to receive compensation, as she has served only four-and-twenty years under the Board, but they award compensation to another teacher, dismissed, not for resistance to Proselytism, but for taking an action against the Catholic Bishop of the Diocese, the Most Rev. Dr. McNally. Possibly, however, this may have appeared to the Board a much more meritorious act on the part of a National teacher than merely carrying out its own rules with good faith and constancy, despite

the strong temptation to please an influential, and, as it seems, all-powerful manager. What had the Commissioners to say to a Catholic Bishop or to his diocese? Both well, "Oh! hang the diocese," when told that the reading of the Protestant Scriptures by Catholic children was forbidden by ecclesiastical authority at least in that diocese? The National Board has nothing to say to Bishops or Priests, but it recognises the authority of school managers as paramount and absolute even to punish teachers for doing their duty faithfully by adhering to the Board's fundamental rules. This is what the administration of the National System of Education has now come to—that system which, as Lord Stanley solemnly announced at its promulgation, was to "avoid even the slightest suspicion of Proselytism." How has this public engagement been kept, when a flagrant case of systematic tampering with the religion of Catholic children is not only overlooked, but its perpetrator is actually supported by the Board, as having done, "only what he was entitled to do." Are Protestant patrons and managers of National Schools "entitled to proselytise the Catholic children who may attend those schools? The Commissioners, in effect, say that they are so 'entitled,' and by so saying they plead guilty to one of the gravest charges which has ever been brought against them. But what steps have the Board taken to carry out their fundamental rule, and to throw off the suspicion of Proselytism from the Shantonagh National School. None whatever. Mr. Rothwell's right of dismissal is recognized, and Mr. Rothwell may, therefore, do what he likes with the National School of which he is the patron. It is to be supposed that he has found or will find the slightest difficulty in filling up, with a more complaisant occupant, the post which Miss McGuinness has been forced, by conscientious motives, to vacate. Unfortunately, it is possible, though we hope not easy, to find, even amongst Catholics a teacher who will strive to earn the approbation of such Protestant proselytisers as Mr. Rothwell. National teachers calling themselves Catholics, who pander to the religious bigotry of their Protestant patrons by telling them that 'the people' that is, their own fellow-Catholics, 'were afraid of the priests putting horns on them' and that 'the priests want to keep the people in ignorance,' and who publicly explain the repugnance of Catholic girls to reading the Protestant version of the Scriptures, as 'arising from the superstition natural to their sex, making them afraid that the priests would smite their parents' cattle with diseases were they to disobey their injunctions—these are the teachers who will certainly find favor with the Rothwells, and who need not fear to be turned aside after nearly a quarter of a century spent in the service of the National Board. Does any one doubt that this is the practical working of the National System, not in a few districts only, but over a wide area of the northern and western provinces. The Board, indeed, have certain rules which are very stringently enforced against Catholics, but which proselytising managers find it perfectly easy to evade or violate with impunity. Mr. Rothwell may send, or allow some Souper society to send, not only Protestant Bibles but Souper Tracts into a National School, the pupils of which are almost all Catholics; but the Catholic teacher of a neighbouring National School cannot make her pupils read in the evenings of Lent a chapter of St. Liguori's 'Way of Salvation,' without drawing down on herself the unfavourable report of the Protestant inspector, and the reprimand and displeasure of the Board. How do such undoubted and undeniable facts as those accord with Lord Stanley's undertaking that 'the National System shall avoid even the slightest suspicion of proselytism.' We say nothing now of the notorious partiality shown by the Board and its most influential servants towards those whose complaisance in religious matters helps the system to work smoothly, nor of the official spitefulness and downright persecution which must be endured by Catholic teachers who are at all scrupulous in matters touching conscience. Toward the latter, indeed, the Board can act with a severity which savours of vindictiveness. Miss McGuinness is not the first of her family who has suffered grievous injustice at the hands of the National Board. Her brother, also a National teacher, was some time ago not only dismissed from the Board's service, but actually submitted, at their instance, to police espionage, owing to some quarrel with the same inspector who showed so strong a dislike to the writings of St. Liguori. Certainly, this was carrying partiality towards a Protestant favourite to shameful lengths, and we can hardly credit that so utterly mean and malevolent an act could have the direct authorisation even of such a body as the Commissioners of National Education. But what are we to think of a system under which such things can be done, not only with impunity, but with official countenance and approbation.—*Morning News*.

THE FIRST LORD AVONMORE.—Barry Yelverton, of humble origin, afterwards Lord Avonmore, and successor to Hussey Burgh, as Chief Baron of the Exchequer, had acquired great celebrity as an advocate of the Irish bar, and was at this time rapidly winning his way to the highest pinnacle of honourable notoriety and forensic advancement. He had been elected member of parliament for the town of Carrickfergus, and became a zealous partisan for the claims of Ireland. It would be difficult to do justice to the lofty and overwhelming eloquence of this distinguished man, during the early periods of his political exertions. To the profound logical and conclusive reasoning of Flood; the brilliant, stimulating, epigrammatic antithesis of Grattan; the sweet-toned, captivating rhetoric of Burgh; or the wild fascinating imagery and varied pathos of the extraordinary Curran, he was respectively inferior; but in powerful, nervous language, he excelled them all. A rigorous, commanding, undaunted eloquence burst in rolling torrents from his lips; not a word was lost. Though fiery, yet weighty and distinct, the authoritative rapidity of his language, relieved by the beauty of his fancy, subdued the orator without the power of resistance, and left him in doubt, whether it was to argument or to eloquence that he surrendered his conviction. His talents were alike adapted to public purposes, as his private qualities to domestic society. In the common transactions of the world he was an infant; in the varieties of right and wrong, of propriety and error, he was a frail mortal; in the senate, and at the bar, a mighty giant; it was on the bench that, unconscious of his error, and at home unconscious of his virtues, both were most conspicuous. The deep-seated vice, which with equal force freezes the miser's heart, and inflames the ruffian's passions, was to him a stranger; he was always rich and always poor; like his great predecessor, frugality fled before the carelessness of his mind, and left him a victim of his liberality, and of course in many instances a monument of ingratitude. His character was entirely transparent, it had no opaque qualities; his passions were open, his possessions palpable, his failings obvious, and he took as little pains to conceal his faults as to publish his perfections. In politics he was more steady to party, than to principle; but evinced no immutable consistency in either; a patriot by nature, yet susceptible of seduction; a partisan by temper, yet capable of instability, the commencement and conclusion of his political conduct were as distinct as the poles, and as dissimilar as the elements. Ample qualified for the bench by profound legal and constitutional learning, extensive professional practice, strong logical powers, a classical and wide-ranging capacity, equitable propensities, and a philanthropic disposition, he possessed all the positive qualifications for a great judge; but he could not temporize; the total abstinence of skillful or even necessary caution, and the indulgence of a few feeble counteracting habits, greatly diminished his high reputation which a cold phlegmatic mien, or a solemn, imposing, vulgar plausibility, confers on miserably inferior judges. But even with all his faults Lord Avonmore was vastly superior to all his

judicial contemporaries. If he was impetuous, it was impetuosity in which his heart had no concern; he was never unkind that he was not also repentant; and ever thinking that he acted with a rectitude, the cause of his greatest errors seemed to be a careless ignorance of his lesser imperfections. He had a species of intermittent ambition, which either led him too far or forsook him altogether. His pursuits, of course, were unequal, and his ways irregular. Elevated solely by his own talents, he acquired new habits without altogether divesting himself of the old ones. A scholar, a poet, a statesman, a lawyer in elevated society he was a brilliant wit, at lower tables a vulgar humorist; he had appropriate anecdote and conviviality for all, and whether in the one or in the other, he seldom failed to be either entertaining or instructive. He was a friend, ardent, but indiscriminate even to blindness; an enemy warm, but forgiving even to folly; he lost his dignity by the injudiciousness of his selections, and sunk his consequence in the pliability of his nature; to the first he was a dupe, to the latter an instrument; on the whole, he was a more enlightened than efficient statesman, a more able than exceptional judge, and more honest in the theory, than the practice, of his politics. His rising sun was brilliant in its meridian cloudiness, his setting obscure; crosses at length ruffled his temper—deceptions abated his confidence, time tore down his talents, he became depressed and indifferent, and after a long life of chequered incidents and inconsistent conduct, he died, leaving behind him few men who possessed so much talent, so much heart, or so much weakness. This distinguished man, at the critical period of Ireland's emancipation, burst forth as a meteor in the Irish senate; his career in the Commons was not long, but it was busy and important; he had connected himself with the Duke of Portland, and continued that connection till the day of his dissolution. But through the influence of that nobleman, and the absolute necessity of a family provision, on the question of the Union the radiance of his public character was obscured for ever, the laurels of his early achievements fell withered from his brow, and after having with zeal and sincerity laboured to attain independence for his country in 1782, he became one of its sole-masters in 1800, and mingling in a motley crowd, ungenial to his native character, and beneath his natural superiority, he surrendered the rights, the franchises, and the honours of that peerage, to which, by his great talents and his early virtues, he had been so justly elevated. Except upon the bench his person was devoid of dignity, and his appearance ordinary and mean, yet there was something in the strong marked lines of his rough unfinished features, which bespoke a character of no common description; powerful talent was its first trait, fire and philanthropy contended for the next; his countenance, wrought up and varied by the strong impressions of his laboring mind, could be better termed indistinct than expressive; and in the midst of his greatest errors, and most reprehensible moments, it was difficult not to respect and impossible not to regard him.—*From Sir Joseph Barrington's "Rise and Fall of the Irish Nation."*

GREAT BRITAIN.

DEATH OF THE DUCHESS OF KENT.—We regret to announce the death of her Royal Highness the Duchess of Kent. Her Royal Highness had been unwell during the greater portion of the week, cancer having made a fatal progress. On Tuesday last, in consequence of the unfavourable accounts from Frogmore, the Queen and Prince Consort made a visit to Frogmore, and her Royal Highness the Princess Alice visited her illustrious grandmother on Thursday. At six o'clock yesterday (Friday), a telegram was received at Buckingham Palace from Dr. Brown the Duchess of Kent's medical attendant, announcing that a decided change for the worse had happened. In consequence of the receipt of that message the royal dinner circle was countermanded, and at seven o'clock the Queen and Prince Consort, with her Royal Highness Princess Alice, proceeded by special train to Windsor, and immediately visited her Royal Highness at Frogmore. Her Royal Highness passed an unfavourable night, and shortly before ten o'clock this morning passed tranquilly into eternity, the Queen and Prince Consort being present at her dissolution. The mournful intelligence was received at Buckingham Palace at a quarter past ten, when her Royal Highness Princess Helena and other members of the royal family left town for Windsor. The death of her Royal Highness was at once telegraphed to his Royal Highness the Prince of Wales at Cambridge, and the sad intelligence was also transmitted by telegraph to the King of the Belgians, at Brussels, likewise the Duke of Saxe-Coburg-Gotha. The late Victoria Maria Louisa, Duchess of Kent and Strathern, in Great Britain, Countess of Dublin, in Ireland, was fourth daughter of His Serene Highness Francis Frederick, late reigning Duke of Saxe-Coburg-Saalfeld. Her Royal Highness was born on the 17th August, 1786, consequently was in her 75th year. She married, first, the 25th Dec. 1803, his Serene Highness Prince Balthasar Charles of Leiningen, who died 4th July, 1814, by whom her Royal Highness had issue Charles Frederick William, late reigning Prince of Leiningen, K.G., and Princess Anne, married to Prince Hohenzollern-Langenbourg. Her Royal Highness married secondly, at Coburg, 29th May, 1818, and at Kew, 11th July, 1818, his Royal Highness the late Duke of Kent, fourth son of George III., who died on the 23rd January, 1820, by whom her Royal Highness had issue an only child, our gracious Queen, The Courts of Berlin, Brussels, Portugal will be placed in mourning by the mournful event. Information of her Royal Highness's decease was forwarded to the Lord Mayor, as customary on such occasions. Shortly afterwards the Lord Mayor issued a proclamation, which was affixed to the walls of the Mansion House, and the great bell of St. Paul's was tolled.

A correspondent of the *Union* complains that "the Bishop of Oxford dined with the Grocers' Company, on Wednesday, the 27th Feb., returned thanks for the House of Lords, and proposed the health of the Master and Wardens," he adds: "Many Priests are doing what they can to discourage the laity from giving dinner parties during the present season of forty days' fasting and penitence; but what can they say to their flocks if one of the most eminent High Church Bishops himself sets the bad example of adorning a civic banquet with his august presence and eloquence on a Lenten Fast Day? It mars the effect on the minds of the laity of special sermons and solemn missions during the Lenten season when the episcopal promoter of these good works—at the very time that one of these sermons is being preached—is himself sitting down to a sumptuous repast in one of the halls of the City of London Guilds. The *Times* reporter does not say whether Dr. Wilberforce abstained from flesh meat on the occasion. If his Lordship did not, I hope he was provided with a dispensation from the proper ecclesiastical authority."

BRITISH AND FOREIGN SHIPPING.—In the year 1860, 5,763,464 tons of British (and British colonial) shipping entered our ports with cargoes, and 4,292,823 tons of foreign, an increase in the British shipping of 373,511 tons over 1859, and in the foreign of 592,226 tons. The clearances outwards with cargoes were,—British shipping, 6,359,103 tons; foreign, 4,425,433, an increase of 134,785 tons of British shipping over 1859, and 407,127 of foreign. The relative share of business obtained by British and by foreign shipping last year, as shown by the tonnage entered and cleared, was, therefore,—British shipping, 58.2 per cent.; foreign, 41.8. The total tonnage entered and cleared was 20,839,823 tons.—Fifteen years before it was considerably below half that amount; the proportions of British and foreign then were 71 and 29 per cent respectively. Ten years ago the tonnage had risen to 12,000,000, and the proportions were 67 per cent British and 33 foreign. Five years ago the tonnage had increased

to 15,000,000, and the proportions were 60 and 40 per cent. Since then nearly 2 per cent have been transferred from British to foreign shipping. By far the greater part of this trade is with foreign countries; last year a tonnage of 10,249,737 arrived from or departed to foreign countries, and 4,590,086 from or to British possessions. These statements do not include the coasting trade, which is almost wholly in our own hands; in it 33,815,531 tons of British shipping entered and cleared during the year, and only 202,270 of foreign. It is almost unnecessary to add that repeated voyages are all counted.

THE DIVORCE COURT.—A letter in the *Times* says: "There have been 250 causes set down for hearing in this court, and up to the present time 70 have been disposed of, leaving a balance of 180 untried. The court has been sitting about three months, and, taking the average of cases to be adjudicated upon at 25 per month, deducting Easter and the Long Vacation, it would bring the last cause on probably about March 1862. Then Sir C. Cresswell will find another monster array of more than 200 new causes staring him in the face."

GAVAZZI.—The notorious Dr. McNeil, of Liverpool, writes to the *Record* to induce persons to send friends for renting a preaching-room for Gavazzi in Naples. He hopes for a "Reformation" in Italy of which Gavazzi is to be the Apostle. He seems to complain that Gavazzi had not openly separated himself from the Catholic Church, but states that Gavazzi, on being reproached with not avowing himself a Protestant, said, "If I leave the Church of Rome, where shall I go? My friends in Scotland say, 'Join us.' My friends in England say, 'Join us.' Dr. McNeil might have recommended him to join the Methodists."

ALLEGED CONFESSION OF THE ROAD MURDER.—We have received information, from a quarter which is entitled to respect, to the effect that the murder at Road House has been confessed by Miss Constance Kent, who, it is said, states that she drowned the child, and afterwards cut its throat, and opened the shutters of the house in order to avert suspicion from herself. The reports add that Miss Constance Kent has shown unmistakable evidence of derangement, and is now in confinement.—*Western Morning News*.

VITAL STATISTICS OF SCOTLAND.—The sixth annual report (for 1860) of the Registrar-General of births, deaths, and marriages in Scotland has been laid before Parliament. It is but a bare statement of the figures for each county, without note or comment.—During the year 105,704 persons were born, 68,055 died, and 42,236 were married. As the population of Scotland was estimated at 2,152,478, the rate per cent. of the births was 2.55, of the deaths 2.15, of the persons married 1.94. The birth rate and the marriage did not differ materially from the average of the preceding five years; but the deaths were considerably above the average, which is scarcely an appreciable fraction over 2 per cent. In England, in the same year (1860) the birth rate was higher—namely, 3.418, and the death rate was lower, 2.114; the rate of marriage is not yet ascertained, but it is always above that of Scotland. On the other hand, Scotland had 9,331 illegitimate births registered in the year, above 9 per cent of the whole number of births, and the proportion registered in England is not very much more than two-thirds of that.—*Times*.

UNITED STATES.

A dispatch from New Orleans, 3d of Thursday, March 29th, says:—A Penzance steamer in the 26th, have been received here. The Brooklyn has left Pensacola, and it was supposed she had gone to Key West to obtain provisions. Troops of the Confederate States continued to arrive at Pensacola in large force, and the number would soon reach five thousand men concentrated at that place.

HARD ON BIBLE-WORSHIPPERS.—Our attention has been called to an address from London directed "to the members of the American Bible Union," by one of their "dear fellow-laborers," Mr. Heberster. Various considerations flow from his theory, and even from his facts. His theory is that the New Testament was all written in Hebrew on the theory now in conflict with historical tradition on the subject. He deduces from his theory that the exact Greek versions are all of them versions, on translations, from the Hebrew. He claims further, what Catholic critics do not claim, that the famous Vatican Manuscript, recently edited, is the authoritative and the only authoritative version, and, after the common fashion of a Protestant, who, by whatever inadequate and feeble process, he has an opinion for himself, he would compel every one else to agree with him, and jumps forthwith to the conclusion that "man is bound to accept the testimony of that Manuscript alone." He says:—"Seeing that the Vatican Manuscript does not contain One Single Passage that can be demonstrated to be Spurious; or that by the Evidence of other Manuscripts, and of the Context, admits of Just Doubt, as to its authenticity; a Position that no other Manuscript enjoys. Man is bound to accept the Testimony of that Manuscript alone, as his present Text of the Sacred Record, wherever he possesses its Teaching; and in those portions of Holy Scripture, of which that Manuscript is defective no Position can be accepted, that is not supported by far more than the Single Testimony of any one of the other Manuscripts." The awkward part of this argument is, for Protestants, that the translators of the current English Protestant Translation, known as the King James's Bible, did not have the Vatican Manuscript at all. Yet the address we are noticing tells the American Bible Union that, on collating Griesbach, the most critical edition of the Greek Testament as used by Protestants, with this Vatican Manuscript, which the address declares to be the only authoritative one—between six and seven thousand errors occur in Griesbach, "nearly one error to every verse." And, right on the head of this the address tells the Bibliologists that such an "amount of error destroys the possibility of obtaining by manuscripts definite evidence of any description." Here is the entire paragraph:—"The differences that exist between the Extant Greek Manuscripts of the Sacred Text, are far too numerous to admit of being ascribed, to Accidental Errors of the Transcriber. I lately Collated Griesbach's Text of the New Testament with that of the Vatican Manuscript, and found that if either of them represented the True Text, the other exhibited Errors: to the amount of between six and seven thousand; nearly One Error to every verse; an amount, which if attributed to Accidental Mistakes of the Transcriber, destroys the possibility of obtaining by Manuscripts, Definite Evidence of any Description." For us Catholics, who have the *Liturgic Church*, which in the fourth century after Christ determined what books were of divine inspiration, and closed up the canon of the Scriptures, and which has kept, in every age, and in every year, and in every day of every year, the record of her canonical writings, there is no embarrassment, and no misgivings. As to those who pin their faith on King James's translation, or on the botched manuscript copies of the Evangelists and Apostles, from which the King James translation was made, one of their "dear fellow-laborers" tells them, as some have told them before, that they seek to draw water from broken cisterns, which can hold none. As we would grieve to trouble any earnest and trusting soul—as we would regret lessening the degree of trust that any such have in the Christian religion as true, we can only exhort them who feel thus disquieted, by learning that their version of Scripture is pretended to be made from manuscripts that contain "nearly an error for every verse"—to examine the far stronger, the different and substantial grounds, upon which the Catholic Church claims that men should believe her teachings.—*N. Y. Freeman*.

Joseph G. Hernandez, tried in Boston, last week, for shooting Miss May with intent to kill, was convicted and sentenced to the State Prison for five years.