

upon the House of Commons and the governing classes generally to induce an earnest and fearless consideration of the grievances connected with the State Church and the system of land tenure. The answer to this question depends entirely upon Irishmen themselves; that it would be idle for any English well-wishers to offer a conjecture on the subject. We do not wonder that some Irishmen of influence held back from the recent demonstration. Archbishop MacHale, who declined taking part in it, seems to have expressed comprehensively enough the reasons which naturally operated to this effect. So many agitations have been begun in Ireland for similar objects, and have presently ended in nothing but the promotion of a few place-hunters, that many men are unable to see any special ground of hope for the new effort. Yet there would surely seem to be much in favor of such a movement. The Irish people declare that their land-tenure system is unsatisfactory. We do not know any one, we have never heard of any one, who considered it satisfactory. The Irish people complain that the State Church imposed upon them is a grievance and an insult. We are not aware that anybody without direct interest in the maintenance of the system regards it in any other light. It is an institution absolutely not to be defended in reasonable argument. It is a grievance which could not possibly be imposed upon any English community. As Mr. Bright said, in his letter to the letter to the Lord Mayor of Dublin, 'it is an institution so evil and so odious under the circumstances of your country, that it makes one almost hope for Irish freedom from it that Irishmen have borne it so long.' The late Lord Campbell justly declared it was only because we were so familiar with the grievance that we were not shocked at its existence. It has been denounced and condemned by our ablest writers and speakers from Dr. Johnson to Sidney Smith; from Edmund Burke to John Stuart Mill; from Melchay and Brougham to Professor Goldwin Smith. The Dublin meeting can add nothing to what most of us already know and feel on this subject. Indeed it seems almost a superfluity of rhetoric to employ a word for the purpose of demonstrating the injustice of a system which makes the Church of a small minority dominant over a great majority. Up to the present—at all events for many years back the popular representatives of Ireland in the House of Commons have shown little inclination to co-operate with the English Liberal party. They have taken generally one of two courses—either they have said themselves to the Whigs for office, or they have said with the Tories for spite. We do not know whether any Irish member is now really possessed by the insane idea that his country is likely to get religious equality and an unequal land system from the Tories. But it is quite certain that of late many Irish members who are supposed to desire just those objects above all others, and who are not to be confounded with the mere adventurers and place-seekers among their ranks, lend a steady support to the Conservative party, and may be reckoned among the opponents of the English Liberal body. Now we take leave to state that as long as Irish members pursue and Irish constituencies countenance this course it is utterly useless their holding meetings to complain of the State Church and to demand an improved land tenure system. They may spare themselves all such futile labor, if they cannot make up their minds to go boldly for free trade in land, full freedom of worship, and to join with the only political party prepared to advocate those reforms, then any agitation they begin here is their future foreboding upon it. We are not of those who condemn what is called agitation, and who argue as if political stagnation could help to make a country prosperous. Where there are grievances to be removed there ought to be agitation to get rid of them; and agitation without grievances is a political phenomenon which must surely be of the rarest occurrence. But we may express our sincere conviction that if the movement now begun in Ireland does not take some practical course it can do no good and may do some harm.—Star.

A man named Michael Doyle has got two months' imprisonment for throwing a stone at his parish priest, the Rev. George O'Sullivan, near Killorgan, in the county of Kerry. The priest was sitting in his room, which was well lighted, when the prisoner attempted to injure him, perhaps to kill him, by throwing a stone at him with such force that it made a hole in the glass like that which would be made by a bullet.—Times Cor.

THE POOR MOOR'S MOTHER.—Mrs. S. C. Hall, during a lecture she recently delivered in Wexford, suggested to the people of that thriving town that they ought to erect a marble slab in front of the house in Corn-market, where was born the mother of Thomas Moore, the poet. The idea was an excellent one; but the necessity for any joint action in the matter on the part of the people has been rendered unnecessary by the mayor, John Greene, J.P., who has put up the slab at his own expense. After stating that Mrs. Moore had been born in the house, the legend on the slab goes on to state that, on the 26th of August, 1835, the poet returned to it 'in the zenith of his imperishable fame, to render homage to the memory of his mother, whom he venerated and loved.'—Express.

Some three weeks since, two bailiffs, named Daniel and Lacey, went to the lands of Carrigeneabrough for the purpose of serving orders from the Court of Chancery on two tenants of the lands, the Widow Stokes and Thomas Fahy. On arriving at the holding of the first-named they were met outside by a man named Thomas Connors, who asked, 'what brought you here?' Daniel replied that he came by authority, when he was told the sooner he and his companion would go with their lives the better. Connors then turned into the yard, but almost immediately returned with four young men, who used the same threats as he had done. The bailiffs then left without serving the notice on Mrs. Stokes and went on to Fahy's. On reaching that place, a girl from the house got up on a ditch and called out, 'the four young men who were at the widow Stokes ran across the fields and again drove them off. The bailiffs then proceeded to return; but while on their way back they were met by a large crowd of men and women who set upon them, dragged them to a pond that was near and threw them into the water. On reaching home, informations were sworn to the above effect by Daniel and Lacey before the Mayor of Clonmel, and summonses were issued requiring the parties to appear at the Mayor's office for examination.

At the Belfast petty sessions, on the 2nd of Jan. there were 50 prisoners in custody. Some of them were charged with breaches of the laws in shouting 'No Popery; No Surrender!'

An inquest was held yesterday on the body of Mr. Thomas Reynolds, of Longwood, county of Meath, who filled the situations of parish clerk, clerk of petty sessions, and master of a free endowed school. He was shot in the head by an assassin on Tuesday evening, and died of the wounds next morning. The inquest was postponed in consequence of the non-attendance of the coroner. It appears that Mr. Reynolds was sitting in the school-room attached to his dwelling playing backgammon with a young lady. So unconscious was he of danger that the shutters of the window were not closed, and the assassin, resting his gun on the sill, was enabled to take deliberate aim at his victim. The house was situated close to the road opposite the church of Rathore, in the county of Meath. The murderer took the precaution of putting straw on the ground near the window, lest he should be traced by the marks of his boots. The deceased is said to have been held in much esteem by the gentry of the neighbourhood, and he was remarkably quiet and unobtrusive in his manners. The only cause assigned for the outrage is the supposition said to be quite false, that he had something to do with intended evictions in that neighborhood. Three farmers have been arrested on suspicion—their names are John and Thos. Nugent and James Flynn.—Times Dublin Cor., 31st Dec.

One of our Irish exchanges speaking of the murder of Reynolds, says:—"The Meath murder had its origin in the land. The dread 'Notice to Quit' had gone before the bullet. The cause for the assassination of Reynolds appears to be as follows:—A Mr. Dyer, of Abbey, purchased the interest in the leases of several farms, among others, those of the men arrested, John and Thomas Nugent and James Flynn. As he desired to convert the farms into a large grazing ground, he served notice of eviction on all the tenants. Reynolds, the man who was shot, conveyed the messages from Mr. Dyer to the men under notice. It has not otherwise transpired what connection he had with the evictions. Those who were served with notice to quit were all respectable men, and owed no rent. Their case was certainly a bad one, and might drive the most temperate and cool-minded to desperation. A gun, asserted to be recently discharged, was found in the house of one of the tenants. If the tenants were protected by law, the country would be saved from this fresh blood-mark."

Since Christmas Day last, upwards of one thousand seven hundred persons, in the city of Dublin, have abjured the dreadful vice of drunkenness by taking the pledge of total abstinence at the hands of the Very Rev. Dr. Spratt. On Sunday evening, Jan. 1, during the progress of the usual weekly meeting in the Temperance Hall, Cuffin Lane, the Rev. gentleman administered the pledge to about six hundred postulants. Every day Dr. Spratt labors in this good cause with the same zeal he has continuously displayed in it for now more than twenty-five years.

GREAT BRITAIN.

CATHOLIC CONVENT IN NORWICH.—The mansion lately occupied by Captain Ives, and hitherto used as the Judges' lodgings, has been purchased by the Roman Catholics, for the purpose of a convent, and some of the sisterhood will shortly take up their residence there.—Bury and Norwich Post.

THE PAPAL ALLOCATION.

(To the Editor of the Times.) Sir,—Now that the correct version of the Papal Allocation, which differs materially from the Reuter's version, is published, I am anxious to call your attention to the analogy between one of the parts of the document most attacked by the press, and the 18th article of the Established Church. I refer to the condemned propositions No. 16, 17, and under the head of 'Indifferentism, Latitudinarianism, and not as Reuter reported—'Indifferentism, Toleration.'—They are as follows:—

16. 'Men may find the way of eternal salvation, and obtain eternal salvation, in every form of religion.' 17. 'At least the eternal salvation of all those (illorum omnium) who have never been in the true Church of Christ may be hoped for.' These two propositions are identical in principle. The 18th Article of the Established Church is as follows:—"They are to be held accused who presume to say that every man shall be saved by the law or sect which he professeth so that he be diligent to frame his life according to that law and the light of nature; for Holy Scripture doth set out unto us only the name of Jesus Christ, whereby men must be saved."

It is evident that the Allocation condemning Nos. 16 and 17 and the 18th Article are absolutely identical in principle; and the only difference that would arise between an Anglican and a Roman Catholic would be as to the meaning to be given to the words 'the true Church of Christ.' And indeed the Allocation is less exclusive than the Article. For the Allocation only denies that the salvation of all (illorum omnium) who have never been in the true Church may be hoped for.—It therefore does not deny that some who have never been in the true Church may still be saved, though out of the pale of the Church.

I must add that the denial of the condemned proposition 15 is philosophically true. This proposition runs thus:—

'Every man is free to embrace and profess that religion which each man shall believe to be true, guided by the light of reason.'

This proposition is false, for no one can correctly be held to have a moral right to any opinion contrary to truth, though he may be excusable for doing so. Thus the reason of an individual may lead him to hold that murder is a guiltless action, or that the three angles of a triangle are not equal to two right angles. But he has no moral right to hold these opinions, because they are false. So no man can have a moral right to embrace a false religion in conformity with his individual reason, though he may be morally excusable for doing so. For example, the individual reason of some men leads them to be Atheists, but no man has a moral right to be an Atheist, because Atheism is a false opinion—formed by erroneous or perverted use of human reason. The external and legal responsibility of men for the opinions and determinations formed in the exercise of their reason and manifested by honest acts, is a separate and distinct question. On this subject I will only say the external forum of the Church exercises no jurisdiction over opinions not so manifested, for—Ecclesia non iudicat de occultis.

I beg you to publish this letter, and I hope it may lead your readers to suspend their opinion about the Allocation until they have carefully read the original.

Your obedient servant, GEORGE BOWYER.

Radley Park, January 2, 1865.

A CHURCH FOR PUBLIC DECEIT.—It is but as yesterday that the miserable law which unchristianized the English law of marriage, by degrading it from a union for life to a union 'during good behavior,' was under discussion. Thank God, we did our utmost against it. But the time had come. Protestantism was to ripen on more of its deadly fruits in England as it already had long before in all other Protestant countries; and the evil law was passed. God grant that we may live to see the public feeling of our country so far changed that it may be possible to obtain its repeal. There are those who think that they see signs of such a change. For ourselves we have no hope that anything except the general spread of the Catholic religion will ever produce a result so blessed. That the Catholic religion is strong enough even to make a great nation give up this miserable license after it has obtained and used it for years modern history would prove if it had not been proved long ago. France is a country by no means so Catholic as we could wish. But whatever it has of religion is Catholic, and the result is that although the demoralizing principle that marriage may be dissolved was established in the great Revolution and remained in full operation for more than a whole generation, yet the Catholic religion at last prevailed and the French Legislature in 1816 restored the Christian law of marriage.—Since that time we need hardly say how many and great have been the revolutions which have shaken the foundations of French society; but the law of marriage has remained unchanged; at least in its fundamental principle,—namely, that no human authority can in any case put asunder those whom God has once joined. This fundamental principle, abjured by the new law of England eight years ago, we heartily desire, but dare not hope, to see restored. But we must ask, why has it not been restored? or rather, why was it ever renounced? England has, what France has not, a great and wealthy Church Establishment, entwined with the fundamental principles of its Government. Its Prelates from a very considerable estate of the Legislature, and its clergy have a strong influence, whenever they resolve to exert it. Religion in England certainly possesses a political force which no religion has possessed in France since the great Revolution. Why has it never availed to repeal; why did it not avail to prevent the wicked and hateful law of

Divorce? The reason is too clear. The English Establishment is Protestant, and Protestantism, however powerful in some respects, is without power in matters such as this, because it has no fixed principles, no Divine authority. If the Bench of Protestant Bishops were asked whether or not, by the law of God, marriage is indissoluble, a small minority would earnestly answer 'Yes! a considerable proportion would almost as decidedly answer 'No! while the great majority would either say nothing, or answer that they do not know. When the trumpet gives a sound so uncertain 'who shall prepare himself for the battle?' no wonder that the Legislature should have rejected the Divine law of marriage; when the Prelates of the national religion, who from so important a part of it, cannot agree among themselves what the Divine law is. But even if the fundamental evil principle of the Divorce Court cannot be got rid of, there are evils incidental to it, with regard to which we are more hopeful, and the removal of which would be considerable gain. There is decency and good feeling enough left in England to make the disgust at many of its proceedings very general, and if we cannot do what we would, it is of extreme importance to bring public opinion to bear upon those points. Of these, one most momentous evil is the perpetually given to all the revolting details of evidence produced in that Court. We are heartily glad to see that the Saturday Review, a paper of sufficient influence to secure its obtaining a hearing, has taken up this matter with regard to the Times. We fear the other daily papers are no better, and that many even of the weekly papers are very far from innocent. But the Times is the great offender, first, because of the extent and character of its circulation; and next, because it has become an English institution, that the standard of morals in such matters is set by the Times. The Saturday Review very truly says that all the moral evil done by all the obscene books in the world is not to be compared to the evil done by the publication of demoralizing trials in the Times. It is everywhere—it lies on every table. Even a Paterfamilias, who goes the unusual length of excluding it from his own home, cannot prevent its being seen everywhere by his children and servants. They find it on the table in every home to which chance takes them. Everything combines to make people read it. It is full of the most curious and valuable information. It daily contains essays of great ability. It is a sort of the national religion. It affects a high tone of morality; and has lately been reading a serious lecture to the cheaper London newspapers against the outrage of publishing advertisements which may be morally injurious. And yet, during many months of the year, it is hardly possible to take up a single number of this trusted paper without lighting upon evidence printed in detail, of which the Saturday Review most truly says that it could not have been more carefully selected if it had been deliberately intended to teach the youth of both sexes, in minute detail, how the greatest sins against morality are to be committed.—Weekly Register.

The extraordinary charge of the Bishop of Salisbury has not been allowed to pass without remonstrance. It will be remembered that his lordship recommended for the adoption of his clergy practices that have always hitherto been regarded as peculiar to the Church of Rome, and without the recommendation of any of those safeguards which would prevent them from becoming mere adjuncts to a monastic system. Among these, were periodical seasons of spiritual retreat, and he suggested that some convenient parsonage house might be taken where those of the clergy who felt inclined might put themselves for a time under the charge of a spiritual guide. He followed up this recommendation of a mere mechanical devotion by a lamentation over the isolation to which the Church of England is reduced, in being separated from the Church of France and other Popish churches of the Continent, and avowed it as his opinion that the first advances towards a re-union should come from the Church of England.

It is a curious indication of the degree to which Scotch notions about the Sabbath have penetrated even among high Anglicans, that the Guardian, commenting beforehand in a leading article on the fact of Christmas-day falling on Sunday, says, 'The circle of our Christmas amusements will be a little narrowed for a single evening, all our music will be sacred, and our songs either hymns or psalms. The character of Christmas-day will be a little changed for the time. Our children will not play quite so freely around us, and grown up men will not throw themselves quite so impetuously into childish ways.' This all goes upon the Scotch notion (which so far as we are aware was never dreamed of even by Calvin, as it certainly was not by any of the inventors of Anglican Protestantism), that the thing forbidden on Sunday (by whatever authority, a question difficult enough to answer on Protestant principles), is not servile work only but amusements, and even laughter and cheerfulness. A more radically anti-Christian idea it would not be easy to find. Modern Scotch and English religion is almost wholly built on this rotten foundation.—Weekly Register.

THE PRINCESS MARY OF CAMBRIDGE.—We are authorized to state that there is no foundation whatever for the statement that her Royal Highness the Princess Mary has recently contracted a matrimonial alliance. So long as a similar report was circulated as a mere rumor we thought it too absurd to require notice, but now that it has been confidently asserted as a fact we feel it our duty to meet it with an explicit contradiction.—Times.

A 'brotherhood' is being organized in Leeds, under the auspices of the clergy of the parish church, to be called 'The Brotherhood of the Holy Redeemer.' The brethren are to be subject to strict rules, and will be expected to attend prayers, &c., at similar hours to those which are appointed in the Romish Church.—Leeds Mercury.

DR. COLENSO'S ARREST.—The arguments on the case of Dr. Colenso have come to a conclusion. The case has been admirably argued on both sides, and the Judicial Committee takes time to consider its decision. Thus far, the whole of the arguments have been purely technical and legal; and hence a number of lawyers have been probably the fittest persons to consider them. The difficulty in the case as far as it has gone, arises from the nature and character of an Established Church, and the very indefinite ideas that lawyers—and, indeed, Englishmen—generally attach to the words 'Royal Supremacy.' Does the Anglo-Catholic Church on going to a colony carry any of its Anglican Establishmentarianism with it? and if it does, how much? This is one question which has to be solved. And another is—Is the Royal Supremacy an integral and necessary part of the doctrine of the Anglo-Catholic Church; as integral, for instance as belief in the Holy Scriptures. But there is another topic of consideration suggested by the Colenso case in its present stage. Lord Westbury, in saying he should take time for his decision, spoke also of the possible eventuality of its being 'necessary to go further and to hear arguments upon what had been called the merits of the case.' This gives us time for consideration. As a judge in the matter of the Royal Supremacy, both as to its claims and its limits we have little confidence in Lord Westbury. Yet that is his own special province as a lawyer, and *cuicque experto in sua arte credendum*. But 'the merits' of the Colenso case involve the authenticity of the writings of Moses, the divine origin of the Ten Commandments, the amount of knowledge possessed by the Saviour of the world, the credit to be reposed in His words. It is terrible to think of Lord Westbury having to sit in judgment and to decide authoritatively what all who belong to the Anglo-Catholic Church in England or abroad are to believe in future upon such subjects as these. It is simply terrible. We cannot bear it. No Royal Supremacy, or any other legal fiction can disguise the deep repugnance of the fact.—London Churchman.

THE ST. ALBANS RAID AND THE CONDUCT OF THE CANADIAN GOVERNMENT.—The worst danger to Canada arises out of the obvious pusillanimity of her Government, which has shown on all occasions a servile anxiety to conciliate the North, even at the expense of what is due to the equal rights of the other belligerent. Mr. Lincoln, like all other creatures of his kind,

"Still yelps and snaps at those who run,  
Still runs from those who smite;"

and the best security against his insults is an air of defiance and an attitude of self-defence. The people of Canada are as guileless of complicity in the partiality and timidity of their rulers as we in England are innocent of the meanness and servility of Lord Russell, and any Federal officer who should presume on the favor of the Governor General and his advisers would have reason to think himself lucky if his punishment were not so prompt and complete as to leave nothing for the tribunals to do. The warning which enabled the North to defeat the attempt to release its victims from Fort Johnson—an attempt to which the neutrality of Canada was strictly respected—shows us in what spirit we are to interpret the eagerness now displayed to repress the St. Albans raiders.

We do not venture to pronounce what the letter of the law applicable to their case may be; but we are quite certain that the claim for their extradition, if tenable in form, is utterly unwarrantable in substance. Political offences are excluded from treaties of extradition; an exception so liberally construed by the American tribunals as to exempt the murderers of Irish landowners. Now there can be no manner of doubt that the offence of the St. Albans raiders was purely political. They were soldiers—guerrillas—of a government at war with the United States; and as such they plundered and destroyed Federal property and the property of citizens of the Union. And they had a perfect right by the laws of war to do so.

The Spectator, indeed, suggests that the right to commit hostile acts belongs only to soldiers; but this is bad law, and if it were good, it has no application to the American war.

For the rule which confines acts of hostility to soldiers applies both actively and passively; and if the Government of the North burns and plunders the homes of non-combatants, as it systematically does, retaliation in kind or otherwise, is a right conferred thereby on every Southern citizen. The raid on St. Albans was an act of the war, now raging between North and South. Had the raiders been taken in the act, no quarter would have been given; but when they had escaped on to Canadian soil, and come under our law, they were, so far as the North is concerned, refugee soldiers of the enemy or else rebels. In neither case could we justly be called on to give them up. If they have committed any crime at all, it is against us and on our soil, by planning there an invasion of Northern territory; and it is we who must deal with that offence.

To give up these men would be just as bad as to have given up the fugitive slave Anderson. He was like them: a robber and a murderer by the laws of the Union; they are like him, in eyes of morality and of English law, men justified by peculiar circumstances in acts otherwise unlawful. It is lawful for a slave to escape, and to take life in defence of his liberty; it is equally lawful and equally meritorious for Southern guerrillas to avenge on Vermont the wrongs of Virginia. Sons, and husbands, and fathers, of the victims of Vermontese robbers and plunderers—men whose homes, or the homes of their countrymen have been burnt by soldiers from New England—are not only justified, but act well and patriotically, in doing their best to bring the horrors of war home to New England towns and farms. The surrender of these men, therefore would be on our part a cruel and cowardly treason; and the eagerness displayed in their pursuit is not honorable to the Canadian authorities.

It is said that Judge Coursol will be suspended or dismissed! But this we cannot believe. The vilest and meanest Government on the face of the earth could hardly dismiss a judge for giving a decision displeasing to a foreign Government. Charles II. was unworthily complainant to France, and cared very little for the independence of the Bench; but even Charles II. would hardly have discharged a judge at the demand of Louis XIV. In our days the independence of judges is reckoned the most sacred of civil rights and the chief security of civil liberty. It is the chief distinction between constitutional liberty on the one hand, and tyranny—autocratic or democratic—on the other. Liberty is never safe unless the judge can decide on the questions before them without fear or favor; and this they can only do on condition that they hold office 'during good behavior.' Now, there can be no doubt of the 'good behavior' of Judge Coursol.

The point of law which he decided in favor of the prisoners may be doubtful; but there is no ground for questioning that he believed, as many lawyers do, that his view was the true one. He decided according to his conscience, and in favor of liberty; and to punish him for so doing would be an outrage on the first principles of English law, and English liberty, such as has never been committed since the Revolution. If any Canadian minister could be found capable of giving such advice, it would be the duty of Provincial Legislature to impeach him. If the Legislature should sanction such a step, it would be the duty of the Governor General to rebuke and dissolve them.

If the Governor General should permit the act it would become the duty of the House of Commons to petition her Majesty to recall him, and never again employ him in her service. We strongly suspect that Judge Coursol is right, for none of those who assail him show a fair excuse for disputing his law. But let him be ever so wrong, it were better to incur twenty years of war than to dismiss a judge because his decision—in favor of liberty—gave offence to a foreign power or to his own Government; for of all calamities the worst that can befall us is murder our liberties with our own hands.—London Standard.

WESLEY AND DEMONIAL POSSESSIONS.—With reference to the three letters, lately stated to have been written by persons acknowledging themselves murderers, it is well known that Wesley, the founder of the Methodists, believed in the existence of demoniacal possessions in his own time.—'About the year 1787,' says Dr. Hales of Killeshandra, in Ireland, 'I had the pleasure of meeting Mr. Wesley, Dr. Coke, and some of their assistant preachers, with several of the most respectable members of the Dublin Society, at the hospitable table of a common friend in Granby-row. The conversation during dinner happening to turn on the subject of witchcraft I asked Mr. Wesley whether he had read, and if so, what he thought of Bishop Hutchinson's book upon witches; on which he declared that Bishop Hutchinson and the whole band of bishops together could not 'invalidate the reality of witchcraft.' And when I expressed some surprise, he repeated a story of a gentleman of consideration in the north of England, about 20 years before, who suddenly disappeared, and after a fruitless search for some time was generally supposed to have been privately murdered. Some time after a person in the neighbourhood voluntarily came forward and accused himself and two of his own brothers of having perpetrated the deed, which they promptly denied. However, on his persisting in the accusation, and declaring that nothing but remorse of conscience extorted the confession, they were all condemned and executed. But, strange to say, shortly after the gentleman who had been missing returned home from France, whither he had absconded for debt. Mr. Wesley then asked me whether the informer's conduct respecting witchcraft or demoniacal possession.'—London Magazine, August 1820. This curious narrative is not, I believe mentioned by Southey in his 'Life of Wesley.'—Notes and Queries.

THE "GUARDIAN" (ANGLOMAN) ON THE REVOLUTIONARY LETTER.—The following passage occurs in an article in the Guardian against the Encyclical Letter:—"The document appeals really, in the most solemn way, to the whole civilized world, and to all who believe in Christianity, and are interested in the welfare of society, and the maintenance of truth and right. It is a document which ought to command attention and respect, if not to awaken interest and sympathy, wherever men think and feel about the grave and awful questions on which it dwells. It is a rebuke and a warning meant to be a rebuke and a warning of the most emphatic kind—a rebuke to sink deep into the age, and to be remembered by it."

A sad calamity has occurred at Dundee through the recklessness of an impatient crowd,—a not unusual cause of similar catastrophes. It was in fact a repetition of the awful scene at the Victoria Theatre a few years ago, on Boxing-night. A concert was to be given in a large hall beneath a Presbyterian chapel, to which access was had by a flight of fifteen steps, an extremely dangerous arrangement. Long before the appointed hour the intending visitors began to assemble, and of course there soon was the pressure, and the crushing, and the clamor usual on such occasions. After a time the door gave way before the pressure, and the persons in front were precipitated into the gulf, followed by those behind, who fell, tumbling over each other in a confused mass. When order was restored, nineteen corpses were taken out, as well as several persons more or less seriously injured. Most of the hapless victims were boys and girls, and some of them mere children. The scene is described as most horrible, and the details are heart-rending.—Weekly Register.

A young man in England is said to have lately lost an excellent party, a girl in fact, with twenty thousand pounds, through an inexhaustible act of 'fastness.' It appears that one Sabbath he went to church with his intended, who having occasion to search for the collect, asked him what Sunday it was. The unhappy 'fast man,' giving way to what was uppermost in his mind, replied, 'that it was the last Sunday before the Derby,' which worldly-minded answer so disgusted his innamorata, that a coldness ensued, and the match was ultimately broken off.

WHAT OUR COTTONS LOSE.—During the year 1864 we paid, upon an average, from £60,000 to £70,000 a month for foreign goods.

TRADE WITH AMERICA.—British and Irish produce and manufactures were exported from the United Kingdom to the United States of America to the amount of £11,584,256 in the first ten months of 1863; £11,847,639 in the first ten months of 1862; and £15,403,017 in the first ten months of 1864. In 1860, before the war, our exports thither in the whole year were under £22,000,000. But in quantity less goods have now been sent for the same money. The cotton piece goods have now been sent for the same money. The cotton piece goods exported from this country to the States in the first eleven months of 1864 were to the quantity in the corresponding period of 1860 (counting millions of yards) only as 62 to 103—that is, less than a third.—Times.

From the official return of the number, name, tonnage, armament, and horse-power of each vessel, both steamers and sailing ships, composing the British navy, published on the 1st of January, 1865 under the authority of the Lords of the Admiralty, we find that the total strength of the navy of England numbers 765 ships of all classes, exclusive of which there are now building at the various royal dockyards and private firms 28 others which will mount from 1 to 8; guns each, and many of which are far advanced towards completion. Of the above number of vessels we may calculate upon 350 line-of-battle ships, frigates, corvettes, sloops, &c., as being ready to put to sea at a short notice, exclusive of about 100 gun-boats. The number at present in commission and doing duty in various parts of the globe amounts to 224, besides 18 coast-guard cruisers, and 38 watch-vessels. The above total may be summarized thus:—242 effective lines of battle ships, frigates, corvettes, sloops, &c., mounting from 1 to 131 guns each; 114 screw gunboats from 209 to 270 tons each; 108 sailing ships, many of which are in commission; 115 employed in harbor service as receiving ships, hospital ships, powder depots, coal depots, &c.; 48 coast-guard cruisers; and 48 coast-guard watch-vessels.

UNITED STATES.

The Richmond Enquirer says.—There is no doubt that, if the fortunes of war should go against this country, many of its gallant soldiers and officers, deprived of all property by the confiscation of the enemy, would follow the profession of arms for a livelihood. But whether the ranks of the enemy or those of Mexico would receive their services, would depend very much upon the conduct of the United States. So far as this war is concerned, the people of the Confederate States have no reason whatever to help Maximilian nor to give to France or England any support. Neither France nor Mexico nor England has extended to this Confederacy any encouragement, and if our cause fail, after every manly effort that we can make in its behalf, then pride as well as interest would dictate that, if we are to be conquered, we should belong to a great and powerful nation; that we should endeavor to extend the power and influence of that nation from pole to pole, and uniting every country of America by alliance, either constitutional or treaty, seek to make this continent a unit against the world. In the grandeur and power of such a nation: with armies such as the United States and the Confederate States have put into the field during this war, united under one flag; with a navy such as the united resources of the two nations could put upon the ocean: with the wealth and population which peace and union would develop in a few years, we might find at least a hiding-place for our shame, and perhaps some consolation in the fact that America would become the colossal power of the world. Maximilian would not reign in Mexico, nor England hold Canada six months after our conquest. Ireland would call to her rescue the thousands of her sons now awaiting opportunity, and the navy of the United States would give the requisite arrogance to every adventurous spirit that would rush to battle for the freedom of that island. The undisguised hatred of the people of the United States for England would render a war with that power the most popular party-cry that could be raised. The cotton that would be saved from the destruction of the war, would be held in the United States, and the little that would be cultivated by the new and unorganized free negro labor, would find consumption at home; and there would be precipitated a commercial convulsion upon British finances by prolonging the cotton famine, and that, too, at the beginning of war. . . . If the Confederate States are ever conquered, it is highly probable that the Monroe Doctrine, as the land-grabbing propensity of the Anglo-Saxon has been called in the United States, would become the most important and popular principle in American policy. We have offered commercial advantages and sought to impress these facts upon the governments of Western Europe by every suggestion, but all has been in vain. Neither France nor England is entirely satisfied with the *entente cordiale*; neither will trust the faith of the other. France fears that England may prove false and unite with the United States, and sweep the French navy from the seas, while we have no navy to bring to her assistance. England fears that France has designs on California and the East Indian commerce. Thus these two great powers, with no faith or trust in each other's pledges, neutralize each other's influence. . . . The fate of war may go against the States—such an end is possible—and if it does, every Confederate citizen would demand from the United States, and would obtain armies for Mexico, armies for Canada, armies for Cuba, and armies for Ireland.