

The *Nation* of Saturday says: "For several hundreds of years the Corporation of Dublin have been, as the lawyers say, seized of a pew in the (now) Protestant Church of Dublin; said pew being for the use of City Fathers, who, by a pleasant legal fiction, were presumed to attend worship therein regularly every Sunday down to the 18th of the present month. That is to say until the passing of a recent act of Parliament, it was only in Protestant places of worship that the civic representatives could attend as such. The Corporation of Dublin, however, having, for nearly thirty years, been composed of Catholics, two to one as numbered with Protestants, the latter have had the privilege of free sittings and official recognition at religious ceremonies all to themselves to the utter exclusion of the Catholic representatives, who constituted two-thirds of the Civic Council. By the recent act the distinction was abolished, and the Corporation of Dublin might, we suppose, if it so lasted, have disposed of its pew in Christ's Church, and retained sittings in accordance with the requirements of the vast majority of the Council in the Catholic cathedral. But a more generous, liberal, and tolerant course was adopted. It was decided to let the pew in Christ's Church remain for the use of the Protestant minority, and to retain a pew in the pro-cathedral for the Catholic majority. But oh, the ingrained and ineradicable bigotry of your genuine Ultramarine! The *Mail* and *Sanders* were all at once stricken with horror at the idea of official sittings in church! They never woke to this idea as long as such sittings were enjoyed by their own co-religionists, to the exclusion of Catholics. All at once they bethought them that there ought to be no continuance of such an ancient practice. (Not a word of objection to it by Ultramarineism throughout three hundred years, while a monopoly was secured by law to Protestants.) All out of compassion for the 'over-taxed rate-payers,' too! This gliding, it was presumed, would cover the poison of pill bigotry! The 'Ultramarine faction' had, forsooth, taken the course, being 'at their wits' end' how to organize a triumph over 'true Protestantism.' Now the whole proposition, it turns out, emanated from Mr. Norwood, one of the leaders of the Conservative party in the Council and not from the 'Ultramarine faction' at all. Mr. Norwood found the Catholic members in the act of voting money to execute some requisite fittings in the Christ Church pew; and he seems very naturally to have asked why any longer need this be done for his co-religionists—the small minority—and nothing done for the vast majority of the Council who were Catholics. So, on his motion, it was ordered that application be made to the Cardinal Archbishop for a municipal pew in the pro-cathedral, Marlborough-street, for the use of the Catholic Lord Mayors and members of the Council. Miserable and disgusting, indeed, has been the exhibition made by the Ultramarine press on this occasion; but we must state—and we state with much reluctance and with unfeigned regret—that we never contemplated the human intellect in a state of such revolting debasement as that exhibited by the Ultramarine journalists when dealing with subjects of this nature.

**THE GREAT SEAL.—CATHOLIC EXCLUSION.**—The Lord Chancellor will take his vacation in a few days, and try his hand at the grouse. The Great Seal, as usual, will be put in commission. Heretofore Catholics were disabled from being Lord Chancellors or taking charge of the Great Seal in the Chancellor's absence. But that disability has been removed, and they are now qualified to be Chancellors or Keepers. A Queen's letter, it appears, has arrived, naming the Commissioners who are to have charge of the Seal. Not one is a Catholic. A Judge of the Prerogative Court and two Masters in Chancery are recommended to the Queen as fit and proper persons to hold the Great Seal, while such men as the Chief Baron, Justices O'Hagan and Fitzgerald, and Baron Densy, are passed over. It would have been a graceful recognition of the principles of religious equality, more fully developed in the Oaths and Offices Act, if the Government had the good taste to appoint one or more Catholic judges, instead of 'going in search of temporary substitutes' of an inferior class, as the *Mail* properly observes. To pass over nine Catholic Judges and appoint an expiring Chancery Master only shows how superficial is the 'liberality' of the Irish Government. Of course the Catholic Bench will smile at the Orange spirit which dictated their exclusion. We do not know who is responsible for the blunder, nor do we much care. It more clearly concerns the Cabinet and the Lord-Lieutenant. The *Mail* reproves the 'ungracious blunder' with good sense and good taste as follows: "The Great Seal of Ireland has not, as has been stated, as yet been put into commission, nor will the Lord Chancellor leave Ireland earlier than next week. A Queen's letter has arrived, naming the following Commissioners to take custody of the Great Seal during his lordship's absence, viz.: The Master of the Rolls, Lord Justice of Appeal, Baron Fitzgerald, Judge Keatinge, Master Brooke and Master Fitzgibbon. We cannot but think that an ungracious blunder has been made in the omission from among these names of some of the Roman Catholic Judges, who are now qualified by law to hold the Great Seal. It was surely unnecessary to descend below the Bench in search of temporary substitutes for the Keeper of the Seal, when such men as Chief Baron Pigot, and others whom we need not name, were at hand, and no doubt, ready to accept the slight compliment that would be implied in their selection. We know not who may have been accountable for a mistake akin, in a small way, to that committed by Sir Robert Peel when he affronted Mr. O'Connell by refusing to make the Roman Catholic Relief Act retrospective in his case; thus putting him to the 'useless inconvenience' of a second election for the county of Clare."—*Freeman's Journal*.

It is in connection with its influence on the policy of foreign governments, not less than its home results, that true statesmen must contemplate the Irish emigration. If the diminution was merely a transfer of labour from one country to another, it would still deserve to be considered from both points of view, but it is more than that. It may mean a transfer, to some extent, of the political power, and may foreshadow a change in the character of our international relations. The practical

solution of the problem will only be accomplished by a reformed parliament; but no time or opportunity is to be lost in showing that the subject will receive the earnest attention it demands. In this way future complications may possibly be avoided; the people may still bear up patiently, hopeful of better things; and the sting of the emigration may be drawn. How greatly that emigration has affected, and yet steadily continues to affect the population, may be judged by the following computations:—In 1861 the census gave the population 5,788,415; every year since, in spite of increase by births, it has been declining, according to the estimates of the Registrar-General. In 1862, it was 5,775,784; in 1863, 5,739,569; in 1864, 5,675,307; in 1865, 5,641,086; in 1866, 5,582,625; in 1867, 5,557,196. Twenty-one years ago the population of Ireland was over eight millions and a quarter; sixty-one years ago it was nearly of its present figure, being computed at 5,574,105. But the relative proportion of the sexes is not the same for 1866 and for 1867; the difference is noteworthy, for it indicates the distinction between a small population increasing under natural circumstances, and a large one diminishing by the emigration of its virile youth. In 1866, with a total population of 5,574,105, there was an excess of females by 50,469; whilst in 1867, with a total population of 5,557,196, there is an excess of females over males by 104,756. One of the saddest facts which the statistics reveal is the increase, not merely relative but absolute, of deaf mutes, insane, idiotic, and decrepit inhabitants. Contrasting 1851 with 1861, it will be found that whilst the population had decreased enormously, the number of deaf mutes had increased by 473, on their former total of 5,180; the blind by 1,092, on their former total of 5,787; the lame and decrepit by 225, on their former total of 4,375; and the lunatic and idiotic by the immense number of 4,118, on their former total of 9,980; mounting up in 1861, notwithstanding a great decrease in the population, to 14,098. To France alone, after the scourging conscriptions of Napoleon, could Ireland be compared with any hope of finding a parallel for facts so lamentable.—*Chronicle*.

The Dublin correspondent of the *Post* states that the cholera has made its appearance in different parts of Ireland, and, although very little has been said about it, there is no doubt that in the poorer districts of Dublin it has lately been rife enough to deserve the title of epidemic. Many of the cases were of the milder type, called English cholera, or dysentery, produced by the extreme heat of the weather and the eating of stale or unripe fruit and vegetables, but a tolerably large proportion were of the true Asiatic character.

The *Reporter* has the following:—As Mr. Hunt, of Friarstown, was having some portion of his land dug up some few days ago, the labourer came on the bones of a human being who must have been one of the great Fomorian giants of a far distant age. The circumference of the cranium was no less than thirty-five inches—indicating a phenomenal development which we believe to be unparalleled. We have not heard whether Mr. Hunt sent the head to any of our national depots of curiosities; but certain it is that such a head deserves a niche in the temple of fame. We have not been informed whether Mr. Hunt measured the bones of this giant.

Friday, Aug. 30.—The Lord Lieutenant of Ireland has been making a not over wise speech. His lordship says Ireland only wants a good harvest to make her people happy and contented. No less than 500,000 acres of land have gone out of cultivation since 1860, but the number of sheep and cattle has increased. Then emigration in the first six months of 1867 took 48,000 of the people out of Ireland.

A Drogheda correspondent of the *Dublin Freeman*, under date August 28, writes:—The harvest operations have set in briskly on the Meath and Louth sides of the Boyne this week and the demand for labourers has become such that any person who can handle a sickle in the field will find employment. Yesterday and to-day the wages for men were 4s. each, and for women 2s. 6d. to 3s. We observed girls of seventeen years engaged in large numbers. There are numerous English orders here for new oatmeal, which millers are most anxious to complete. One gentleman in this district has sold £200 worth of oats on the foot, to be delivered at the mill within a week. New oats delivered at the stores vary from 17s. to 18s. per 196 lbs.

#### GREAT BRITAIN.

A subscription is being made in Birmingham in order to compensate the poor Catholics who suffered during the Murphy riots. Both Catholics and Anglicans have contributed to it, but as yet only 200 guineas have been raised towards meeting claims amounting to nearly £500.

When we stated in the spring of this year that the negotiations between our Government and that of the United States in reference to arbitration on the Alabama claims were in an unsatisfactory position, and that Mr. Seward's despatches betrayed a disposition to evade a settlement of the dispute, Lord Stanley endeavoured by a somewhat ambiguous explanation in the House of Commons to give an apparent contradiction to our statements. The correspondence, however, which has just been published by the Foreign Office, fully confirms our assertion. The government of the United States is stubborn and unflinching in maintaining that the recognition of the Southern States as a belligerent by England was premature and unjustifiable, and constituted an intervention on our part in favour of the insurgents; and in insisting that our behaviour in this respect shall be made a subject of inquiry and arbitration, along with the claims for compensation for the depredations of the Alabama and other Confederate cruisers. Mr. Seward refers to the prompt action of his government in preventing Fenian operations against Canada, to point the contrast between the impartiality and friendliness of the United States and the unjust and unfriendly conduct of England. To this Lord Stanley replies on November 30, that it was the declaration of a blockade by the United States Government which forced our government to proclaim its neutrality. He adopts Lord Russell's position that only two courses were then open to us: to acknowledge the blockade and pro-

claim neutrality, or to refuse to acknowledge the blockade and to insist upon our right to trade with the ports of the South. Our choice was in favour of that course which was most just and friendly to the United States. Not only the declaration of a blockade, but the decisions of American courts, implied the existence of a civil war, and therefore justified the recognition of the South as a belligerent. Lord Stanley cannot understand the process of reasoning by which the acts of British subjects in furnishing assistance and supplies to the Southern States can be traced to the issue of the proclamation. 'Undertakings of this nature in favour of either of the belligerents were equally in contravention of its terms, and those who engaged in such enterprises did so at their own risk. The United States, whose communication with Great Britain was uninterrupted, received assistance of this illicit nature to a very much larger extent than their antagonists.' Lord Stanley denies that there is any parallel between the fitting out of Confederate cruisers and the Fenian preparations against Canada.

The British Government were ready, anxious, and determined, throughout the whole course of the civil war, to exert all the power conferred upon the Queen by the law of the land to prevent British subjects from taking a part in that contest. But the law could not be put in force against offenders, unless on the production of evidence, first that the law was violated; and secondly, that its violation was the act of the persons charged with that offence. The secrecy observed by these persons in their unlawful proceedings baffled all the efforts of her Majesty's Government, no less than those of the diplomatic and consular agents of the United States in this country to detect them. The action of the Fenians, on the contrary, was open and avowed. The Government of the United States needed, therefore, no research on the part of its own officials, nor even a denunciation by British authorities, to establish against these Fenian agitators a palpable case of infringement of the laws of the United States, coupled with a deliberate design to undertake from the territory of the United States, whose Government were in amity with that of her Majesty, a military operation directed against either Canada or Ireland.

Her Majesty's Government cannot admit that because four vessels escaped the action of British law, two of them unperceived, one by an accident, and one for want of evidence, Mr. Seward is justified in stating that 'ruinous British warlike expeditions against the United States are practically allowed and tolerated by her Majesty's government, notwithstanding remonstrance'; and looking to the fact that at least an equal number of vessels were arrested before commencing their career, and that on all occasions when the law could be enforced legal proceedings were taken against the offenders, they consider that they have a right to assert that, under circumstances similar to those in which the United States Government has been lately placed, they would not have pursued a less fair or friendly course. It is not the intention of her Majesty's government to pursue this discussion further, yet I must observe that, were it their wish to apply to the conduct of the United States the same kind of criticism in which Mr. Seward has indulged with regard to them, they might fairly be entitled to ask whether the restoration by order of the President of arms captured from Fenian insurgents, without any appearance of an intention on the part of those insurgents to abandon their culpable projects, and the discontinuance of government prosecutions instituted against their leaders without any proof that the evidence against those leaders was inadequate for their conviction, are not circumstances quite as open to an unfavourable construction as any of those on which Mr. Seward has laid so much stress as against the conduct of this government.—*Pull Mail Gazette*.

**ENGLAND AND NON-INTERVENTION.**—The *Saturday Review* notices that the Continent has shown a disposition to criticise and condemn the tendency of English statesmen to keep clear of Continental affairs. It is beginning to be thought both at home and abroad, that England is a sort of venerable lioness who only cares about a single cub. When the Sultan was over here, he went about in the character of our one tame protegee who is never to be meddled with by anybody. The various Sovereigns of Europe who come to London enjoy no such chosen position. The King of Belgium and of Greece seem, in the comparison, merely to be Royal country-cousins, for whom John Bull will always be happy to do anything in reason that he can. He takes a deep interest in their moral and religious welfare; he hopes they mean to bring up their subjects in the principles of civil and religious liberty; he trusts they may marry well, and, if possible, may marry Protestants, and that they may be blessed with a numerous progeny; and a knife and fork, so to speak, will always be laid for them at Buckingham Palace. The Sultan is altogether differently placed. He is not expected to be moral, or pious, or economical, or constitutional, or to keep one wife, or to consult any of the prejudices of the British public. If there is an extra massacre of Christians in the Lebanon or in Crete, or if the Turkish Government show signs of approaching insolvency, we all feel that it is only the Sultan doing something in the name of the Prophet, and nobody minds so privileged a being's little indiscretions. Some agent of the family is sent down to look after his financial embarrassments, his fleet is put to rights by English admirals, he gets his guns and gun carriages cheap, and everything is put smooth for him gratis. The contrast between the tone of England about Turkey, and her general tone about Continental politics, is obvious both to ourselves and foreigners, and throws light on the general character of the non-intervention to which we are supposed in Europe to have committed ourselves. Hungarians, Italians, Poles, Austrians, Prussians and Belgians, it is understood, may go where fortune pleases. If anything untoward happens to them, we shall regret it, hold public meetings to lament their fate, subscribe something for the wounded soldiers, send out the products of innumerable bazaars to their widows, and spend on their cause our usual contribution of placid philanthropic fuss. But we shall not on that account leave the even tenor of our way, or depart from those great principles of non-inter-

vention which Providence, we half murmur to ourselves, has decreed that an enlightened nation like our own should observe and promulgate. All this noble and high-minded disinterestedness vanishes, however, into thin air whenever the Foreign Office conceives of the bare idea of any one laying hands on the Sultan, that favoured child of England and of Allah. We straightway furbish up our arms, fling non-intervention programmes into our waste-paper basket, and remark, with an air of pious confidence in Heaven, that we are quite ready in the cause of truth and honour to undertake a just war. This apparent inconsistency in our behaviour brings us into real odium abroad. Foreigners find it no difficult matter to prove by a train of instances, that England's political creed comes to this—that nothing is usually of any consequence, but that anyone who lays a finger on her overland route to India, is guilty, politically speaking, of the sin for which there is no forgiveness. Selfish, Pharisaical, worldly, are the epithets lavished freely on us as a nation. It is not by any means unnatural that it should be. We should employ terms as harsh and as severe about any European State which talked and acted as we do ourselves.

**THE ABYSSINIAN EXPEDITION.**—The statements which have appeared in some of the papers respecting the Abyssinian expedition are not quite correct. The expedition will be organized in India, under the command of Sir Robert Napier, Commander-in-Chief at Bombay, who is to be entrusted with the chief political as well as military authority. Sir Charles Staveley has been selected as second in command. A quantity of steam transport has been taken up, and will start for Bombay immediately, so as to be there in the course of November; but the Bombay Government have also provided a quantity of transport for themselves. Officers have also been despatched to various places to purchase camels and mules. Massowah will probably be selected as the base of operations, but this point is not finally settled. Three steamers have been provided, which are being fitted up as hospital ships, and will be furnished with appropriate stores. Medical officers will be appointed to them. The whole of the arrangements are under the direction of the India office, in order to secure unity of action; but the expense will be borne by Imperial funds.

What will the new Reform Act do? is a question which the National Reform Union is attempting to answer. There are 1,207,000 male householders in England and Wales, and both the Premier and the Chancellor of the Exchequer estimated at the beginning of the session that after making allowances for double entries, non-payment of rates, and apathy to the possession of the franchise, no fewer than a million voters would appear on the registers. The Reform Union endeavours to show that the new bill will be much more conservative in its operation, and that it will place only an additional 120,000 on the electoral lists. Obviously some grave errors in calculation must have been made. Mr. Gladstone estimated this 17 rental franchise would have added 204,000 names to the registers. Below this line there were at least half a million householders; and yet, after the rental qualification has been entirely knocked away, and the privilege of voting granted to every household who pays his poor rates, the Reform Union tells the public that a miserable 120,000 is all that the boroughs will get after so many years of action on the part of Reformers. The registration in the autumn of 1868 will prove whether such a calculation is as fallacious as many believe it to be.

Notwithstanding the statement that King Theodore had released his prisoners, the British Government was pressing the preparations for the departure of the Abyssinian expedition.

**THE BALLOT.**—There seems to be a very decided change taking place in the minds of many men who were determined opponents of the ballot. Even the most moderate reformers are beginning to see that under the Reform Act it will be the longest purses, those which can spend the most money, by whom every seat in Parliament will be secured, or else the ballot must modify the whole sale bribery which will be rife at the elections under the new Act. If there is no ballot it will, in future, be the most wealthy candidate who must win every contested election. We have always looked upon the new bill as an Act fraught with great danger—a leap in the dark taken by a Ministry determined to hang on to place at all risks. Whether we were right or not, time only can show. But both to give the new Act fair play, and to protect the great body of electors against the purses of Cottonopolis on the one side, and against the "roughs'" intimidation by means of trades union on the other, the ballot has now become a necessity for the voters of England, and we rejoice to hear that a systematic agitation upon the subject is to be commenced forthwith.

**THE ENGLISH DIVORCE COURT.**—The annual return shows that in the year 1866, 215 petitions were filed in the Divorce Court for dissolution of marriage, 8 for declaration of nullity of marriage, 64 for a separation, and 17 for restitution to conjugal rights.

It was reported on Saturday that a small boat, the John U. Ford, had been lost in attempting to cross the Atlantic, with all hands on board. The particulars are now published. One man, Andrew Armstrong, it seems, escaped, and he tells the tale. The little craft left Baltimore on the 22nd of June, and, after putting into Halifax, she finally left on her cruise for Europe on the 16th July, her crew consisting of four persons, Captain Gould, the master, Shering, the mate, Armstrong, the survivor, and Murphy, a lad. On the afternoon of the 5th ult. a sea struck the boat, and she turned over, but righted again almost immediately. She lost all her oil, however, which was necessary for the light at her compass, and the crew suffered much from cramps and the loss of water. The hands then cut up the boards that secured the ballast and the internal fittings, in order to burn and obtain a light for the compass. Heavy gales from the S.W. to E. N. E., were experienced, with a cross sea, and on Monday, the 19th ult., she bore up for Cork, when about 10.30 p.m. a terrific sea struck the boat, and turned her over, and the ballast boards being gone, the ballast shifted and was thrown in the water and the boat kept turning right over as the four hands endeavoured to get on her, until the lad got entangled between the rigging and the mast and she was so kept steady. The men were in this position until noon the following day, being frequently washed off by the seas, when a sail was observed bearing down upon them; and for a time they were in hopes of being relieved. The sail, however, passed by without rendering them help. The mate Shering then asked Armstrong and the survivors to pray with him; and they continued to do so for some time. The mate then shook hands with all of them and kissed the forehead of his wife. The then became much excited and after biting the captain's leg, fell off the boat and perished. The same evening the lad Murphy asked Armstrong to make him fast, which was done to his belt, but shortly afterwards a heavy sea swept him off and he disappeared. The captain and Armstrong were washed off, and the captain, as he went away, and sunk, fell

"God help my poor wife and family." Armstrong succeeded in regaining the bottom of the boat, and remained on her till 4 a.m. on the 23rd, without the slightest nourishment, and after being washed off by the heavy seas, when the ship *Aerolite*, Capt. Allyn, of Liverpool, discerned the shreds of canvas which were flying from the one which he was enabled to raise, and bore down to him. In a very exhausted and almost insensible condition he was taken off the bottom of the boat and got on board the *Aerolite*, where he received every kindness and attention. On the following day or so he was transferred on board the *Mary Blake*, from Antigua, which brought him on to London. The dimensions of the John U. Ford were 19 ft. length of keel, 22 ft. 6 in. over all, 7 ft. beam, and 2 ft. 8 in. depth of hold.

**PROGRESS?**—When the Oxford movement, which began in 1830, was still in its infancy, or rather its youth, a certain zealous young clergyman, whose episcopalianism was at the time at white heat, amazed the Low Church Bishop of his diocese by suddenly going down upon his knee and asking for his lordship's blessing at the end of some business interview in the 'palace.' 'Good Heaven!' or 'God bless my soul!' exclaimed the bewildered prelate, lifting up his hands, but not in the attitude of benediction; 'how should I, a miserable sinner, give anybody my blessing? Get up, Sir, at once, and let us have no more of these Popish mummeries!' What a misfortune, indeed, it was for the enthusiastic young parson in question that his lot was not cast some 30 years later, either in that happy abode of intensified episcopacy the Cape of Good Hope, or in London itself, where the Bishop of the said colony is now only too willing to bestow his 'blessing' upon clergy and laity indiscriminately. What would have been the joyful anticipations of the earlier Tractarians could they have foreseen such a fruitful result of their labours as that displayed last week at a church in Shoreham, when a couple of hundred men and women marched unexpectedly in, led by the ex-Father Ignatius, to thank Bishop Gray, now in England, for bullying Bishop Colenso, and to entreat his episcopal 'blessing,' all kneeling on the ground before him. The notion of a couple of hundred poor people pronouncing an opinion upon the Colenso criticisms on the Pentateuch is, in truth, so ludicrous that it is surprising that even a person so destitute of all sense of the absurd as this same ex-Father Ignatius did not detect its silliness.—*Pull Mail Gazette*.

#### UNITED STATES.

The will of the late Bishop Timon, of Buffalo, was admitted to probate by the Erie County Surrogate on Wednesday. It disposes of about \$10,000 in personal and \$1,000,000 in real property, all of which it gives to the Church.

**THE 'LAZY MONKS.'**—A writer in that sterling journal, the *Philadelphia Catholic Standard*, alluding to the order of Passionists and their progress in the United States within the past fifteen years, pays the following well-merited tribute to the Monks and religious orders of the Catholic Church in all ages:—"Labor is the motto of our people; idleness does not exist in this country, even among the wealthier classes. Well, let us take the busiest of our merchants or speculators, the maddest in the pursuit of the 'Almighty Dollar,' and his time is not so well filled as that of the pious men I have just described, let alone the importance of the result attained. Yet it is nothing new in Catholic history; these religious are but walking in the footsteps of their predecessors, continuing the work of centuries. The revolutionists and infidels of the Old World have hunted against the 'lazy monks'; they have closed their monasteries, robbed them and cast them adrift; 'No more idle mendicants,' they said; 'go forth in the world and work!' Insensates! The work done by those 'idle' men has never been equalled: it has benefitted mankind, benefited you, the disposers of your benefactors. The monasteries were the cradle of literature, the treasury of history, the inexhaustible mine of science and art. To them you owe the earliest discoveries in Medicine, in Astronomy, in Agriculture; from them have come thousands of useful inventions that created national industry. Their time-worn manuscripts are the only light you have to read the history of past ages. The monk in his cloister worked for you like the priest in your midst, like the missionary among the savage tribes. Wherever these servants of Christ have labored, you have reaped the fruits, and you reap them now. The Church has laid the true principles of democracy, and secured the rights of the people; not by revolution and violence, but by opening her arms to the humblest and bidding him 'learn and work, elevate thyself by thy deeds.' From the ranks of the people came priests who spoke to kings and rulers from the pulpit, and reminded them that there was a King on high who judges the crowned monarch as well as the humblest peasant. Between the feudal lords and the serfs the Church stood, a conciliating agent, protecting the one and restraining the other.

**GOING TO CANADA.**—The *New York Express* regrets to learn that many citizens of the South are sending their families to Canada. In some parts of Alabama and Mississippi, in the large towns and cities, the audacity of the negro has become so great, and the disposition so general among officers of the Freedmen's Bureau and others in authority to wink at, sanction, or pass over these outrages, that, as a matter of safety, many persons in the South are sending their wives and daughters out of the country. Canada is a favourite resort, because living is less costly there, even at gold prices, than in the large cities of the North. The absence of the inflated currency has been of immense advantage to the Canadians, and would be to us. But irrespective of this it is a disgrace to the Government, and to the military service, that the females of whole families feel compelled to leave the South to secure protection.

A *New York Journal*, the *Gazette*, says:—Sad are the stories that float in upon us from the carnival life at Long Branch, Santaqua, and other of the fashionable summer resorts. Frivolities we expect. A measurable amount of dancing and gaiety is not surprising. But we do not look for such reports as those which are left to appal us by the ebullient season. We do not look to see ladies and gentlemen who are prominent in metropolitan social life engaging in downright carousals. We mean drinking and drunkenness—not one whit short or less. This has been the shame and curse of the season. It has left a blight which will sadden lives through long years. It has, to our certain knowledge, taken two persons straight down to death.

**INSISTS ON HIS RIGHTS.**—A colored man who was up before the police court at Louisville a few days ago, on a charge of stealing, rather took down the concern by remarking, as he was about to be marched off to jail, that, 'If they didn't let a nigger steal a little in his dam country, 'Ise gwine back to Tennessee where Mr. Brownlow'll see a nigger git his rights sure.'

**THE COAL TRADE.**—It is predicted that many of the small coal companies which have been formed during the past two or three years will have to go by the board, as the prices of coal are so low at present that the mines are not making any money. The prospect of moderate rates during the coming winter months will be welcomed by the poor.—*Boston Herald*.

The *Tribune* thinks there is some colour of authenticity in the report that the President intends to assert the amnesty doctrine to the uttermost, to carry constitutionalism to a crisis, and to promote Congress.