

The cry of the advanced Reformer is that the State should by persuasion of force take the land from its present owners, hundreds of whom have purchased it within the last twenty years with the hard earnings of their lives, and should give it more or less completely to those who have no other title than that they happen to be the occupiers for the time. All these schemes agree in this—that the State is to assume gigantic liabilities, to become an universal money lender, an universal landlord, an universal surety against loss to anybody—in other words, that the people of Great Britain and all the propertied classes in Ireland shall be heavily taxed, or shall increase the National Debt, in order to create innumerable petty holders of land, each of whom will be continually in debt to the State, and over each of whom the State must exercise the minute supervision of a creditor and a landlord. It is such a scheme were put into practice, can there be any doubt of the result? It is certain that no legal machinery could prevent these semi-independent occupiers from subdividing and sub-letting their patches of ground, and thus reproducing the evil of the old time—a swarming population with a wretched subsistence from the soil. A still more important matter to the English people, whose money is to enable the State to do all this, is that it is morally certain nine-tenths of what ever is advanced would be totally lost. How is the State to make its tenants pay rent or instalments of purchase money, except by the same process that the landlord uses—by distress, and in the last resort eviction? And who can doubt that any attempt of the Government to enforce the claims of the Treasury would be met with the fiercest obduracy and the most dogged resistance, until at last all claims for repayment would have to be abandoned? These proposals do in reality simply mean that the English people are to spend untold sums in order to give the land to the Irish peasants for nothing. We have not got to that yet. Fenianism may be a troublesome thing, but it is not so dangerous that it should terrify us out of our reason. This conspiracy, which has led to such wild and reckless proposals, is but a temporary malady; it will pass away under firm and vigorous treatment, and with it will pass away, we believe, the revolutionary schemes to which it has given rise. What these are, we will still remain. The anomaly of the Irish Church must be redressed. The right of the tenant to the value of all he has done for the soil must be enforced by Parliament, and it may be that the relations of landlord and tenant can be improved by legislation. But it can never be admitted that there is anything so exceptional in the state of Ireland that Irishmen's rights should become our wrongs. We believe the Irish people are not so unreasonably as their self-constituted advocates represent. Doubtless he who tells the most ignorant class that they are oppressed, and that they have a right to the land which another man has inherited or bought, will always have plenty of hearers, and it may gratify them to attribute their own poverty and equal to Cromwell and William and Protestant ascendancy. But there are as sensible men in Ireland as are to be found in any country in the world, and of late years fairness and tolerance—rare virtues formerly—have made their way. The best Irish know that what Ireland wants most is quiet. It requires another fifteen years like those which elapsed between Smith O'Brien's rebellion and the American War—a period during which, in spite of traditional grievances, Ireland made greater progress than ever was known in her history. If the House of Commons were to pledge itself to every word of Lord Arthur Clinton's Resolutions, which come on to night, it would not perform a greater service to Ireland than if it were to determine that the social regeneration of Ireland which is now in progress shall not be interrupted. Judgment and firmness must be united with the spirit of conciliation; and Parliament will have better advisers than those who first encourage discontent by representing political anomalies and legal defects as systematic oppression, and who then use that discontent as a means to the British people. —Times.

THE TORY GOVERNMENT AND IRELAND.—Parliament met last week for the despatch of business, and almost the first act of Lord Mayo was to bring up in a bill for the further Suspension of the Habeas Corpus Act, which he said would be used in a careful and moderate manner. The same Act has been very often suspended in Ireland and what has its suspension done to make the people in love with the rule practised over them? I was thought that Mr. Disraeli would make some declaration respecting the course he intends pursuing relative to several Irish questions of great importance, but so far he has kept silent. It is stated that we are to get a reform bill and that whilst the franchise in the boroughs is to be lowered to 4l or 5l, the 12l franchise in the counties will be retained. This is rather a strange way to reform the elective franchise. If it is to be lowered in the boroughs to 4l, why should it not be reduced to 5l or 6l in the counties? We think the county electors are entitled to have their condition fully considered, for they are worse represented than the boroughs and require power to select representatives who will fully carry out their views in parliament. But no matter how the franchise is dealt with, our opinion is, that most of the county elections will be nothing more than farces, unless the electors are protected by the Ballot. So far the government have not expressed their views on the tenant right question, but next week, in the discussion of Mr. Maguire's motion on the condition of Ireland, Lord Mayo is to speak on the important subject. There is a rumour afloat that it will be referred to a commission, and if this be true, we have no doubt that such a proposition will lead to the defeat of the government. The land question is one of a vital nature for Ireland. She is looking for a settlement for the past twenty-seven years Year after Year she hoped for success, but every succeeding session has dashed the cup from her lips. We hoped that the present government would have the wisdom to throw the shield of a just land code over the Irish farmers, but so far they have not done so. And if they attempt to solve the question for another year or two, by appointing a Commission, to hear evidence on what every man in Ireland is well acquainted with they cannot expect the support of the country. They have a grand opportunity now to conciliate our people, and next week we shall learn what they resolve to do on the subject. If they commence to shuffle or devise plans for delay, they may at the same time make up their minds for an inglorious defeat.—Dundalk Democrat.

The Dublin Correspondent of the Times writes.—The declaration of the Roman Catholic faith contradicting the assertion that they do not feel aggrieved at the present ecclesiastical settlement of Ireland, and in favour of 'religious equality,' is now re-published with the additional signatures which have been obtained since its first issue, about two months ago. The signatures include the names of 12 peers, four privy councillors, four honourables, 88 deputy-lieutenants and members of Parliament, 320 justices of the peace, nearly all the Roman Catholic members of the Bar, a large number of aldermen and councillors connected with the several corporations, as well as private gentlemen in different parts of the country. There are altogether nearly 1,000 names attached, and the list presents a formidable muster-roll against the hosts of the 'Central Protestant Defence Association.'

THE DEFENDERS OF THE ESTABLISHMENT.—The London Review accepts it as a fact that the Irish Established Church is a thing regarded as an evil by those who are bound to it by collateral sympathies, and that it has no friends save a few faithful believers in obsolete bigotries, and upholders of such historical statements as the Battle of the Boyne and No Popery. The Central Protestant Defence Association put forth their most active energies on a recent occasion. The preliminary convention in Hillsborough proving unsuccessful, it was thought that a move to the metrop-

polis of Ireland, and vigorous whipping in of patrons would bring about a more imposing display—but the association literally reckoned without its host. The correspondent of a contemporary enables us to arrive at a true estimate of the representative value of the assembly. In Ireland, he says, there is one Duke; his name is not appended to the resolutions. Out of twelve Marquises but three have signed them. Of sixty-two earls thirteen attach their names. Out of forty-two viscounts four appear on the list. Out of seventy-two barons seventeen patronise this movement, and the sum total is that out of 194 Irish peers only thirty-seven have joined the Protestant Defence Association. When we come to members of Parliament, the new bulwark of the State does not appear to be better off. Out of 105 members, only thirty-three encourage the gentlemen who are anxious to maintain the Established Church in its sphere of integrity and usefulness. Therefore we may consider this concern to have broken down on the very threshold of its action.

IRISH RAILWAYS.—Lord Ernie writes to the Irish papers to give his opinion, as a large holder of Irish railway shares, on the subject of a purchase of the lines by the government. His lordship warns shareholders to be on their guard, and to let the Government know that they are not indifferent to the effect which the settlement of that question must have upon the value of their property. The public (Lord Ernie thinks) will care little for the pockets of the shareholders as long as they get reduced fares and increased accommodation. He has not noticed the names of persons holding shares in any extent, in connexion with the purchase movement. Those by whose money many Irish railways were constructed have already been losers to a large amount by the nonpayment of dividends; is it fair that these should be called upon to suffer the loss and far greater loss which must ensue should government become purchasers of their stock at a price now depreciated by circumstances over which they had no control? Lord Ernie adds that he could mention many causes of this temporary depression of railway stock, such as a succession of bad seasons, Fenianism, a former tightness of the money market, all which are being speedily removed. He hopes the entire subject will be thoroughly ventilated at the forthcoming half yearly meetings.—Pall Mall Gazette.

GREAT BRITAIN.

THE 'TIMES' ON CONVOCATION.—Convocation has been once more discharging, with a perseverance that seems to care not for results, its annual interchange of pious wishes and religious ideas. It would be presumption to deny all utility or purpose to a labor of love, performed by so many good and able men with characters to lose and positions to maintain, always in some danger of committing themselves by a rash word, and without the slightest chance of reaping the harvest they are sowing, unless indeed they should suddenly find they have been sowing the wind, and are reaping the whirlwind. As they, or most of them, fondly believe, there is a spiritual toil. Deprived of all legislative and creative power they are striving to conjure up in the world of thought an ideal Church, the various parties each according to its respective predilection. Before the threatened break-up of our institutions they hope to stamp their own pattern of holy things well on the mind of Churchmen, and this can only be done by speeches and arguments, by presenting petitions, alleging grievances, and setting up one scandal against another, to establish at least a balance of pretensions and grievances. Such is the explanation due to men who are doing what they can, and who are not to blame if they cannot do more, or rather, if they can, in fact, do nothing at all. Unfortunately, they cannot even agree; but this does not diminish the necessity which lies on every side to advance its own ideal. It is a race to be won with swiftness, courage, and strength. Each one rides—we must not call it his own hobby, for each one thinks his principles vital and paramount; but never was there wider divergence or stronger antagonism on so sacred a field as that which is supposed to compromise all our hopes for time and eternity.—The Upper House has been chiefly employed upon a modest attempt made by the Bishop of London to establish the principle that each clergyman is not to choose for himself his ritual observances, either as to the amount or the kind. That there should be even occasions for such a suggestion will astonish the outer world. No doubt, however, at this moment there are thousands of churches in want of a such check upon Ritualistic enterprise. It is evident that the Resolution would only be an appeal to the sense of propriety, carrying with it no more weight than the opinions of the Bishops speaking or voting in its favor. Even as this it has been criticized and challenged, pulled to pieces, and finally mated with an equivoque. Such a rule implied, it was objected, that it had a foundation in the fact of a general uniformity being so such fact; or that it was possible to come to some actual uniformity which was impossible; or that the Bishops were generally agreed, which they were not; or that the existing law could accomplish a uniformity, which it could not; or that it could not accomplish a uniformity, which remains to be proved; or that the question was not fairly open to historical investigation; or that Ritualism was to have less justice done it than preaching, in which a large liberty was now cheerfully conceded by common agreement; or that the Resolution assumed a lighted candle to be a greater error than an unsonneted doctrinal statement. Finally, a diluted form of this exceedingly mild Resolution, itself a matter of course in any other Church, was adopted with the pendent that uniformity had regard to defects as well as excesses; and that if too much was wrong, too little was wrong also, and none worse still. Such was the discussion carried on within sound, as it were, of the tremendous and costly conflicts in the Courts of Law, for which many thousand pounds have been subscribed, for which clergymen are staking all their means and all their happiness, and which other searlets on both sides, will always be found to take up. Ritualism is only an engine of warfare. It is employed as the proper defence, and most stinging retaliation, not only against what is called anti-ritualism and mere slovenliness, but against Evangelicalism, rationalism, and modern freedom of thought. A clergyman is allowed to publish peculiar views on inspiration, eternity of punishment, and to explain away mysteries. So, instead of refuting him or moving the Bishop with a view to legal proceedings, the neighboring clergy light candles, wear stoles of quaint device, make processions, and practise movements and gestures supposed to have the sanction of an unknown antiquity. When people complain, the answer is, 'Why don't you complain of Mr. So and So, who explains away our faith altogether? Which is worse, a gilt cross or no cross at all, emblem or reality? Such is the war in which the Altar, the Pulpit, and the Reading-desk are played one against another, while it is only too evident that Convocation only adds fuel to the flame, and that every year new men are throwing themselves into the fray, if only because they have to figure in debates at the Queen Anne's Bounty-office and the Jerusalem Chamber. The Lower House has entered on the Session with the advantage of not having been in the slightest degree committed to the proceedings of the Pan-Anglican Synod. The most questionable of those proceedings was the Primate's letter to the Eastern Patriarchs, and it has various decided, and rather trenchant criticism on one side, as well as friendly succour on the other. There are men in Convocation whose hearts, or whose heads, are so constituted that they can really and honestly believe this letter to be not only legitimate and proper as a formal act, but likely to obtain sympathy and a con-fidanture union with the Greek Church, and a convincing reply to the general belief as to the Church of England's insular position. As nothing has been

said in Convocation as to any answer from the Eastern Patriarchs, the actual results may justify a belief which we confess to think utterly without foundation. Indeed, no sooner was a show of defence made by the latter, than position after position had to be abandoned. Was the Greek Canon less corrupt, as the Church of England counts corruption, than the Church of Rome? No one could venture on such an assertion. Was it more orthodox? It was even less so by Anglican measure, by the creeds on which we stand. But Rome had positively excommunicated us, and would only take our Letter from the postman's hand to fling it into the gutter. The Eastern Church, it was hoped, had not. But it has excommunicated us over and over again, as only a subdivision of the Western Schism. Its members anathematize us solemnly once a year on 'Orthodox Sunday' wherever they may be. It will have nothing to say to us, and, moreover, is not allowed to have anything to say to us, whenever Russia has anything to say to it. In other default of common sense in its favor, the apology fell back on sentiment. The Greek Church was an oppressed Church, which was a special ground of sympathy. The Greek Church was a quiet, inoffensive Church, which attempted no aggression, made no converts, went not out of itself. But there can be no claim to sympathy here, for our Church attacks all other Churches most offensively and makes costly attempts to proselytize all other Christians, and convert the heathen all over the globe.—Then, if we were to write to anybody, why not to the Continental Protestants, who hold our creeds, and have not formally excommunicated us? This comes the greatest difficulty. In one of our creeds we do anathematize all the Eastern Churches, as not holding the entirety of the Catholic faith. Can we go on doing so when we appeal to them for sympathy and concerted action? On the other hand, are we to give up an article battled for for fifteen hundred years just for the sake of the sympathy which we shall never receive, which would not be of the smallest fractional value to us, and which we believe the Russian Church could not offer if it would? What does the offer come to at last but a solemn piece of trifling, without any significance whatever, except to produce a momentary illusion that the Synod had done something? But Convocation, the Lower House especially, has gone too far in the struggle with Dr. Colenso to recede, and men who pity Convocation even less than they would the actual occupant of the See of Natal will still hold it on to the battle. Convocation, they say, has pledged itself to support the successive acts of the Bishop of Capetown, and to find a successor to the deposed and excommunicated Colenso. But how the law stands is now patent to the whole world, and rash indeed would be the man who attempted to set the law at naught, or to evade it by some hole-and-corner contrivance, or by smuggling some episcopal pretender into the diocese of Natal. However, these errors are for the Bishops, and Archdeacons, Proctors, and such small folk may talk about superseding Colenso without incurring the penalties of the Act of Proscription. So, as long as Convocation sits, and when ever it sits again, Colenso will be a safe and standing topic; though, to all present appearances, he will not be the less safe or the less enduring for their discussions.

To popular Protestantism forty years ago Catholicism was odious, absurd, and wicked, by reason of those very observances which are now adopted by a large section of the clergy of the Church of England, and which now in many parishes and country districts are enthusiastically welcomed and followed by the Protestant laity. It was not the Canon of Trent nor the Catechism of the Council which revolted the Protestant prejudices. It was our candles and vestments, our incense and our genuflections. It was prayers for the dead, purgatory, monastic vows, fasting and abstinence, the invocation of saints, and arduous confession. Well, so great is the change that not only all these things the masses, but everything in their direction every thing which suggests them, excites a powerful attraction, is relished and sought after with avidity in England. These things no longer afford Protestants useful topics for invective against us, for they are in vogue among Protestants themselves. Protestant Bishops tell us that the attempts made to check them have increased them. The Bishop of Salisbury says that the Legislature intervenes against them it will break up the Protestant Church. And Dr. Gemming, who finds signs every where where he is not, and in all countries of which he knows nothing, that the Papacy is tottering to its fall, is obliged to make a solitary exception of England, where he lives himself and has an opportunity of judging, and where Popery is making such advances that he actually believes that the great battle will be fought in England. It is, indeed, said by some that the Ritualists prevent conversions to Catholicism because they pacify and satisfy the minds of many who but for their world have become Catholic. It seems to us that that is necessarily a matter of conjecture, and that no means exist of verifying it. But at least these Ritualistic observances familiarize the minds of Protestants with ideas, doctrines and practices, which Catholics believe to be true and salutary and holy. They weaken those national prejudices which we used to consider our most dangerous enemies, and they form a serviceable breakwater for our protection.—Tribune.

Within the last week two of our leading men Earl Russell and Mr. Stuart Mill, have favoured the public with their ideas on the subject. The Daily News describes Mr. Mill's proposal thus.—'The appointment of a commission with compulsory powers to examine every farm in Ireland that is let to a tenant, and to commute the present variable for a fixed rent. The most to be ascertained in each case what annual payment would be an equivalent to the landlord for the rent he now receives, provided that rent be not excessive, and for the present value of whatever prospect there may be of an increase from any other source than the peasant's own exertions. The annual sum should be secured to the landlord under the guarantee of the State. He should have the option of receiving it from the National Treasury by being inscribed as the owner of Consols sufficient to yield that amount. Every farm not farmed by the proprietor would thus become the permanent property of the tenant, who would pay either to the landlord or to the State the fixed rent that had been decided on.' Earl Russell, on the other hand, adopts for the settlement of the Irish Land Question the principle of special protection for Irish tenants, which is common to the bills of Lord Mayo and Mr. O'Connell. With regard to the Church Question, his idea of a modus vivendi is, that out of the existing Church revenues in Ireland the Protestant, Catholic, and Presbyterian Churches ought to be endowed. In Earl Russell's opinion the reduction of the Protestant Episcopal Church to one eighth of the present Church revenues of Ireland would be just and salutary. This is his idea of a modus vivendi, and the only statement fit to undertake its establishment, is in Earl Russell's opinion, Mr. Gladstone's. —Tribune.

DEATH OF MR. JUSTICE SHEE.—The news of Mr. Justice Shee's death was unfortunately only premature. His lordship expired on Wednesday morning at a few minutes past eight o'clock, at his residence in Saxeux place, Hyde Park gardens. On the 7th inst. he discharged his official duties as one of the Justices of the Court of Queen's Bench, and pronounced judgment in at least one important case. The following day he was stricken with illness so serious as to greatly alarm his family and friends. Although he rallied a little, such improvement as he manifested was delusive; for his strength gradually ebbed until his death on Wednesday. His name will be memorable on the roll of English judges as that of the first, in modern times of the Catholic religion. His brilliant career at the bar forced the way to this peculiar distinction, and his elevation to the bench

was an event generally approved. His Lordship was the eldest son of Mr. Thomas Shee of Thomastown County Kilkenny, by the daughter of Mr. John Dorell, of Sotney Castle, Kent. He was born in 1804, and married, in 1837, Miss Gordon, daughter of Sir J. Gordon, Bart., of Gordonstown. The learned judge, who was educated at Dubaw Oathello College, was called to the bar in 1828, and went the Home Circuit, of which he ultimately became the leader. He was created serjeant at law in 1840 and became Queen's serjeant-at-law in 1854. In 1864 he was appointed a judge of the Court of Queen's Bench, on which occasion he was knighted. At the General election in 1847 he was an unsuccessful candidate for Maylebone. In 1852 he was returned to the House of Commons for Kilkenny, which he represented till 1857, and unsuccessfully contested at the General election in that year.

LONDON, March 9.—In the House of Commons this evening, in reply to an enquiry from Mr. J. Harvey Lewis, Mr. Gathorne Hardy, the Home Secretary, stated that the police had been previously informed of the plot for blowing up one of the walls of the Clerkenwell prison, and thereby effecting the release of the Fenian prisoners. Their informer, who was within the prison, was to give them notice when the conspirators approached to light the fuse by throwing a white ball over the wall, whereupon the police were to seize the guilty parties. On the night before the explosion a cask of powder was seen in the street but no attempt was made to blow up the wall that night, the preconcerted signal was not given. The powder was allowed to remain, and no arrests were made. The police supposed that the execution of the plot was postponed to the following evening, and were off their guard when the explosion took place, unexpectedly, during the day.

LONDON, March 11.—In the House of Commons last night a warm debate took place on the condition of Ireland, and the following resolution was introduced, but further consideration thereon was postponed till to-morrow: 'That the discontent of Ireland is a source of uneasiness to the Empire and must be remedied. That laws for Ireland should be framed to suit the wishes of the people. That the present church, school and land tenure systems are unjust; and that, in the opinion of this House these wrongs should be righted.'

LONDON, March 12.—General Dix, the American Minister to France, has arrived in this city, and will remain two or three weeks. It is said, he came on business connected with the question of the Alabama claims.

The Scotch Reform Bill was read a first time on Monday the 17th inst. It makes the burgh franchise similar to the borough franchise in England, i. e., all householders rated and paying their rates will have votes. Lodgers are already provided for in Scotland, where they are entered on the register as tenants.—In counties the ownership house qualification is to be reduced to £5 clear yearly value, as in England. The occupation franchise is to be a rated value of £12. Until 1832, Scotland was represented by 45 members, 30 for counties and 15 burghs. The Reform Bill increased the Scotch representation to 53 for counties and 23 for burghs. It is now to be increased to 60.—Tribune.

Earl Mayo, the Chief Secretary for Ireland, had to submit to the consideration of the House a plan for a new Irish University, the officers of which were to be named by the Catholics, but whose privileges were not to be confined exclusively to Catholics. The House then went into committee and resumed the debate on the grievances of Ireland.

It is reported that a proposition was recently made to Lord Stanley to submit the Alabama claims to the arbitration of Prussia, and that he was willing to entertain the proposition so far as it applied to the question as to indemnity, but he refused to submit the other points to dispute.

Mr. Digby Seymour has received an acknowledgment from the Home Secretary of the Irish local and district address, which Mr. Hardy has had great satisfaction in laying before the Queen, adding that her Majesty has been pleased to receive the same most graciously.—Guardian.

LONDON, March 10.—The Prince of Wales will soon make a visit to Ireland where he is to be made a Knight of the Order of St. Patrick.

The Fenians who were captured at Merthy Tidal in Wales have been indicted for treason, and will be tried at the Swansea Assizes.

UNITED STATES.

THE PROGRESS OF RELIGION.—The official announcement has just been received from Rome, that fourteen new Bishops are to be added to the present number of our American Catholic Hierarchy. During the past week this news has been going the rounds of the papers; so it must, we presume, by this time have reached the ears of every member of the community. Whilst in the announcement itself there is nothing which will seem wonderful to the mind of the Catholic, who is fully convinced that the Church of Christ, being as she is progressive, from the nature of her Divine constitution, must, when left unshackled to her action with the world, advance the work of her heavenly mission in the acquisition of souls. Still to us in particular on this side of the Atlantic, it will not fail to offer a special subject of much consolation.—Catholic Standard.

A TRIBUTE TO THE PAPAL ZONAVES.—From an editorial in the New York Tribune on the Papal Zonaves probably from the pen of our gifted (former) towns woman Mrs. James Sadlier, we extract the following passage:—'A morning of sweet memories, and one long to be remembered, was that we spent in St. Peter's Church, Barclay street, on Saturday last, the 22nd inst., being the Feast of St. Peter's See at Antioch—a remarkable, and we may hope, auspicious coincidence.—while the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass was offered up for the gallant young Canadians who are on their way to join the Pope's army. Bound to Catholic Lower Canada by many and dear ties, cherishing the fondest recollections of the years and days spent amongst the kind, courteous, truly civilized people of that province, it was with no ordinary feelings of pride and joy that we entered St. Peter's Church that morning, and saw half the pews in the nave filled with young Canadians in a plain grey uniform, faced with black. The remaining space was occupied by hundreds of our Catholic people who had come to get a sight of the Canadian volunteers to the Papal army, and assist at the mass offered up for them. The altars were radiant, the Church was solemn and imposing as ever, the faithful crowded around, but nothing was so grand, so impressive, as the gallant corps of Christian soldiers who had left home, and friends, and country, to defend in a far off land the cause of truth and right, and justice,—the cause of religion against infidelity, of civilization against barbarism.'

THE ALABAMA CLAIMS.—The remarkable debate on the Alabama claims which took place in the British Parliament on Friday night, and of which the telegraph gives us a long abstract this morning, ought to convince us that if there is any insuperable obstacle to a speedy settlement of our dispute with England, that obstacle must exist with ourselves. All parties in Great Britain are anxious that the matter should be set at rest. There are very few who are not ready to admit nearly everything we we claim and to appoint a mixed commission immediately to settle the amount of damages. What then is the point of difference between the two Governments? Simply this; Mr. Seward maintains that the British Government acknowledged the rebels as belligerents sooner than it had any right to do so; that this acknowledgment was a material aid and comfort to them; and that an arbitrator must take it into consideration before the indemnity due us can be properly adjusted. Lord Stanley will not admit

this; and so the matter stands. Now whatever may be said of the justice of our position (and it is by no means certain that it is just, for the first person to recognize the Rebels as belligerents was not Queen Victoria but President Lincoln), it ought not to be forgotten that what we really want is not a decision of this question of belligerency, but the payment of damages. Grant that Lord Stanley is right; that the moment any large fragment of a nation takes up arms to assert its independence, all the rest of the world has a right to acknowledge it as a belligerent; who will profit by the admission of the doctrine so much as we ourselves—we who have always been prompt to recognize and encourage popular insurrections against despotic powers? Besides, Mr. Seward, he remembered, does not ask that an umpire shall decide upon the justice of the recognition. He only wants the arbiter to turn the matter over in his mind; to see what bearing it may have upon the question of responsibility, and perhaps the amount of damages. But the responsibility is not seriously denied in England. Many leading statesmen are ready to admit it at the start, and to agree to a mixed commission for settling the claims without further preliminaries. At any rate we risk little or nothing by waiving Mr. Seward's point and leaving history to pronounce upon the precise time when the Southern Confederates became belligerents in the sense of international law. That they acquired belligerent rights in the course of the war nobody denies; that they acquired them before the Alabama was put to sea, we think can hardly be disputed. Mr. Seward's difficulty therefore is mainly a matter of sentiment, and cannot seriously affect the real question at issue, which is the amount of compensation Great Britain ought to make us for the deprivations of cruisers fitted out in her ports and with her connivance. She recognizes the debt, and is willing to pay it. Let us not bicker over the means of getting at the amount, but meet her in a frank and friendly spirit, and a great trouble will be off our minds.

'A Sailor' has written a letter on 'Our Naval Strength' to the Boston Advertiser, in which he makes the following lugubrious confession:—'In these days of Alabama claims and Fenian sympathy it is well to look at the English navy and at ours. Remember that one fast steamer, the Alabama laid up our commerce, and that speed is a desideratum in the war-vessel which is an ocean cruiser. In the British navy the Warrior, Black Prince, Bellerophon and Achilles are types of the largest size of iron built and iron-plated ships of war, of 6,100 tons. They are propelled by engines of 1250 horse power and carry each from 40 to 20 heavy guns. The Hector and Valiant, Defence and Resistance, are types of the medium and smaller sized iron-built and iron-plated ships of war, from 3,700 to 4,100 tons. They carry heavy guns. The Royal Oak, Prince Consort, and Cadonia, of 4,060 tons, 800 to 1,000 horse power engines, carrying 35 heavy guns Armstrong rifles, are types of the largest sized wood-built iron-plated ships. One of this class, the Ocean, was the other day reported at Batavia en route to join the Indian fleet. The Royal Sovereign, of 3,765 tons, an altered wood built ship, has an armament of five guns of large calibre, worked within four turrets. These vessels are types. They and their fellows can keep the sea for months at a time, with no attendants or comforts save water, and can maintain a sustained speed of twelve knots per hour in moderate weather. Twenty of such ships can be let loose in as many days. France also claims our attention, and what is said here of Great Britain may with propriety be ascribed to her. The 'Napoleon Third' and Grand Bretagne are types of iron-clad ships not excelled by any in the world, for speed or defence. What have we as an offset? Nothing. The fleet of monitors cannot go to sea except to dodge along the coast under escort, at six knot speed. Of the straight-sided two turreted ships of the Monadock class, 1,500 tons, 4 guns, there are four at present. Maximum speed at a sprint with several days in the repair shop is the inevitable result, nine knots; sustained speed seven knots. All the others are on the stocks and in the matter of speed will be no better off—seven knots.

GREAT FIRE IN BROOKLYN.—Burning of the Catholic Church of St. Charles Borromeo Brooklyn, was destroyed yesterday morning. The origin of the fire was a defect in one of the chimneys. William Murphy sexton, lighted the fire shortly after midnight, and at 1 o'clock, having closed the dampers, and being satisfied that everything was secure, went on his usual tour. A dense smoke was seen at 2 1/2 o'clock and it was found that the fire had already made considerable progress. The Rev. Dr. Friel and the Rev. Father Givern, hastened into the edifice, and, together with others began the removing of articles of value. The firemen were quickly at hand, but the interior was on fire before sufficient water could be procured. They therefore turned their attention to the house occupied by the priests the flames having already entered one of the windows. That building and those opposite were saved with slight injury. It was five hours before the firemen could suppress the flames. It was then after daylight, and nothing but the bare walls was standing everything inflammable having been consumed. The building was a plain brick structure, 60 feet by one hundred, and 35 feet high. It was erected by the Corporation of Grace Church (Epis.), and occupied by them until 1848, when it was sold to the Catholics. The losses are about \$18,200. The insurances are as follows: On building, in Mechanics' Fire Insurance Co. \$10,000; On parochial residence, in Atlantic Fire Insurance Co. \$8,000; On organs and music, in Niagara Co. \$2,800; On vestments, &c., in Niagara Co. \$1,800; On furniture in Presbyterian in Atlantic Co. \$100.

In New York and Philadelphia, many of the Episcopalian ministers and Presbyterian ministers fraternize, exchanging pulpits. It may be assumed that this was not taken into the account when the American bishops were invited to the Pan-Anglican Synod. These have returned to their duties more high pretensions and exclusive than they were before, with much loftier notions of episcopal privileges, and much less inclined to admit the competence of any Presbyterian or Congregational minister. But if the American and English churches are to be closely welded, it may become a question, Shall the Church of the new world that of the old, or the old freeze up the new? There is yet another possibility—that an importation of stiff High Churchism into the American Episcopal body will split it up; and the Evangelicals, who have not the same inducement for clinging to it there that they have in England, will go off and form a new community, which will exchange the pretence of apostolical succession for that true mark of churchmanship—apostolical humility.—English Independent.

Butler went to hear Dickens in Washington, talking in late and making himself as prominent as possible. The selection was Bob Sawyer's Party, which is very funny and the laughing was, at times, immoderate. There was a point, however, at which it became very much like a vulgar roar, and it wasn't the funniest part of the reading, by any means. Mr. Dickens felt a little confused, for a man of his nice perceptions know exactly where the fun comes in, and we all know there is such a thing possible as a laugh at the expense of an actor, which is always more vivid than that provoked by the play. Dickens evidently thought he had blundered, but he hadn't. He had simply read the colloquy between Hopkins and Noddy which closes:—'Sir, a friend of mine shall wait on you in the morning.' 'Sir, I am very much obliged to you for the caution; and I'll leave particular direction with the servant to look up the spoons.'