

The Limerick correspondent of the Cork Examiner, writing on the 12th of May, says: "About noon today a fearful sudden death took place on the North strand, immediately adjoining the Welesley Bridge, to which considerable popular interest appeared in consequence of the connection of the deceased, by relationship, with the crime mover in the drama of the 'Collegeians,' upon which powerful tale of crime Gerald Griffin, the 'Goleen Boy,' is founded. The poor man whose existence so suddenly terminated was named Fraeels (better known as 'Frank') Scalan and had been employed as a ship-waiter in the service of the Messrs Harvey. He had just passed at the time stated, and paid toll to the collector, being then apparently in his usual health, but he had not proceeded more than twenty yards in the direction of the Militia Barrack when he was seen to reel and fall on the road. Some carmen who were passing the spot ran to his assistance, but on lifting him up he was found to be a corpse. The body was moved in upon the foot-path, and a doctor and a clergyman were at once sent for, but the vital spark had fled. The deceased was only surviving brother of John Scalan, of Ballymore, who was executed in Limerick for the murder of 'Billy O'Conner.' He was unmarried and bore the character of being a sober, industrious man. The occurrence created a painful sensation in the neighborhood. The deceased belonged to one of the most respectable of the old families of this county. He was the son of a landed proprietor, and his aunt was married to the late Hon. George Massy."

TRAGEDY, May 20.—A large number of persons came into the village of Ballybegue on Tuesday, to see off emigrants. They drank heavily during the day and quarrelled amongst themselves in the evening. Three out of five policemen in the village interfered, and failed to quell the riot, and the two arrested. The prisoners were rescued and the policemen slightly wounded. Irritated by this, the policemen made a determined effort to recapture their prisoners. The crowd became violent, and the policemen were pelted with stones, and driven to their barracks, one being prostrated by a serious wound on the head. Having seized their rifles, two sub-constables and constable Hall issued in pursuit of the retreating crowd. Stone-throwing again commenced and the police fired, shooting through the right lung a man named O'Hara, an Irish-American stated to be the ringleader. The crowd dispersed at once, and two persons were arrested. Sub-constable Crowley has been dangerously injured, O'Hara mortally, and two policemen slightly hurt.

FURTHER DETAILS.

The Cork Examiner of the 19th ult., says:—Timothy O'Hara is stated to be mortally wounded, and two other men, one named Dunne and the other named O'Hara, also, and a younger brother to Timothy, received wounds. Dunne was shot in the left thigh, very near the groin, with a rifle ball, which passed through, without, however, touching the bone, and lies in the county infirmary since one o'clock today. The second O'Hara was wounded, very fortunately but slightly with a sword, and is in the custody of the police at Ballybegue, his wound not necessitating medical treatment so promptly as Dunne's. A Catholic clergyman prepared Timothy O'Hara for death at an early hour this morning. An investigation was held at Ballybegue, this evening, by Captain Hall, R.M. Six persons, alleged to have been engaged in the disturbances, including the wounded men O'Hara and Dunne, were committed for trial at the assizes on the evidence of the policemen for riot and assault. The deposition of O'Hara and Dunne were taken at the County Infirmary.—They allege that the police used their side-arms in the first encounter, and that the stone-throwing followed; and also that the policemen pursued the crowd a mile before the melee occurred in which they fired. O'Hara's death is hourly expected.—Several persons have been injured by sword cuts Dunne received a bad thrust in the groin.

The prosecution of back directors is the order of the day. Were I to mention the number of civil actions against directors of other joint stock companies for misrepresentation at present in progress, I should make the lips of your junior bar water at the thought of the pickings in prospect for their brethren at this side of the Channel. An Irish M.P., and an Irish ex-M.P., who 'rugged' the market, must suffer severely.—Irish Times.

The Lord Chancellor of Ireland arrived in Belfast on May 17th.

William John Stuart was recently arrested in Dundalk, as he was on the point of jumping off the parapet of the bridge, near the police barracks, into the river. He was then held as a March hare, and had escaped but a few days before from the Belfast Lunatic Asylum. He is a blacksmith by trade.

The Protestant Archbishop of Armagh has been carrying out a small scheme of disestablishment and disendowment on his own account—and not altogether, we are bound to say, in that generous and gracious spirit which we know, on Mr. Diarmid's authority, ought to be conspicuously displayed when such enterprises are taken in hand. His grace lately gave notice to his gate-keeper to quit; and the defendant, 'a respectable old woman' was summoned last week to show cause why the house of which she persisted in retaining possession, should not be surrendered to the Archbishop. The poor woman stated that her husband, who died last December, had been with the late and present Primates for forty six years, as gate-keeper; and she added that during all that time she had opened the gate of the archiepiscopal residence from four or half-past four in the morning till ten at night. She evidently considered that there were certain 'vested interests' to be taken into account, and under this impression she declared that it was unfair that the most revered gentleman should be fighting for his living in London, and that she should not be allowed to fight for hers. Unfortunately for the lodge incumbent, the court was as ungracious and ungenerous as the archbishop and granted an order that the house should be given up in eight days. No compensation clauses were added to the bill.—Birmingham Post.

THE NEW MAYOR OF CORK.—Mr. O'Sullivan's necessary Alderman Hegarty, was sworn on Saturday, May 22, and entered on his duties as Mayor.—This gentleman is a moderate Liberal in politics, and Mr. O'Sullivan is said to have earned for himself the hearty detestation of many of his former supporters by voting for him instead of the 'nationalist' candidate, Mr. Nagle.

The following additional particulars concerning the election of the new Mayor are furnished by a correspondent:—The election was then proceeded with, and resulted as you have already learned, in favor of Alderman Hegarty, a moderate Liberal, who defeated the Nationalist candidate, Mr. Nagle by a large majority. Mr. Nagle, who was the popular favorite, was loudly cheered by the crowd. He explained that his principles were Democratic Liberal, and declared himself in favor of domestic legislation. The ex-Mayor voted for Mr. Hegarty, and was immediately turned upon and denounced as a traitor. One of the local journals gives the following description of the closing scene:—The crowd Mr. Dominic O'Mahony, occupying a prominent position—here rushed at the ex-Mayor very excitedly, and asked him, did he vote for Mr. Hegarty?

The ex-Mayor, who appeared totally unprepared for such an exhibition of popular feeling, was unable to answer the question for some moments.

Mr. Nagle here interposed for the protection of the ex-Mayor, and endeavored to appease the people.

Mr. Dominic O'Mahony: You degraded yourself; you brought your office into degradation [Cheers and approval.]

The ex-Mayor: I voted according to my—[Great hissing.]

One of the crowd who assumed a most menacing attitude towards the ex-Mayor, shaking his fist in

his face: You were put into a position by the people, and you betrayed them [Great cheering.] You sold the country. [Applause.]

The ex-Mayor: I did not. I— [Cries of shut up your mouths—traitor.]

Mr. O'Mahony: You degraded the position, sir. [Cheers.]

The ex-Mayor: I voted as my principles dictated. [Cries of 'To tell with you,' and fearful commotion.]

At this juncture Mr. Nagle, Mr. O'Sullivan, and other gentlemen, interposed on behalf of the ex-Mayor, and endeavored to get that gentleman to leave the court house.

The ex-Mayor: Let me tell them. Cries of 'We want hear you, you informer!'

A Voice: Ah, Dad, why did you vote for leather-belly?

Another Voice: We'll stick Hegarty in the tabole. [Much laughter.]

The ex-Mayor: I am an alderman of a ward. [Approval.]

A Voice: You ought to be a ward in Chancery, you idiot. [Laughter and applause.]

Another Voice: You will go out the next time, Dad. [Cheers.]

The scene became so turbulent that the whole Council withdrew to an adjoining room but the crowd followed Mr. O'Sullivan in an excited manner, and it required all the influence which his friends possessed to shield him from the violence of his former admirers. There was a large body of police in the hall of the court, but their services were not required, as the indignation of the mob, although very fierce, did not extend beyond mere words and abuse.

GREAT BRITAIN.

LIFE PENITENTIARY BILL IN THE HOUSE OF LORDS.—In the House of Lords to-day the bill for the creation of life penitentiaries passed in Committee, with an amendment limiting the number of years to be created under its provisions to two annually.

REPORTED CRUELTY TOWARDS FENIAN PRISONERS.—London June 4.—In the House of Commons, this evening, Mr. Bruce explained a report which had been current, of cruelty towards Fenian prisoners. He said the report arose from the necessity to repress violent and outrageous conduct. Rossa, since August, was reported as the best conducted Fenian prisoner.

FUSCH'S MEMORIAL.—Mr. Fusch seems more like the Mr. Fusch of elder days when he begins to substitute good nature and good humor for the sneer and sarcasm which so ill become him, in treating of Brother Jonathan. He now announces: 'Mr. Fusch himself has paid Mr. Sumner's bill. The handwriting of the latter being indistinct, Mr. Fusch is not quite sure whether he asks for two hundred and fifty millions or billions, and therefore has sent over the latter sum. If there is a balance, Mr. Sumner can keep it for himself or lay it out in building a lunatic asylum into which, if the quarrel should really arise, the people of the United States will do well to insert every public man they have, from Governor Sumner down to drunken Chancellors.'

The Conservatives of Leamington some time since sent a memorial to the Bishop of Worcester, requesting him to authorise the clergy in his diocese 'to pray to Almighty God during the morning and evening services, on behalf of the Irish branch of the United Church of England and Ireland, at present in deep affliction.' The Bishop replied: 'Although I value and respect the feeling which has prompted the memorial, I have no power to authorise the introduction of any additional prayer into the order prescribed by the act of uniformity.'

LONDON, JUNE 3.—Despatches have been received to-day from Mold, a small town in the northern part of Wales, giving the details of a formidable riot which occurred last evening, whereby several lives were lost and many persons injured. An attempt was made to rescue two prisoners in the hands of the Sheriff. The Sheriff and his guard resisted manfully, but the mob being too strong, it was found necessary to call out the military force, which fired upon the rioters, killing four of them instantly, and wounding many more. At the date of the last despatch the town was quiet and the prisoners still in custody.

We have at last a complete list of the sufferers from the Fenian attempt to blow up the Clerkenwell prison. The neighborhood thereabouts is thickly settled with a labouring population, and the close proximity of the tenement houses to the scene of the explosion accounts for the extent of the havoc made. The summary shows that 37 people were killed of whom 20 were infants; 120 wounded—15 permanently—and two women went mad with grief and suffering. Thus far, but one of the authors of this slaughter has been hung.

LORDS STRATFORD DE REDCLIFFE AND CLARENDON ON THE 'ALABAMA' CASE.—In the House of Lords this evening, Lord Stratford de Redcliff, moved for the copy of the 'Alabama' treaty. He said the Government had shown the greatest consideration in its desire to maintain peace, and trusted that negotiations were resumed, that a calmer spirit than that which succeeded Mr. Sumner's speech, would show its influence, and that Americans would feel that there were demands that England could not entertain. He hoped such negotiations would place our relations upon a satisfactory footing and all would rejoice if that end could be attained by the able man, whom all admire. Lord Clarendon greeted unavoidable delay in furnishing the papers called for. He traced the history of the negotiations, and said the House of Commons was not entitled to assume that the majority of the Senate and people of the United States supported Mr. Sumner's demand. He believed that without intervention the sympathetic feelings and good sense of America would ultimately prevail. The friendly feelings were reciprocated. He would shrink from no sacrifice to maintain peace, but the national honour must be maintained. He was not aware of Mr. Motley's instructions but he hoped what had occurred would promote and not hinder negotiations, as the terms that England was willing to concede, or must refuse were well known.

MR. GLADSTONE AND THE IRISH CHURCH.—Dr. McNeill, the Dean of Ripon, has fired off a most scathing mortar against Mr. Gladstone. In a letter to the Premier which occupies two columns of the Times, he lays down that religious equality is impossible in Ireland; that the alternative is between Romanist and Protestant ascendancy; that the Romanist system is the worst that it teaches the restitution of Irish estates. 'For every step towards this consummation the Treasury of the Church is open, and if any of these steps require duplicity, falsehood, bribery, poison, pistol, or rifle, the ready produce of that Treasury is plenty indulgence.' Further, when Rome has won the game, the person of an heretical though gentle sovereign shall sink under the murderous arm of some modern Pyrrhus, some noble-minded Fenian. Let no one be deceived by Catholic moderation. 'There may be the making of a battery of the Tridentine Council; there may be a modern Sion with blind assistants of meekness, opening entrance into a Protestant citadel for the wooden horse of Pagan perfidy; there may be the serpent coil of spiritual charity, and real envy, hatred, and malice encircling and enfeebling the bold and faithful Laocoon; but 'no true and consistent subject of the Royal power can be true and loyal to the government of a Protestant State,'—consequently, in ceasing, as he alleges, to be a Protestant State, the United Kingdom is edging disloyalty! We should have thought, on the Dean's own showing, it was diminishing it. Mr. McNeill's logic is worthy of his rhetoric, and his history, and all three worthy of the Papal Allocutions they so exactly resemble.

London, June 5.—The temperate speech of Lord Clarendon in the House of Lords last evening on the

subject of the Alabama treaty has elicited the following comments from the London journals:—

The Times says—For our own part, considering the demands of America and the ready concessions of England, we would rather that the latter got off so well. The rejection of the treaty was unfortunately chosen by the result of the firmness of anybody engaged in behalf of Great Britain.

The Standard says—The negotiations for the Alabama treaty failed because America never intended them to succeed. If England admits that it is her duty to renew her efforts for a peaceful settlement, it is without hope. Our honest desire for such a settlement will not be appreciated but by a small section of the American people. In the mean time, until the details of Mr. Motley's mission are known we should fold our hands and make our compliments to him as a great historian.

The Star says that America can no longer doubt our willingness to do them right, or our determination to preserve our national character and credit.

The Daily Telegraph regards the speech of Lord Clarendon as neither definite nor subservient, but as dignified by a firmness which expresses the national determination. It shows that what may be solicited with success is contained in the articles of the rejected treaty, and that what it hopes to suggest, is contained in Mr. Sumner's speech. England will never put a troublesome pressure on Mr. Motley, to hasten the completion of his task, but will be always ready to cancel every trace of angry feeling likely to disturb the relations of the two powers.

The relations between the United States and Great Britain are very much affected by the Irish element in the former, and by the condition of Ireland itself in the latter country. But it is obvious that, regarding the military question to be decided in the event of war, there is little weight to be attached to either. True, a certain number of Irishmen would enter the American Army, and would probably take a forward part in any conflict between the troops of each nation, fighting with an energy against their own countrymen in the service of the Queen. Equally true is it that Ireland itself would be an objective point in the campaign, and that the Americans, by their agents would seek to excite insurrection there and might even be rash enough to send, or attempt to send, an expedition to foment or sustain a rebellion. But, after all, what would be the result of such a policy? The loyal population of Ireland, aided by the regular army, and by the militia regiments of Great Britain, which would be called out in the event of hostilities, would find no great difficulty in disposing of armed opposition on the part of the rebellious peasantry; and the Americans, who are unable to keep a line of Atlantic steamers afloat, would discover that the equipment of an expeditionary force to cross 3,000 miles of sea is one of the most onerous operations next to the successful landing of it the most onerous of modern warfare. The idea of their covering the seas with privateers is quite absurd. How would they get them? In America? If our fleets are not able to keep a pretty close watch on the great outfitting ports we much underrate their power, but admit that some privateers may escape. If they are sailing ships they can do little damage for our cotton trade will be suspended, and the liners will be turned to other work. If they are steamers, and are intended to have a cruise far away, they may find it rather uneasy to get their coal; and certainly they will not meet with much aid or sympathy from the great European powers, except, perhaps, from their Russian allies. But is it not a game that Great Britain can play, at least as well as her enemy? Our ocean-going steamers are to theirs in the proportion of at least eight to one. Our iron clads of course are still more numerous, and, with all their brag and swagger, they know that they cannot make large rolled plates such as are needed for the best class of armored vessels, and that their big guns are inferior in every way but weight and size. If the enemy seeks to equip privateers in foreign ports our consuls will neglect their duty very egregiously if the Government is not informed of every progress made on every suspected vessel, and the Navy will do its part very boldly if there be not a little bit of a white-on-white fight at the entrance just as our friend is about to step out to sea. No Government would ever dream of sending any force to invade the American States, but it is not so certain that attempts to ascertain whether the States of the South might not be aroused to strike a blow for their old liberties and for States rights, would be neglected or unattended with success. There is a great element of weakness in the diffusion of British settlements and establishments from a military point of view, but the remote points present no facility to the aggression of an enemy, and we must make up our minds to some losses in our encounter with a vindictive and tolerably powerful antagonist. In the old days of independence, when Great Britain was fighting the colonists against tremendous odds and enormous advantages, there is no instance of the Americans being successful in a pitched battle with British regulars of equal numbers.—With every respect for their courage and military spirit, it may be doubted if, man for man, an American Army would hold its own against a British Army now, because it would necessarily be inferior in discipline and steadiness. But there is little probability of a conflict between equally large masses of the troops of either country in the field, should such a dreadful contingency as open warfare absolutely come upon us. There are weak points on the coast of the States as there are on our own, but attacks on them would rather intensify than tend to terminate the struggle. It is pitiable that such thoughts should be forced upon us by the bitter vanity and paltry rhetoric, artifices of such a man as Mr. Sumner, who, in his desire to cast Mr. Seward from the management of foreign affairs, and, in his intense conceit, panders to the passionate resentment of his people. The national sentiments of great nations are not to be trifled with; and, whether Mr. Motley comes with or without instructions on the Alabama claims, our Government must obtain securities for the observance of decent behaviour in diplomatic relations. We are quite sick of this game of brag, and admit at once the Americans can beat us at it. If they will not forgive this country for demanding the surrender of Messrs. Mason and Sedell, why do they not say so? That is one of the offences they never can forgive; and, if at this moment a parallel case were to occur, in spite of the force of law and of public opinion, they would resist the demand to which they yielded in 1862, and would force Great Britain to adopt other means to vindicate her honor. Mr. Sumner when he was in this country, was the toast of every man of title who would take notice of him, and on his return to America during the war, he never departed from secret insinuations that Mr. Seward was a sworn foe to England, and that he (Sumner) alone, kept the peace between the two countries. Now, to gratify his inordinate self love and conceit, he excites his countrymen to regard us as enemies with whom at an early and favourable moment, they are to proceed to direct, instead of suppressed, warfare.—Army and Navy Gazette.

A SINGULAR STORY.—The Preston Guardian tells the following singular story:—The following facts, if not authenticated beyond dispute, would scarcely be credited. On October 1, 1867, a Blackburn manufacturer procured from the Manchester and County Bank, Manchester, in payment of check, £400, of which five £20 Bank of England notes formed a part. These five £20 notes were paid to a Blackburn yarn agent, and by him handed over to his spinner. On reaching home, a little beyond Colne, the spinner gave the notes to his father, who was also his partner, and the payment was duly entered in the cash-book at the mill. The old gentleman did not keep a private cash-book, but simply deposited the money where many thousands had been placed before, and for the time thought no more about it. A little more than a fortnight ago a man, with a gipsy phy-

siognomy, along with a child about ten years of age, called at the house of the spinner, soliciting charity. Compassion was excited, the man and child were fed, a pair of trousers was given to the former, and from the wardrobe of the spinner's daughter the child received ample contributions. On the same evening the man returned, saying he had found in the lining of the trousers a £20 note, which he handed to his benefactor. The man was rewarded for his honesty, and went away rejoicing. The fact of the £20 having turned up so strangely was told to the police-officer stationed there, and he in turn told the circumstances to the police-sergeant at Colne. Unfortunately, our hero of the raven locks and olive complexion now assumed another character, and the romantic incident which told so well for him was altogether changed. The fact is, he found in the pocket of the trousers not one, but five £20 notes, and report says, though this might not be true, finding he could not get them changed he offered them as flash notes at 3d. each, and yet was unable to part with them. He then thought that he could ascertain what the notes really were by taking back one, and finding out its value the worth of the other notes would then also be known. Shortly after the man had discovered that the notes were genuine he was seen in Colne, and he got very drunk. He purchased at Nelson a quarter of a pound of tobacco, and tendered a £20 note, which, after some precaution on the part of the shopman, was cashed. Being now in funds and in the height of his hilarity, he ordered a pair of trousers to be made for himself, bought shirts for the child, and in short squandered right and left the money he had so strangely obtained. It is believed by the police that one of the £20 notes was used for lighting a pipe; but, as the number is known, if it has been destroyed the value can be recovered. The man was taken into custody and last week the case came before the magistrates at Colne. The cashier of the County Bank proved the identity of the notes recovered; the facts above stated were sworn to by other witnesses, but as the man pleaded 'Guilty' the case was summarily treated. He was sentenced to seven days' imprisonment in Preston House of Correction. The money recovered to the spinner amounts to a little over £64.

A meeting of the Conservative Peers was held yesterday to determine what course should be pursued in regard to the bill for the disestablishment of the Irish Church. Lord Cairns argued that opposition should be made to the bill at its second reading and that it be finally rejected. He said the leaders of the party did not wish to dictate, and were anxious that the judgment of each Peer should remain unfettered. He felt that as the country had never pronounced on the present bill and as the feeling of the House of Lords was so opposed to it, the most politic, consistent and best course to pursue under the circumstance would be to repudiate the measure. Lord Salisbury deprecated the course recommended by Lord Cairns. He said the agitation which would follow the rejection of the bill would be most disastrous to the country, and would do nothing to save the Irish Church. It would be better to accept the bill and modify it in Committee than to renew such an ill-feeling. Lord Cairns supported the recommendations of Lord Salisbury, and urged that the House of Peers, now that it was able, make terms for the Irish Church, as the might not have the opportunity hereafter. Lord Derby was in favour of the rejection of the bill, contending that personal fears should deter no one from doing right. The majority of the Lords present approved of the views of Lord Derby, and it was agreed that the second reading of the bill should be opposed. It is estimated there will be a majority of eighty against the Irish Church bill on the second reading in the House of Lords.

UNITED STATES.

IMPERIALISM OR NIAGARA.—The Northern people must turn short off into Imperialism or go over a political Niagara at no distant day.

For their sakes we would rather see them go hand over hand into a political hell; but for our own sakes we prefer to see them land in Imperialism. If they go over Niagara, we, who are tied to their, cannot escape.

It becomes, then, a matter of consequence to know what that Imperialism is into which we must land or be dashed to pieces over a political Niagara.

A Yankee Emperor with a Yankee Court, is not a pleasant object to contemplate from a Southern standpoint. Neither is a Yankee President with a Yankee Congress of fanatics at his back.

At the same time, Grant as Emperor is far preferable to Grant as President.

Whatever instincts of manhood he may possess and in the terms granted Lee at Appomattox he certainly showed that he has some, he cannot, as President in name and the mere creature of Congress in reality, bring any one of them into exercise. In his present capacity he is the mere bulldog of the mongrel party, ready to pull down any game on which they set him; sworn to carry out whatever laws they may enact. So trammelled he cannot administer justice to the South, even if he feels inclined to do so. He will fail as Andrew Johnson did before him.

Once freed of party shackles, and responsible before the civilized world for the proper administration of his great office, a worse man than Grant would refrain from placing the stupid tyrant. Feeling the great responsibility that would lay upon him; that on him depended the reorganization of the country; the restoration of municipal rights, and of good feeling among the various sections, he would call into his cabinet the best and most intellectual men of the land. He would be under an absolute necessity of doing so.

No matter who may be the coming man, the day that sees him installed as Emperor, or President for life, for it matters not what his title be, it designates a chief magistrate relieved of party shackles—that day will witness the restoration to power and influence of the intellect and respectability of the South. There can be no Imperialism in America with the pillar known as Robert E. Lee rejected by the builders.—Mobile Tribune.

SLAVERY IN MASSACHUSETTS.—The discussion of this important historical subject, some time since, in our columns, led to the discovery of very much that was interesting, and enabled the historians of New England to record the fact that slavery was established by statute law in Massachusetts, and did not grow up there, as in other States, without the aid of positive enactments. The revelations made in the progress of the discussion were astonishing to all who took any interest in the history of American slavery, and although at the first a few enthusiastic gentlemen attempted by bold assertion to re-establish the notion that the Puritans came to Massachusetts as pioneers of civil and religious liberty, this attempt was quickly abandoned, in the face of accumulated evidence, and there is now no one to be found so bold as to claim that any idea of liberty, civil or religious, prevailed in the settlement and growth of Plymouth or Boston.

That portion of the discussion being substantially ended, the second branch became interesting, and it was regarded as important to show that the kind of slaveholding which prevailed among the Puritans and their descendants was but a mild form of servitude, freed from the evils which elsewhere characterized the relation of owner and owned. On this point also such a mass of testimony has been collected, that the reader of New England history cannot fail to be astonished at the apparent ignorance of former writers on the subject. In the Historical Magazine for February we find a remarkably interesting paper by George H. Moore, Esq., which sheds a flood of light on the whole subject. No evidence could be more conclusive on the general character of Massachusetts slavery than such as enables us to judge of its effect on the relation of marriage. In all slaveholding countries, among the greatest evils of slavery has been regarded its interference with the family bond. Mr. Palfrey thinks 'from the reverence entertained by the Fathers of New England for the nuptial tie,

it is safe to infer that slave husbands and wives were never parted.'

But Mr. Palfrey saw the Fathers of New England through the rosy atmosphere which modern Massachusetts historians have been accustomed to look to through when regarding the Puritans. What shall be said of them after reading Mr. Moore's astonishing paper? He first refers to the 'Serious addresses to the Episcopal separation in New England,' by Rev. Noah Hobart, in 1748, in which that Rev. author found fault with the use of the Episcopal form of marriage in the case of slaves, as tending to profane the ceremony, because the slave could not possibly fulfil the premises, and the ceremony must therefore be regarded as only a 'solemn farce.' Hobart instanced only the fact that the slave could not own property, and that therefore the endowment clause of the promise was foolish and profane, but he referred to other instances which might be produced under this head. It would seem plain from this that the Puritan form was more flexible than the Episcopalian and not liable to the objections of Mr. Hobart. The discovery of a genuine form used in negro marriages serves not only to show how this sacred relation was regarded by the public sentiment as well as the religion of the day, but also to give, in the address of the clergyman to the married couple, a summing up of the entire character of the slavery of Massachusetts. It was pretty much the same thing there as everywhere else as long as it was profitable. We quote from Mr. Moore's paper:—

'How, then, was it that Parson Hobart, in 1748, could put his Episcopal brother to the blush for profaning the marriage service in the manner alleged unless the more accommodating spirit of his own sect enabled him to adapt its formulas at discretion to the cases which came before him? The inference is obvious, and sustains the tradition that in Massachusetts the marriage of slaves, while they were unquestionably more formal in some cases than merely "jumping a broomstick," had in reality little more significance in their obligations, limited as they were in extent and duration, by the necessary conditions of servitude. This tradition is now corroborated by contemporary documentary evidence, which proves beyond doubt that the kind of wedlock by which Sambo and Dinah, Pompey and Chloë, became nominally husbands and wives, under Massachusetts law, was very uncertain and precarious, and its religious celebration "a solemn farce."

One of the most accomplished historical scholars in the country, Mr. J. Wingate Thornton, of Boston, has recently discovered the form of negro marriage prepared and used by the Rev. Samuel Phillips, of Andover, Massachusetts, whose ministry there, beginning in 1710 and ending with his death in 1771, was a prolonged and eminently distinguished service of more than half the eighteenth century. His immediate successor was the Rev. Jonathan French (1772-1809), in the family of whose son Mr. Thornton found the document, at North Hampton, New Hampshire, on the 21st of December, 1878. I am indebted to his liberal courtesy for the opportunity to make use of it at the present time.

A FORM FOR A NEGRO MARRIAGE.

'You, S., do now, in the presence of God and these witnesses, take to be your Wife
'Promising that so far as shall be consistent with ye Relation which you now sustain as a Servant, you will perform ye part as an Husband towards her; and in particular, you Promise, that you will Love her; And that, as you shall have the Opportunity and Ability you will take proper Care of her in Sickness and Health, in Prosperity and Adversity.
'And that you will be True and Faithful to her, and will Cleave to her only, so long as God, in his Providence shall continue your and her Abode in Such Place (or Places) as that you can conveniently come together:— Do you promise?'

'You, R., do now, in ye Presence of God and these Witnesses, take S. to be your Husband.
'Promising, that so far as your present Relation, as a Servant shall admit, you will perform the part of a Wife towards him: And in particular,
'You Promise, that you will Love him; And that, as you shall have the Opportunity and Ability you will take proper Care of him in Sickness and Health, in Prosperity and Adversity.
'And you will be True and Faithful to him, and will Cleave to him only, so long as God, in his Providence shall continue his & your Abode in Such Place (or Places) as that you can come together.
— Do you thus Promise?'

'Then, agreeable to your Request, with ye Consent of your Masters and Mistresses, to Declare that you have Licence given you to be conversant and familiar together, as Husband and Wife, so long as God shall continue your Places of Abode, as aforesaid; And so long as you Shall behave yourselves as it becometh Servants to do:
'For, you must both of you, bear in mind that you remain still, as really and truly as ever, your Master's Property, and therefore it will be justly expected, both by God and Man, that you behave and conduct yourselves as Obedient and faithful Servants towards your respective Masters and Mistresses for the Time being:
'And finally, I exhort and charge you to beware lest you give place to the Devil, so as to take occasion from the License now given to you, to be lifted up with Pride, and thereby fall under the Displeasure, not of Man only but of God also; for, it is written, that God resisteth the proud, but he giveth Grace to the humble.
'I shall now Conclude with Prayer for you, that you may become good Christians, and that you may be enabled to conduct as such; and in particular that you may have Grace to behave suitably towards each Other, as also dutifully towards your Masters and Mistresses, Not with Eye Service, as Men-pleasers, but as ye Servts of Oht doing ye Will of God from ye heart, &c

[ENDORSED] 'NEGRO MARRIAGE.'
Thus the mutual pledges of these poor creatures were formally in terms made subordinate to their relations as slaves; their personal fidelity to each other to depend on their respective places of residence for the time being; and their matrimonial privilege or 'licence' to be conversant and familiar together as husband and wife, was to continue so long as they live in the same neighborhood and during good behavior. Both these conditions were, of course, determined by the owners.

But such a formula or marital obligation as this needs neither comment or explanation! It speaks for itself and finishes an illustration which epitomizes and emphasizes the whole story of slavery in Massachusetts. How long it would take such a guarantee to the slave of "the rights of marriage and of family" to bring "about a total modification of the character of the historian or the imagination of the reader." Historical researches are of the greatest importance for present instruction and future guidance. It may be that much of the present character of Massachusetts is due to the moral effect of its slaveholding customs and laws. It may be also that while slavery has been abolished elsewhere in temper and fire and blood, the slow progress of liberty in New England has not been so effectual. We have been told that the present condition of the surviving Indians in Massachusetts is practically one of slavery. It is said that an Indian cannot work for hire in some parts of the State, but that his earnings belong to the township in which he lives, and that he can have no share in them. It is even affirmed that an Indian having made a whaling voyage and returned safely with a very considerable sum of money as his lay in the voyage was forbidden to collect it, and that it was actually claimed and seized by the town and went into the common treasury. If this be so, it is a strange commentary on President Grant's inaugural address, proposing to treat the Indian with reference to his future citizenship. If two hundred years of Massachusetts civilization leave him virtually a slave, we may well ask what is that civilization? and what is the liberty that prevails under it?—N. Y. Journal of Commerce.