FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE.

FRANCE.

ANNIVERSARY OF THE JULY INSURRECTION.—A funeral ceremony took place on Tuesday morning, at half-past eleven o'clock, in the Church of St. Paul, Rue St. Antoine, in commemoration of the persons who fell during the insurrection of July, 1830, and of the last day of which this is the Anniversary. The ceremony consisted of a Low Mass, and the chanting of the *Dies iræ* and the other dirges appropriated in the Catholic ritual to the departed. Between 200 and 300 persons, chiefly of the working classes, were present. After the service the survivors of the insurrection of July, and the persons otherwise interested, walked round the catafalque and sprinkled, each in turn, holy water on it. Amongst the foremost who did so was the aged M. Dupont (de l'Eure.) On quitting the Church you were again asked by a low-sized young man, with rather a barricade cast of face, for something "*Pour les familles des detenus politiques*," and a *Merci, citoyen*," repaid you for the additional two sous you gave in favor of the democracy militant. The whole affair passed off in the coldest and most unexciting manner.

A man who took part in the dreadful scenes of the first Revolution, named Pala, formerly deputy-judge at the revolutionary tribunal, has just died at Liege, aged eighty-eight. Fouquier-Tinville made him first one of his secretaries, and afterwards deputy-judge. He was present at the trial of Marie-Antoinette. His opinions in his old age were quite opposed to those of his youth.

On Tuesday the Assembly adopted, by 420 to 230 votes, the prorogation from the 10th August to the 4th November.

The Legitimist party are making an effort to come to an understanding with Louis Napoleon, in the hope of preventing him from becoming a still more important personage from the resistance of the National Assembly. The announcement by some of the Orleanists of a wish to put the Prince de Joinville in nomination for the Presidency of the Republic has had great effect on the Legitimists, but still greater effect has been produced by the information that they have received from the clergy in the Legitimist departments, that the feeling there is favorable to Louis Napoleon, and that the most influential persons are of opinion that the true policy of the party is to continue the provisional government in his hands by co-operating with him on fixed conditions, instead of running the risk either of an election in his favor, which would give him supreme power, or of permitting the Orleanists to bring in the Prince de Joinville, or permitting the Red Republicans and Socialists to avail themselves of the divisions in the party of order to get into power, and by their schemes reduce to nothing the value of property, and produce a state of anarchy, against which the Count de Chambord has urged his friends to contend, even though anarchy should be regarded by them as the surest step to a restoration.

M. Guizot, too, it seems, has materially modified his opinions about Louis Napoleon.

ITALY.

The *Giornale di Roma* of the 16th, in noticing the return of the Pope from Castel Gandolfo, states that the moment the report became current that his Holiness was expected, a crowd of persons of all classes went out a considerable distance on the road to meet him. The Appian road was covered with carriages, and from the Clemiente Gate to the Vatican the streets were filled by a dense crowd, who received the Pope with the greatest respect, and implored his Apostolic blessing. In the evening the city was illuminated.

ELECTORATE OF HESSE.

An extraordinary spectacle was witnessed at Cassel, in Electoral Hesse, on the 24th instant. The President and six judges of the Criminal Tribunal of Rothenburg appeared at the bar in their robes, before a court martial, composed chiefly of Bavarian officers, to be tried for having in October last condemned a public functionary, named Faber, to three months' imprisonment, for having violated the constitution of 1848, though at that time the indictment alleged the constitution had virtually been abolished. The court-martial condemned the seven judges to eight months' imprisonment. The condemnation created great sensation in the town.

THE RUSSIAN DEFEAT IN THE CAUCASUS.

Letters from Warsaw say the defeat of General Neisterow at Serebickow, and the flight of the Russians on the plains of Tiflis is more than true. The loss of the army in men, ammunition, weapons, and horses, is far greater than has been sustained for years; nearly all the strongholds which had been conquered and maintained at such an immense expense have been again lost. Report adds that one of the commanders of the Hungarian campaigns is to be commander-in-chief of the Caucasian army.

INDIA.

Advices in anticipation of the overland mail are from Calcutta the 12th, and Bombay the 25th June.

From the extremity of Simla to the prominence of Cape Comorin, tranquillity the most profound pervades the continent of India.

A good deal of attention has been excited by some proceedings calculated to open up the Hindoo conversion question. In Calcutta a very large and influential meeting of Brahmins and Hindoos was lately held, for the purpose of devising means whereby the re-admission of converted Hindoos to their caste privileges might be rendered possible, which now it is not, except on the terms of wandering about as a Fakir for forty-eight years. After a long discussion, it was agreed on the part of the Brahmins that a fine should constitute the principal condition of re-admission to the forfeited privileges of caste. This is one of the first consequences of the act of the Indian legislature, whereby a Hindoo or a Mahomedan convert to Christianity was maintained in all his social rights, notwithstanding the rules of their respective religions pronounced them to have forfeited property, family, and every other claim, by reason of their conversion. The act in question has been brought into operation at Madras in a very striking manner by Sir W. W. Barton, one of the judges of the Supreme Court there, bringing before him the wife of a converted Hindoo, who had been abstracted from her husband by her own family, and, in the face of a multitude of Hindoo fanatics, giving her up to the custody of her husband, who, he decided, had not forfeited his rights over her by abjuring his religion. This decision has occasioned a great sensation among the native Hindoo population.

IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.—JULY 28.

THE CASE OF MR. ALDERMAN SALOMONS.

The discussion on the case of Mr. Alderman Salomons came on shortly after the commencement of the sitting.

After the Speaker had read a letter from Alderman Salomons, stating that two actions at law had been commenced against him to recover penalties for sitting and voting in that House.

Sir Benjamin Hall moved that the electors of Greenwich be heard at the bar in support of the right of their Member-elect to take his seat. He dwelt upon the justice and expediency of permitting the claim to be fully and formally developed, and he named Wilkes's case as an instance in which one House of Commons had rightly and properly rescinded the resolutions of a preceding one.

The motion was opposed by the Attorney-General, Mr. Newdegate, Sir F. Thesiger, Sir R. Inglis, and Lord J. Russell. Their main ground was that no new light could be thrown on the question, since an infinity of learned gentlemen had been already heard on it.

The motion was defeated by 135 against 75.

The adjourned debate on Lord John Russell's resolution in regard to Mr. Salomons was resumed by Mr. Anstey, who moved as an amendment the addition of words to the effect that the House, having regard to the religious scruples of Mr. Salomons, would use its undoubted right to make such an alteration in the Oath of Abjuration as would enable Mr. Salomons to take and subscribe it. In a long speech (in the course of which he twice had occasion to deny that he was "speaking against time,") he supported this amendment, concluding by announcing his intention to press it to a division.

Mr. Headlam opposed the amendment, which (after some observations from Mr. John Evans) was negatived by 88 to 50; majority against it, 38.

Mr. Bethell entreated Lord John Russell not to tarnish his former reputation by pressing his proposed resolution, and strongly recommended the House to hold over its decision upon the legal question until the judgment of a court of law should have been given.

Lord J. Russell (in reply) remarked upon Mr. Bethell's having availed himself, in a purely legal question, of every argument except one derived from law. Having defended his own conduct in reference to the subject, his lordship said that, though perfectly willing that the opinion of a court of law should be taken upon any question which could properly come before it, he could not see how it could be a case for such a court, whether a Member of that House had or had not duly taken the requisite oaths.

Mr. Anstey delivered an energetic address against the resolution, and the conduct of Government.

Mr. J. Abel Smith also opposed it, warning the House that the question would come before it again and again until the Jews should attain their rights.

The House then divided, and the numbers were:—for Lord J. Russell's resolution, 123; against it, 68; majority for declaring Mr. Salomons incapable of sitting, 55.

HOUSE OF LORDS—JULY 29.

THE ECCLESIASTICAL TITLES ASSUMPTION BILL.

The Marquis of Lansdowne moved the third reading of this Bill, upon which

The Earl of Aberdeen repeated his objections to the measure, urging that it was most unsatisfactory and irrational. The discussions which had taken place had certainly not removed the apprehensions he entertained of its evil consequences, nor shaken his opinion of its radical injustice and intolerance. He should place upon the journals of the House his reasons for dissenting from the measure, leaving it for those who came after him to decide whether his apprehensions were well-founded, or whether they were only imaginary.

The Bishop of Oxford, the Duke of Argyle, Earl Fortescue, and the Earl of Glengall, supported the Bill; Lord Stuart de Decies, Earl Nelson, and the Marquis of Sligo, protested against it. After some further debate, the Bill was read the third time.

Upon the question that it do pass,—Lord Monteagle proposed a clause to the effect that Roman Catholic Bishops should take the titles by which they were designated in the Charitable Bequests Act.

The Marquis of Lansdowne said there was no necessity for the clause. No person, he thought, would be disposed to refuse that sanction and authority to Roman Catholic Bishops which had already been given to them by Act of Parliament.

The amendment was withdrawn, and the Bill passed. The House then adjourned.

THE ECCLESIASTICAL TITLES BILL.

PROTESTS AGAINST RECEIVING THE REPORT OF THE ECCLESIASTICAL TITLES BILL.

Dissentient—1. Because, while ready to uphold and to defend the rights and prerogative of our most gracious Sovereign and the honor and the independence of our country against all aggression, we do not feel ourselves justified in supporting a bill which trenches on that religious freedom which her Majesty has been pleased to assure us "it is her desire and firm determination, under God's blessing, to maintain unimpaired"—which it has been the object of the legislature during the last sixty years to extend and to secure and which now happily forms a fundamental part of our constitution, and is inseparably bound up with our civil liberties.

2. Because it is irreconcilable with the spirit and with the letter of the Roman Catholic Relief Act to impose new and to increase existing penalties, falling exclusively on the members of one religious communion; and our objection to this fatal course is augmented when it is announced that this bill may lead to other measures of a similar character, in case the stringency of its provisions is not found sufficient to answer the purpose of its framers.

3. Because we view with alarm the declaratory enactments of this bill, undefined, as they are, in their legal consequences, rendering solemn antecedent acts and public instruments unlawful and void, and rendering unlawful and void likewise all the "jurisdiction, authority, pre-eminence, or title," derived from such acts and instruments.

4. Because these alarms are increased from the want of any clear definition in this bill fixing the incidents and the limits of its penalties, thus creating all the dangers which must ever attend vague and uncertain laws, exposing the Roman Catholic laity to wrong and privation, interfering with the jurisdiction of the Ecclesiastical functions of the Roman Catholic Clergy, and leaving it a matter of grave doubt whether both parties may not be exposed to criminal prosecution as well as to civil penalty.

5. Because it is irreconcilable with the wise policy of late years, shown in the repeal of barbarous penalties contained in ancient and intolerant laws, to revive and give robustness and energy to a severe penal statute, passed nearly 500 years back, enforced only once since its enactment, and that in the year 1607, in a case which we are informed is of doubtful authority.

6. Because we cannot reconcile the Charitable Bequests Act, which recognises the *status* and existence of Roman Catholic Archbishops and Bishops, and their successors, officiating and exercising Episcopal functions in Ireland, with this bill, which interferes directly with the appointment of such Archbishops and Bishops, and declares the official instruments and official acts required for such appointments, as well as "all jurisdiction, authority, pre-eminence, or title" derived therefrom, to be unlawful and void. Nor is this difficulty removed by the saving clause, which leaves it doubtful whether the fourth section may not defeat other portions of the bill, or whether the general import of the bill may not deprive that saving clause of its efficacy.

7. Because it seems illogical, inexpedient and unjust, when the Rescript or Letters-Apostolic of the Pope of the 29th of September, 1850, are relied on as the cause and justification of this bill, that we should extend its restraints to a part of her Majesty's dominions to which that Rescript has not any possible application.

8. Because it has been admitted in debate, on high legal authority, that the penalties of this bill are limited to what are described as being "pretended sees," while other sees or districts are subjected only to the less severe provisions of the 10th George IV., chap. 7.

It therefore follows that a different state of law will exist in England and in Ireland, as well as in different parts of Ireland, producing anomalies and contradictions incompatible with sound legislation; the severity of the law and its penalties not varying according to the geographical limits within with such imputed offence may have been committed.

9. Because, if such be true, as has been stated in debate by the supporters of this bill, that if it becomes a law it cannot be carried into effect, but must remain "a dead letter," we consider that it is still more inconsistent with sound legislation to pass a bill which, without giving any security whatever, tampers with all the principles of all religious feeling, creates discontent and alarm, and by bringing the law into contempt lessens its force and rightful authority.

10. Because a determined resistance has been offered to all suggestions made during the progress of the bill for the correction even of obvious and verbal errors, as well as for the amendment of certain provisions of which no justification has been attempted; and because the reason assigned for taking this course, arising from the possible inconvenience and delay apprehended if this bill were returned to the House of Commons, is inconsistent with the free deliberations of this house, and derogatory to its just rights and authority as a branch of the legislature.

11. Because, upon these grounds, we cannot but consider the passing of this bill to be most inexpedient and most unjust. We consider it ill-adapted to protect either the prerogative of the crown or the independence of our country, while calculated to revive civil strife and sectarian dissensions; we protest against it, likewise, as a departure from those high principles of religious liberty to which our greatest statesmen have devoted their intellect, their genius, and their noble exertions.

MONTEAGLE of Brandon.
VAUX of Harrowden.
LOVAT.
CAMOYS.
MONTEAGLE (M. of Sligo).
ROSSIE (Kinnaird).
FINGALL.
CHARLEMONT.
LEITRIM.
PETRE.

Dissentient.—1. Because no such measure as the present is consistent either with justice or expediency.

2. Because the bill appears to have been mainly dictated by the excitement which has recently prevailed—an excitement which it was the duty of the government and the legislature rather to allay than to encourage. An attempt to interfere with doctrine by act of parliament is not likely to fail, but may even promote what it is intended to repress.

3. Because it is most unreasonable and inconsistent to profess to grant full toleration to the Roman Catholic religion, and, at the same time, to prohibit that species of communication with the See of Rome which is indispensable for its perfect discipline and government.

4. Because the undue assumption of power involved in the terms of the Papal Rescript of the 29th of September, 1850, and of other documents connected therewith, however justly open to exception, can supply no reason for depriving her Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects of a regular and ordinary part of their Ecclesiastical organisation.

5. Because the appointment of Ecclesisstical officers is essentially a matter of religious concern; and although it may be expedient in particular cases that such appointment should be under the control or influence of the civil power--and although it is the undoubted duty of the legislature to provide that no temporal powers are exercised, and no temporal rights impaired, under the pretext of Ecclesiastical regulation, yet to restrain a religious community not established by law in the management of its religious concerns, otherwise than by confining them within the sphere of religion, is inconsistent with the spirit of all our recent legislation. Such restraint involves the principle, and may lead to the practice of religious persecution.

6. Because the act of the 10th George IV., chap. 7, which for the first time since the Reformation secured to the Roman Catholic subjects of the crown an equality of political rights, constituted a solemn expression of the intention of the legislature, and a pledge to the Roman Catholic community that they should thenceforward enjoy a full religious toleration.

7. Because the 24th section of the 10th George IV., which prohibits all persons others than those thereunto authorised by law, from assuming the titles of Archbishops, Bishops, and Deans of the National Church, affords no precedent for this bill, inasmuch as the former simply defends from invasion certain known legal titles already appropriated, and importing high dignities and valuable rights, whereas the latter amounts to the total prohibition of a Diocesan Episcopate.

8. Because the penal provisions of this bill not only differ in the above named respect from those of the 10th of George IV., but they differ further to the prejudice of our Roman Catholic fellow-subjects, inasmuch as they are preceded by recitals and declarations of law, concerning which the 10th George IV. was silent, whereby a new and extended construction may be given both to the penal provisions of this measure, and likewise retroactively to those of the 10th George IV.

9. Because the ancient statutes against the exercise of a foreign jurisdiction, or restrictive of the importation of Bulls, Briefs, and Rescripts, which are cited in justification of the present bill, are unavailable for such a purpose. Those statutes have long been suffered to remain in desuetude. If now revived, they may be found to assert powers for the crown which would be destructive of the religious liberties secured to Protestant Dissenters as well as Roman Catholics. They have no special reference to the establishment of provinces or sees, or to the assumption of titles, but are equally and indifferently directed against all exercise of jurisdiction, whether by diocesan Bishops or by Vicars-Apostolic, and are, therefore, incompatible with our recognised principles of toleration and religious freedom.

10. Because there is a peculiarly harsh and ungracious character in the present prohibition of diocesan government of the Roman Catholic community; as it is not disputed that at various periods from the Reformation down to a recent date, the Secular Clergy, and more especially the Roman Catholic laity, have sought for the introduction among themselves of a diocesan Episcopacy, with the approval and encouragement of the British government.

11. Because there are presumptive grounds for believing that the late measures of the Pope have been adopted under the persuasion that, if he should do what in his judgment was requisite for the spiritual wants and interests of his own communion, the advisers of the crown not only would have no desire, but had in fact publicly disclaimed all intention and all title to interfere.

12. Because this bill, while it professes to refer to Roman Catholic titles, enacts a further and wholly gratuitous interference with religious freedom, by forbidding the assumption of Episcopal titles on the part of any other persons than the Prelates of the Established Church and the Prelates of the Scottish Episcopal Communion. By the exception from its provisions of the last-named Prelates, who are appointed independently of the Royal authority, the bill plainly admits that the appointment of Bishops is in its essence a spiritual matter, and thereby condemns its own principal provisions.

13. Because it is inexpedient to protect the rights of the Episcopate established by law, by needless and unjust restraints upon the religious freedom of others. Such protection is likely to weaken rather than to strengthen the National Church in its proper office of maintaining and enlarging its influence over the people by moral and spiritual means.

14. Because the bill, besides being unjust in principle, greatly endangers the peace and harmony of the various classes of her Majesty's subjects in the United Kingdom, and especially in Ireland. Should the measure be carried into actual operation, it may engender the most serious political and social evils; while if it should be put in force against the use of titles openly assumed, its introduction into the statute-book will have tended to disparage the dignity of parliament and the authority of the law.

GORDON (Aberdeen).
NEWCASTLE.
CANNING.
ST. GERMANS.
WHARNCLIFFE.
LYTTLETON.
MONTEAGLE of Brandon.

THE LAW OF MORTMAIN.

In the course of the proceedings of the Committee to which the question is referred, it became necessary to secure the attendance of his Eminence the Archbishop of Westminster, in order to ascertain from him, as the best exponent of their views, the feelings of the Catholic body in reference to these laws as they at present exist.

Cardinal Wiseman was examined before the Committee on Thursday afternoon by the Chairman, who stated that he was called upon, as the most likely person to express the sentiments of the Catholics of England, to give his opinion as to their feelings in reference to the laws which at present affected charitable trusts. Did Cardinal Wiseman apprehend that there was any feeling among the Roman Catholics of England opposed or adverse to the existing laws of Mortmain?

In answer to these and other interogatories, Cardinal Wiseman said that he knew of no unfavorable feeling on the part of the Catholic body in reference to these laws, unless it were to that portion of them which referred to money bequeathed for 'superstitious uses.' What was termed a 'superstitious use' by the Established Church would not be considered so by Catholics, particularly in referring to bequests for prayers or masses for the dead. The money so bequeathed, if a small sum, or personally left to any priest, would go to him only, but larger sums were invested in the names of trustees, either for the foundation or endowment of some new church, or for the maintainance of some spiritual work in connexion with an existing church. He saw no legal reason why the laws affecting charitable trusts should not be the