

FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE.

FRANCE.

**THE PRESIDENT AND THE ASSEMBLY.**—The rejection of the *urgency* of the electoral law proposed by government did not, as was expected, end in referring the measure to the tardy consideration of the *Conseil d'Etat*. The Assembly, on Thursday week, decided to transfer it to a committee, feeling probably the danger of keeping the country in suspense. The majority, at meetings held at the houses of M.M. Daru and Molé, had already fully resolved on throwing out the measure, and accordingly the committee, which met on Friday to examine the bill, having appointed M. Molé its President, and M. Daru its reporter, at once decided on its rejection. M.M. Baroche, Léon Faucher, Fould, de Montalembert, de Broglie, and Cavagnac, all spoke strongly against the measure. M. de Broglie declared that for the Assembly to yield now would be to vote its own annihilation.

At the sitting of the Assembly on Tuesday, M. Daru presented the report of the committee, urging the Assembly not to agree to the abrogation of the law of May 31, as proposed by the government, which would be a stultification of themselves, and a yielding to threats most unbecoming to the Assembly. The discussion was fixed for Thursday.

There is as yet very little prospect of an arrangement between the two powers.

Many timid persons are giving credit to a rumor, that if the new electoral bill be rejected there will be an *emette* on the occasion of the election in Paris on the 30th Nov.—One would have supposed that these announcements of *emettes*, after so many proofs of their being utterly unfounded, would now have no effect. As regards the prediction for the 30th, I can assert that there is not the slightest thing to give importance to it. The only thing to be feared for the 30th is, that there will not be voters enough to secure the return of the candidate, whoever he may be.

I wish there was nothing to alarm us but conjectures of disturbances. Unfortunately the crisis has produced an evil greater than a street row, which could be suppressed in a few minutes by the armed force. Trade of every kind is paralysed, and if there be not soon a solution to the dispute between the two powers, Paris will be in almost as bad a state as it was in 1848. The funds alone are steady, but, under existing circumstances, this is no criterion of confidence.—*Globe Correspondent*.

**PARIS, NOVEMBER 15TH.**—The sitting of the Assembly to-day afforded a new instance of the utter absence of parliamentary decorum for which the proceedings of that body have become notorious. A perfect storm was excited by the "interpellations" of which M. Sartin had given notice; but all storms subside, if you only give them time, and at length this hubbub lost so much of its intensity as to permit the assembly to pass to the order of the day.

**MILITARY POWER OF THE ASSEMBLY.**—It will be recollected that the constitution grants the power to the Assembly to call out and dispose of any number of troops which it may consider necessary for its defence. The words "dispose of" would by ordinary people be considered as implying the nomination of the commander of the troops in question, especially as in a subsequent clause it is added that the President of the Assembly can issue his orders to all military and civil functionaries; but it is certainly not explicitly stated that the Assembly should have the power of nominating the general to command the troops. Unfortunately for themselves, the questors of the Assembly have a lawyer among their number (M. Baze), who discovered what he considered an omission, and who determined to show his zeal by endeavoring to have it supplied. No one had hitherto doubted the power of the Assembly to nominate its own general, but he, instead of saying nothing about the matter, which was the course prudence would have dictated, proclaimed the doubt to the world by introducing a declaratory bill. A more mischievous proceeding could not be conceived, for it at the same time throws doubt on the powers of the Assembly, and enables Louis Napoleon to stand up for what he is entitled to consider an invasion of his prerogatives.

The Court of Appeal at Nismes has sentenced Rosette Tamisier to six months' imprisonment, and sixteen francs fine, for the affair of the picture at St. Saturnin.

SPAIN.

**MADRID, Nov. 5.**—The chambers were opened to-day by a decree of the crown. There was no speech. A vote of thanks to the army and the inhabitants of Cuba was moved by Benavides, and carried unanimously. The minister has refused to suppress the *Nacion* on the demand of the Pope's nuncio, on account of the general indignation caused by the suppression of the *Europa*, the radical evening paper. However, the *Nacion* and four other morning prints have had informations filed against them by the fiscal.—*Daily News*.

ITALY.

Strangers are beginning to arrive in great numbers, chiefly Prussian, German, and English, but very few French. A certain number of the French Bishops are expected, probably five or six at least will arrive to make their visit *ad limine*. Among the strangers of distinction at present in Rome is Silvio Pellico. The *Corps Diplomatique* is also assembling. M. d'Useedom, the Prussian Minister, arrived two months ago; M. de Bouteneif, the Russian Minister, only a few days since; as also M. de Liedekerke, the Belgian Minister; and M. de Venda Cruz, the Portuguese Minister.

There is also talk in the Piedmontese journals of the speedy arrival of a Sardinian envoy, who is to

resume, if possible, the negotiations relative to the Concordat.

Mgr. Valerga, Patriarch of Jerusalem, left for that city on the 22nd. This Prelate, consecrated by the Sovereign Pontiff in 1847, is the first Patriarch who, since the Holy Land was in the hands of the infidels, has had the mission to reside in Jerusalem. Before him, the Patriarchs decorated with this title, like those of Constantinople, lived away from their see. The tolerance happily introduced into the Ottoman empire, the establishment at Jerusalem of a Protestant bishopric, the titular of which resided, the desire of raising again a see so illustrious, and of giving a more efficacious protection to Catholic interests, and of furthering the restitution of the Holy Land usurped by schism, were the motives for deciding on this measure.

The *Bologna Gazette* of the 29th ult. publishes the following notification of Count Nobili, commander of the 8th corps of the Austrian army:—

"At the moment when Nicholas Moschini, lieutenant of the Pontifical Gendarmes, was entering his barracks on the 8th of July last, he was stabbed in the back with a stiletto, and expired almost immediately. The murderer escaped in consequence of the terror he inspired, but, having been since arrested at Cesena, he was recognised to be an individual named Artidoro Branzani, who had formerly been confined at Ravenna for a robbery committed in France. As no proof, however, could be adduced he was restored to liberty. Branzani pleaded his innocence of the murder of Moschini, but was nevertheless sentenced by court-martial to twenty years' hard labor."

AUSTRIA.

Terrible floods are again desolating parts of Upper Austria and the southern portions of the monarchy. The Drave has inundated southern Styria and the communications with Croatia over the Save are interrupted. The Isenzo has likewise overflowed its banks, and, with the sole exception of the line of road between Bruck and Klagenfurt, all the roads in Carinthia are under water. Similar accounts come in from the Venetian provinces, the Adige, the Muso, and the Tagliamento having burst their boundaries, and overspread the country with desolation. On the 2d instant the grand square of St. Marc, at Venice, was under water, and only accessible in gondolas. All this devastation is attributable to the heavy fall of snow that has lately covered the mountains of the Tyrol.

HANOVER.

The state of health of his Majesty during the last few days has been of a hopeless nature. On the night between Tuesday and Wednesday his decease was hourly expected, and the Crown Prince was sent for. Since yesterday a change for the better has taken place.

KOSSUTH.

(From the *Dublin Freeman*.)

What is Kossuth? Kossuth is an unsuccessful "insurgent"—a fugitive Mitchel of Hungary—the Robert Emmet of Eastern Europe—the Smith O'Brien of England for doing that in Hungary which Irishmen have been hanged for even attempting in their native land. In behalf of Kossuth, the theoretical "justice" by which the affairs of Ireland are conducted has been suspended or outraged with the most barefaced audacity. It cannot assuredly be consistent with "justice" to eulogise Kossuth to the skies, and to hang or banish an Irishman for performing the same deeds! A native of Hungary who revolts against Austria is greeted in Britain as a demi-god; while a native of Ireland who revolts against unparalleled oppression is transported as the blackest villain. The very efforts which are held meritorious in the one, are punished as offences of the deadliest type in the other, and by the same "just judges." Had M. Kossuth performed the same acts beside the Shannon which he has attempted beside the Theiss, far from being feasted in England by civic adulators, he would be hanged on another "Tyburn-tree," with the hearty concurrence of those very men who now feast and fete him. Fortunate it is for M. Kossuth that he is not a native of Ireland! In that case, the newspapers which extol him as a hero, would denounce him as a "diabolical incendiary." Had his name been Milesian, and his birth-place Donegal, he would be pursued with curses and howled at with loathing.

We cannot understand how it is that "insurrection," when it is exotic, smells so sweetly in English nostrils, while the same flower is trampled with horror when found budding near home! Why should not Irish rebels come in for a modicum of the admiration which is lavished with so generous a profusion on the rebels of Hungary? When Irishmen resist oppression, the rope is hung out and the coffin is made ready; while, if a foreigner perpetrate the very same action, the table is prepared and the feast is seen to smoke! The foreign rebel is embraced as a brother, and the money-loving English encircle him with salutations and bellow forth hosannas, and bray their veneration in all the modulations of the great gamut of donkey-ism.

It is plain, however, to the most superficial observer that the adulation bestowed on Kossuth in England is false and grossly hypocritical. There is no sincere love for human liberty in the hearts of those who cram their stomachs at the groaning tables where Kossuth plays the orator. They have no real love of patriotism—no hearty passion for the struggles of an uprising people, else those attributes would be admired in every lover of his country; and the Shannon and the Theiss, the Suir and the Danube, Buda and Dublin, would be all the same to them.

In estimating the value of England's sympathy for Kossuth's struggle, it must not be forgotten that the stimulus which roused the Hungarian to revolt was by no means so urgent as were the stimulants in operation nearer home. The sorrows of Kossuth's country were not so dark as the sorrows of Ireland. Hungary under the protection of the house of Hapsburg was a paradise when compared to that country of which it has been said so truly by an English writer:—"No description can describe it. No parallel exists, or has ever existed, to illustrate it. No province of the Roman Empire

ever presented half the wretchedness of Ireland. At this day the mutilated Fellah of Egypt, the savage Hottentot and the New Hollander, the New Zealander, the Negro slave, the live chattel of Carolina and of Cuba, enjoy a paradise in comparison with the condition of the Irish peasant—that is to say of the mass of the Irish nation."

We repeat, under the shadow of the double-headed eagle—dark though that shadow was—the incentives to revolt were not so stimulant as those described by Sergeant Byles, from whose book we have quoted, to exist under English misrule. There was no Golgotha like Kilrush in the fertile valley of the Drave or the Danube. The dead men were not devoured by dogs, as they were at Skull and Skibbereen! The Hungarian peasants enjoyed rights and comforts for which the serfs in Ireland still vainly implore. They enjoyed a tenant-right—the principle of compensation for labor was recognised in Hungary; or, to use the language of Malte Brun, "the peasants could not be turned out of their farms until they were indemnified for labor" bestowed upon such farms. The Hungarian peasant was generously fed and warmly clothed.

Those pesty gormandisers who gobble victuals and drink to honor Kossuth in the presence of his exiled companions should blush for shame at the contrast between the Irish peasant and the Hungarian boor.—They should cover their moon faces when they offer sympathy and roast beef to a revolutionist who, comparatively speaking, had so little reason for rebellion as this Hun, and applaudingly acquiesce in the banishment of Smith O'Brien, whose reasons for rebellion were so strong and powerful. The bigoted Kossuth is far less worthy of honor and eulogy than Smith O'Brien, who was no bigot. His countrymen were not threatened by famine like those of the Irish chief. His attempt, heroic and gallant though the struggle was, has been crushed with as ready a tyranny. Wherefore, then, should he be extolled if Smith O'Brien is proscribed. The Hungarian Mitchel—this Magyar Emmet is not a whit more illustrious or glorious, if judged by the motives that impelled, and not by the quantity of blood that flowed, than the Mitchel of Emmet of Ireland. If, then, the English sincerely love patriotism, let them feast the Irish rebels. They need not go to Hungary for machinators of rebellion! When we produce Kossuths the English hang them—the Hungarians produce Mitchels, and the English hug them. Let the gluttonous gormandisers be just to our productions. Why should not a rebel from Dublin be as acceptable as a rebel from Pesth?

THE POPE AND LORD MINTO.

The *Freeman's Journal* gives the following narration of a dialogue which is stated to have taken place between the Pope and the Earl of Minto:—

"Within the last few days we have been put in possession of the following particulars of an incident connected with this very subject, which we would recommend to the attention of any person, lay or clerical, in Ireland, who may be inclined to attach importance to the project. The incident appertains to this very matter of a state provision for the Catholic Priesthood in this country; and we make no doubt but the report of the same facts was reposing in black and white in the portfolio of Lord John Russell when he issued his ukase against the Catholic Episcopacy of the kingdom. The narrative rests upon the authority of one who tells it upon the evidence of a person who, we believe, heard it from the lips of his Holiness himself. Amongst the several topics which occupied the attention of Lord Minto in his late quasi-official and memorable mission to Rome, the question of a state provision for the Irish Priesthood held a prominent place. In a special and quasi-diplomatic interview with the Pontiff, Lord Minto introduced the subject, and expressed to his Holiness the great anxiety of the British Cabinet to provide for the more decent maintenance of the Irish Clergy. He made no secret of the wish of the government to attach the Clergy more closely to the ruling body in the empire by means of the proposed state provision. 'Some Ecclesiastics in Ireland,' said Lord Minto, 'more turbulent than others, and, in consequence of their present independence of the government, more free to express their sentiments, succeed in creating feelings of discontent with certain of the acts of the English cabinet.' 'I am not aware,' observed his Holiness in reply, 'that Ecclesiastics in Ireland possess any Ecclesiastical immunities or exemptions from the civil law.' 'Nor do they,' was the answer of Lord Minto. 'Well, then,' said his Holiness, 'if they violate the civil law, you punish them?' 'Certainly,' continued his lordship. 'So far, then,' said his Holiness, 'you show cause against the necessity of my interference.'

"His lordship continued to urge the propriety of providing a state pension for the Clergy, as one of the means of connecting them in closer bonds of union with the government. His Holiness, upon being thus urged, expressed his readiness to co-operate with the British cabinet in bringing about such a consummation, and continued by observing that 'if he was correctly informed there was an immense amount of property confiscated by the state from the Catholic Church in Ireland, and handed over to another Clergy, whose flocks formed only a fractional portion of the Irish population.' Lord Minto admitted the truth of the statement. 'Well, then,' said his Holiness, 'restore this property to its rightful owners.' 'The British Sovereign,' observed his lordship, 'would sooner part with the brightest gem in her diadem than give up the temporalities of the Established Church in Ireland.' 'Upon no other condition,' concluded his Holiness, 'shall I ever give my consent to have the Irish Priesthood accept a state provision from the British government.'

"The moral deducible from the foregoing narrative, the truthfulness of which rests upon indisputable authority, is twofold. The conversation in which his Holiness's hostility to an enslaving pension was so clearly expressed was known to the Whigs, and yet they would fain persuade us that such a state pension was a legitimate subject for discussion amongst the Irish Catholic body. In the next place, the same narrative discloses in the most glaring manner the moral depravity of the leaders of the present English cabinet.—The very men who, in the year 1846, were anxious to secure not only a legal existence in all its integrity for the Catholic Hierarchy of Ireland, but to tax the empire some millions sterling per annum for their support, turn round in the year 1850, and, without any alteration in their conviction, have the shameless effrontery to come down to the House of Commons with a bill purporting to ignore and destroy the legal existence of the very same Episcopacy. There is in this an extent of political knavery to which we hardly imagined that even Whig baseness could descend."

PROTESTANT BISHOPS AS THEY ARE.

What (asks the *Morning Chronicle*) "is the abstract conception of an English Bishop—the *de facto* Bishop? It is that of a dignified Clergyman made up of equal parts of proctor and registrar-general, whose function it is to keep things straight, to discourage extreme people, to put the best face upon things in general, and to see only what it is convenient to see, or impossible to affect not to see." Of Anglican Episcopal charges, the same journal remarks:—"They do for the most part say nothing—only they have got the knack of saying that nothing in the most offensive way—or rather, perhaps, they come to nothing, for by simply clearing the board, by snubbing everybody, by proscribing everything, by vexing and irritating every variety and shade of earnestness, by paring down zeal and consistency wherever it inconveniently manifests itself, and, by forecasting dangers in every direction, every scheme is clouded with suspicions, while hesitation, doubt, distrust, irresolution, and vacillation are encouraged and invited. The only parties who escape scathless from a visitation are, we fear, those who are least worthy of respect—those who certainly are not innovators simply because they try nothing, think nothing, teach nothing, and do nothing." We quite agree with most of these observations, as characterising very forcibly and truly the notion which Anglican Superintendents appear to entertain of the duties of the Episcopal office. At the same time, there is one subject unnoticed by our contemporary, on which the Anglican Superintendents take care that their teaching shall be highly positive, and that its drift shall not be misunderstood by the humblest of their flocks. Witness a charge lately delivered by the "Bishop of Oxford," of the principal portion of which we give an abstract in the following paragraphs:—

"THE BISHOP OF OXFORD" ON CATHOLICISM.

"The Bishop of Oxford" (Dr. S. Wilberforce) delivered a charge to his Clergy on Thursday, the 6th inst., in which he stated that the chief dangers he apprehended were "Romanism" on the one hand, and infidelity on the other. Yet, as to the first he said—"I have no apprehension that there will be any large defection of our people to that corrupt Church. The prevalent temper of the present day appears to me to be hostile to her pretensions, and proof against her efforts. The Romish agents may accomplish something among the teeming population of our large towns, where our Church has scarcely yet fixed its seat, and among whom the other sects languidly subsist; but where, with her usual subtlety, Rome makes the main object of her efforts; but I do not believe that they will ever bring again the masses of this country to believe in superstitions which they detest—in impostures which their forefathers detected, and in corruptions which have no temptations for them." He admitted, indeed, the fact that though Rome "made no impression on the masses of our army," she had, nevertheless, "born away leaders, some of whom had left behind them no superior for power of intellect and for devotion of the soul to the cause of God."—This unpleasant phenomenon, led the Bishop "to allude to some of the chief instruments by which Romish artifices triumph, and against which, therefore, it was necessary to be upon their guard." What were these artifices? The Bishop considered that in a great number of cases the approach of "the enemy" had been through the feelings and not the understanding. Hence he advised his Clergy not so much to fortify themselves with new arguments, as "conscientiously to guard their feelings." Then, another artifice was the "undervaluing the palpable corruptions of the Papacy." Most of these preserved some truth, and an "ingenious" [did he mean fair and honorable?] "mind will love to follow up the train of thought till he comes to where the falsehood joins to the truth, and where the evil is explained. There is no more safety for him who has reached that point." Then Rome had many attractions. "One will be overcome by the apparent want of unity in our Church; another by his soul being tremblingly desirous to secure his own safety. Absolution may betray a third. A fourth may fall from the deceitful halo of holiness which invests religious vows, religious orders, and mortifications of the body, while lighter minds are led astray by things not more substantial than the incense of the altars and the decorations of the Priests." The great remedy was to keep clearly in view "the great corruptions of the Romish Church, and to beware of 'tampering with temptation' [i.e., steadily resist the grace of God pleading with their souls].—*Tablet*."

FRANKLIN'S POLAR EXPEDITION.

A fresh effort is about to be made in a region hitherto untried, to discover traces of this long-missing expedition. From the remains found at Cape Riley it is now pretty generally inferred that the exploring vessels passed through Wellington Strait, beyond which and to the north of the Parry Islands it is thought by many geographers and navigators that they would meet with a more open or "Polar" Sea. It is also believed that Franklin himself had resolved to endeavor to reach the longitude of Behring's Strait by sailing westwards in such Polar Sea. On these dates Lieutenant Pim, a zealous and able officer, who has served on board her Majesty's surveying-ship *Herald*, Capt. Kellett, in Behring's Strait, has formed the following plan of research:—

He conceives that when Franklin reached the longitude of Behring's Strait he would be foiled in all his efforts to get southwards through the one only passage from meeting with a great east and west barrier of ice and land, and that consequently he may have struggled on along its northern shore further to the west, until he became inextricably entangled in a region which, though entirely devoid of human beings, is supposed to abound in animals on which the navigators could subsist. Lieutenant Pim has in consequence suggested the following bold plan of research:—He proposes to leave London on the 18th of November for St. Petersburg to present letters, and to enlist the sympathy of the Russian government in the cause. Supposing that the negotiations with the court of Russia terminated favorably, his track would lead from St. Petersburg to Moscow by railway, from Moscow to Irkutsk by sledges, a distance of 3,544 miles; and from Irkutsk to Takoutz also on sledges, a distance of 1,891 miles, the whole journey occupying about four months. At Takoutz all regular travelling conveniences terminate, and the 1,200 miles to the river Kolyman, as well as the 2,000 miles of search, would have to be performed in a manner best adapted to the resources of the country. From the river Kolyman, accompanied by two or three persons only, he would proceed either to the islands of New Siberia and others visited by Wrangel and Anjou, or in whatever other direction he