

FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE.

FRANCE.

The greatest efforts were being made to reduce the estimates within the limits necessary to produce a budget, on which the Emperor has set his heart.

The budget will be laid before the Assembly in March.

One hundred and fifty political prisoners have been amnestied by decree.

The *Moniteur* of Paris publishes the following article (supposed to be from the pen of the Emperor himself) on the pamphlet entitled "Lettres Franques." It will be seen that the sanguinary longings of the writer of the pamphlet, which caused so much uneasiness in England, are entirely disavowed by the French government:—

"Parties cannot accustom themselves to see France and Europe escape from their hands. The peace of the world is onerous to them. Not daring to hope anything more from the public spirit, abused for a moment, their only hope is in the return of disorder.—For that all means are good to them; on one hand, sanguinary provocations; on the other, anonymous calumnies, writings which, under pretext of awakening the generous instincts of the country, only tend to lead them astray, and to keep up by those means distrust and agitation. Such is the subject of a new pamphlet, entitled "Lettres Franques," published by a writer of the legitimist party, and which would no more merit the attention of the government than of the public, if there was not reason to believe that silence would be falsely interpreted. The author addresses himself, *sans facon*, to the Emperor of the French; he decides with an incredible self-sufficiency on the highest diplomatic questions and the destinies of Europe. After having taken for the motto of his pamphlet the memorable words of the speech at Bordeaux, "The empire is peace," the author only applies himself to urge France to war by holding up to its resentment established treaties, and endeavoring to revive an ancient hatred against England. The tactics of those who inspire such publications are not difficult to be understood. They said to themselves that the Government of the Emperor would be placed in the disagreeable alternative, either of wounding the national feeling by combating these writings, or by its silence giving them a sort of tacit approval which should be for Europe a permanent cause of inquietude and distrust. It is so painful for the vanquished parties to see peace and the general prosperity established without them and in spite of them. The snare is of too gross a kind for the country and the government to be caught in it. The Emperor, as well as France, wishes for peace—a fruitful, honorable peace, the only one which becomes the nation; and certainly it is not to the old parties that the heir of Napoleon the Great will go to ask counsel about national honor and dignity. One cannot feel too much surprised at such provocations proceeding from those who entertain legitimist opinions. Do those writers believe, then, that France has forgotten her recent history, and do they not know that it would be easy to confound them with it? But the government has too much at heart the interest and the glory of the country, it considers the cessation of our ancient dissensions of too much importance to allow itself to have recourse to recrimination, even the best founded, by reviving melancholy recollections."

AUSTRIA.

Vienna letters are full of the recent attempt on the life of the Emperor. The assassin says he had no accomplices, and that it was not his intention to kill the Emperor; but only to give him a mark. He had it in contemplation since 1850. On being led to the prison, he cried, "Vive Kossuth."

German papers state that a rising was anticipated at Pesh, and that fears are entertained of an outbreak in Hungary. Extraordinary precautions are taken by the authorities in consequence.

Milan letters state that the Austrian authorities, believing Mazzini to be in Milan, had taken most rigorous steps to prevent his escape. The inhabitants are forbidden to appear on the Bastions after seven o'clock. In case of disturbance, house-holders are to close their doors, and every man found in the streets to be considered concerned in an affray.

It is not believed that the difficulty between Austria and Turkey will result in war.

GERMANY.

PROTESTANT EDUCATION.—M. Eugene Rendu has been employed to investigate the methods of popular education in Germany, has returned and delivered to the Emperor a very copious report, in which he gives the modes of education adopted in Prussia, Saxony, Hanover, and the Catholic States of Bavaria and Austria. He reduces his report to the following results:—"Has primary instruction given as it has been during the last half century successfully contended with evil? No! Has it established such entire harmony between the faculties which it has stimulated to exertion, that the will inclines towards rectitude in the same proportion as the understanding apprehends truth? No. Why not? For three reasons,—1. The development of the religious sentiment has not been proportionate to the development of the intellect. 2. The communication of knowledge has too often superseded the formation of habits. 3. Instruction has not been properly adapted to the classes to whom it has been imparted." M. Eugene Rendu winds up an elaborate and very important report, since it sets the much vaunted schools of Prussia, Saxony, &c., in a new light, by observing, "If your Majesty should think it useful if the idea presented to you in this memoir should appear to you worthy of being reduced to practice, I shall be prepared to submit to the Minister of Public Instruction,

the requisite machinery, and the means of its application."

AUSTRALIA.

DISAPPOINTMENT AND CRIME AT MELBOURNE.—From every part of the world as well as from Great Britain, vessels are daily pouring in, filled with living cargoes, to swell the houseless number. I have, not once, but frequently, within the last month, counted in the daily returns of published arrivals, from two to three thousand passengers and emigrants in a single day, and we are told that this is as yet but the commencement. What to do with this superabundance of population is now the great question—where to lodge them, and how to feed them? Immense numbers, it is true, hurry at once to the mines without delaying in Melbourne, and the once lonely road from thence to Forest Creek and the Bendigo Diggings is now little less thronged than that between London and Epsom on a Derby day, although with a somewhat different-looking class of travellers. Nevertheless, the town remains crowded to suffocation; every house doing treble duty by accommodating three times its proper quantum of occupants—wooden villages are rising in the suburbs, and encampments of tents line the banks of the Yarra, or spring up like mushrooms in the flats adjoining the town. The social condition of the colony can never be much worse than it is at this moment. The law, enforced as it is by a few underpaid policemen and a handful of soldiers only, is almost powerless, at a time when it ought to display itself in its fullest vigor. The streets at night are filled with prowling desperadoes, ticket-of-leave holders, ex-convicts, or escaped convicts from Van Diemen's Land; while the roads to the mines swarm with mounted ruffians of the same class, who, under the name of bush-rangers, emulate in Australia the doings of the Dick Turpins and Claude Duvals, who in former days took the road on our English heaths and highways. Murders, robberies, and outrages of every kind are so fearfully prevalent as to have become wearisome in their constant repetition, and even the quietest and most peace-loving individuals in the community cannot now stir out of their houses after dark without carrying with them the protection of revolver, dagger, or life-preserver. You will find that the newspapers I send with this parcel fully bear me out in this description of the golden age in Australia. I would draw your particular attention to the *Argus* of Monday, the 19th of October, in which you will find a detailed account of the proceedings of a party of five or six armed bush-rangers, who actually, on a fine sunny afternoon, took possession of the public road leading from Melbourne to St. Kilda and Brighton, within three miles of the metropolis, and for upwards of two hours robbed every individual (upwards of thirty) who passed up and down the road; taking them afterwards into the bush, tying them together, and detaining them as prisoners, until they had brought their day's operations to a satisfactory conclusion. I might cite numberless other instances of similar lawless outrages, but I think that this in itself is a sufficient specimen of the unprotected state of the colony, and the insecure tenure by which we hold our property and our lives.—*Dickens's "Household Words."*

Drinking here would astonish you. A case of champagne is a common order. A digger in Melbourne called for half a hoghead of port wine, which was brought him, and anybody might drink that wanted. Ale and spirits are double price, but that is no matter. I was talking the other day to one of a party of four, who said that the expenses of the four for the fortnight amounted to £1,000. He met with a woman one morning at 8 o'clock, and before 10 they were married. He had the fireplace in his room filled with champagne, gave £35 for a musical-box, and used to drink and dance until he could stand no longer. And then for gold rings you would be surprised.—*Melbourne Correspondent of the Times.*

REASONS FOR LEAVING ANGLICANISM.

The conversion of the Rev. Lord Charles Thynne, late Vicar of Longbridge Deverill, and Canon of Canterbury Cathedral, must be fresh in the memories of many of our readers. It appears that the government bishop of Salisbury, took occasion, the other day, to impugn his Lordship's motives for leaving the Parliamentary Church; in self-defence Lord C. Thynne has published in a letter to his former parishioners, his reasons for abandoning the State communion. "I am blamed" says his Lordship.

1st.—For leaving you at all.

2nd.—For entertaining opinions which have made it necessary that I should leave you and the Established Church.

The first point may be dismissed in a very few words. I did not leave you for the sake of any worldly advantages, but I left you because I could not honestly hold the position in which I had been placed. By this I mean that I did not consider it to be the act of an honest mind to believe one thing and to teach another. I will give you some instances of this.

I believed that in order to obtain the remission of our sins by absolution, it was necessary to confess them to some one possessed of authority to receive confessions, and to give absolution. I believed this to be necessary for all who have fallen into sin after Baptism. But when I had recourse to the only means within my reach, when I was a member of the Church of England, I was pained by the very secret stealthy way in which alone my necessities could be met, showing that so far as the Church of England was concerned there was something unreal and unauthorised in the act; and after a fuller inquiry into the matter, it appeared to me, both from the practice of the Church of England, as well as from the testimony of the Bishops, that it did not sanction confessions, except in extreme cases, and as a kind of religious luxury for the dying. I mentioned this to the Bishop of Salisbury, and asked his opinion upon the subject.

He very candidly told me that as a Minister of the Established Church of England I could not enforce the necessity of Penance, which is a Sacrament in the Catholic Church of Christ, and of which Confession forms one important part. Conceive then, my distress of mind. The very peace which I felt to be so necessary I could neither obtain for myself, nor lawfully apply to others equally in need; nay more, I could not even encourage them to seek it, so long as they continued to be members of the Church of England. That blessed fountain for the remission of sins has been closed against the people of England for three hundred years. Ever since the Reformation successive generations have passed away, unabsolved; and it seems to be the intentions of the Church of England (so long as it shall remain) that future generations shall pass away in the same uncomforted, unhelpful state.

Again, I had always maintained that all who dissented from the Established Church were by the very fact of their separation excluded from the graces and the certainty of salvation, which are inseparable from the True Church of Christ. I, at that time, held that, absurd notion, that it was possible that separate national churches, distinct from each other, and anathematising each other, could make up the one Church of Christ, and on this ground I pressed upon Dissenters the necessity of union with the Established Church. But here a difficulty soon presented itself to my mind. The Church of Rome, as the centre of all unity, claims jurisdiction over all baptised Christians. The Church of England denies this claim, and yet at the same time asserts a similar claim over all Christians in England, affirming that she represents to them the Catholic Church, though she is herself divided from the rest of Christendom. In endeavoring to maintain this, I was led to admit the claim of the Church of Rome, for I found that in admitting the argument by which the Church of England justifies her separation from the Church of Rome, it, in fact, admitted at the same time the argument by which Dissenters defend their separation from the Church of England; for the Dissenter justifies his separation from the Church of England upon grounds very similar justifies her those upon which the Established Church justifies her separation from the Catholic Church of Christ, whose circumference is the world and whose centre is Rome. Step by step, I became convinced that union with Rome is as necessary to the vitality of a Church, as the union of a branch with the trunk is necessary to the vitality of the branch. How, then, could I honestly maintain my position, holding as I did the necessity of unity, while division is the principle of the Church of England?

Again, I had believed that the Established Church maintained as its exclusive teaching the doctrines of baptismal regeneration, and of the real presence of our Lord in the Holy Eucharist. But I soon found that these doctrines were, at least, as frequently denied as they were taught, by the ministers of the Established Church; and that even the Bishops of that Church are so little agreed upon the true doctrine of Holy Baptism that when it was denied, they could not agree to vindicate it. How, then, could I remain where I had no authority for my teaching, or where at least the same authority was equally claimed for the denial as for the assertion of the true doctrines of Christ's Catholic Church? How could I remain amongst you, and remain true to God,—to my own conscience, and to you? This, then, is the reason why I left you, because I believed more than I dared to teach, and because for my teaching I had no other, no higher authority to fall back upon than the authority either of individual men, or of my own mind; and, professing to be a messenger from Christ, I could not rest upon less than a divine authority, and this the Established Church does not possess, and therefore cannot give.

The other point on account of which I may have been blamed is, that I have allowed these opinions to have any place in my mind. Now I think that you will admit that if these opinions are of God it would be very sinful to attempt to resist them; if they are of God they cannot be overthrown,—if they are of Satan they will soon show that they are his, and will fade away. The advice of Gamaliel is applicable here, and should be followed, lest men be found fighting against God. Yet seeing how much of the happiness of others would be involved in my act, I consulted the most learned, and even endeavored by an act of the will to crush the thoughts which were continually rising up in my mind. For this I must ever humble myself in deep penitence before God, that in my blindness I once strove against Him, when He would in mercy call me to Himself. But the stirrings of God's grace are mightier than any human efforts, and, thanks be to His Holy Name, He did not leave me till He had blessed me; He did not forsake me, but has guided me to His holy hill, where I hope and pray to dwell in safety for ever. But perhaps you will say to me, "Why did you not go on struggling against these doubts, you might have succeeded in overcoming them at last?"

My dear friends, I will tell you why I did not do so. First, because I did not dare. I believed that God's grace was at work, and I dared no longer resist it. Secondly, I remembered that the principle of the Church of England, of which I was then a Minister, was that each man should satisfy his own mind, by examining every doctrine for himself, and should not be required to accept anything as true, until he had satisfied his own mind upon it. I, therefore, searched the Scriptures, and by the exercise of the right of private judgment, which the Church of England affirms to be the right of all her members, I was convinced that my plain and obvious duty was to submit myself to the one True Church of Christ,—the one holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, which is governed by Bishops united under one visible Head, the Bishop of Rome. It would weary you if I were to go through the several points which presented themselves to my mind, and have led me to take the step which I have taken. Therefore I will speak as briefly as I can of those points which I have already mentioned.

1.—The Unity of the Church. 2.—The Sacraments of the Church.

1st.—I read in the Bible that unity is the mark which God has set upon all His works. When the world was sunk in guilt, and Almighty God overthrew it, He saved one family, the family of Noah. Afterwards He called and blessed one family, the family of Abraham. Then He chose out one nation, and then established one Church. Afterwards He sent His Son into the world, the visible manifestation of God in the flesh, to save the world; and when Jesus Christ came fulfilling the law, He was not the author of confusion, for He still maintained the same principle of unity. He founded the one Church, He laid her foundation upon one rock; He called her the one fold of the one Shep-

herd,—the one vine,—the one kingdom; He instituted one Baptism and one Eucharist. As the Jewish Church was the shadow of that more perfect Church which was to come, and was one, so the substance which cast forth the shadow, the great reality which had been pre-figured, is one also. So we find the Apostles afterwards speaking only of one Church—of one society of Christ of one body, one House, and of Christian unity as the abiding in the Apostles' doctrine and fellowship. The Church is the one dove, the one ark of safety, the one faith; she is the visible presence of our Divine Lord's mystical body upon earth, and like the eternal God-head one. Her object is to preserve Christianity, or the revelation of God, by which salvation has been, and is continually announced to man; and as Christianity or revelation is one, so the Church, the keeper of that revelation, is one also.

It is, therefore, impossible to admit the theory of independent national churches—of churches bounded by territory and separated from all others. The principle of particular churches is a dissolution of unity, and destroys Catholicity. "As the sun is one and the same throughout the universe, so the preaching of the truth shines everywhere and enlightens all men who wish to come to a knowledge of the truth."

Holy Scripture has taught me the value of this unity—Holy Scripture has taught me to believe unity to be a mark of Christ's Church. Does the Established Church possess this mark? Is it one with the rest of Christendom? Nay, is it one with itself? Is it not the house divided against itself? Three hundred years ago it lost this mark of a true Church, and cannot recover it but by returning as a penitent to the centre of unity, from which at that sad period it broke loose.

2nd.—And now let me speak of the Sacraments. First, the Established Church has mutilated them as to their number. Throughout Catholic Christendom there are seven Sacraments,—Baptism, Confirmation, Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Holy Orders, and Matrimony. The Church of England acknowledges but two.—Baptism and the Supper of the Lord; and in her rejection of the other five she is condemned by Holy Scripture, by antiquity, and by the great majority of Christians. Even the Greek Church, though it has broken away from the unity of the Catholic Church, yet retains seven Sacraments. This fact in itself condemns the Established Church of England for her rejection of five out of the seven. No one can deny that the agreement between the Catholic Church and the Greek Church affords a very strong testimony in favor of those points on which they agree, testifying, as it does, that such must have been the doctrine or practice (as the case may be) of the Catholic Church previous to the Eastern Schism—that she teaches now what she has always taught.

What, then, can the Established Church of England say in her defence for having thus tampered with the great verities of the Catholic Church? How can she justify her isolated position, having, in her pride, broken up and (so far as she is concerned) destroyed that sacramental system which our Blessed Lord established for the consolation of His children. How great a loss she has sustained by this rejection of Sacraments which are, and ever were, the strength, support, and consolation of saints and penitents in the Catholic Church, it is impossible to form a just estimate. Yet the continual contention and fret against everything like Church authority, and the jealousy existing between the laity and the clergy, prove how great a blow has been inflicted by the denial of the Sacrament of Holy Orders, while the carelessness and immorality with which matrimony is generally approached by the English people, and the little acquaintance of the clergy with the spiritual condition of individual souls committed to their charge, prove how ruinous has been the effect of the Church of England's rejection of the Sacrament of penance, and of her degradation of the Sacrament of matrimony.

Secondly,—The Church of England has mutilated the force and meaning of the only two Sacraments which she has kept. Upon holy baptism she allows two contrary doctrines. In this article of her faith she at least connives at heresy.

In the service for the Holy Communion she denies the real presence of our Lord. To prove this I need but refer you to the Rubric at the end of the Communion Service, though there are parts in the service itself which sufficiently prove it. I might also bring forward the general practice of the clergy with regard to the consecrated elements, which is a forcible commentary upon the service itself, and confirms the Church of England's denial of the Catholic doctrine of our Lord's Presence in the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist. And here I would remark but one of two doctrines can be held upon this article of faith, either a Real Presence or a Real Absence, and of these but one is the truth; I know of nothing between the two. The Catholic Church of Christ, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, has ever maintained the Real Presence. The Church of England seems to prefer the Real Absence. But it is painful to have to write upon these subjects, for I cannot forget that I was very lately a minister of that church which I in my conscience believe to be in schism and in error. There are some, I know, who lament the position of the Church of England, and who profess to desire to bring about the restoration of unity and hope to do so by remaining to fight on. But for what do they fight, and against what do they fight?

They fight for a Church (if it be one) which for three hundred years has been in a state of wilful schism,—has at least doubtful orders,—has mutilated the Sacraments,—has no living voice, no definite teaching, has surrendered its highest trust to the Crown, which is now its head, and the judge of its doctrine. In a word, they fight for a shadow.

The fight against a Church of unbroken succession—of undoubted unity—herself the centre of all unity—possessing all the Sacraments—the mother and guide of souls distinct and clear in her teaching—whose voice can be heard above the tumult of the world,—whose visible Head upon earth is the successor of St. Peter, the Prince of the Apostles,—which has lasted for more than 1800 years, in spite of all the trials and adversities which would have overthrown any human kingdom, but which cannot hurt or prevail against her, for she is founded on the rock. The Almighty dwelleth in her; she is the kingdom of God and of His Christ; the one Holy Catholic and Apostolic Church.

My dear friends, this is my defence. I have acted honestly by you and by myself. My only repentance (and it is one which I must carry with me to my grave) is that I did not obey the call at once when I first heard it; but I knew not that it was the Lord who called me. I have sought for the pearl of great price, and God be praised, have found it, and you, my dear