

TUESDAY MORNING, MARCH 5.

The Way of the World.
Any man or woman, practice the Sabbath in its speech and practices in conduct; they may be thought to be from home and go about like loafing beggars, armed with wine, revellings, banqueting and abominable follies; and yet none loses their place in society, but he who practices them most. But let a woman tell the same story, and she is called a "lily." Eve, from the social paradise. If even the breath of suspicion blows upon her vestal robe, it is killed. If she has once from the path of virtue, she will like Lucifer. Not so with the woman who like the Leader of the Host, has never turned her back on the pedestal from which she fell. No tears can wash away the stain upon her fair name. You might as well attempt to recover the sun from the ocean to remove the stain and disgrace from her.

"To write more lay
On the board, and over the door;
When the world is over, and the door
Is closed, and the world is closed."

Now I am not
The last time the false lord came
From me, and I was cast down,
The state gave the name of a star to me,

And I am still here, and still will be,
As we were angels, while the victim
of his hellish act is Cain, a vagabond
upon earth. And even the virtuous woman
who should have been the last to leave him,
will give him his hand and heart
as if he had never sinned. — Philip Shumley.

What handwriting is this? — Virginia.

Lord Derby's handwriting is beautiful—equal
in size to mine, but clear, pleasant, and no
means obscure. The Duke of Newcastle writes

an excellent hand. — Long, well-formed letters,
and very distinct. — Lord John Murray's penmanship
is equal to that of the Duke of Wellington, but

in a smaller scale. Other instances might be
cited, but it serves to the purpose of the present

paper to say that the East India Co., necessarily
engaged in the business of the Government, has

excellence in the calligraphy of their chief
servants. General, who has an example of penmanship to the whole chain of

written which can be seen. — Lord George's handwriting is per-
haps the best that we have ever seen. — Sir

George Barlow's was little inferior. — Lord
Minto wrote remarkably well. — Lord Amherst had

something stately in his penmanship, but every
letter was as clear as type. — Lord Wm. Bent-
tuck ran his letters, and the rest of his work
was in such other hands, he wrote a good flowing hand, which was rarely obscured.

Lord Auckland's was not distinct; but was pre-
ttily formed. — Lord Palmerston's was pre-
ttily formed. — Lord Dalhousie wrote a hand
which was not equal to that of his contemporaries.

— Lord Grey's was good, but not equal to his

contemporaries. — Lord Clarendon, need not

be mentioned, as he was not equal to his

contemporaries. — Lord Granville, need not

be mentioned, as he was not equal to his

contemporaries. — Lord Hartington, need not

be mentioned, as he was not equal to his

contemporaries. — Lord Palmerston, need not

be mentioned, as he was not equal to his

contemporaries. — Lord Clarendon, need not

be mentioned, as he was not equal to his

contemporaries. — Lord Granville, need not

be mentioned, as he was not equal to his

contemporaries. — Lord Hartington, need not

be mentioned, as he was not equal to his

contemporaries. — Lord Palmerston, need not

be mentioned, as he was not equal to his

contemporaries. — Lord Clarendon, need not

be mentioned, as he was not equal to his

contemporaries. — Lord Hartington, need not

be mentioned, as he was not equal to his

contemporaries. — Lord Palmerston, need not

be mentioned, as he was not equal to his

contemporaries. — Lord Clarendon, need not

be mentioned, as he was not equal to his

contemporaries. — Lord Hartington, need not

be mentioned, as he was not equal to his

contemporaries. — Lord Palmerston, need not

be mentioned, as he was not equal to his

contemporaries. — Lord Clarendon, need not

be mentioned, as he was not equal to his

contemporaries. — Lord Hartington, need not

be mentioned, as he was not equal to his

contemporaries. — Lord Palmerston, need not

be mentioned, as he was not equal to his

contemporaries. — Lord Clarendon, need not

be mentioned, as he was not equal to his

contemporaries. — Lord Hartington, need not

be mentioned, as he was not equal to his

contemporaries. — Lord Palmerston, need not

be mentioned, as he was not equal to his

contemporaries. — Lord Clarendon, need not

be mentioned, as he was not equal to his

contemporaries. — Lord Hartington, need not

be mentioned, as he was not equal to his

contemporaries. — Lord Palmerston, need not

be mentioned, as he was not equal to his

contemporaries. — Lord Clarendon, need not

be mentioned, as he was not equal to his

contemporaries. — Lord Hartington, need not

be mentioned, as he was not equal to his

contemporaries. — Lord Palmerston, need not

be mentioned, as he was not equal to his

contemporaries. — Lord Clarendon, need not

be mentioned, as he was not equal to his

contemporaries. — Lord Hartington, need not

be mentioned, as he was not equal to his

contemporaries. — Lord Palmerston, need not

be mentioned, as he was not equal to his

contemporaries. — Lord Clarendon, need not

be mentioned, as he was not equal to his

contemporaries. — Lord Hartington, need not

be mentioned, as he was not equal to his

contemporaries. — Lord Palmerston, need not

be mentioned, as he was not equal to his

contemporaries. — Lord Clarendon, need not

be mentioned, as he was not equal to his

contemporaries. — Lord Hartington, need not

be mentioned, as he was not equal to his

contemporaries. — Lord Palmerston, need not

be mentioned, as he was not equal to his

contemporaries. — Lord Clarendon, need not

be mentioned, as he was not equal to his

contemporaries. — Lord Hartington, need not

be mentioned, as he was not equal to his

contemporaries. — Lord Palmerston, need not

be mentioned, as he was not equal to his

contemporaries. — Lord Clarendon, need not

be mentioned, as he was not equal to his

contemporaries. — Lord Hartington, need not

be mentioned, as he was not equal to his

contemporaries. — Lord Palmerston, need not

be mentioned, as he was not equal to his

contemporaries. — Lord Clarendon, need not

be mentioned, as he was not equal to his

contemporaries. — Lord Hartington, need not

be mentioned, as he was not equal to his

contemporaries. — Lord Palmerston, need not

be mentioned, as he was not equal to his

contemporaries. — Lord Clarendon, need not

be mentioned, as he was not equal to his

contemporaries. — Lord Hartington, need not

be mentioned, as he was not equal to his

contemporaries. — Lord Palmerston, need not

be mentioned, as he was not equal to his

contemporaries. — Lord Clarendon, need not

be mentioned, as he was not equal to his

contemporaries. — Lord Hartington, need not

be mentioned, as he was not equal to his

contemporaries. — Lord Palmerston, need not

be mentioned, as he was not equal to his

contemporaries. — Lord Clarendon, need not

be mentioned, as he was not equal to his

contemporaries. — Lord Hartington, need not

be mentioned, as he was not equal to his

contemporaries. — Lord Palmerston, need not

be mentioned, as he was not equal to his

contemporaries. — Lord Clarendon, need not

be mentioned, as he was not equal to his

contemporaries. — Lord Hartington, need not

be mentioned, as he was not equal to his

contemporaries. — Lord Palmerston, need not

be mentioned, as he was not equal to his

contemporaries. — Lord Clarendon, need not

be mentioned, as he was not equal to his

contemporaries. — Lord Hartington, need not

be mentioned, as he was not equal to his

contemporaries. — Lord Palmerston, need not

be mentioned, as he was not equal to his

contemporaries. — Lord Clarendon, need not

be mentioned, as he was not equal to his

contemporaries. — Lord Hartington, need not

be mentioned, as he was not equal to his

contemporaries. — Lord Palmerston, need not

be mentioned, as he was not equal to his

contemporaries. — Lord Clarendon, need not

be mentioned, as he was not equal to his

contemporaries. — Lord Hartington, need not

be mentioned, as he was not equal to his

contemporaries. — Lord Palmerston, need not

be mentioned, as he was not equal to his

contemporaries. — Lord Clarendon, need not

be mentioned, as he was not equal to his

contemporaries. — Lord Hartington, need not

be mentioned, as he was not equal to his

contemporaries. — Lord Palmerston, need not

be mentioned, as he was not equal to his

contemporaries. — Lord Clarendon, need not

be mentioned, as he was not equal to his

contemporaries. — Lord Hartington, need not

be mentioned, as he was not equal to his

contemporaries. — Lord Palmerston, need not

be mentioned, as he was not equal to his

contemporaries. — Lord Clarendon, need not

be mentioned, as he was not equal to his

contemporaries. — Lord Hartington, need not

be mentioned, as he was not equal to his

contemporaries. — Lord Palmerston, need not