

credit, being judged honest and respectable in their line and situation of life.

It is a characteristic mark of the Irish nation, neither to forget nor forgive an insult or injury done to the honour of female relatives. It had been boasted of by officers of rank, that within certain large districts a woman had not been left undressed, and upon observation in answer, that the sex must then have been very complying; the reply was, that the bayonet removed all squeamishness.

Scouring parties were so much matters of course, that it appeared from the testimony of the officers on the trial of Hugh Wollaghan, a yeoman, charged with the murder of Thomas Doherty, they were considered as acts of military duty; nay, so brutalised were many of these corps, that they spoke of them as a diversion, which they called partridge shooting and grousing. They hunted not unfrequently, with dogs in the brakes, hedges, ditches, and woods, to spring any unfortunate peasant, that might have concealed himself from the fury of these blood-hunters, whom they instantly shot.

A Mr. Wright was employed as a teacher of the French language by several boarding schools and families of respectability. Having heard that Mr. T. Judkin Fitzgerald, late high sheriff of the county of Tipperary, had received some charges of a seditious nature against him; he went to the house of Mr. Fitzgerald, and being shown into his presence explained the purpose of his coming, when Mr. Fitzgerald, drawing his sword, said, "Down on your knees, you rebellious scoundrel, and receive your sentence," which was first to be flogged, and then shot. The unfortunate man surrendered his keys to have his papers searched, and expressed his readiness to suffer any punishment the proof of guilt could justify. Mr. Fitzgerald's answer was, "What! you Carmelite rascal, do you dare to speak after sentence?" He then struck him and ordered him to prison. The next day being brought forth to undergo his sentence, he knelt down in prayer, with his hat before his face. Mr. Fitzgerald snatched his hat from him and trampled on it, seized the man by the hair, dragged him to the earth, kicked him and cut him across the forehead with his sword, then had him stripped naked, tied up to the ladder, and ordered him fifty lashes. Major Rial, an officer in the town, came up as the 50 lashes were completed, and asked Mr. Fitzgerald the cause. Mr. Fitzgerald handed him a note written in French, saying, he did not himself understand French, though he understood Irish, but he (Major Rial) would find in that letter what would justify him in flogging the scoundrel to death. Major Rial read the letter. He found it to be a note for the victim, which he thus translated:—

"Sir—I am extremely sorry I cannot wait on you at the hour appointed, being unavoidably obliged to attend Sir Laurence Parsons."

"BARON DE OLIVES."

Notwithstanding this translation, Mr. Fitzgerald ordered him fifty more lashes, which were inflicted with such peculiar severity, that the bowels of the bleeding victim could be perceived to be convulsed and working through his wounds. Mr. Fitzgerald finding he could not continue the application of his cat-o-nine-tails on that part without cutting his way into his body, ordered the waistband of his breeches to be cut open, and fifty more lashes to be inflicted there. He then left the unfortunate man bleeding and suspended, while he went to demand a file of men to come and shoot him; but being refused by the commanding officer, he came back and sought for a rope to hang him, but could get none. He then ordered him to be cut down and sent back to prison, where he was confined in a dark small room, with no other furniture than a wretched pallet of straw, without covering, and there he remained six or seven days without medical assistance.

"The extreme rigour of military government was enforced by General Lake in the northern district, in the execution of which barbarous outrages were committed by the military, which tended to exasperate the minds of the people, already too highly inflamed. Not only some women and children were murdered, but the houses of several respectable persons were pillaged and demolished, upon the bare suspicion of their being United Irishmen. It is not my object to rehearse every feat of cruelty or outrage committed either by the military or the rebels—there are too many, alas! on both sides. I would not be thought to hazard general assertions loosely; and therefore merely mention some few instances, which began as early as the spring of 1797. In the barony of Lower Orion, in the county of Armagh, one Birch, under a military escort, with his hands tied behind him, was cut down by the sergeant, and died of his wounds. The pretext was, that some countrymen attracted by curiosity, came near them and intended to attempt a rescue, and on the night of the wake of the deceased, some soldiers, under the command of Colonel Sparrow, broke into the house, took out the corpse, and severely wounded and mangled those who were in the house. The Colonel was tried and found guilty, though he had the King's pardon in his pocket, which he produced upon the sentence being pronounced against him. A party of the Essex Fencibles burnt the house and furniture of one Potter, a respectable farmer, because his wife, who had seven infant children, either would not or could not tell where her husband was. Another party of the same regiment, quartered at Enniskillen, broke open the house of farmer Durman, at two o'clock, murdered one and wounded another of his sons whilst in bed. The like outrages were committed at Coolairl upon one Price, an innkeeper, and his daughter, who were both dangerously wounded."

"No European nation more keenly sympathises with the sufferings of their unoffending relatives than the Irish; none more prompt to make resentment of them a common cause. It has been remarked by Sir John Davies, vol. 1, p. 22, that there is no nation under the sun that loves equal and indifferent justice better than the Irish; nor will rest better satisfied with the execution thereof, although it be against themselves. If these sentiments still mark the national characteristic (experience daily shows they do), it is difficult to prove, that the system of sending unarraigned persons on board the tenders, and flogging and torturing tried individuals to extort confessions either of themselves or others, of burning and destroying the houses and property of persons either slightly suspected or maliciously charged, of inflicting punishments on men, committing outrages on women, and devastating houses, villages, and whole districts with impunity, under the semblance of law and countenance of government, should not goad a people of warm and quick sensibility into hatred, revenge, and frenzy, rather than reclaim them from rashness, or reduce them to mildness and obedience."

"In all the debates in parliament, whenever the outrages of the army were mentioned, they were never contradicted, but palliated or justified by the treasury bench. They were the natural effusions of a loyal army in a rebel country. The courts of law were open to redress, and none should complain who refused to seek it. Insulting solace. To remit cottagers, labourers and farmers to the legal right, without the means of prosecuting either civilly or criminally. The British cabinet had most judiciously appointed the gallant Sir Ralph Abercrombie, Commander in Chief in Ireland, well knowing that he would require the duties without debasing the character of the soldier. Soon after his arrival, he found himself under the necessity of publishing in general orders that the army was in a state of licentiousness, which rendered it formidable to every one but the enemy. The liberal and genuine spirit of the British soldier, so prominent on the face of these orders, was repugnant to the coercive system of the Irish ministry. The inflexible firmness of that gallant veteran was not to be subdued by extortion, fear, or adulation. Corrupt influence prevailed, and he was forced to resign."—Extracts from Plowden's History of Ireland.

THE GREAT BRITAIN.

The news of the Indian revolt reached London on the 27th of June. In July we despatched about 9,000 troops; in August upwards of 15,000, and in ships of greater size and swiftness than before. In the twenty-nine vessels departing in July there was one steamer; in the twenty-eight vessels which followed in August there were seventeen.

We are glad to learn that several zealous Priests have offered themselves to His Eminence the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster to go as Chaplains to India. The Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster is invested with the necessary powers from the Holy See to give faculties to such Chaplains to India as well as China.—Weekly Register.

The French Ambassador has subscribed £100 to the fund for the relief of the sufferers by the mutiny in India.

ARCHDEACON DENISON'S CASE.—The appeal in the celebrated Ecclesiastical case of Ditcher v. the Archdeacon of Taunton will come on for hearing before the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council early in November. When the case was before the Archdeacon of Taunton, it was taken by appeal from the Bishop of Canterbury's Court, at Bath, Sir John Dodson, the Dean of Arches, decided that the proceedings were not legally commenced, according to the provisions of the Clergy Discipline Act, within two years of the commission of the alleged offence, and that, therefore, the whole of the proceedings were null and void. After this decision Mr. Ditcher appealed to the Privy Council. Dr. Bayford will open the case for the appellant, and the Archdeacon will be represented by Dr. Robert Phillimore. As the case rests entirely upon technical grounds, the arguments will last several days, and it may be some time before a final judgment is delivered. In the event of that judgment being in favor of Mr. Ditcher, the case will have to be reargued again upon the important points of doctrine which are involved.

The Rev. Dr. Irons, Protestant clergyman at Brompton, writes thus to the *Guardian*:—"To what purpose, I would solemnly ask, are the field preachings, or Exeter-Hall sermons, so lauded of late as means to reclaim the 'dangerous,' and increasing irreligious masses of our people? 'Reclaim them,' to what? To anything that Parliament may order? May not any man stand up in Exeter-hall, and make answer to the rev. or right rev. admonisher, 'Sir, your exhortations are ridiculous; for your own religion may change next session. You changed in 1857, and may change in 1858.'"

It is said that at a late meeting of the Tractarian party, it was determined to hold a "monster meeting" similar to the celebrated Gorham meeting, and in the same building—St. Martin's Hall. The object is to give expression to the dissatisfaction of the Protestant High-Church Clergy in reference to the legislation of Parliament upon Divorce, and the contemplated revision of the Liturgy and other matters.—Those who remember the great excitement and the wonderful pledges at the Gorham meeting, and the no less extraordinary failure in its result, will not attach much importance to the contemplated gathering.—Weekly Register.

Mr. Spurgeon's house of prayer turns out to be a den of the biggest thieves in London. The managers of the Surrey Gardens, who professed themselves so zealous for the success of the preaching of the rev. gentleman, are declared by one of themselves to be more adepts in the iniquity of swindling than the directors of the British Bank. It seems that the liabilities of the shareholders will not fall much short of £70,000 upon property which they believed to be out of debt, and upon which they had received a dividend of 10 per cent. by way of blinding them to the actual state of things. Poor Jullien, who aimed at rivaling Mr. Spurgeon, is a loser one way or another, to the extent of some six thousand pounds.—Mr. Spurgeon has abandoned the Surrey Gardens in disgust, and has made his appearance in the Rosherville Gardens at Gravesend.

A correspondent in a northern parish of Aberdeenshire writes to the *Banffshire Journal* on the 20th:—"Many of us in this parish were much hurt the other Sunday, being the Sunday, before our Sacrament, by observing, when we went into church, a schedule lying in every seat, charging us for payment of taxes on dogs, windows, servants, &c. It was not at the schedules we were grieved, but at the unusual and absurd way we were served with them."

A NOBLE OPPOSITION TO THE DIVORCE ACT.—Mr. Denison suggests that although this Act compels an incumbent to yield up the use of his church for the purpose of breaking the Divine Law of Marriage, it nowhere declares that he is to give up the key of the church containing the Registers. A worthy ground of conflict truly for a High-Churchman and Anglo-Catholic to take. The honor of "the Catholic Church of England" is to be vindicated by a squabble about the key of a box! Another "Anglican Priest" suggests that the coverings and cushions of "the altar" might be taken away, leaving nothing but an unsightly wooden table for the "hymenal altar."—This is a very ingenious method of giving discomfort, but we suppose it would not prevent the marriage. As for the expedient of Mr. Denison, we suspect that the law would reach him; we believe that by a previous law he is required to see that every marriage which takes place in his church is duly registered, and to forward a copy thereof to the Bishop's Registrar. We are sorry to see gentlemen driven to such expedients to vindicate a GREAT CAUSE.

The *Morning Star* gives publicity to a rumour which prevails in Clubs, and is generally believed, but for its accuracy it is of course impossible to vouch. "The story runs that Prince Albert has for many years past been dissatisfied with the title which he bore in this country, and that the desirableness has been pressed upon more than one administration of raising him to the rank and title of 'King Consort'; which, though it would give him no higher status than he already possessed in this country, would entitle him to precedence in Continental society. It is said that Lord Palmerston was disposed to accede to the proposed change of title on the part of the Prince, but that he was not exactly sure how the proposal would be received by the country; and that, as a temporary compromise, he consented to the title of 'Prince Consort,' upon the understanding that if no serious objections were raised to it by Parliament or out of doors, the higher title of 'King Consort' should be granted at the expiration of a reasonable period."

HER MAJESTY AND A CRIMEAN HERO.—On her Majesty's arrival at Holyrood on Friday she might have noticed a man in the livery of a park keeper, who was decorated with the Crimean medal and clasps, the China war medal, the medal given by the Emperor of the French, and the Victoria Cross. Her Majesty inquired about the gallant fellow, who had recently been appointed by Sir Benjamin Hall to the office he holds, and gave orders that he should attend at the palace on the following morning. He attended accordingly on Saturday, and before leaving, her Majesty spoke to him of his gallant conduct, which had earned for him such honors as those which he wore upon his breast, and on learning from Sir Benjamin Hall that the new lodge in front of the Palace would be completed in a few weeks, and had not been promised to any one, directed that it should be occupied by the brave soldier. The name of this recipient of her Majesty's favor is Samuel Evans. He enlisted in the 26th regiment in 1839, and remained in it twelve and a half years, served in China and the East, and was in three general engagements in China he volunteered from the 26th to the 19th Regiment, and was in three actions, at Alma, Inkermann, and Sebastopol, in the latter of which he was wounded both in the left breast and arm.

As a consequence of the fashionable rage for crinoline, whalebone has risen in price from £300 to £440 or £500 per ton.

THE POTATO DISEASE IN ENGLAND.—The provincial newspapers speak of the potato disease having manifested itself in various localities. In North Lancashire, the Great Eccleston correspondent of the *Preston Guardian* says:—"The only serious drawback to the potato blight, which without doubt is this year more serious than ever it was. It is, however, principally confined to heavy soils, the light moss lands being only very slightly affected."

Things are tending to their natural development. The Reformation in every realm has relaxed the marriage bond, and Protestantism has tended to polygamy. At the close of Elizabeth's reign, it was found necessary to pass a statute reciting that persons, having already husbands or wives, married other persons. That statute made bigamy felony. But it was a sin before it was a felony. And it was made an offence punishable by the human law, because people in this country had ceased to care for the Divine law. There seemed danger to society through the rapid growth of polygamy; and hence the Legislature took the alarm, and made bigamy a crime. Subsequent statutes have increased the punishment, to check the rapid progress of the offence. But people have found the law too rigid, and now there is a reaction in favor of bigamy. But amidst these fluctuations of human legislation, the same Divorce Law has remained, and must remain, the same. Bigamy was not less a sin before than after statutes made it a transportable felony, and would not be less so were they all repealed. Partly repealed they are by this Act of Parliament, which provides that in certain cases it shall be lawful for persons, who have been lawfully married to marry others, as if the prior marriage had been dissolved by death. It shall be lawful—that is, it shall not be indictable. That is a poor salve for a conscience. Many mortal sins are not indictable; and bigamy was not so before a certain statute. Happily, the statute does not venture to say it is not still a sin. But, as senators are men of the world, and know that, alas! many persons care not for sin so that it is not indictable, so the statute says bigamy shall be lawful—that is, not indictable. That is its sole effect. And so, the marriage bond is not dissolved after all; and the Legislature don't pretend that an Act of Parliament can dissolve it. So that, if men hereafter sin by violating it, they will not be able to plead even the poor palliation of a legislative dissolution. As we said last week, the Legislature, like the Devil, 'palters with them in a double sense'; and while their Court will 'pronounce' the marriage dissolved, just to lure men into sin, it leaves the marriage undissolved after all, and binding still, as it must ever be, having a Divine and irrevocable sanction.—Weekly Register.

The *John Bull* has the following remarks upon the recent attempted exhibition in Finsbury Theatre:—"We think it speaks highly for the good feeling of the Irish people that this impudent exhibition—an appeal, as one of our contemporaries calls it, of an acquitted prisoner for the purpose of establishing his guilt—should have turned out so complete a failure. We are afraid it would not be so in England. Spoken in Dublin, come over to London. We fear that the speculation would prove a more profitable one. A live reputed murderer would be a great card at the Surrey Gardens, if Mr. Spurgeon should get stale. We recommend some of our British Barnums to think of it."

THE STEWARDSHIP OF THE ENGLISH NATION.

A Discourse preached in St. John's Cathedral, Salford, on Sunday morning, July 26, 1857, by His Eminence Cardinal Wiseman, Archbishop of Westminster, on behalf of the Manchester and Salford Catholic Orphan Asylum Revised, with Notes, by His Eminence. 6d. London: Dolman.

A moral view taken by our Cardinal Archbishop of the Indian disasters, should not have waited for notice in these columns, but that, by some oversight, the publication came into our hands no earlier than the middle of the present week. His Eminence has here put into eloquent words what must be the feeling of every correct Catholic mind that reflects upon British policy in India. That policy, if one of guilt, has brought on the nation a responsibility, from a personal and proportional share of which we, as members of a self-governing community, can none of us escape.

"The moment the action of one nation is exercised upon others, it is folly to flatter ourselves that the blame, by being distributed to any extent, cannot fall upon any of us individually. God sees things not merely in general as men do. He is not looking down now upon this multitude assembled here, for instance, as upon one mass. He does not see, as I do before me, a confused group of bodies, but He is looking into the heart of every one, and He reads the sentiments, the feelings of each. If, my brethren, at this moment there were before us a matter on which we had individually to ballot for one or the other side, and there was one side which was just, and the other which was unjust, and if the main body carried that which was in the sight of God unrighteous, God would see every one distinctly and separately, according to his vote, and hold him responsible as one atom in that mass which had cohered together for evil, as a grain of that rock which was rolling impetuously down to destroy. He would not look at the bulk; He probes the veins and heart of the individual. And, if in a national cause of any sort, there is justice on one side and injustice on the other, every one who culpably chooses what in God's sight is unjust, will be responsible to Him for a personal act, while the whole nation may have to bear the penalty of the joint act of its majority."

The ground taken in this discourse is, that the greatness of England abroad depends on our vast and all-pervading commerce far more than on the success of our arms. Our merchants are influential even in regions so remote or so desolate that there our fleets and armies would be powerless. But commercial greatness hangs, above all things, on our character for commercial integrity. That has of late been unfortunately stained with enormous private crimes; and these have gone far to destroy the confidence once placed in British honesty, and in so far to undermine our commercial prosperity abroad: "We know not (says His Eminence) to what extent the mischief may go; and great national crimes may be the result of even private sin, unless the classes with which it has been connected so completely throw themselves into the cause of right and truth, so decidedly make known throughout the whole world their disapproval of these unjust doings, and so govern themselves, and so combine, that it shall be almost impossible for an individual to reflect upon them. Unless this is done, not by words but by deeds, the blame may attach to us all, and we may unfortunately be marked as a nation which, for the purpose of gain, can commit even the most awful social crimes."

The indictment against us runs thus; and that it is a true one nobody who is observant of public affairs can deny:—

"We have been, for a hundred years, striving to civilise an immense population; to civilise it in every way except by Christianising it. On the contrary, the very basis of all our efforts to attach those millions and millions of poor Hindoos to us, has been the promise that we will not make them Christians. I will not examine this principle; it is one which has been adopted, and upon that we have acted. We have told them again and again, 'No, we do not desire you to be Christians.' If not those express words, others as strong have been used. 'We do not wish you to be Christians; remain heathens as you are, provided you are faithful subjects of our sovereign, and provided you serve us in our great end of worldly advantage.' Be it so. We have made the attempt to civilise according to our system; but in one point only have we succeeded in making them adopt European methods, and skill, and that is in the art of war. We have succeeded

in making them soldiers—we have taught them all the secrets of our warfare—we have trained and disciplined them under our best officers, and have made a powerful army. At the same time, as I have said, it has been under the condition of not making the slightest approach towards winning their consciences, or their hearts to God. Now, what happens? Just observe how small a cause may lead to great result. If the accounts which we have read be true, and certainly they have been repeated, if not confirmed, down to yesterday, it seems that so far did we carry that desire to make them good and powerful soldiers, that the very last arms that had been invented had been put into their hands; and connected with this was the necessity of making use of some unctious substance in preparing the charge for use. The contractor, the person who undertakes to furnish the cartridges, finding that there is a slight trifling gain upon using an animal substance, instead of that which was prescribed, commits the commercial fraud, for it is nothing else, of gaining a little upon his contract by using a substance which he thought could make no physical difference. And yet it made all the difference of its being considered an attempt upon the religion of these poor people. Thus, while with one hand we have again and again declared to them that we would not attempt to change their religion, with the other we minister to them that which they consider to be a breach of their religion to taste. And really upon this dishonesty for a trifle, for this miserable gain, which some one or other has made, we have had 50,000 men thrown into rebellion; we have had officers murdered in cold blood by their own soldiers; we have had men, women, and children butchered in the most brutal manner; we have had a large presidency thrown into a state of rebellion; we have the inhabitants of our great cities trembling for their lives; and we know not what to-morrow may bring us of further dismay! All this may be the result of one petty attempt at commercial gain! See, then, how small a commercial crime may produce an immense disaster, and may possibly rob us of an empire. Is it not then the interest of every one to establish the standard of commercial honor on such a footing as that no man should dare to violate the sacred law of his stewardship?"

But another indictment lies against Protestant England on the score of Indian administration. It is the treatment of Catholic soldiers, their Catholic children, and Catholic Priests, in India. Much has been said on this subject of late in our columns and elsewhere. But the Cardinal presents us with an unexpected and most remarkable confirmation of the complaints put forward by Catholics on that score. The authority is, of all others, the one best calculated to secure respect at the present moment. It is that of the late illustrious Sir Charles Napier, whose great military renown may now almost be said to be eclipsed by the political acumen and perspicacity that could predict so accurately the catastrophe under which we are groaning. The Cardinal thus relates the interview he had with the great Indian General:—

"Now, as these words of that great man, as he showed himself always in India, have come thoroughly to pass, I will quote some other words of his spoken to myself, and you shall judge to what extent they agree with those. A few years ago, the year before his death, I was in the Exhibition in London, looking at a picture representing one of his battles in which he was in the very centre of danger, the most conspicuous object amid the terrors of the fight. Standing close to it was the hero of the piece, Sir Charles Napier himself. It was impossible to mistake him; but he desired to be introduced to me. I asked him a few questions about the picture and its correctness, and he then took me by the arm, and drew me aside—there were several persons round us—and he said, 'Cardinal Wiseman, you Catholics are shamefully treated in India. I have told them again and again, I have told the government there that a time was coming very soon when, to save our empire, we should require the united, combined forces of all British subjects without distinction, and that it was their duty to prevent any disunion or any religious differences. I have spoken in vain, they will not listen to me, and they are keeping up a system of disunion and separation instead of one of union. I have been again and again ashamed when in India, at being thanked by the Catholics, as for a favor, for what was but a piece of the commonest justice.' These nearly are the very words which he spoke to myself, and I can vouch for the truth of every expression. Here, again, he foretold the events which have come to pass, and declared to me that the time was approaching when it would be necessary to unite all, without distinction, in a combined effort, to save our Indian Empire. Yet, what has been done by its rulers? Every regulation, by which Catholics are made to feel that they are a distinct class, that they are not to expect the same treatment as others, is still continued, or rather strengthened; it is almost impossible for a Catholic soldier to have his children educated in his own religion; and what is more, if he die, he can hardly reckon on their being brought up in it, so one-sided are the rules for the education of orphans. So that a poor Catholic has to fight his battles, has to go into peril of his life with this feeling, either he has sent his child against his conscience to a school, where he will be taught error for the sake of that trifling remuneration which he could not otherwise gain, or else that he has given his child no education, and is going to leave him an orphan in the hands of those who will only educate him contrary to his wishes and convictions. Is this fair? Is this public justice? Is this the stewardship proper to a great national corporation, which has emphatically and publicly declared to its very heathen subjects, that it knows no difference of religion in those who faithfully serve it?"

Such words as these and those before quoted require no comment. They ought to be potent—at least with Catholics—in stirring up a public opinion amongst us which shall go to control the suicidal want of principle with which our Indian affairs have been managed, and which shall at least demand in tones not to be mistaken, equal justice and toleration and religious rights for Catholic soldiers, Catholic children, and Catholic Clergymen in India.—Weekly Register.

UNITED STATES.

AN AFFECTING EVENT.—Among the deaths in this city last week, was one caused by religious excitement or intense conviction of sin, from which the unhappy sufferer, a young lady of much promise could obtain no relief. Medical men could discover no trace of physical disease, and the efforts of faithful clergymen to lighten the burden from her mind were unavailing. Overpowered by a sense of the Divine wrath, she steadily refused nourishment, and thus entered upon the untired service of a future state.—*Providence Post*.

CURLEYS IN THE U. S. ARMY.—A letter from one of the Kansas correspondents of the *Missouri Democrat* says:—"I have reliable information that a private in the U. S. Army at Fort Pierre some time last summer, committed some trifling offence against the military dignitaries, for which he was court-martialed and sentenced to receive fifty lashes. The sentence was executed with great severity, so much so, that the soldier died in the operation or soon afterwards. Another member of the army had been accustomed for years to write for Southern journals, and at this time he made a note of the incident, in which he rather intimated that the officers were culpable, for being so severe in the execution of law as to cause death. For this, and this only, the writer was arraigned before a court-martial, and sentenced to receive thirty (or fifty) lashes—to have one-half his head shaved, and to wear the ball and chain for one year; and the poor man is now at Fort Riley, suffering the last part of the sentence."

THE "AZAROTH" OBSCURITY OF THE AMERICAN PROTESTANT PRESS.—While every honest man and woman in our country is wondering at the increased depravity among all classes, and trying to find the key of the great temple of filth, so as to enter and purify the Augean stable, we beg leave to call their attention to the journals that enter our hearthstones, and in them they will find the *Jons et origo mali*. Take the Daily Press of New York. Commence with the Tribune. Horace Greeley professes to be a very moral man, a steady church-goer; he is at the head of the vast Tribune establishment, employing nearly two hundred persons. He can, if he chooses, exercise a censorship over what appears at least on the Editorial page. We took up his sheet a few days since and there we read an expose of a frail wife, discovered by her husband at a "disreputable house" in a fashionable quarter in *flagrant delicto* as the law books have it. The affair was related with an infinite gusto and regard to details that would have honored those infamous sheets, the *Rape, Broadway Belle*, or *Venus Miscellany*, recently suppressed by the police. Pure girls, ingenious boys read this immaculate Tribune, and what is the result? Their moral sense becomes weakened, their passions are unduly stimulated, and utter destruction of all purity and chasteness is too often the result. Take the *Herald* another monster establishment. Old Potosi as the *Herald* man is called, issued a terrible fulmination against the Tribune for the dirty article above mentioned; yet if a Rev. Mr. Kallach sould the pure ermine of his profession, or a Rev. Sunderland abuses his parsonic position, and becomes a foul leech; or a Pittsburgh Divine is equally guilty of violating the ten commandments, out comes the *Herald* and panders to the vilest tastes by relating all the short-comings (and a great deal more) of these Rev. sinners. The *Daily Times* is tolerably pure, yet this paper will insert almost any advertisement for money; no matter how immoral or impure it may be. If any doubt we can refer them to a number of April 18th, 1857 now before us, where a miserable scoundrel advertises a book for sale entitled the "*Evidences against Christianity*," in two large volumes, with the following headings to some of the chapters: Jehovah, a barbarous Divinity; Jesus, not a great moral hero; Paul an impostor; David a scoundrel, &c. Can anything be imagined more monstrous, more blasphemous, more horrible? The *Times*, *Tribune*, and *Herald* are the three leading daily sheets in New York. They influence the thoughts and emotions of some 300,000 readers. As they are at present conducted without a censorship exercised over their columns, they are vast reservoirs of mischief, which spreads over this broad and beautiful land, and poisons every town, village and hamlet.—*Golden Price*.

THE CLERGY AND CHURCH.—So frequent have been the exposures of clerical vice in this country these few years, that a general feeling of insecurity is becoming prevalent against allowing them into our houses. One religious paper boldly proposes that the clergy of the country be requested to pay no pastoral visits to the homes of their parishioners, except at the special invitation of the heads of families. The public seem to be so inflamed by the spread of clerical licentiousness, that something to check it is demanded. It does seem as if the biggest rakes of the country became clergymen on purpose to carry out a systematic course of profligacy of this nature. Idle and luxurious lives stimulate the passions to such a degree, that our clergy seem to have become a sort of libidinous maniacs! The papers give seven discovered amours of the clergy for one week! how many undiscovered ones is beyond the "kon" of the press. Moffit and Bishop Oudebold carried on their profligate careers for years before discovered.—*N. York Cor. of the Toronto Colonist*.

ANOTHER POLITICAL CLERGYMAN FALLS.—One after another of the political clergy of the country are being exposed and are falling from grace. The last case we have to record is from the Celena (Mercer County, Ohio), *Standard* of the 3rd inst., which says that the Rev. Westley Brock, who is one of the loud-voiced Black Republicans in the North-west, an old minister and recently President Elder of the district, has been guilty of the crime of seduction, and that the lady whom he has ruined has commenced legal proceedings against him.

GOD'S PROVIDENCE.—Many of our readers may remember the Rev. Mr. Kelsce, an Ohio preacher and Know-Nothing, who by his romance entitled "Danger in the Dark," inaugurated the campaign of literary fiction, which, during the late anti-Catholic excitement formed no inconsiderable part of the malignant war waged by press and pulpit against our Holy religion. "Danger in the Dark" was soon succeeded by the "Jesuits in our Homes," the novels of the ex-Mr. Lester, Miss Bunckley's Captivity and its variations, and many others written by men and women, in which filthy language and sly insinuations were made to mind the curiosity of depraved readers. Mr. Kelsce's book we have never read; but as it was the model of the rest, we may well suppose that it lacked none of those attractions, which recommended its successors. This much is certain: its staple was the immorality and crimes of Catholic Bishops, Priests and Religious in the United States, and the venerable Archbishop of Cincinnati was introduced by name amongst its villainous heroes. God's providence, however, soon punished the wanton falsehoods of this calumniator, by manifesting publicly before men his true character. Scarcely had a few months elapsed when this self-constituted champion of woman's chastity against the fabled snares of a licentious priesthood, stood convicted of seduction and adultery, and only by an ignominious flight escaped the just punishment of perpetual bondage in a Penitentiary. A new and striking example, added to the many already existing which have occurred to form for Catholics a standing principle, based on induction, in virtue of which they may safely affirm that every man who stands up prominently to attack their religion on *these* scores, gives *prima facie* evidence of being a profligate in disguise! "Danger in the Dark" pleased the perverted tastes so well that they had it dramatised, in order that morbid imaginations might enjoy its scandalous scenes the more, seeing them in life-like reality on the stage. It was designed only, it seems, for a private circle; nor do we believe that it was acted more than once. But what is undeniable is, that Mr. Kelsce, the parson's brother, who personated Archbp. Parcel in the play, has ever since lost the use of his right arm.—The arm that he then raised, pretending in mockery of Catholic usage, to give the archiepiscopal blessing has been ever since numb and lifeless from a paralytic stroke!—*Catholic Miscellany*.

A REGULAR JACK SHEPPARD.—An intensely laughable robbery was perpetrated at the Jarrett House St. Anthony, on Thursday night, which in boldness eclipses any similar enterprise of modern times. Col. H. Wiltse, hearing somebody knocking around in the hall near his room, at an unreasonable hour, and supposing it might be some villain who meant to rob him, rose from his bed, fixed the door of his room open, got his brace of pistols and prepared them for "an emergency," then sat down on the bed to wait for the anticipated scamp to present himself. In this position he fell asleep!—and while enjoying a perpendicular dream (probably of a robber writhing with a bullet in his thorax), the ungrateful and inconsiderate vagabond aforesaid walked into the room through the open door, helped himself to a new dress coat, and two pair of pantaloons and a vest, pocketed six dollars and fifty cents in money, deliberately became an accomplice of Procrastination (the thief of time) by stealing a valuable gold watch, took the gold studs out of the shirt of the slumberer and reluctantly departed! Mr. W. woke just in time to find his "victim" ransomed, and himself minus property to the amount of 200 or 300 dollars. In fact, almost everything in the room had "gone off" except his faithful pistols, which were firmly grasped in either hand ready capped and cocked! The funny gentleman with the dark lantern has not been seen or heard of since.