

completed as speedily as possible, I cannot too strongly express my opinion that you ought on no account to accept from the rebel tribes any imperfect submission, and that you should not allow hostilities to be concluded by anything but their complete subjection and unconditional surrender. It is thus only that a real peace, and not a short and hollow truce, can be obtained."

I have, &c., H. G. SMITH.

CAPE OF GOOD HOPE.—RETURN OF SIR H. SMITH.
By the arrival at Spithead, on Sunday afternoon, of the steam ship *Gladiator*, Captain Adams, we have received the news of the arrival of the rebel tribes at the Cape to the 19th April. The above vessel has brought home the ex-Governor, Sir H. Smith and Lady Smith. The new Governor, Major-General Cathcart, arrived at King William's Town on Good Friday, where he had a long interview with Sir H. Smith, who quitted that place on the following day on his return to England. The accounts from the seat of war state that several serious attacks had taken place in all of which the enemy had been beaten with considerable loss; still the British troops had some sharp work of it, with many narrow escapes, and had been severely harassed, losing, however, but very few men. Among these slain, we regret to learn, were Captain Gore, of the 43rd, and Dr. Davidson. These successful operations had dispirited the enemy, who had also sustained immense loss from the capture of cattle. Great regret was felt by the people of the colony at the recall of Sir H. Smith, particularly as the war was thought to be near its termination. On his way to the port of embarkation, vast crowds assembled to witness his departure, and to pay their last personal respects to him, whom all revered for the important services he had rendered, while placed at the head of that overland.

INDIA.

CAPTURE OF MARTABAN AND RANGOON.

BOMBAY, May 3.—Yesterday's post brought a telegraphic dispatch announcing the capture of Rangoon and Martaban. To-day's post (this instant received) has brought further particulars. Martaban was taken on the 5th by the Malinein brigade, commanded by Lieutenant-Colonel Reynolds, C.B., of the 18th Foot, and consisting of the right wing of Her Majesty's 80th, the Madras Regiments quartered at Moulemin, and the artillery. The capture of Martaban was a work of comparative facility, the troops having been landed under a protecting fire from the ships, led by Her Majesty's ship *Rattler*, and advancing rapidly, in conjunction with the artillery, upon the works of the enemy. The whole of the operations lasted, we believe, only some four or five hours, when the place was ours. After its capture the troops re-embarked, and proceeded to the Rangoon river, where they and the Madras troops joined the Bengal force, and the operations against Rangoon commenced. On Easter Sunday, the 11th, the entire squadron proceeded up the river, not intending, however, to commence operations on that day, but the steamers towing the transports having taken them higher up than was intended, they came within the range of the river-batteries of the Burmese, which immediately opened up in them, and a reply was inevitable. A terrific cannonade was then commenced on both sides, the steamers opening their broadsides on the river faces of the Burmese works on both banks of the river, and entirely demolishing them, both at Rangoon and Dalla. Her Majesty's ship *Serpent* then proceeded up to Kemmendine, upon the banks at which place she opened fire, but the return was so severe, and the enemy's guns so well served, that the brig was obliged to haul off, and sent down the river for aid, when two war-steamer were sent up to her with assistance. With these the Kemmendine batteries were silenced, and, a landing having been effected, the enemy deserted the works, which were occupied by sailors and marines from the ships, and European troops. During the cannonade and shelling on Sunday, besides the destruction of the Burmese works on the river face, the enemy suffered great loss by the explosion of their powder-magazine, a shell from one of our guns falling on it, and causing it to blow up with a terrific sound. On Monday, the 12th, the land operations commenced, the troops effecting their disembarkation under the protection of the ships' guns, and all the boats of the squadron being employed in effecting the landing. Here the brunt of the work commenced, as it was necessary, soon after landing, to attack and capture a strong stockade a short distance in shore, where the enemy fought most gallantly, and caused considerable loss to our force. On Tuesday, the 13th, there was a pause, which was occasioned by the unavoidable delay in landing the heavy guns from the ships, the last of which did not arrive in the camp, if we may so call the bivouac of the troops, till midnight on the 13th. On the 14th, in the morning, the entire force broke ground, and advanced towards the great Pagoda stockade, throwing out skirmishers the Burmese, also fighting well in their fashion, and knocking over many of our men. Nothing, however, could check the advance of our soldiers, seconded by a tremendous fire of artillery, and they advanced rapidly but steadily towards the Pagoda stockade, taking some minor ones in their forward movement. At length, towards noon, it was resolved to deliver the general assault, which was made by all arms with the greatest spirit and intrepidity, on the north-east angle of the Pagoda hill and stockade, when the enemy gave way and retreated at all points. They never expected that the assault would have been made at this point, and a gate was actually found open there, through which our troops rushed in and instantly occupied the place, when all the fighting was concluded by two o'clock in the afternoon. We regret to announce the following casualties among the officers:—

In the action of the 12th, on taking what is called the Whitehouse stockade, Major Oakes, Madras Artillery, and Major Griffiths, Madras Infantry, who both died of *coup de soleil*; Colonel Bogle, wounded by a musket-shot through the thigh; Lieutenant Donaldson, Bengal Engineers, mortally wounded; Capt. Blundell, Her Majesty's 51st, dangerously wounded; Lieutenant Trevor, Engineers, very seriously wounded; Lieutenant Harris, Madras 38th Native Infantry, severely wounded; and Colonel Ford, Madras Artillery, struck down by *coup de soleil*, but soon recovered. On the 13th, the day of cessation, Colonel Warren, commanding the Bengal brigade, and Lieutenant Piercy, Her Majesty's 18th, struck down by the sun, but since recovering. On the 14th, Lieutenant-Colonel Cote, Her Majesty's 18th, wounded in the assault, and Lieutenant D'ran, Adjutant of Her Majesty's 18th Royal Irish, killed, when advancing to storm the Pagoda stockade. All arms behaved splendidly, but we have especial pleasure in recalling the gallant and praiseworthy conduct of the 40th Native Infantry, who

did not rest satisfied with performing what they had agreed to do, but lent a hand to everything, guns, working, parties, &c.

Cholera was raging from the offensive and unhealthy state of the place, and Captain Hint, of the 20th Foot, fell a victim to that disease. Another was suffering from the same malady, without hopes of recovery. Privates of the several regiments were dying in numbers. The cholera had also broken out on board some of the ships, but not to any alarming extent. What was to be the future course of proceeding was not known when this account was dispatched.

The north-west frontier continues in an unsatisfactory state. It is now clear that the only result of Sir C. Campbell's operations last cold season has been to weaken the force at Pashawur, by the detachments required for three strong and distant outposts, the establishment of which, instead of curbing the incursions of the hill tribes, has only irritated them into incursions against us. Sir C. Campbell is again "out" with a force. On the 13th and 14th of April reports arrived that the fort of Shub Kudder was threatened by a strong party of Momands, so Sir Colin started with 300 cavalry and two guns of Major Waller's troop of horse artillery to reinforce the post. On the 15th, the enemy came down in unexpected numbers, 5,000 or 6,000 strong, and Sir Colin, with his reinforcement and the greater part of the garrison, moved out to meet them. Three hours' skirmishing then took place, the enemy retiring towards the hills as our troops advanced, and following them again as they returned towards the fort. They kept out of musket-shot, but occasionally advanced within 200 yards of the guns, and lost thirty or forty by grape-shot. On one occasion the old General charged in person at the head of a body of the 15th Irregular Cavalry, and cut up eighteen or nineteen more.

FRANCE.

The sensation produced by the publication of the particulars with reference to the attitude the Powers would be likely to assume in the event of certain contingencies in France is the best excuse for noticing a statement in the *Lithographic Correspondence* from Berlin. That correspondence says:—

"Some few days past the *Times* published a summary of diplomatic notes alleged to be exchanged between the Cabinets of St. Petersburg and Vienna relative to the policy that ought to be followed with respect to the Prince President of the French Republic. We do not know whether those communications are exact, but when the *Times* affirms that our Cabinet participates in the view of the two other Cabinets, and adds that the most perfect concord exists between the three Powers of the North, we are enabled to affirm that the Prussian Government has never associated itself with a correspondence of that kind; so that it is not true that it participates in such ideas."

Now I decidedly reject the "correspondence" just mentioned as an authority; first, because it commences by avowing its ignorance as to whether the communications took place or not; and, secondly, the said "correspondence" must be imperfectly informed, inasmuch as it is stated that M. de Heckeren had not been received by the Emperor of Russia at the very time it was known in Paris that he had been received. No one has stated that there existed on the part of Prussia, Russia, and Austria complete concord. We know very well that there are many points—for instance, the question of the Zollverein—on which Prussia and Austria have different interests and entertain different views; but on the great question of defensive policy with reference to France, should circumstances require it, I believe there would be found to exist a conformity of views and of action between the three Powers. The "correspondence" is no better authority than the *Monitor*; and notwithstanding the virtuous indignation of the official and semi-official organs at the bare mention of ambitious projects, or the establishment of the Empire, we have an equally good authority—the *Public*, a well-known Elysean organ—declaring only yesterday that "the Empire is the only solution capable of putting an end to disturbances and factious ideas." Let the *Monitor*, the *Public*, the *Bulletin de Paris*, &c., all inspired as they are from the same source, try to reconcile their contradictions as best they may.—*Times*.

Spirit of the Press.

YEARNINGS FOR A LITURGY AMONG THE UNITARIANS.

A correspondent of the *Christian Enquirer* is strongly urging the adoption of a Liturgy. Hear him:—"It appears to me when Unitarians take into consideration their high intellectual cultivation, broad, tolerant and truly Catholic spirit; and particularly their need of some common, visible, and tangible bond of union, by which they may be recognized in the Christian world—and, let me add, more strongly held together—that a liturgy, adopted by common consent, and containing some comprehensive but positive declarations of religious opinions as a basis, would be of immense advantage.

I do not mean by this latter proposition, that Unitarians should adopt a creed. I would be the first to raise my voice against anything of that kind. But I do desire that, inasmuch as we have some, and those not a few cardinal principles, or doctrines of an affirmative character, that these should be set forth by common consent; that inquiring minds, wandering from other folds, may know where to find us, and that we are not a congeries of mere negations; in short, that we have something vital and conservative among them. Neither do I mean by this that the use of a liturgy should be binding upon us; only that its use should be recommended by the judgment of as many clergymen as could be found to agree to it, and that it should be of a uniform character that is, that there should be but one liturgy thus recognized. In this might be comprehended all the services in use in the Episcopal Church; besides those for morning and evening, the services for Communion, Baptism, Catechism, Confirmation, Matrimony, Visitation of the Sick, Burial of the dead, &c., together with the Psalms of David in metre, and hymns not omitting some general articles of religion.

Now, it seems to me that something of this kind might be adopted without interfering with our liberty or compromising our principles."

The editor supports him as follows:—"We are aware also that those unused to a liturgy underrate its worth, and stigmatize as a formal petition of hackneyed words a habit which may be the most sincere and vital worship.

"We believe that our brethren in the Liberal ranks, and, in fact, Protestants at large, not already committed to an exclusive ritual, agree pretty well now in desiring a service that shall combine freedom of utterance with

some liturgical community of voice, and order of worship. In this respect we are probably less likely to copy the English Church than the continental churches of Europe, who mingle both elements and have some responsive readings and prayers, without presuming to shut up the minister's lips against free prayer in view of special convictions and circumstances. As certain we are that some office of united devotional expression is demanded by our people, as that they will not submit to system that limits prayer wholly within written forms.

"The subject has already engaged the attention of our clergy and congregations here and abroad. We can name as many as five liturgical collections in use among our churches, beginning with the Chapel Liturgy of Boston, and ending with that prepared for the Channing Church in St. Louis, by its faithful pastor, William G. Elliot. We suggest the subject as suitable for discussion next week at Boston, and presume that it would be as profitable a topic as the points of order so frequently argued by brethren so gifted in prosing, or the matters of political rancour which sometimes show that great men, like great locomotives may flounder and plunge, with great outlay of strength and fire, without making any observable progress, when thrown off their true track. We request any brethren who have experience on the subject to write us freely their views."

SOMETHING TO THINK ON.

At the late Kingston assizes, as stated by us last week, Joseph Henry was tried and convicted for the murder of James McCoy, near Napanee. In passing sentence, the presiding Judge used the wonted solemn prayer, "and the Lord have mercy on your soul," whereupon the miserable prisoner rejoined, "thank you, sir; that is more than my father ever said!"

The advocates of our infidel system of common school education maintain that the pedagogue has nothing to do with Christianity. They assert that the duty of indoctrinating the youth with a knowledge of religion ought to be discharged by ministers, or parents, or guardians, and by them alone.

Now in the first place, it must be notorious to the most casual observer, that in our province the supply of clergymen, or ministers, falls miserably short of the exigencies of the population. Voluntaryism makes but slender provision for the poor, and hardly even professes, as a general rule, to visit the "highways and hedges" in search of the reckless and case-hardened. Preachers cannot live upon air, and consequently they can only afford to confer their services upon parties who are able and willing to pay for them.

In these circumstances, and taking into account the comparative poverty of our provinces, it is self-evident that so far as pastoral instruction is concerned, a large per centage of our fellow-colonists must either lack it entirely, or receive but a very scanty and insufficient modicum of the same. The most devoted, disinterested, and pains-taking of ministers in Canada, have, generally speaking, fields of labour committed to their care, ten times too extensive to be properly worked. Many of our parishes or missions are, geographically considered, more formidable than a British or Irish Bishopric.

To say, then, that the religious instruction of the rising generation should be entrusted to these over-worked and unendowed functionaries, is downright and heartless mockery. We can compare it to nothing else than offering to starving wretches a stone in place of bread, and a serpent in lieu of a fish.

"Bat," rejoins the sordid and satirical voluntary, doggedly buttoning up his ungracious pockets, "it is the natural duty of parents to nurture their offspring with spiritual food. They can, and they will do what is needful in the premises."

Will they? Alas! let poor doomed Joseph Henry, the representative, we more than fear, of a frightfully increasing class, answer the question!

There is a pathos profound and solemnly suggestive in the simple words which issued from the blanched lips of that poor outcast, as he stood trembling before his earthly judge: "Thank you sir, THAT IS MORE THAN MY FATHER EVER SAID!"

How many Joseph Henrys, though, albeit, unstained with human blood, could be found amidst the cities, villages, and forests of our adopted land.

With exceptions few and far between, the denizens of Canada have to labor hard for daily bread. The life time of hundreds and thousands is a continual struggle against the difficulties which necessarily environ the occupants of a new country. Small time and less strength is consequently left to parents for the instruction of their children, even when a disposition to impart such knowledge really exists.

It is much to be apprehended, however, that in a multitude of cases, such a desire has no existence at all. Ignorant himself about God, and careless as a beast about eternity, what motive has a father to direct his children's little eyes heavenward.

But even this morally debased one—this practical heathen, will, most probably appreciate the advantages of secular learning.

Reading, writing and arithmetic have all a direct and obvious tendency to render the rising generation smart and worldly-wise. To constitute them "smart men" as our republican neighbours delight to express it. Hence it happens that secular education is appreciated not only by the pious, but by the irreligious and profane, who, unless signally debased, will strain a point and pinch themselves, in order to obtain its benefits for their offspring.

Worthy of all admiration is the practical logic of our mammon-adoring "powers that be."

Men have an appetite for worldly knowledge and therefore the imparting of worldly knowledge is cherished and endowed.

Men, naturally, have no craving after spiritual nourishment, and consequently the teachers of Christianity are left to their own single-handed, unaided resources.

If this be not the ethics of perdition, then Satan is a mere myth, and Pandemonium the dream of dotards and fictionists!—*Hamilton Gazette*.

The Earl of DERBY, as the *Times* informs us, in an article dictated by the most jealous regard for the interests of "public morality," has "drunk to the very dregs" of the cup of "periodical degradation." The ground on which this astounding announcement is made, is the fact that the late Ministers and their partizans are unable to extract from the Noble Earl any declaration to suit their own factious purposes. He cannot be got to say that he has abandoned Protection, nor will he pledge himself to reverse the Free Trade policy; and as, in reply to all inquiries on the subject, he continues to reiterate his determination to consult the voice of public opinion before he commits himself to any definite line of policy, he and his colleagues are

described as men "who give us no other clue to their intentions than the endless task of reconciling contradictions, or speculating on which word of a sentence the emphasis is to be laid; who will take back to-morrow what they have conceded to-day; unsay in the hot fit what they have said in the cold, and recant with the same facility with which they assert." The accusation comes, it must be confessed, with singular grace from a journal whose columns are proverbial for their self-contradictory character, which is universally acknowledged as *facile princeps* in the art of "taking back to-morrow what it has conceded one day, unsaying in the hot fit, what it has said in the cold, and recanting with the same facility with which it asserts." Satan reproving sin is a model of consistency in comparison with the *Times* bringing such a charge, as a proof of "periodical degradation," against any man or body of men.

Two blacks, however, do not make a white. Humiliating as is the reflexion that "we, the once downright straight-forward English nation, have come to this pass," that a journal whose principles are fixed in the same sense in which the weathercock is fixed at the top of the steeple, can pretend to "lead" public opinion in this country, we readily acknowledge that the humiliation would be far greater if the only body of statesmen having any claim to fixity of principle should have sunk down into the same state of "periodical degradation" as that in which the "leading journal" sustains its luxuriant existence. But is it a fact that the Earl of Derby and his Cabinet are reduced to this "periodical degradation," or is the charge brought against them only another evidence of our contemporary's notorious "facility of assertion?"

The position which the Earl of Derby took up, when the reins of Government, reluctantly dropped by his predecessor, were placed in his hands, and which he has ever since maintained with a firmness of purpose rarely equalled, is the only position which a wise and practical statesman could take up under the circumstances under which the Noble Earl was called to office, and it is, at the same time, perfectly frank and straightforward. The Earl of Derby believes, and every thinking man in the United Kingdom must agree with him in believing, that the course of government and legislation has of late years been of an exceedingly vicious and pernicious character. Contending factions of professional statesmen have been wrangling for the possession of power, and, with a view to their own party interests, have been outbidding each other in appeals to the passions and prejudices of the ignorant multitude. Party cry after party cry has been raised or the purpose of placing or keeping this or that party in office; and in the scramble for the possession of political power, the object for which political power exists, the good of the country has been lost sight of altogether. One of the most recent and most effective of those party cries is the "big and cheap loaf" cry, raised by Richard Cobden, adopted by Lord John Russell, and succumbed to by Sir Robert Peel, who in obedience to it made alterations in the financial policy of the empire, fraught with injustice to the most important classes of the community, and eventually with ruin to the whole country. To this cry, and to all the other revolutionary measures and proposals of the factious competitors for power, the Earl of Derby and those associated with him have ever since been offering a steady opposition, upholding, through good report and evil report, the ancient principles of the Constitution and the maxims of a sound and just financial policy.—The result of the firm and high-principled course pursued by them, and of the reckless political profligacy of their opponents, has been the abandonment of office by the latter, through a multiplicity of embarrassments of their own creating, and the instalment of the Earl of Derby at the helm of affairs.

What, then, under these circumstances, and with these convictions, was the Earl of Derby, as a practical statesman, deeply concerned for the welfare of the country, to do? Was he to omit from his consideration all the other important questions by which factious leaders have attempted to agitate the country, and to limit his view of the duty he owed to his Queen and his country to the one question of the reversal of the "Free Trade" policy established six years ago? Or was he to take into his consideration the general situation of the country, and the alternative in which it is placed between his own government and the advent of revolution; determining to deal with the subordinate question of its financial policy, not according to his own personal convictions and those of his political party, but according to the ascertained state of public opinion throughout the country,—on the principle of effecting, if not all the good he would wish to effect, at least as much as is practically attainable in the present state of the public mind, and, at all events, preventing a great amount of public evil? There cannot be a moment's doubt which of these two courses was the more dignified, the more just, and the better calculated to promote the country's welfare.

It is possible, undoubtedly, that the popular delusion produced by the cry of the "big and cheap loaf" may yet be too deeply ingrained in the minds of the people to admit of the reversal of the "Free Trade" policy without incurring the risk of serious disturbances of the public peace, and of political convulsions, the extent and the end of which it is impossible to foresee. The advocates of "Free Trade," and among them the perverts to that fallacious system, have done their best to vitiate and to inflame public feeling to a most dangerous extent; they have not scrupled to hint that the reimposition of a duty placing the British corn grower on a footing of equality with the foreigner, would justify rebellion on the part of the people, and even mutiny in the army. On the other hand it is at least equally possible that the nation may have recovered its senses after the frenzy induced by the "Free Trade" clamour; that it may have discovered that to "buy in the cheapest market" may in the long run prove a ruinous proceeding; that to destroy the bone and sinew of the nation for the sake of insuring a temporary advantage to an upstart interest wholly devoid of every element of solidity, is not only a gross injustice, but downright madness. The question has now been argued for the space of six years,—with great ability on both sides, but on the side of what is termed "Protection" on the ground of well ascertained facts and by means of sound reasoning, on the side of "Free Trade" by means of plausible fallacies, and on the ground, partly of expectations which have proved illusory, and partly of temporary successes the permanent value of which has yet to be ascertained. It is by no means impossible, therefore, that an impression may have been made upon the sound sense of the British people, not altogether favourable to the continuance of the "great experiment." Experience, too, has come in aid of argument. It has been found, that to annihilate, or all but annihilate, the profits of that large body of customers, the agriculturists, and to cut down the income of the landed proprietors and of those dependent on them, is a process which cannot be accomplished without entailing upon the trading classes of the community a serious dimi-