

RELIGIOUS EQUALITY.—In reply to a letter from Mr. Lucas, Lord Palmerston mentioned that it was proposed by the Government to allow Catholic prisoners to have the attendance of their own clergy. This has aroused the bile of the liberal Protestants, who have addressed a strong remonstrance to the Home Secretary upon his unworthy concessions to Romanism—"What right have Papists?"—the memorialists ask—"to the ministrations of idolatrous priests? Are there not Protestant ministers enough? Are not the Rev. Jabez Busters—the Stigginses and the Mawworms, ministers of the conventicle, better than all the Priests and Bishops of Rome?"

"Your Lordship's memorialists do humbly pray that your Lordship may be pleased to alter your avowed intention; that you may leave the convicts in the galls to the care of the veritable Catholic clergy appointed according to law; that you may not introduce Roman chaplains or Roman priests to perform unhallowed rites called, by law and by truth, 'superstitions and idolatrous,' nor allow them any annual or other payment for such 'idolatrous or superstitious' ordinances, and further that you may not advise to have conceded to them those 'facilities' which are now the 'privileges' of the clergy of the Church of Christ and of 'the true professors of the Gospel' established by law, and reserved to them by the solemn oaths, declarations, and coronal undertakings of our most religious and gracious Queen."

To be sure the Grand Duke of Tuscany allowed Protestant ministers, to any extent, to visit those interesting martyrs—the Madriais; but the conduct of a Popish tyrant can afford no precedent for the liberal and enlightened Protestants of Exeter Hall.

UNITED STATES.

The *N. Y. Freeman's Journal* strongly advises the Irish Catholics of New York, not to allow themselves to be prevented, by the menaces of a parcel of rowdy ruffians, from celebrating in the usual manner the Festival of their Patron, and the glorious Apostle of Catholic Ireland. If interfered with, we doubt not that the Irish of New York will be able to make good their rights as citizens.

The *Western Tablet* states that the Archbishop of St. Louis has received Bulls from Rome appointing the Rev. Mr. O'Regan of Carondelet, Mo., Bishop of Chicago.

From the *Pittsburg Catholic* we learn, that the Rt. Rev. Dr. O'Connor has been re-appointed Bishop of Pittsburg, and that the Right Rev. Dr. Jos. Young has been named Bishop of Erie.

The *Boston Pilot* announces the arrival of Dr. Cahill for the spring of this year; the object of the visit of this celebrated divine will be to further the objects of Mr. Pagan's mission, who is engaged in collecting contributions for the Catholic University of Ireland. God speed the good work.

ARCHBISHOP HUGHES ON THE PROTESTANT RIOTS.—Archbishop Hughes has recently addressed letters from Cuba to the Right Rev. Bishop of Charleston in which he refers to the late anti-Catholic riots that have disgraced some of our Western and Northern cities. He thinks that these riots, however shameful and lamentable in themselves, will in the end be more productive of good than of evil. They will serve to open the eyes of unreflective Catholics; and incline those of our brethren, who are now tepid and indifferent, to a closer union with those who are more zealous and fervent in the same Faith. They will show the world how solid and steadfast is the Catholic Church, equally invulnerable against treachery or violence. The *C. Miscellany* publishes the substance of the Archbishop's thoughts without adhering strictly to his language, and remarks, "We hope his words will make an impression on some of our Irish brethren in the Faith—too honest, too innocent and unsuspecting for the bad company in which they are thrown—too easily misled by the demagogues, whom their simplicity mistakes for patriots. As for our Irish Radicals, who shake hands with German ruffians and Italian assassins, smile sideways at Cuban buccaneering, and work slyly at Bedini riots, we neither imagine nor hope that the words of the great Prelate will have any effect on them. Men who have broken faith with their God and their country, who have trampled on the Church that nursed them, and the religion that watched over their cradle, can scarce be suspected of reverence towards one of its ministers, even though he be such a one as Archbishop Hughes."—*Boston Pilot*.

STATISTICS OF PROFANITY.—A correspondent of the Franklin county (Vt.) *Herald*, while stopping at a hotel in one of the most populous towns in Vermont, took pains to count the oaths which were spoken in his hearing. The names of the Deity were profanely spoken on Monday 136 times, Tuesday 297, Wednesday 148, Thursday 369, Friday 191, Saturday 205, and Sunday 331. The prevalence of this vice is a disgraceful feature of the age.

METHODIST REVIVALS.—The more intelligent, and devout minded Protestants in the United States are speaking out boldly against the evils of these abominable displays of cant, rivalry, blasphemy, and immorality known as "Protracted" and "Revival Meetings." The *Christian Inquirer*, a leading Protestant journal of New York, has a long article on the subject, in which the writer denounces these assemblies as "highly injurious to the cause of pure practical and consistent Christianity," as "a blot and an excrescence on the Church of Christ. He assigns the following reasons:—

"They are always followed by a reaction of coldness and indifference; they drive many into insanity; lead to irreverent expressions towards God and His Holy Spirit, and handle the holiest of them with disgusting familiarity; they encourage the notion that religion is a thing, a species of *petit*, which can be 'got' at once by a blow; they multiply the number of crude Christians, and pave the way for backsliders; they indoctrinate the community with an erroneous theology; promote cant; encourage false and irreverent ideas of God; promote false pride, and vain glory; harden many; and while they promote fanaticism in the church increase infidelity in the world."

To these objections the writer might have added another, based upon the statistics of illegitimate births; always most numerous where Methodism, and its "Revivals" are most ripe—as may be seen by a glance at the statistics of Wales—(the hot-bed of Methodism)—given in a late number of the *Edinburgh Review*.—Dangerous as are the theatre, and its associations, to the young, the consequences of "Revivals" and "Protracted Meetings" are far more fatal. We rejoice therefore, in the cause of morality, that the most influential and spiritual minded of the Protestant press in America are taking up their testimony against these abominations.

The Rev. Miss Antoinette Brown, Pastress of a Protestant Church in the State of New York, has found scriptural authority for a female ministry; based upon the text—"There is neither male nor female; for ye are all one in Christ Jesus."—*Gal. iii, 28.*—This should settle the question as to man's exclusive right to the "bifurcated garment." Only we see what a blessing it is to be able to chap scripture.

SECOND ADVENT.—One of the Second Advent churches in Salem, believing in the coming of Christ next May or June, and at this time in a highly excited state of religious feeling under that preaching, and having daily additions to their members, on Sunday last baptised twenty-two persons by immersion. Three of the individuals were mere children, less than twelve years of age. Some three thousand persons were present to witness the ceremonies.—*Newburyport Herald*.

We learn from the *Pittsburg Catholic* that a novel subject of reproach against the Catholic Clergy has been broached in the United States; they are destroying the State Schools by force of competition, and by giving education to the poorer classes at so late a rate as to supersede the necessity of the government establishments. Of the insidious designs of these rascally Popish priests a Yankee Protestant editor, out West, complains:—

"We have but one school in our State; but we should have one in every county, town, and village, had it not been for the accursed hordes of lazy Catholic Clergy, who have infested our State, and turned almost into hell, our whole community, by their infamous influence over the laymen. Their priests came here, and being destitute of every thing, and wishing employment, (pity they're not made to work on our streets) opened schools at such reduced rates, as almost to supersede the necessity of common schools."

In view of the impending danger to the cause of State Schoolism, Protestants are exhorted to "lend their whole hearts, hands, and talents for the speedy extermination" of the Catholic clergy.

A Swaddler calling himself the Rev. J. Inskiss, has lately been lecturing on Popery at the "Broadway Tabernacle," New York. Amongst other horrors, he narrates the following, which is much at the service of the *Montreal Witness*:—

"An Individual was taken sick, and his friends sent for the Priest to administer the last rites of the Church. But the messenger didn't bring the Priest—other messengers were sent, but still no Priest; for it happened he was gloriously drunk, and the man died without the rites he desired. A friend of the deceased, highly exasperated, repaired to the Priest, and pistols in hand, demanded his release from purgatory. The Priest attempted to explain, but nothing would do but the release. The Priest sat down and wrote what purported to be one, as follows:—

"My Dear St. Peter, &c.—Admit the bearer to thy celestial kingdom, and by so doing you will oblige, Yours, for ever,

"PATRICK McMANUS, Parish Priest of Derryginia, County Galway."

"This was placed in the hands of the dead man.—This is no fabrication. Here, exposing it, is the copy of the document as taken from the dead man's hand, by one who is at present in this building. (Sensation.) Can we pronounce Romanism Christian after such acts?"

SLEEPING AT CHURCH.—The *Albany* (United States) *Express* states that the Baptist minister in Hudson-street finding, on Sunday afternoon, that some 39 of his congregation were asleep, when he had preached about half his sermon, said he should "postpone the delivery of the balance of it" until they woke up. It seems that five minutes' silent pause brought them all into a state to receive "the balance," and the preacher then went on.

On the 23rd ult., Gen. Cass presented, in the Senate at Washington, a petition from a number of American citizens, praying the United States Government to take the steps necessary for securing to American citizens full liberty for the exercise of their religion in the Catholic countries of Europe. The correspondent of the *N. Y. Freeman's Journal* makes some very pertinent remarks on the prayer of this petition, and the objects of its promoters:—

"The Senator must certainly be aware that this movement has originated with religious bigots and fanatics who are in the habit of using the sacred name of religion as a cloak for the propagation of sedition and for disturbing the good order and peace of foreign countries; that it is a movement of bigotry alone, because it is aimed exclusively at Catholic countries and at the Catholic Religion, both at home and abroad, and that the object of these fanatics is to arouse the spirit of religious hatred and persecution against our Catholic fellow-citizens here by canting about and misrepresenting the treatment received abroad by Protestants in Catholic countries. The parsons, and they alone, are the instigators of this crusade against Catholicity. With what bad grace, too, does it not come at this particular time, immediately after the outrages and persecutions which have been heaped upon the head of an illustrious foreign ecclesiastic on account of his religion, here in our own country, without the interference or prevention of our Government, to which he was accredited in a high official and friendly capacity, and which on this account was in an especial manner bound to protect him. The question may be asked, too, are the citizens of foreign lands protected here in the enjoyment of religious freedom? True the Constitution of the United States forbids Congress to apply a religious test or establish any form of religion. But this is only to the extent that the United States Government has jurisdiction. The States themselves are not so prohibited, and are free to legislate upon this subject without the let or hindrance of Congress, and we know that many of them have interfered by law with religious freedom, and that there are still extant vestiges of intolerance. If then the General Government cannot protect the religious freedom of foreigners in this country, how can we claim from other Governments that which we cannot reciprocally grant and protect? If the States have exclusive jurisdiction over this subject at home, how can the General Government assume jurisdiction over it in any respect? Has the General Government protected the Ursuline Nuns of Charlestown, the Catholic churches of Philadelphia, and the Pope's Nuncio in Cincinnati, or even taken any notice of these religious persecutions? If not, what right has that Government to travel abroad, claiming that it has, and demanding 'reciprocity?' If the memorial contained the true question at issue, we could argue that question upon general principles; but as it does not, we must apply the *argumentum ad hominem*.

A SINGULAR STORY.—A Mr. Lawrence, of New Orleans, has lately been missing and no traces of him could be found, although the opinion is, that he was murdered and thrown into the river. The *New Orleans Delta*, of the 17th ult., contains the following singular narrative, and says it comes from a highly responsible source, and that the veracity of the gentleman from whom they received the story is unquestionable. Says the *Delta*:—

The wife of one of Mr. Lawrence's most intimate friends, who had for a number of years been on terms of the closest friendship with that unfortunate gentleman, is a mesmeric medium, and her brother is in the habit of placing her in the mesmeric state. Being at the house of an acquaintance in Lafayette, on last Sunday night, about 10 o'clock, before any person had the least intimation that any misfortune had befallen Mr. Lawrence, the company requested the brother to mesmerise his sister, as many of them were anxious to see the effect of mesmerism.

The lady was placed in a mesmeric sleep and on the request of several persons present, that he would propound to her a few questions, he asked her, 'What do you see, sister?' she immediately replied, 'I see three men engaged in a fight on the Levee.'

'Do you know any of them?' 'Yes, one of them is Mr. Lawrence, the others I don't know; one of them is a very tall man, and the other about medium size; and these two men are striking Mr. Lawrence. Why don't somebody help him? Why don't he shoot them? There, now they have knocked Mr. Lawrence down. Good heavens! they have killed him.'

'What are they doing now?' 'The tall man is taking his watch, and the other is feeling in his pocket. He is taking some bank bills out of Mr. Lawrence's pocket; now he is taking some gold. They are talking together now; now they pick Mr. Lawrence up and carry him towards the river; will nobody save him?—There, they have thrown him in. Mr. Lawrence is gone.'

She stopped talking for a minute or so, when she was again asked, 'what do you see?'

'See a steamship lying at the wharf. It is about to leave. There are a great number of passengers on board; and among the passengers I see the two men who killed Mr. Lawrence and threw him into the river. The tall one has his watch. They are both better dressed than they were before.'

Here the company having become satisfied with the experiment, the brother woke his sister, and when she was informed of what she had said, she laughed incredulously, remarking she recollected nothing of what had taken place. The sister of Mr. Lawrence was present and the company were pretty free in passing their jokes about the matter; and all were vociferous in their denunciations of mesmerism as a humbug. Little did they think that the vast scene the young lady had described, was actually at that moment perhaps being enacted, and that Mr. Lawrence was then no more. It is also a remarkable fact, that two steamships sailed for California from the wharf, on Sunday morning.

Mr. Lawrence was not seen after leaving his office, with five or six hundred dollars in his pocket, at a late hour on Saturday. No anxiety was manifested by his friends until Monday morning, when beginning to be alarmed, they instituted a search for him. His hat and some other articles with blood upon them, were found upon the Levee, in the Fourth District.—All then remembered the story of the mesmeric subject, and mesmerism had more than one convert in that company. Was Dumas' romance of the "Circasian Brothers" all a fiction?

The following article from the *London Nonconformist* on the "Maine Liquor Law," is worthy of perusal:—

The more intently we reflect upon the matter, the more reason we do see for dissenting from the proposal to prohibit the sale of intoxicating drinks by force of law. Such a step as it appears to us, would infallibly prove to be one of those short-sighted expedients, by no means uncommon in the annals of society, which, in too hasty a pursuit of admitted good, disregards some leading principle of God's moral government, and in the end introduces greater confusion than it corrects. We are sensible, indeed, of the profound disadvantage under which men labor, when opposed to an immediate practical benefit in deference to a general theoretical standard of right and wrong. We know how captivating to benevolent enthusiasm is the short method of putting an end to a present evil by stringent authority—and how tedious it must appear to eradicate a moral disease by moral remedies alone. But we have learnt, notwithstanding, to attach a higher importance to a strict observance of first principles, than to any temporary gain to be derived from a violation of them. Neither in surgery, nor in social economy, are we enamored of amputation—and, as in the first, so in the last, violence is often a substitute resorted to by those who are short of faith and patience. Several of our correspondents have charged us with inconsistency, because we have encouraged the suppression of letting houses, but refuse to concur in prohibiting the sale of intoxicating drinks. One of them has furnished an amusing plea from our own words in favor of the Maine Liquor Law, by simply exchanging the words "betting" for "drunkenness." Now, the radical difference between betting and drunkenness may not be much—for vice is vice, however one may call it. But the proper parallelism between the two cases is concealed by a dexterous misapplication of terms. "Betting" should be put on a par with "taking alcoholic beverage," and "betting houses" should be paralleled 'by places where such beverage may be obtained.' Betting is a vice—drinking beer or wine, is not a vice, although it often leads to it. A betting house is a place set up for making a profit by the indulgence of vice. A public house is established for the sale of malt liquors, wine, and spirits. We consent to attack the one, because it is *per se*, and in its own nature, evil. We decline to attack the other, because it is not evil *per se*, but is only liable to be made an occasion of evil. Betting is not a vice arising out of an excess in what is lawful, but is itself to be condemned; drunkenness is purely a vice of excess arising from inadequate self-control. The moral state of society revolts from putting into the category of vices the mere act of taking a vinous or alcoholic stimulant, and until our correspondents learn to distinguish the difference between a lawful indulgence and an intemperate gratification, we fear we shall not be much enlightened by their incubations. To return, however, to the main position, from which the foregoing paragraph is a digression, we observe that providential law invariably proceeds upon

the principle of improving men by self discipline—that human law is, in its design, essentially and exclusively protective—and that the suppression of the former by the latter can only be justified when the existence of society is threatened by a general breaking down of all the safeguards of self-restraint. At once, then, and without qualification, we reject all the arguments in behalf of the Maine Liquor Law, grounded upon the misery produced by drunkenness and the personal degradation, disease and death, which when habitually indulged in, it invariably entails.—Excesses of all kinds are, appropriately, punished. Violated nature avenges herself. God has inscribed upon all his gifts to man, what man's experience soon renders visible; "Thus far you may use them, but no farther." The loss of reason, of speech, and, at last, of sensibility—the heaving stomach—the aching head—the trembling hand—the collapse of animal spirits—to say nothing of the grave physical evils which follow a long course of intemperance, are all of them the divine teachings addressed to the conscience, and they impressively warn men to govern their appetites, and put a bridle upon their passions. And mark! the self command which grows out of trial, is a higher result in all respects than the non-indulgence which is the consequence of the absence of temptation. To nourish us into strength in the government of ourselves is the only visible reason for leaving us exposed to such a multitude of evils. Not to cut off opportunity but to arm the man to meet it, is the method, so far as we can see, of infinite Wisdom, and our impatience with the present mixture of evil and good, argues nothing but our own distrust of His plan of administration. But again, by attacking the outward occasions of mischief, instead of dealing with the internal cause of it, we do but alter the form of depravity, and seldom diminish its vitality. It is easy to drive vice beneath the surface—not so easy to stanch the sources of it. We may prevent the sale of intoxicating drinks but are we certain that we shall not drive men to the use of stupefying drugs? but if not, if a Maine Liquor Law for Great Britain should prove a decided success, may we not reasonably fear the application of so efficacious a remedy in many other directions? May we not see it right to regulate marriages, to compel education, to place literature under a censorship, and to ward off from Society all the evils which can overtake it during the imprudent conduct of individuals? What would be the result? As a community, we should suffer less, and we should be less. We should escape some mischief and we should lose more good. We should retreat towards a second childhood, and be for a second time put under tutors and governors. May it never be our lot to live amongst a people made virtuous by law—a people whose minds and morals are kept straight by the iron and pals of civil law—a people who have no falls because provided by Parliament with go-carts—a people of passive and negative worth of character only, kept orderly while the eye of a governor is upon them, but, when left to themselves helpless as Russian serfs! Do not our friends know that out of the nettle, danger, they must pluck the flower, safety? In truth, we are alarmed at the tendencies of the times in these respects. We see an increasing penchant for legislative preventatives of moral wrongs. Results are everything now-a-days, and processes nothing. Superficial cuttings and scarifications are the quick nostrums for the diseases bred in the constitutions.—Would it not be better, if possible, to put one half of the community in prison, and employ the other half in watching over them? From what a world of licence would such an arrangement as this save us! Aye! but whilst men gather up the tares they would gather up the wheat also. On the whole, perhaps the wisest method is that of "letting both grow together until the harvest." No preponderant good comes out of forcing humanity to be virtuous. We shall take a future occasion to deal with the remaining branches of the question.

The *London Watchman*, the organ of the Methodists, introduces to the public a new remedy against flatulency in the following elegant strain:—

"[ADVERTISEMENT.]—A New Year.—These words—though simple in themselves—are prolific of pleasing anticipations. Cherished in our riper age, amid the war and strife and anxieties of life, the memories which each returning year awakens within us are dear to each of our hearts, and indelibly engraved there. Thoughts of bygone times, dim and indistinct at first—thoughts of other joys rise up from the depths within, and grow clear and more tangible before us. On each occasion we recall with delight the many joyous scenes which we have witnessed—scenes which are inseparably identified with the recollections of the merry days of our youth. But too often these pleasing reminiscences are chastened by other thoughts and images—blending in one common picture the lights and shadows of the past, and thus engrossed in saddened strain, we muse—perchance at times unconsciously—repeating to ourselves those plaintive notes which still recall our boyhood's task—

'They are past and gone! those merry ones,
'That were so glad and bright.'

"Soon another circle in the great journey of life shall be attained—soon another New Year may be permitted to dawn upon our vision—soon may it be our favored lot to mingle in the circle of life, and administer to the cheerful offices of friendship; and should our spirits be chastened when we look around and behold those 'vacant places,' let each heart that pulsates in health and strength expand with gratitude to that source from whence proceed those issues of life, 'inestimable gifts'—and may the 'weary and heavy laden' look in faith to the thousand means which have been mercifully provided to mitigate their pains and to soothe their afflictions. And we may be permitted to mention, as one of the means of alleviating pain and suffering.

"That extraordinary medicine, Page Woodcock's Wind Pills."

BREAKING THE PEACE IN AMERICA.—The cost of 'breaking the peace, varies according to locality.—You may give a fellow a drubbing in Washington for a mere nothing, that will cost you a good sum in N. York—something upon the Irish principle: A man was fined £5 by a magistrate at the College Police-office, Dublin, for assaulting another; and as he paid the money into court with considerable reluctance, he shot a glance at the victim of his indiscretion, and said: 'Wait to I get you in Limerick, where beating's cheap, and I'll take the change out of you.'—*Bunn's Old and New England*.