THE PROTECTOR
AND CHRISTIAN WITNESS.

"RIGHTEOUSNESS EXALTETH A NATION: BUT SIN IS A REPROACH TO ANY PEOPLE."—Prov. xiv 34.

Vol. 2. Charlottetown, Prince Edward Island, Wednesday, April 14, 1858. No. 7.

The Protector and Christian Witness,

GEO. T. HASZARD, PUBLISHER.

Edited by a Committee of Protestant Gentlemen. Terms: 12s. per annum, in advance; otherwise 15s. will be charged. Advertisements inserted at the usual rates.

KIRWAN'S LETTERS TO BISHOP HUGHES.

SECOND SERIES.

LETTER I.

Reasons for this Second Series.—Why addressed to Bishop Hughes.—Evil days have come upon Popery.

My Dear Sir,—When I closed the letters I had the honor of addressing to you during the last spring, I fondly hoped that my part in the thickening controversy on Romanism in our country had closed also. As those letters formed my first, I designed that they should also form my last appearance before the public on that topic. So I expressed myself to you in my closing letter; but the unexpected "ripple" has been "excited on the current of my feelings," and, whether wise or otherwise, I have concluded again to address you.

My reasons for so doing, and thus departing from my original resolution, are breifly these: The public, who have so kindly received and so widely circulated my "Letters," have called for another series, embracing the reasons which I have omitted to state, and which, together with those stated, forbid my return to your Church. At least one of the papers devoted to the interests of popery in this country calls upon me, in a semi-serious manner, to give my views on certain points which it raises; individuals of your communion, who have given my letters a candid perusal, have asked what Kirwan had to say upon this and that point not considered by me; and last, though not least, is a desire to put into the hands of every inquiring Roman Catholic a complete manual of my objections to your Church, candidly and kindly considered. These, reverend sir, are the reasons and motives, and not a love of controversy for its own sake, which induce me again to address you. Controversy, for its own sake, is not desirable, but it is necessary so long as error resists progress of truth.

While yielding to these reasons and motives, I yet confess to you that I deem the present series of letters, which will be brief, a work of supererogation. If you have never performed such a work, you know what it means. My conviction is, that the reasons given in my former letters for refusing to return to your Church are sufficient—sufficient to induce any sane mind to withhold its faith from your teachings, and every sane man to abandon your Church. This, you will say, is a partial decision; it may be so. But as a tree may be held in its place by a few weak roots after the main ligaments that bound it to the earth are cut, and when the weakest wind that blows may cause it to totter, so a mind, when the power of an ancient superstition over it is broken, may yet retain a connection with it, influenced by reasons which seem unworthy of consideration. I know this to be the case. The belief in "witches and warls" was early impressed on the mind of David Hume; and it is said of him that, after he reasoned matter and mind out of existence, he could not hear the rustling of a leaf after dark without starting as if a witch were upon him. The taste and smell of a sour liquid remain long in the emptied cask; and if any mind, rejecting the great outlines of your system, is yet held to it by some reasons which I have not considered, and whose absurdity I may be able to expose, I feel anxious to relieve it. I must not withhold from you my deep conviction that popery is an evil tree—that its fruits are only evil. I believe it to be a falling tree. Its branches are withering in the air, and the axe, wielded by an Almighty hand, is cutting its roots; and if I can assist in cutting a few more of its roots, and thus hastening its fall, I feel that I will be conferring a benefit upon our race, and contributing to the emancipation of millions of men from a slavery in comparison with which that of the Pharaohs was freedom. Hence these additional letters; and all I intend doing is to state to you some farther reasons which forbid my return to your Church.

Before entering upon a statement of these reasons, permit me to say a few things which I can better say in this preliminary letter than any where else.

The question has doubtless suggested itself to your mind and to the minds of others: Why do I address these letters to you? Some of my reasons I have already given you. I believe you to be a man of sense and of fair character, which can not be said of all papal priests. You are put forth, now that Bishop England, also one of our countrymen, is no more, as the Achilles of your party in these United States. If any man in the country can refute my reasoning and obviate my objections, it is thought you can do it. In the absence of the higher qualities of mind, you are considered as quite smart; and as my sole object and aim is the truth, I have selected the man, in my opinion, best fitted to correct me when in error; when false, to show me the fallacy of my reasoning; and if he should reply, who would reply as a gentleman. If you can not confute me, no man of your Church in these United States can. Nor will I consent to notice what may be said in the way of reply to or abuse of these letters by any man save yourself. I have, as they say, a drawing toward you as an Irishman; I respect your open and manly bearing; and sadly as, in my opinion, you prostitute your talents, I have respect for them. Hence I pass through the ranks of soldiers, and by inferior officers, and go up to Achilles himself.

But you have not answered my former letters! I confess to you, sir, that I had no expectation that you would answer them, and for these reasons: First, because they are anonymous; and as I like not myself to contend with a masked opponent, so I judged of you. The text is capable of wide application: "As face answereth to face in water, so the heart of man to man." I prefer, for the present, to stand behind the curtain; and for this, among other reasons, that you and all men may decide upon what I say simply upon the merits of my statements and arguments; and for the additional reason, to prevent a *personal* controversy. It is an old trick of your Church to leave the argument for the man. And, secondly, because of their matter. I speak to you of what my eyes have seen, of what my ears have heard, of what my heart has felt. Facts are stubborn things. How can you make a man believe that to be sweet which, from actual taste, he knows to be sour! It is hard to reason against a man's experience. On these grounds I expected from you no reply. And although, unless I mistake you, not one of the little men who seek to put the more abundant honor on the part that lacketh by a mock dignity, by an assumed superiority, yet you know when to be wisely silent. If, sir, without compromising your crosier—if, during some hours of leisure from your varied and manifold duties, you would consent to answer some of the reasons and considerations which I have stated, and will state in the following letters, which forbid my return to your church, there is one, at least, that will read your reply with great pleasure. I am not, sir, among those who impute your silence to your inability to reply to my statements; but if I can only gain access to the public ear—if I can only obtain from candid Roman Catholics a careful consideration of what I say, your silence will give but little trouble. You may play dumb as long as it suits you; my object will be attained.

Permit me to make one other remark before closing this letter. Evil days have come upon the system of which you are so open an advocate. Once you could silence inquiry by Church authority; but, in this country especially, that day has passed away; it is passing away even under the shadow of the dome of St. Peter's. There are those yet, in this country and in the old countries of Europe, who, like that useless bird of sable wing, called the jackdaw, which you and I have seen in our youth, love the narrow window, and the toppling tower, and the mantling ivy, who hover about whatever is ancient, however worthless or truthless; but their number is small, and is daily diminishing. The great inquiry is after the true, the scriptural, the reasonable. The day for the trial of all things has come. Mere authority in philosophy, in morals, in religion, is valueless. When man appeals from the Church to the Scriptures, it is of no avail to say to him, "Believe the church." No appeal is admitted from the Scriptures to the Fathers—from the teaching of Paul to the decisions of councils. Old things, if absurd, are passing away, and their wrinkles only hasten their death. Nor is there in the physical or moral sciences, nor in the science of government, nor in the theory of religion, a single principle that is not tried and sifted as if never tried before. At this treatment, hoary error may lift up its hands in holy horror, and fall back aghast as did Saul before the ghost of Samuel, but it can not be helped. There may be, and doubtless is, a reckless speculation, a profane tampering with sacred things, but nothing will eventually suffer but the truthless. And what will become of popery when proof and Scripture supplant authority and credulity!

It becomes you, then, sir, to buckle on the harness. The battle has but begun between truth and error. You have witnessed hot contests, but far hotter are before you. The system you advocate is considered not only hugely false, but greatly dangerous to all the interests of man, and its every principle and all its policy will be tried as in fire. In your soul and in mine there should not be a desire but for the triumph of the truth. Let any opinion that I hold be proved unscriptural and unreasonable, and I will cheerfully give it to the hottest furnace you can heat to consume it. Let the truth of God triumph, whatever human systems perish. Will you join me in this aspiration!

In my next I shall proceed with my statement of some of the additional reasons which prevent me from returning to your Church.

With respect, yours,

KIRWAN.

ROMAN CATHOLIC FEMALE SCHOOLS.

A LETTER OF AN AMERICAN MOTHER TO AN AMERICAN MOTHER.

My dear Friend,—I was both surprised and pained by the intelligence that you had placed your daughters in a Catholic Seminary, and were avowing yourself a decided patroness and a warm friend of such institutions; and I trust I shall not be deemed impertinent or intrusive while I address you upon a subject which I feel to be of vital interest to us *as American and as Christian mothers*—as those who have children committed to them to train for their country and their God.

I cannot indeed refrain from expressing my astonishment that one who so highly values the word of God, who has taken it as a lamp for her feet, who has proved the exceeding preciousness of its promises in the hour of trial—on the bed of sickness, who has been buoyed by them above the fear of death, and who has felt that she enjoyed through them the certain hope of a glorious immortality, should be willing to place her children where the light of the sacred page is shrouded, the pure fountain of eternal truth is sealed, and the only draught allowed to the thirsty soul is drawn from the stagnant pool of Romanism.

The reasons assigned as grounds of preference for these schools have been, 1. You thought it a duty to be *liberal;* 2. The Catholic school was *the best in your vicinity;* and 3. You had received a pledge from the teachers that they would *not interfere with the religious instruction of your children*, and therefore your children would not be affected by the tenets of their instructors.

How, my friend, would you define *liberality?* Is it necessary, in order to be liberal, to confound the distinctions between right and wrong? To be liberal, is it necessary to feel that there are no errors of belief which are to be avoided? no principles of truth which are to be inculcated? Have you become so liberal as to feel that there is no difference between that faith which rests upon the declarations of the inspired volume, and that which is avowedly built upon the traditions of men? Are our views of the opinions of others to be so *liberal* that we are allowed to have *no principles* of our own? Are we to be so considerate of their wishes as to have no respect to our own duties? No, my friend, I have not learnt such liberality in the school of Christ—*nor will you learn it in the school of Rome.* Always to demand respect for herself, and never pay respect to the rights of others, has been the rule of that church. And now, while we receive her votaries on our shores, and give them the benefits of our free government and our liberal institutions, are we to be branded as illiberal, because we refuse to embrace their principles, or to have our children nurtured in their faith? Look around you, my friend, and see their seminaries springing up in every part of our land, from the eastern shore, which first received the pilgrim who fled from his country to preserve the rights of a man and the faith of a Christian, to the western wilderness which has scarce yet lost the print of the savage foot, and ask yourself if there be not some covert design in the efforts thus made to control the education of our children?

It is said they are strangers, and we should welcome them; exiles, and we should pity them. Yes, as strangers let us extend to them the kindness and the courtesies of life, but we are not bound to become their slaves. As exiles, we welcome them to our firesides, and allow them to share in all our civil and religious blessings, but we do not ask them to erect either nunneries or colleges for our children, while their own are landed by thousands upon our shores, and left to want and ignorance. And we will do more; we proffer them that Bible which they denied to our ancestors, and all those blessings, to procure which, our forefathers braved the terrors of an almost unknown ocean, and sought a refuge with the savage of the forest.

As to your *second* reason, the superiority of the Catholic teacher, if it be valid, allow me to tell you that you, with other parents in your vicinity, are greatly to be blamed. It is not because there are not Protestant teachers entirely and eminently fitted, but that you have not taken pains to procure them. You have waited until foreigners have done for you what you should have done for yourself: until Rome in her kindness has sent you teachers for your children, and as her reward, will claim your children for herself.

But have you in truth so little of American feeling as to prefer foreigners as teachers of your children? Would a foreign Catholic *linger with delight upon the scenes of our early history?* Would she love to paint the landing of our pilgrim fathers? Would she dwell upon their resistance to all tyranny, civil and ecclesiastical, and tell her pupils, that from that germ have sprung our republican institutions? And where have these foreigners been educated? In convents — in the very strongholds of superstition. They have received the light of science through the grates of their prisons, and have been educated for American teachers, under the immediate supervision, and according to the directions of Popish ecclesiastics!

Think of France! Think of her females, as they were during the last century, when they were more entirely committed to the cloister for education, and ask yourself, Are these the models after which I wish to form my daughters? The French revolution has buried in a sea of blood the remembrance of much of the guilt of those who perished in it; but it should not be forgotten that the atrocities of that revolution were perpetrated by Frenchmen nurtured by mothers who had been educated in the superficial accomplishments, the blighting superstition, or the concealed licentiousness of the cloister.

In educating our sons, we always place before us a definite object. Their studies are regulated and their teachers chosen with a constant reference to their ultimate destination. And shall we be less wise in the education of our daughters? Ought we not, in the instruction we give them, to have a constant reference to their future destinies, duties, and avocations? Shall we be satisfied with the acquisition of a few accomplishments which may enable them to shine and glitter for an hour, and neglect the welfare of the undying soul and the cultivation of the imperishable mind? Let us so train them, that we may lean upon them when our own steps are feeble, and receive light and consolation from them when our eyes are dim through age, and our hearts heavy from the sorrows of increasing years. Let us educate them as the future companions of the intellectual and virtuous; that they may understand the duties and rightly appreciate the privileges of the American mother, and that they may be prepared to transfuse into their own offspring the spirit which animated the heroes of our revolution. And will these objects be attained by committing their education to foreigners trained at the feet of Popish ecclesiastics? Can it be that a land which still boasts a Sigourney, and which has sent from its bosom a Mrs. Judson and Mrs. Winslow to elevate and enlighten the Eastern mothers, must commit the education of her own daughters to strangers to her institutions, to aliens to her soil, to the enemies of her faith?

Your other reason is, that you do not think the teachers whom you have chosen for your children will *influence at all their religious principles.* You expect from them utter neglect and entire indifference to every thing connected with the eternal welfare of your children! But are they not immoral? And if they perish through your neglect, will not their blood be required at your hands? How can you, my friend, in view of your solemn engagements, commit their education to those whom you dare not allow to communicate any instruction upon the most important of all subjects? How can you place them where they may never hear the pure truths of the Gospel enforced, where they cannot be taught their own personal interest in its solemn declarations, where the most and the best you hope for their eternal welfare is silent forgetfulness of all things connected with it. O, can it be that a mother who feels herself ransomed by the sacrifice of Christ, cleansed by his blood, accepted through his merits, heard through his intercession, sanctified by his Spirit, will consent to have her children educated in ignorance of all he has suffered, of all he has promised!

Catholic schools are some times placed upon the same footing as those of different denominations of Protestants. It is sometimes said, We are not Baptists, Methodists, or Presbyterians, and yet we can send our children to their schools, and why not extend the same liberality to Catholics? But I need not say to you that all evangelical Protestants have one common bond of union in their one standard of faith. We have minor differences of opinion, but we all receive the inspired word of God as our only infallible rule of faith and practice, and we believe it to be our duty, as we feel it to be our privilege, to examine its pages ourselves, and to instruct our children from them. And thus we can all teach, what we all believe, the prominent articles of the christian religion, without reference to sectarian differences. But in a Catholic school this cannot be. The rule of faith with the Catholic is the tradition of the church, and the children committed to their charge must be either trained in the superstition of Romanism or left without any religious instruction. Thus all Protestants committing their children to Catholics can only choose between superstition and infidelity.

Does this startle you? Look, I beseech you, at the multitudes educated in Catholic seminaries, and see if my assertions have not truth for their foundation. Where the teacher is sincere in his devotion to Rome, every effort is made, through those objects which affect the senses and influence the imagination, to occupy the youthful heart, and to bend the forming character to the despotism of Rome. Where teachers have been nominally Catholics, but in reality infidels, there have been formed the most hopeless of all characters—infidels, trained in close contact with a despised and loathed superstition, and yet one whose distorted lineaments are exhibited as a correct delineation of Christianity.

I would not, my dear friend, trust my children with a Catholic who would give me a pledge not to communicate any religious instruction. Looking, as the Catholic must if he is sincere, upon all Protestants as heretics, anathematized by the only true church, and dying thus certainly sentenced to misery, where is the benevolence if he consents to have beings exposed to such a fate committed to his charge, with a pledge that he will make no efforts to rescue them? No, my friend, such a teacher is not to be trusted.

(*To be continued.*)

IRISH GOVERNMENT AND SCHOOLS.

We have not hesitated on numerous occasions to express our thorough dissatisfaction with the Irish portion of Lord Palmerston's Government. All the Castle influence was exercised on behalf of concession to Romanism, and not a solitary step was taken to uphold that Protestant truth which is the surest bulwark of England's throne. Now that a change has taken place the inquiry is being made, what will the Government do in respect to Irish education? Will they embrace the splendid opportunity afforded them of ending for ever what has been inaptly called the "Education War"? or shall we be left to the conclusion that the prominent part which the Earl of Eglinton took in the Lords Committee of 1854 was but a transient flash of Protestant enthusiasm, and the Conservative vote of '56 a mere political move to secure the support of Irish Protestant Members? Perhaps there has never been a more favourable time for weighing the claims of the Irish clergy. The subject is better understood, at the same time that the course pursued by the Romish priests and prelates is becomming clearer and more unmistakeable every year. The advocates of the National system have perchance fondly dreamt that the agitation against it would gradually die of inanition, and that the substantial advantages offered by the Board would buy off the scruples of the clergy as they felt the increasing pressure of their school expenditure. If so, they must have been grievously disappointed, for, with comparatively few exceptions, the clergy to a man hold out for scriptural education as firmly as ever and, on the other hand, the Board have the consolation of reflecting that, from first to last, as it now turns out, they have been playing into the hands of the priests. It is impossible that the controversy should be settled, so long as the present system is maintained, and there is a heart beating beneath the power of Evangelical truth to protest against it. So far is it from being settled, that at the present time two influential and independent testimonies have just been recorded against it—the one in the temperate and well-reasoned pamphlet of Dr. Fergusson, a member of the Endowed Schools Commission, the other in the able Report of the Presbyterian minister, the Rev. W. Frazer, to the Educationalists of Scotland, extracts from which lately appeared in our columns in an advertisement of the Church Education Society. If professions are worth anything, and the past proceedings of our statesmen are any index of future conduct, we may surely hope, with Lord Eglington, as Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland, and Mr. Napier as Chancellor, with Mr. Walpole in the Cabinet here, and others who voted with him, that no effort will be left untried to sweep away the injustice which, for nearly thirty years, has been inflicted on our Protestant brethren in Ireland.

There is all the greater reason for such an effort, because in spite of all that has been said to the contrary, the National system has signally failed in accomplishing the object said to be aimed at in its formation. Scarcely a single hope of its projectors has been realized. The system at the outset was a deception. Professing to be based on the Report of the Commission of 1812, it nevertheless, set out by ignoring and contravening its chief recommendation, viz., that the schools to be established and supported by the Government should be supplemental to the parochial, *i.e.*, scriptural, education schools already existing, these latter schools still receiving the aid of the State grant. In the next place it was intended as a compromise, the result of which would be the union of all parties in working out the National scheme. No such result has been achieved. Instead of compromise, it has proved a great concession, made bit by bit and step by step, to the priestly dogmatism and intolerant demands of Rome. It was but little that was asked at first, but no sooner did the priests find themselves entrenched securely in some 3,000 schools, than the mask was thrown aside, and they have now succeeded in thrusting out of the national schools every element of scriptural instruction. The system now in operation under the name of National Education is one different, in almost every essential particular, from that sketched out at the beginning by Mr. Secretary Stanley. But, with one single exception, every change has been in favour of the anti-scriptural Romanists. The exception is in the case of the Presbyterians of Ulster, to whom, with singular inconsistency, the Board have given the advantages of the Government money without exacting compliance with its rules and conditions. In truth, if the Irish clergy had been disaffected agitators such as we know the priests to have been, instead of the stauncheat friends of religion, morality, and peaceable government, as they have proved to be—if the book whose exclusion they protest against had been the Book of Mormon or the Koran, instead of the inspired truth of God—they could scarcely have expected to be worse treated by the Government. The entire history of the National Education scheme in Ireland is, however, but another instance how impossible it is to make contracts and agreements with the Church of Rome, without finding ourselves overreached in the end. Dr. Fergusson in his able pamphlet brings the fact out clearly, that even the modicum of Holy Scripture permitted in the books and schools of the Board was never intended to be permanently tolerated in the schools attended by a single Roman Catholic scholar. The Pope had condemned the "Extracts," "Evidences," &c., privately, the Board being led to believe all the while that they had his approval. But they were not condemned *ex cathedra*, because assured that "they could not affect the (Roman) Catholic children, as they were to be altogether excluded from them." Instead however, of the children being excluded from the books, the books have been excluded from the children, and at the present moment they are entirely shut out of every school where the priest has either personal or relative influence. And yet, after being thus tricked and cheated, the authorities in Ireland have blindly persevered in upholding a system which is becoming more and more a tool in the hands of the Church of Rome.

IRELAND.

THE REV. ROBERT M'GHEE.

This consistent champion for the truth against the Romish apostasy has addressed a letter to the Roman Catholic Attorney-General for Ireland, in which he remarks upon the novel position of that functionary in being called on to prosecute two priests of the Church of Rome—Messrs. Conway and Ryan—in the name of the Sovereign. "You, sir," says Mr. M'Ghee, "as Her Majesty's Attorney-General, are called on, in compliance with a vote of the House of Commons, to prosecute two priests of the Church of Rome. That is, you are called—as the administrator of the law of your Sovereign, as a subject of her dominions, and as a sworn adviser and officer of the Crown—to carry on a prosecution against two men whom you hold in highest admiration; and you are bound to allege and prove to be an offence against the laws of the realm, that which you know in your conscience was, on their part, a faithful, zealous, and conscientious discharge of their solemn duty to their Church, and to that Power whom both you and they believe to be the supreme power on earth—the Pope of Rome." The "*imperium in imperio*"—that of Pius IX. namely—in this kingdom of the British Sovereign is an unquestionable fact, and virtually incapacitates a sincere Roman Catholic to serve his Queen honestly and *exanimo*.

LIMERICK ELECTION.

Of the uncontrolled licentiousness of the Irish in some districts of the country still, especially in the more Popish parts, a contested election furnishes the most striking proof. The city of Limerick with its garrison of all arms, amounting to 2,000 men, largely increased with a view to contingencies, resembled on the 11th instant a place in a state of siege; and even thus the peace was hardly kept. Both candidates are Romanists, and the priests and the people were divided in their choice. "How happy could I be with either!" the constituency might cry, for certainly the presence of both upon the hustings boded anything but happiness to the electors. After the High Sheriff read the precept of election, the parish priest of St. Margaret's was a whole hour before he could obtain a hearing to propose Mr. Galvin, the interval being filled with hooting, hissing, shouting, screaming, denouncing, breaking heads, and blowing bugles in different parts of the court-house, making worse than Babel of the scene. The priests belaboured each other with their tongues unsparingly, so as to make one blush for the vilifiers and the vilified.—*London Record.*

Dreadful Fire at Wynnstay Denbighshire.—The once beautiful and princely seat of Sir Watkin Williams Wynn, Bart, M. P. for the county of Denbigh, was on Saturday, the 6th inst. destroyed by fire. About two o'clock Sir Watkin was alarmed by a sound like the crackling of fire, and upon getting up he discovered his own mansion to be in flames. He lost no time in communicating the fact to his guests and servants. Of the former there was a good number staying at the hall, amongst whom were Lord and Lady Ernest Vane, and Mrs. Cotton, wife of Captain Cotton. There then commenced a scene frightful to describe. The females ran shrieking out of the house in their night dresses, not even stopping to put anything round them to protect them from the cold wind that was blowing. The fire engine belonging to the hall was at once set in motion, but the wind was so strong that it had but little effect. In the meantime messengers were despatched to Wrexham and Chirk Castle for fire engines. Two soon arrived from the former place and one from the latter; but the fire was not got under until all was destroyed, including the beautiful oil paintings (some of which were in the Art Treasures Exhibition, last year), a splendid library of books, some rare manuscripts, and all the wearing apparel and furniture in the hall—in fact, nothing was saved except the plate and one or two paintings. A vast amount of jewellery was also destroyed, including £4000 worth belonging to Lady Vane and £1500 worth belonging to Mrs. Cotton, besides some smaller lots belonging to the other visitors. It is estimated the loss will not fall far short of £200,000. Sir Watkin although at the head of the Provincial Welsh office, was not insured. The origin of the fire is unknown, but it is supposed to have been caused by an escape of gas.

Nana Sahib's Treasures.—A young officer who assisted at the recovery of some of the Nana's treasure near Bithoor, writing to his father, under date the 30th of December, says:—"I wrote in the beginning of this month from Cawnpore, and since then another engineer officer and myself, with a few Sappers have been fishing treasures out of Nana Sahib's wells at his palace at Bithoor, about ten miles from Cawnpore. The well contained about twenty-five feet of water, but by getting two hundred of the line to work half-a dozen buckets we succeeded in getting it down to three feet. Two or three Sappers then went down, and, after emptying the well of three feet of rubbish, which the fellows had thrown in on the top, we managed to get out about £2000 worth of silver plate and about £6000 worth of gold vessels. Some of the gold plate was magnificent. Two large plates were two feet nine in diameter and of solid gold, and weighed together 80 lbs. The other gold articles consisted of chalices, cups, &c., squirts for throwing rose-water, massive spoons for the Ganges water when worshipping, &c. It was difficult work, for we had no implements for working the well, and the water came in at the rate of sixty gallons a minute. This mine is not quite worked out yet, and a few Sappers we left behind at Bithoor to get at the rupees, which they say are still at the bottom. The Nana's Palace is in complete ruins, and everything belonging to him in the village we have burnt."

The University of Sydney, New South Wales.—The *Gazette* notifies that letters patent are to be passed under the Great Seal, declaring that the degrees in arts, laws, and medicine already granted or conferred, or hereafter to be granted or conferred, by the senate of the above university, shall be recognized as academic distinctions and rewards of merit and be entitled to rank, precedence, and consideration in the United Kingdom, and in the colonies and possessions of the Crown throughout the world, as fully as if the said degrees had been granted by any university of the United Kingdom.

THE LATE KAFFIR PLOT.

(*From the Grahamstown Journal, Jan. 5th.*)

The documents just published in the *Gazette* with reference to the trial of Macomo and others, and more especially the disclosures of the young "Impongo prophetess" and Kwitchi, will for us be historically important. The disclosures of the prophetess and her prompter Kwitchi fully bear out the assertions of the governor in the opening paragraphs of the sentence pronounced upon Macomo and his followers. Those assertions are that the Kaffir chiefs had formed a plot for the invasion of the Frontier districts, and the expulsion of the Europeans therefrom; and that their intention in causing the Kaffirs to destroy their cattle was, that being left without the means of support, the Kaffirs would be driven to to such an extensive course of depredation, that war would be the result. That this was the true state of the case had often been hinted and surmised before, but in the examination of the little girl Nonkosi, in Umhala's location, who led the people to believe that she had conversed with the deceased prophet Umlanjeni at a *vlei*, had seen Hintza, Dushaani, and other dead chiefs with cattle at the same place, and that she had even passed below the ground and visited the new country where they resided, the truth of these surmises is fully borne out; she, after some considerable equivocation, states that all that she had said had been told her by Kwitchi, her mother's brother, and a councillor of Umhala. Kwitchi, too, after a barefaced attempt at hiding the real truth, confessed to having told the little girl these things; and that the chief Umhala had specially sent him for the purpose of making the girl "talk." The chiefs implicated belonged to the Gaika tribe, which, headed by Sandilli, was to have occupied the Amatolas, and ravaged the country round Keiskama Hoek Post, and the Hlambi tribe, headed by Umhala, which was to have occupied the Lynx Bush, and have operated between Fort Pato and East London, while Kreli was to have made a descent on Queenstown. A most formidable organisation for an attack on the colony is thus proved to have existed, and its defeat is said by Kwitchi do be due exclusively to the slowness with which the cattle were killed, so that one half the people were starving, while the remainder yet possessed live stock. Those who had commenced early the work of destruction had then to seek subsistence among the English and Fingoes, the people they were to have destroyed. In this manner it is stated the tribes were broken up, notwithstanding the great exertions used by the various chiefs to hasten on the slaughter of the cattle, and so rush into war. Pato, Sandilli, Oba, Macomo, Namba, Tola, and Mate, are some of the chiefs implicated in the plot, as they are represented as visiting Umhala at the time when the discussions took place.

The facts brought to light in this manner may well give rise to serious consideration on the part of the colonists, and nothing, perhaps, is of more importance than the cause which is stated to account for the failure of the plot.

The colony has given some large share of credit for this failure to the presence of the large body of troops we had on the frontier, but Kwitchi refers this failure exclusively to the want of activity with which the Kaffirs yielded obedience to their chiefs; and it is extremely probable that, although our military preparations must have had some effect on the Kaffirs, yet, that notwithstanding these, war would have been the result, if only the peculiar war preparations of the Kaffirs had been conducted as simultaneously as the chiefs desired. They do not appear to have been altogether dismayed, and after some considerable experience of what English troops can do, they appear to have been ready to brave a larger number of them than they had ever encountered before. Should the time arrive when Kaffir Land, recovered from its present misfortune, and again teeming with a savage population, may feel once more a desire to precipitate itself on the colony, we may expect, therefore, that no amount of preparation on our side for the hostile visit will be effective in preventing it. That, in point of fact, while there is a large savage population upon and within our border, with little or no possible check upon their habits and training, it is impossible that the frontier districts of the colony can ever be safe. Only in taking advantage of the providential turn things have taken, as far as possible; only by the extension of British rule over the whole of Kaffraria, and planting it with British settlers, can we hope to see any real help for the colony, or any effective measures of civilisation applied to the Kaffir.

The manner in which his Excellency has performed his part in the affair has, doubtless, been of the most judicious kind. This forbearance probably prevented events that otherwise would have precipitated the war the Kaffirs were desiring; while the endeavours made to prevent the destruction of the cattle must largely have contributed to the dilatory manner in which it was performed, the very reason why we are not at present in the midst of a war. A lesson, this, for future governors of the colony.

In the judgments passed on the prisoners, Sir George Grey, after stating that they have been found guilty of crimes punishable with death, adds:—"but, as the excitement in British Kaffraria has now almost subsided, and there does not appear to be the same necessity for prompt and severe example, as would have been required if the government could have brought home the crime to its real authors at the time; and as no capital sentence has yet been carried into execution upon any native prisoners in Kaffraria, during the whole of the recent disturbances, and it is, in every respect desirable, if possible, that these should now be suffered to close without even one person having been executed for any part he may have taken in them, and this especially after the calamities that have recently fallen upon the Kaffir nation, which although brought on by their own acts, have yet been so heavy and terrible, that it is impossible to contemplate them without pity and concern—the High Commissioner directs that this sentence shall, in the case of each of the prisoners, be commuted to imprisonment for twenty years with hard labor, from the 19th day of November, 1857, being the date of their conviction.—G. Grey, High Commissioner." With regard to Macomo, the part of the sentence which condemns him to hard labor will not be enforced, in consequence of his age and unfitness for such employment.

Register-General's Curiosities.—All sorts of revelations are unfolded by these registers—some pathetic, some ridiculous. Name after name alike, down a page of deaths, shows a whole family swept off by some epidemic. Signature after signature of the corner shows a ravaging colliery explosion or a shipwreck. Here is a poor child named Alpha Omega; on looking closely, you see that it is illegitimate,—First and Last the mother calls it, recording her repentance on the brows of her offspring. No names are too absurd for parents to give their children. Here are innocents stamped for life as Kidnum Toats, Lavender Marjoram, Patient Pipe, Tabitha Cumi, Fussy Gotobed, and strangest of all, here is one called Eli Lama Sabachthani Pressnail! Other parents are more ambitious, and prematurely ennoble their children by designating them Lord, Earl, Princess Charlotte, &c; whilst, during the Russian war, numbers of poor things were labelled Malakoff, Sebastopol, Redan, Inkermann, and Balaclava. Florence Nightingale, however, seems to have been the greatest favourite, especially amongst the poor, who have shown their admiration for her by perpetuating the name of their families all over the country. The returns for the last two years would show Florence has become a much commoner name lately. Some of the marriage registers are curious. The greatest extremes of age—70 and 17—are often found to unite in matrimony. Occasionally we see an entry only half completed, and a note to this effect: "Ceremony begun, but not finished, the marriage being broken off;" or, "Bridegroom so drunk that the marriage could not proceed." If people's names are any index to their characters, the most extraordinary union of qualities often appears to take place. "Friend," marries a woman named "Amor;" a "Lamb" before marriage becomes a "Lion" after; a "Nightingale" marries a "Partridge;" "Mutton" takes "Ham;" "Salmon," "Codd," &c. Some of the mistakes which the registers make with the cause of death are rather remarkable. People are discovered to die of the following strange complaints, most of them are probably new to our medical readers:—"Imperfect closure of the foreman." "Turner on the right anne," "Disease of the lever," "Hanged himself in a fit of temperate insanity from excessive drinking," &c.—*Chambers' Journal.*