

FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE.

FRANCE.

The *Times* Paris correspondent says:—"It would be hazardous to affirm anything of the probable result of the Conferences until after the lapse of six or seven days."

The *Post's* Paris correspondent states:—"Lord Cowley will probably leave Paris for London on Saturday. Should he do so it is for the purpose, I presume, of receiving instructions on some difficulties which are expected to occur at the Congress, and then return for the next sitting on Monday."

"The intelligence received from Vienna is very assuring as regards peace. The German journals state that the Austrian troops will remain in the Principalities till the proposed reforms are put into practice. Is this the only reason? If I am rightly informed Austria's past conduct is meeting with its just reward. Russia having used that power is now anxious to throw her off, whilst England, France and Sardinia can have little sympathy with her. It is, not impossible that Russia will support England and France on any questions touching Italy."

The accouchement of the Empress is now looked for early in March. The *Moniteur*, in its court news, incidentally mentions that the Empress is in the ninth month of her pregnancy.

A letter from the Paris correspondent of the *Independence* of Brussels says:—

"I have just read a letter addressed to a member of the Legislative Body by the Archbishop of Avignon, in which I find an interesting piece of news. The Archbishop has arrived from Rome, and before quitting that city he went to take leave of the Pope, who told him that he should visit France in case a Prince was born to the Emperor. Pius IX. promised that, should he take the journey, he would stop two days at Avignon, after which he would proceed to Paris to baptize the Imperial child. The letter in which the Archbishop announces this news is written with a feeling of great gratification."

THE EMPEROR OF THE FRENCH AND THE DISTRIBUTION OF PROTESTANT BIBLES.—It will be remembered that in the course of last year a rumor was industriously propagated in England, that his Imperial Majesty the Emperor Napoleon III. had countenanced the distribution of Protestant bibles in France, and had actually contributed towards that object. The absurdity of the rumor was of course apparent to those who knew his Majesty's opinions upon Protestantism. The following letter, which has been made public, sets the matter, however, entirely at rest, the writer declaring the assertion to be simply an invention:—

[Translation.]

"Rev. Sir—You will not, I think, require many words to do justice to the reports which are circulated in England, to the effect that the Emperor gives money for the circulation of Protestant Bibles in France. It is sufficient to tell you that it is all simply an invention."—Accept, &c.,

"L'ABBE MULLOIS."

GERMANY.

It is considered probable that the Emperor of Austria will consent to be godfather, by proxy, to the expected heir to the French throne. An Austrian regiment is to bear the name of the Emperor.

It is believed at Vienna that England and Turkey will demand as an indemnification for the cost of the war, the sum paid Russia when peace was concluded between the two countries in 1829. This sum was 1,500,000 ducats.

RUSSIA.

A letter published in the Paris correspondence of the *Times* states that this spring the Russian steam fleet at Cronstadt will consist of 18 line of battle ships and frigates, 14 corvettes, and 70 gunboats. A triple row of piles has been driven right across the Gulf of Finland, six miles from Cronstadt. This maritime bulwark, twelve miles across, will have but few openings, and can be easily closed or defended. The writer says not a boat can be imperilled, let the attacking force be ever so strong.

ITALY.

SARDINIA AND THE HOLY SEE.—It is said that a difference has arisen in the Sardinian Cabinet on the question of concessions to the Holy See. M. de Cavour, the Prime Minister, is in favor of this policy, while M. Ratz, Minister of the Interior, contends that it would be a display of feebleness not warranted by circumstances.

On Ash Wednesday was received into the pale of Catholicism, by Father Ethridge, the English Jesuit, one whose circumstances as a convert are remarkable. Mr. Oldham, formerly Minister in the Anglican Church, who had actually been engaged to preach a course of Lent lectures at the chapel of that establishment here; and I believe had very recently spoken from the pulpit of that schismatic temple. An Israelite of Florence, named Bussano, was baptised and confirmed by the Cardinal Vicar, at the Church of the Mission (that of the Fathers of St. Vincent de Paul), during Carnival.

CRIMEA.

The *Daily News* remarks, "While the armistice lasts neither army can move its position or occupy new ground, and it may be inferred from the date fixed for the termination of the armistice, that by the 21st of March, the earliest period at which the resumption of military operations is possible, either peace must be concluded or the war renewed. Beyond the fact of an armistice having been agreed to, and the order in which the Plenipotentiaries sit, nothing is known of the proceedings of the Conference."

It is believed that, in case of peace, a French army of occupation, consisting of 40,000 or 50,000 will remain in the East for a certain time.

The *Presse d'Orient* gives an interesting account of the death of a Sister of Charity:—

"A Sister of Charity died on Thursday at Rami Tchilik. She was buried on Friday. She was called in religion Sister Vincent; of the name of her family and of her country we are ignorant. Her illness was one of those prevalent in the hospital—in other words, she died a victim to her devotion for the French army."

"In accordance with her last wishes, she was buried amongst the soldiers. After sacrificing to them her life, she has begged as a favor to be allowed to share their tomb. 'While I lived,' she said, 'I was sick nurse to our soldiers; when I die, let me rest with those that are dead.' Before she expired, remembering that she had a little money still in her purse, the last remittance she had received from her father and mother, she desired it might be devoted to procuring refreshments for the sick soldiers."

ENGLAND FORTY YEARS AGO AND ENGLAND TO-DAY.

(From the *Dublin Tablet*.)

Nations, like men, have their youth, manhood, and old age. Thus it was with past kingdoms and empires, and thus it will be with future ones, which God in His providence will allow to rise and flourish for a time. Egypt, Assyria, Babylon, Greece, Rome, and Constantinople had each its day of glory and greatness; but if they had their day of health and vigor, they had also their day of old age, decay, and death. England, too, has had her day—a long day indeed—of conquest and rapine—an uninterrupted day of sunshine and glory—a day unexampled in the history of nations. Every day, however, has its evening, and we believe that, reading history with the torch of faith—believing as we do in the just retribution of Providence—contrasting the past with the present—England's evening is fast approaching; her day of infirmity and old age is not far away. To Englishmen, puffed up as they are with pride and arrogance—habituated as they are to centuries of sunshine—unacquainted as they are with defeat and adversity—accustomed as they are to scoff and ridicule every thing and person not English—to Englishmen, forgetful that the sins of the parent are visited on the children, and that the more multiplied the crime the greater the retribution, such an idea would seem absurd and ridiculous; but we believe that this overweening confidence in themselves—this characteristic contempt of everything foreign—this haughtiness and insolence that marks their footsteps in every land, will, in the end, alienate, and perhaps combine every nation for their humiliation.

Forty years ago England was the first empire in the world by land and by sea—her army was invincible—her fleet scoured the ocean—her generals and admirals were of the first order; forty years ago England was the scourge and terror of any nation which dared to cross her path. In the days of blood and desolation England was the only nation that could effectually cope with old Bonaparte. She dogged him and thwarted him wherever he turned; she drove his ablest and most experienced generals out of Spain; she finally crushed him at Waterloo, and gave the conqueror of Europe an island-prison of humiliation and death. Perhaps the three brightest hours in the military history of England were, first, the meeting of Blücher and Wellington after the battle of Waterloo. The Emperor was then in hopeless flight—the victor was vanquished—the conqueror subdued—the cry of "Vive l'Empereur," that so often led the French to glory, was hushed amidst the cheers of the British, the shrieks of the wounded, the groans of the dying, and the rout of the French; the "Old Guard," so accustomed to victory, so triumphant in every battle-field, was melting before the chivalry of England and Prussia. This was, indeed, a sunny hour for England. She was then at the pinnacle of her military greatness and pride; her old foe, France, was humbled at her feet, and a long career of glory and power shone in the vista before her. England, however, had another hour equally bright, and that was when Wellington led his victorious legions into the city of Paris. We can form some idea of the chagrin of the Parisians when they beheld the "hero of a hundred fights" marching through their capital—the veterans of Salamanca, Vittoria, Torres Vedras, Badajoz, and Waterloo—the red line that never wavered—the men who drove the French before them in every field, and before whom even the "Old Guard" reeled. It was a proud hour for England when Russia, Prussia, Austria, France, the representatives of every nation, beheld the "Iron Duke" and his veteran army. There was another hour, equally bright and equally important, and that was the entry of Castlereagh into the conference of Vienna, when the news of Waterloo had reached that European congress. "England's ambassador," said the *Univers* last week, "then filled a high and enviable position—all listened with attention to his words, because all knew that the sword of Wellington hung behind him." These were, indeed, palmy days for England—such days as perhaps she may never see again. England forty years ago was the first empire in the world by land and by sea.

Turn we now to a different scene; let the curtain of time hang over the past. "The friends of to-day may be foes of to-morrow." We saw a coalition against France, in which England held a conspicuous place; we see now a coalition against Russia, with the nephew of England's prisoner foremost in the conflict. We have witnessed a gigantic struggle for the last two years, and we hear that another conference is to take place, not indeed, in Vienna, but under the eye of a Bonaparte. England to-day and England 40 years ago are two different Englands. She has now no Vittorias, no Salamancas, no Trafalgars, no Nile, no Waterloo to point at. Her laurels are faded, her glory is gone, her prestige is vanished, her military history for the last two years was one uninterrupted, one unexampled failure. She was saved at the Alma by the celerity and bravery of the French; she would have been annihilated at Inkermann only for the timely aid of the same ally; she lost her cavalry at Balaklava by the blunders of somebody; she lost the finest army that ever went from her shores by the neglect and mismanagement, too, of somebody; and she lost the Redan, and with it her prestige and character, by her suicidal policy to Ireland. We often spoke in words of warning against the extermination of Ireland; we often foretold that England would yet need the strong arms, the brawny frames, the chivalrous bravery of the Irish peasant; we often said that England would rue the day she allowed a handful of land-

lords to decimate a nation of soldiers. The hour of retribution, the day of vengeance, has come on her when she least expected it. England heeded not our warnings; she was drunk with joy at the starvation and exodus of our people. Like Balthazar of old, she heeded not the fingers on the wall; she saw but one thing, the Church of Christ, in Ireland, and she has spared no pains to root out that hated creed, to level our homesteads, and scatter our faithful race. However, England, in her hatred of the Church, overreached the mark. Like Samson, when shorn of his hair, in losing the Irish peasant she has lost her bulwark and her strength.

While other nations are anxious for peace, England is crying out for war, because, maddened at her disgrace and her losses, like the unlucky gamester after a night's hazard and a night's loss, she thinks a continuance would retrieve her calamities. Her voice is still for war, but, like the bacchanalian, she lies on her back unable to rise, because those who would be her friends, the brave arms, the faithful hearts of the Irish peasantry, are either silent in the grave or scattered by her policy, like the children of Jacob, amongst the nations of the earth. If England wish to retrieve her losses; to recover her glory, she must have at hand the men who carried her flag untarnished in every conflict. She must have the men who, century after century, in every clime, under every disadvantage, and under every flag, have proved themselves capable of enduring any toil, capable of storming any breach, and capable of encountering any foe. If England wish to be feared by Russia, to be respected by France, and to be prepared for contingencies, she must change the land law of Ireland, root the people on the soil, and allow no subject to deprive her of the bone and sinew of the country. Look at the statistics of emigration. Is there any nation in the world from which such a continuous tide of the life-blood of the country flows as from Great Britain and Ireland? Even Kossuth, a stranger, remarked on the madness of allowing the rural population to be cleared off. Doctor Hughes, the illustrious Archbishop of New York, in a lecture before the Young Men's Society of Baltimore on January the 17th, thus alludes to the suicidal policy of England:—"Although, in the darkened minds of political economists, who arrange things according to profit and loss, it may have been the doctrine of the British that the extensive grazing farms were adapted to the purpose of improving the breed of cattle, much more profitably to the proprietor than the crowded neighborhood of peasants, yet there was famine on one side, and pestilence in the rear of famine. But there are such things as wars. Wars do occur. Nations find it more profitable, if not in a pecuniary sense, in a spirit of national pride, to have a numerous, hardy, and brave peasantry to meet the enemy, against whom they will not be strong enough to contend. It is not at all probable that, if Great Britain have recourse to its favorite recruiting ground in 1855, with the same results of success as under Wellington in 1815, and preceding years, in that contingency it is not at all probable that the British army would not have been able to take the Redan at Sebastopol. The failure was not for want of bravery, but for want of force; and this exhibits that nation, so reckless of the lives of her own people, descending, and almost consigned to the second rank, whereas she was formerly in the first." England now has an opportunity of preparing for the future; our Tenant Bill is now before Parliament, and if she adopt the same policy that she has heretofore, she will yet fall a prey, if not to the present, at least to some future Napoleon, who will, happily for himself, miss from the battle-field the men who humbled Napoleon I., and made the "Old Guard" reel at Waterloo.

ANTI-CATHOLIC BIGOTRY IN SCOTLAND.

"Modern Athens," so renowned as a seat of learning, and for the liberality of its citizens, has of late been made the laughing-stock of the civilized world by the doings of a nest of wretched fanatics, who fancy themselves the *no plus ultras* of charity and godliness. Witness their insolent and hypocritical address to the King of Sardinia, from whose minister they received a just castigation for their audacity. Unabashed, as all bigots and intolerants are, they have again sounded the tocsin of sectarian hate against their Catholic fellow-subjects in the recent election for Edinburgh, and we are glad that its Liberal inhabitants have vindicated the fair fame of their ancient city by returning Mr. Black, the popular candidate, a man who, through a long, well-spent, and honorable life has been the uncompromising advocate of civil and religious liberty.

The following list of questions proposed to be put to Mr. Black, as they appeared as an advertisement in the *Scotsman* of the 2nd instant, will show the feeling of the intolerant party who now seek to rule in Scotland:—

"THE EDINBURGH ELECTION.

"Questions for Mr. Adam Black.

"1. Do you believe that the Pope is the 'Man of Sin,' spoken of in Scripture, and the head of the great foretold apostacy?"

"2. Will you vote for the total repeal of the Maynooth College Endowment Act, and for the withdrawal of state support from Popery at home and abroad?"

"3. As the Emancipation Act, 1829, prohibits the existence, in the United Kingdom, of Jesuits and other religious Orders of the Romish Church, will you vote for the enforcement of the law to the utmost?"

"4. Do you think that the Roman Catholic officers of state can be trusted to enforce against Roman Catholics the laws of the realm, particularly in cases where the interests of their Church are concerned? and will you require Lord Palmerston to dismiss

"The Popish Attorney-General for Ireland,

"The Popish Solicitor-General for Ireland, and

"The Popish Crown Agent for Ireland,

who, in the case of the Trillick conspiracy, to slay eight hundred Protestants in a railway train, indicted the conspirators for murder, there being no evidence for murder, but only for conspiracy; and whose prosecution, in the case of the Bible-burners at Kingstown, was also a miscarriage?"

"5. As true Papists are mere puppets in the hands of the Pope, through his Priests and Bishops, do you think that it is in accordance with the British constitution that such puppets may vote for and sit as members of parliament? If not, will you vote to exclude all Papists from voting, and from parliament?"

"6. Are you opposed to all burgh-mongering; and, if so, will you vote for disfranchising all the Pope's nomination burghs, and all who are under the influence of, and who render allegiance to the Pope, the great burghmonger?"

"7. If you approve of the Pope, a foreign power (with whom Protestants ought to be unceasingly at war, spiritually and politically), through Priests and Bishops, his consuls sending his Papists into parliament, on what principle would you object to Louis Napoleon, or the Russian Emperor, being allowed to nominate and send British subjects to parliament?"

"8. As Papists are not free agents, do you think it is in accordance with our enjoyment of civil and religious liberty that Protestants be in any degree ruled by Papists, who are themselves neither civilly nor religiously free?"

"9. Do you acknowledge that dissimulation, equivocation, and reservation, the doing evil that good may come, and the keeping no faith with Protestants, are the principles of the Church of Rome; and, if so, will you vote for the exclusion of Papists from all public offices, and places of power and trust in our Protestant nation?"

"10. Are you willing to admit a Papist to the throne? If not, on what principle do you admit Papists to parliament?"

"11. Are you willing to promote the passing of a law to abolish nunneries, on the ground of its being contrary to the principles of the British constitution that Popish alien Priests be allowed to administer vows of perpetual celibacy and seclusion to females in Britain; and that such institutions should not be allowed to exist; or on any other ground?"

"12. Did, and do you approve of, and identify yourself with the Lord Advocate's concordat or bargain with Bishop Gillis, to give Privy Council grants for the building and endowment of Popish schools in Scotland, with a view 'to increase the present number throughout the country,' in return for the votes of the Irish Priests in Parliament in support of his late Scotch Education Bill of 1855?"

"13. Do you approve of the so-called Irish system of National Education—

Which receives from parliament £200,000 per annum;

Which excludes the Bible from its schools;

Which appoints Papists as its teachers;

Which keeps holiday on Popish Saints' days, as the

'Assumption of the Blessed Virgin,' thus impress-

ing that lie on the minds of juvenile Protestants; and

Which commits the management of its schools to

Popish Priests and Popish patrons;

as being a system to be in any way countenanced by

a Protestant nation, or a suitable provision for its Protestant population?"

A strange suit, worthy to be ranked among the *causes célèbres* of Doctors' Commons, was heard and determined in the Prerogative Court on Saturday last. An aged and infirm lady, the widow of a Major in the army, died at Brighton in the month of January, 1850, at the advanced age of 82 years, leaving behind her an only son, a Captain in the Royal Artillery, and having down to the time of her death passed as a widow under the name of Mrs. Major Campbell. The lady was a strict Roman Catholic, who attended on her deathbed by her Father Confessor, who administered the last sacraments to her as Mrs. Campbell, and afterwards performed masses for the repose of her soul under that name. The son was present at her death, and followed her to her grave, and the inscription on her coffin represented her as the relict of Major Campbell. It seems that by her father's will her son was entitled to a considerable property upon her death, subject, however, to the life interest of her husband, if she left any husband surviving her. She had also personal property of large amount to which her son would be entitled if she died a widow and without a will, but otherwise her husband would claim it as his exclusive property in case of her intestacy. After the funeral her son and the friends of the family assembled to hear her will read, when the person who was supposed to be her executor stepped forward, announced himself as her husband, and, as such, asserted his claim to her papers and property, to the exclusion of the son. The friends repudiated the claim; but no will could be found, and a suit for the administration of her property ensued in the Prerogative Court, in which the son was enabled to put the asserted husband on the proof of his marriage. The case of the asserted husband was, that six months before the death of this aged lady he had taken her in a hired carriage to the office of the Superintendent Registrar of the Marylebone district, and in the presence of two witnesses, selected by him, strangers to the deceased, had contracted a marriage with her according to the act of Parliament, which was purposely kept secret for fear of her son's anger. One of these witnesses was produced, and swore that he was not a stranger to her, but knew the lady, and the signature annexed to the entry in the book of the registrar was sworn to be in her handwriting. It appeared further that her age, her residence, and the name of her father were wrongly entered; but the act of Parliament does not permit a false entry to invalidate the marriage. It was in vain for counsel to contend that the marriage in itself was grossly improbable, that the parties never cohabited, never acknowledged each other as husband and wife; on the contrary, that the lady always treated the asserted husband as a guest at her house, to the last moment retained the name of Campbell, and never could have deliberately intended to disinherit her only son, in whose arms she died, as it was proved that she expressed her warmest gratitude to a faithful servant who had summoned her son to her bedside to attend her last moments and a host of witnesses spoke of her as doating upon her son to the last. The asserted husband produced himself as a witness in his own cause under the new law of evidence, and swore solemnly that he was honestly carrying out the deliberate wishes of the mother in endeavouring to deprive the son of his inheritance. The Court felt bound to pronounce that the fact of a marriage solemnized according to the act of Parliament was proved, and that such a marriage was attended with all the consequences of a marriage publicly celebrated, *in facie ecclesiæ*, and acknowledged by the parties during their lifetime. The son left the court stripped of his inheritance, saddled with his own heavy expenses, and with part of the costs of his adversary. It may fairly be a question whether such a state of our marriage law is satisfactory, and whether it is not a scandal to a civilized country that the institution of marriage, which was intended for the protection of the offspring of the wife, should be capable of being perverted to its ruin.—*London Times*.

UNITED STATES.

We clip from a late number of the *N. Y. Churchman* the following specimen of Pharisaic formalism:—"Clerical Contempt of Lent.—The insincerity of the ultra-Protestant school of our clergy, as respects even