

FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE.

FRANCE.

THE REVISION QUESTION—CONCLUSION OF THE DEBATE.—On Wednesday week M. Berreyer made a powerful speech in favor of the revision, but insisting that it should be religiously legal. He also declared himself very vehemently against the re-election of Louis Napoleon. M. de Falloux also argued in favor of the revision, and denied that the country was Republican at all. The Republic was a wretched counterfeit. He traced the signs of the portentous state of affairs in the armed force necessary to secure the peace of Paris. In 1830 10,000 men were sufficient, after a great revolution, to maintain order. In 1848 the garrison rose to 50,000 men. In 1851 it has ceased to be a garrison—we speak of "the army of Paris"—and it numbers eighty thousand men. And, again, looking at the political relations of parties, it was seen that, within forty years, the Royalists have fallen before the Liberals—the Liberals before the Republicans—and now the Republicans tremble in the presence of the Socialists. On Thursday M. Victor Hugo made a violent speech against revision, and against the idea of a monarchy, attacking Louis Napoleon with the most biting sarcasm. "What," said M. Victor Hugo, "because, after a thousand years, a man was found to take up the glove and sceptre of Charlemagne—because one man, whose name is synonymous with Rivoli, and Jena, and Friedland, has let fall in his turn that glove and sceptre, you would lift them up after him in your puny hands, as he lifted them up after Charlemagne? What! after Augustus must come Augustus! After we have had Napoleon-le-Grand must we have Napoleon-le-Petit! A truce to such parody."

On Saturday the Assembly proceeded to vote on the proposition in favor of the revision of the constitution.

The total number of votes was 724.

The votes in favor of the revision were 446; against it, 278.

Majority in favor of the revision, 168.

Nevertheless, the votes in favor not amounting to three-fourths of the whole, or 543, the proposition was pronounced rejected.

Scarcely eight-and-forty hours had elapsed since the division on the proposal for the revision, when another incident occurred, which discloses with far greater energy and distinctness the existence of hostility to Louis Napoleon's Government. A division was taken on an unsuspected vote of censure, specially directed against the Administration of the Interior, for its interference with the petitions of the people on behalf of the revision, and this censure was carried in a very full House by a majority of 13 against the Cabinet. The votes were, 330 for the resolution that "the Assembly, while regretting that in a great number of localities the Administration, in a manner contrary to its duty, has used its influence to excite the citizens to petition, orders the deposit of the petitions in the *bureau des renseignements*," and 320 against it. M. Baze, an Orleanist, spoke with most effect on behalf of this resolution. It was supported also by General Lanoriciere, who, on quitting the tribune, exclaimed, amidst the vociferous cheering of the Left, that "with the help of God, they would insure the triumph of the Republic."

SPAIN.

In the Madrid Assembly on the 16th, it was announced by Senor Bravo Murillo, that the Queen had entered on the fifth month of her pregnancy. After the communication had been read, the President of the Congress exclaimed in a loud voice, "Viva la Reina!" which was repeated from all parts of the House. A deputation was next named to congratulate her Majesty, it being announced that any other deputies who chose accompany it. M. Ventura Gonzales Romero, Minister of Grace and Justice, had addressed a circular to the bishops and clergy of the kingdom, inviting them to offer public prayers to the Almighty for the happy delivery of the Queen.

PORTUGAL.

Portuguese politics wear a very unsettled aspect, the country being threatened with a military re-action. It appears that the Fifth Cagadores made an attempt at revolt on the 16th instant, but from the energetic exertions of Saldanha and his friends, it was crushed in the bud. Several of the soldiers, with a few of the civilians, are in confinement.

IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.—JULY 18.

EXTRAORDINARY SCENE IN THE HOUSE.

There was an unusually full House this evening, and an extraordinary scene characterised the sitting. As the House was about to proceed with the private business on the paper, but before the first Bill had been disposed of, Mr. Alderman Salomons entered and took his seat beneath the Speaker's gallery.

The Speaker observing this, and it yet wanting two or three minutes to four o'clock, said, "Members to be sworn will please to come to the table." Mr. Alderman Salomons then advanced to the table, being introduced by Sir B. Hall and Mr. J. A. Smith, and the clerk of the table presented the hon. member with a book, which, from what next occurred, would appear to be a copy of the New Testament.

Alderman Salomons, without accepting the proffered book, said in a loud and firm voice, "I demand to be sworn upon the Old Testament." The Speaker—Will the hon.—(Oh)—member say why he wishes to be sworn upon the Old Testament? Alderman Salomons—Because, Sir, I believe it to be most binding upon my conscience. The Speaker—The oaths, then, may be administered so.

The ceremony of swearing was accordingly proceeded with upon the Old Testament, the hon. member repeating all the words of the oaths, except those in the Oath of Abjuration, "Upon the true faith of a

Christian," and then reading from a paper, said, "I have now taken the oaths in the form and with the ceremonies that I declare to be binding on my conscience, in accordance with Stat. 1 and 2 Vict. cap. 105; I now demand to subscribe the Oath of Abjuration, and to declare to properly qualification." The scene was exciting to the last degree—some members roaring out at the pitch of their voices, "Withdraw, withdraw!" while others added to the babel of sounds by calling out for "Order!" or rising to go through a pantomimic performance, as if they wished to address something to the Chair. The confusion, however, did not in any way daunt the hon. member for Greenwich, and he continued reading until he came to the close of the papers, when, tossing a roll of parchment across the table, he slowly retired below the gangway, and seated himself upon one of the front rows of benches.

The Speaker then made an essay to speak, and something like order being at length obtained, he said "The honorable member has omitted certain words from the oaths, which is tantamount to not taking the oaths at all, and it is therefore my duty to tell him that he must withdraw."

Alderman Salomons did not appear at all inclined to comply with the request, but still maintained his seat, and the consequence was another scene of noise and confusion was enacted; the members on the Opposition side of the House roaring and shouting again until they were nearly black in the face.

The Speaker's voice was again heard above the storm, and, as far as his words could be heard, he said "The hon. member must be aware that the Act prescribes that no hon. member can sit in this House, or vote upon any question, unless he has taken and subscribed to the oaths prescribed by law. Now the last of these oaths has not been taken in the sense which the House understands the Act—(cheers)—and I again repeat to the hon. member that it is my duty to direct him to withdraw" (cheers.)

Alderman Salomons, seemingly at the request of his supporters near him, then retired beyond the bar amidst the boisterous outburst of Opposition cheering.

Sir B. Hall then rose and said he was requested by the hon. member for Greenwich, to declare to the Speaker and to the House, that the hon. member had withdrawn from the seat which he lately occupied—(laughter and ironical cheers)—in deference to the high authority of the Chair (cheers.) But he was also instructed by the honorable and learned member to state—

Sir F. Thesiger rose to order—(cries of "Order, order," and "Don't be put down;" "Go on, go on.") "I apprehend," continued the hon. and learned member for Abingdon, "that the worthy Alderman has not obeyed the order of the House by withdrawing (hear.) He is at present standing within the House, and I consider it my duty to call attention to that circumstance" (hear.)

[This of course gave rise to another exhibition of feeling on the part of the Opposition, and again hon. members partially jumped up and motioned the hon. and learned Alderman to withdraw, or indulged in strange gesticulations, as if they were addressing some angry observations to the Chair. Sir William Molesworth and Mr. J. A. Smith, advanced to the worthy and dauntless Alderman and endeavored to persuade him to quit the House; but he would not do that; and at length the Sergeant-at-Arms came to the rescue, and at his suggestion the hon. member retired to one of the back seats under the Speaker's gallery usually appropriated to Peers.

Sir B. Hall then said that the hon. member for Greenwich was only anxious to try his right to sit in the House, and in order that the hon. member might put himself in a position to have the matter tried in one of the legal tribunals of the realm, he had to ask the Chancellor of the Exchequer whether, in consequence of the proceedings which had now taken place, or, if that proceeding was not sufficient, whether, if the hon. member came in and took his seat again, Government was prepared to institute an immediate prosecution against him for the recovery of the penalties provided by the Act of Parliament? (cheers.)

Another noisy conversation followed; the Chancellor of the Exchequer proposed to answer the question (the premier being absent) on Monday; but Sir F. Thesiger being told, in the course of one of his interruptions, that he was out of order, moved—"That the Speaker be directed to issue his writ for the election of a member for the borough of Greenwich, in the room of Alderman Salomons, who had refused to take the oath of abjuration in the form prescribed"—(loud and prolonged cheers from the Opposition benches.)

The Chancellor of the Exchequer said he was very much surprised at the course pursued by the hon. and learned member—(cheers and cries of "hear, hear.") He had reason to complain of his making such a motion, after the suggestion had been almost agreed to for the adjournment of the question until Monday.

Sir F. Thesiger said it was certainly not his intention to do anything more than concur in the adjournment; but when called to order, he felt it necessary to conclude with a motion which would give the House to understand precisely the course which he intended to adopt on Monday when the subject again came under discussion (cheers.)

The Chancellor of the Exchequer said his object in proposing the adjournment was to prevent an outburst of that sort of feeling which was evidently rising in the House. He was sure every member was anxious to avoid that degree of angry feeling which prevailed on a similar occasion last year (hear.) He trusted the motion, after this explanation, would be withdrawn.

Sir F. Thesiger said he was ready to do so, as the motion had now served its purpose (hear.)

The motion was then formally withdrawn.

Mr. B. Osborne asked the hon. and learned member whether it was his intention to move the motion again on Monday (hear.)

Sir F. Thesiger—I am afraid, if I answer the hon. gentleman's question, I shall be considered out of order (loud cheers from the opposition benches.)

The incident then closed and the House went into Committee of Supply.

JULY 26.

ALDERMAN SALOMONS' CLAIM TO SIT.

The House on Monday presented a most extraordinary scene, recalling to mind the episodes common to the proceedings of the Legislative Assembly of France.

The Speaker introduced the subject by reading a letter which he had received from Alderman Salomons, in which the latter requested that the minutes of the proceedings of Friday be amended. "Immediately after I had taken the oaths," said the Alderman "I read from a paper which I held in my hand the

following words:—"I have now taken the oaths in the form and with the ceremonies that I declare to be binding on my conscience, in accordance with the statute 1 and 2 Victoria, cap. 105. I now demand to subscribe the oath of abjuration and to declare to my property qualification." No notice has been taken on the proceedings above referred to of my having made this demand."

The Speaker said that these remarks having been made after he had ordered the Alderman to withdraw, it was not thought right to enter them upon the record.

The order of the day for "further proceeding on administering the oath of abjuration to David Salomons, Esq.," having been read,

Sir B. Hall—who seems to have thought that the bare act of sitting was sufficient to create the liability—then rose, and asked Lord J. Russell whether the Government meant to institute a prosecution against the Alderman for taking his seat?

His lordship intimated that, "at present, they were not disposed to think they ought to prosecute for the offence."

Thereupon Sir B. Hall declared that the only course left open, in the opinion of the Alderman's advisers, was for him to come within the Bar, and to take his seat at once.

Alderman Salomons immediately acted upon this suggestion, and seated himself on the front ministerial bench, between Mr. Anstey and Mr. B. Hall.

A scene of noise and confusion ensued, during which Lord J. Russell in vain endeavored to get a hearing.

At length the Speaker said, "I ought to explain to the House, that if the hon. member refuses to obey the order of the Speaker, it is for the House to support the Speaker. The Speaker's order can only be enforced by a vote of the House."

Lord J. Russell then said, "It is for the purpose of supporting the chair that I rise. It seems to me, Sir, perfectly clear, and it is a matter on which I will not waste any words, that the House ought to support the Speaker. I do not believe that the Speaker has authority to enforce the order that he has given, without a regular motion being brought before the House; and, therefore, I now move that Mr. Alderman Salomons be ordered to withdraw from the House."

Mr. Osborne moved, by way of amendment, that Alderman Salomons, having taken the oaths in the manner most binding on his conscience, was entitled to take his seat.

He was seconded by Mr. Anstey, who, after speaking a short time, suddenly moved the adjournment of the House.

A division took place, and the Member elect voted with the minority.

Mr. Osborne's amendment was negatived by 229, against 81.

Upon the original resolution being put,

Mr. Anstey moved the adjournment of the debate, which was seconded by Mr. Bright.

Lord J. Russell could not agree to the adjournment. The House must come to a decision on the question, whether the honorable Member for Greenwich should withdraw. It was his intention to make a motion similar in terms to that which was passed last year in the case of the Baron Rothschild. He did not, however, wish that the House should come to an immediate decision, and he should be ready to make the motion on the following day, but of course if the hon. Member for Greenwich should not pay respect to the decision of the House other measures must be taken.

Mr. Hobhouse called on Alderman Salomons to state the course he meant to pursue.

Mr. Alderman Salomons said he had adopted the course he had, not from disrespect to the House, but in defence of his own rights and privileges, and of those of his constituents who had elected him—"Having said this," he added, "whatever the decision of this House may be, I shall willingly abide by it, provided there be just sufficient force used to make me feel that I am acting under coercion. With these sentiments I shall not further intrude myself on this House, except to say this, that I trust, and I do hope on the doubtful state of the law, such as it has been described to you by the eminent lawyers who have addressed you, no severe measures will be adopted against me and my constituents without giving me the fairest opportunity of addressing this House, and of stating to this House and the country what I believe to be my rights and those of my constituents; what I believe to be the duty of this House, and what I believe this House will never refuse, what no Court refuses to the meanest subject of the realm—that of hearing him before their final decision."

Lord J. Russell, whilst praising the temper with which the hon. gentleman had spoken, regretted he could not comply with his request for a full hearing. The authority of the House must be supported. He was willing, however, to postpone the consideration of the question till to-morrow.

After an energetic speech from Mr. Osborne, the House divided on the motion for adjournment—

For the adjournment, 75; against it, 237; majority, 162.

The House then divided on the original motion, that Mr. Alderman Salomons do withdraw.

For the motion, 231; against it, 81; majority for the motion, 150.

The Speaker then called upon Mr. Alderman Salomons, pursuant to the resolution of the House, to withdraw.

Mr. Alderman Salomons still retained his seat.—The Speaker directed the Sergeant-at-Arms to move Mr. Alderman Salomons below the bar. The Sergeant-at-Arms having approached the hon. member for the purpose of carrying the Speaker's orders into effect, the hon. gentleman retired below the bar.

Lord J. Russell then stated that the resolution he should propose the following day would be exactly similar to that he moved in the case of Baron Rothschild.—Adjourned.

HOUSE OF LORDS.—JULY 21.

ECCLESIASTICAL TITLES BILL.

The order of the day for the second reading of this bill having been read,

The Marquis of Lansdowne in moving the second reading said—My lords, I must confess that the duty which I have now to perform is one painful to me in its discharge, because to me, who have been for the last forty years and upwards a strenuous advocate of the claims of my Catholic fellow-countrymen of this United Kingdom, it is most particularly painful to take any course which may be deemed inconsistent with the course that I have hitherto adopted, or in any degree injurious to the feelings and the claims of a

body I so entirely and deeply respect for their many virtues, and, in many instances, for their warm and devoted loyalty.

The Earl of Aberdeen moved that the bill be read a second time that day three months. He observed that he did not expect much sympathy from the House for the conduct he was pursuing, but that he merely desired to give vent to the dictates of his own conscience, and to express his sense of what was due to the cause of truth and justice. Respect was certainly due to the opinions of the majority, yet majorities were not infallible; but when he felt oppressed by the numbers arrayed against him, he thought of the Popish plot, and was comforted. With respect to the measure before the House, he said, that, although it might not appear of extreme severity in its consequences, it was as intolerable, perhaps more intolerable than the civil disabilities from which Catholics were lately freed. Noble Lords were going out of their course, dealing with that which was beyond their control, and thereby inflicting incurable wounds, which will operate on the conscience of Catholics as severely as the former restrictions. "There was no middle course," as Hallam observes, "in dealing with religious sectaries, between the persecution that exterminates, and the toleration that satisfies." For two hundred years, they had done all they could to exterminate, but for the last twenty had tried the effects of toleration. The present bill dealt with matters purely spiritual, for the creation of Catholic Bishops is purely a spiritual act. Did their lordships then mean to refuse to Catholics the government of their Church by Bishops, for if so they could not be said to tolerate the Catholic Church at all; but if they forbade communication with Rome upon this subject, they refused to the Catholics the government of their Church, and consequently refused to tolerate that Church. To speak of Catholic Bishops being created without the authority of the Pope was an absurdity. He asked no more for the Catholic Church than the statute allows to every dissenting Church within the kingdom; nor did he wish to treat it otherwise than as a dissenting Church. The noble Marquis who proposed the second reading of the Bill, spoke of "insults" and "aggression." But what has the Pope done? He has converted Vicars-Apostolic into Bishops in Ordinary, reverting to the original government of the Church, from a system that was irregular and exceptional. "There is no difference, except for the purpose of internal Church government, and regular administration." The Hierarchy is instituted for its own government, but as far as they were concerned, it was no establishment at all, and could operate in no manner whatever upon their interests. This Bill, however, made it "illegal" to put in force, Bulls, nominating Catholic Bishops; declared every person concerned in the receiving or acting upon such a Bull—the Prelate consecrated and the Prelates consecrating—guilty of unlawful acts; these instruments to be null and void, the appointment of the Prelates to be also void. What consequences would follow? All acts, performed by the Prelates as such, would be void; all marriages and ordinations would be null and void. This opened up such a prospect that it was fearful to contemplate the consequences of so arbitrary and tyrannical a measure. He denied that the Queen's supremacy had been violated. Catholics cannot be expected to recognize the Queen as the head of their Church. This supremacy is rejected by the Church of Scotland, and even by the Episcopal Church in Scotland. A few years ago, a new Bishoprerie was founded in Scotland without the slightest reference to the Crown, without the Queen's supremacy being violated. He demanded for the Catholic Bishops, that they should be put upon the same footing as the Protestant Bishops in Scotland, for he could not see upon what principle of justice or common sense it could be otherwise. But even if there had been insult and aggression, Government had done nothing to resent it in the quarter from whence it had emanated, but had, instead, persecuted all their Catholic fellow-subjects. "My Lords," he continued, "I think that the person who has, after all, the most reason to complain, is the Pope himself. (Hear, hear, and a laugh.) For if you had endeavored to entrap him into this act you could not have done differently. (Hear, hear.) The whole course of your legislation has had this tendency. Look to the Bequests Act; not actually describing the Catholic Bishops, but acknowledging the existence of such Bishops and their successors. And the Public Cemeteries Act describes Archbishop Murray as Roman Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, and allows him to appoint successors in that office. (Hear, hear.) And in the colonies you have done exactly what the Pope has done. You have set him the example. You have allowed Catholic Bishops to be appointed in the colonies without any objection, and it is most strange that, after having over and over again done the same thing in other parts of the world, it should have excited so much indignation at home. Again, the honor bestowed on the Catholic Prelates in Ireland must have indicated to the See of Rome a disposition encouraging the act complained of—(hear)—which I maintain was perfectly regular, usual, and ordinary. (Hear, hear.) The noble earl (the Earl of Clarendon) the Lord Lieutenant, wrote a letter, in which he expresses such profound respect for his Holiness—(Hear, hear, and a laugh)—that the Pope might well venture on such a step. But of all the persons who have encouraged this act the First Lord of the Treasury is the most important. (Hear.) He has done everything that was possible to induce the Pope to think that he was committing no offence against the Queen or the country. In 1814 the noble lord said, "You have provided by statute that the Catholic Bishops shall not assume the titles of any dioceses—I think that this is a most foolish prohibition." (Hear, hear.) In 1846 the same noble lord says, "As to preventing persons assuming particular titles, nothing can be more absurd and puerile than to keep up such a distinction." It has been said, that this would produce a declaration of war with England. I will not give utterance to any expression of that kind. But this I will say—that if you pass this law, unless it shall become—as I devoutly trust it may become—a dead letter upon the statute-book, you will never see peace between England and Ireland. (Hear, hear.) My lords, the penalties imposed by this bill, if executed in Ireland, will produce consequences which I dread to look at. Just see the effect of this clause, which says that any one receiving those Bulls shall be visited by a penalty, to be recovered by action, with the consent of the Attorney-General. Here may be a refractory Priest, a man censured by his Bishop; he goes and informs against this Bishop for having received Bulls from Rome. In hundreds of cases this would open the door to vexation and torment, and