

## FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE.

## FRANCE.

**THE FRENCH EMPEROR AND THE ALLIED POWERS.**—Paris, Jan. 18.—I know not how far you may be informed of the danger that existed, at the commencement of this month, of, at least, a continental war. I shall take leave, therefore, to acquaint you with the particulars.

You are aware that the three Northern Powers delayed their negotiations of "the Empire" of France purposely, to render impossible the presence of their representatives at the reception (levees) at the Tuilleries on New Year's-Day. This studied, yet stupid, incivility had its effect in predisposing the Emperor to dissatisfaction. At length the Ministers of Russia, Prussia, and Austria announced to his Majesty their reception of letters of credit, and, as usual, communicated copies of their instructions, and of the communications to be made to the Emperor. Finding that those communications were deficient in several points—for example, that they did not contain the word "sire," nor that of "cousin," or "brother," and were otherwise significant of discourtesy, as to his sensitive mind appeared, his Majesty called for his Secretary for Foreign Affairs, and desired that he demand that those communications be revised, and the omission to which he referred, be supplied; and that if this were refused, he should send to the ambassadors their passports. The Emperor further instructed his Minister (M. Drouhin de Luys) to acquaint the whole of the *corps diplomatique* in Paris with these orders, with the exceptions of the British Ambassador.

M. Drouhin de Luys—a very able, discreet Minister—remonstrated with his Majesty, and ventured to attempt dissuading him from this resolve; but the Emperor was immovable. The Minister withdrew.

Being a person who (deservedly) holds a high place in the Emperor's esteem, M. Drouhin de Luys determined on risking his displeasure, and on attempting to obviate a situation so unpleasant, and possibly so dangerous as would result from a proceeding so extreme as (in point of fact it would be) the expulsion of the ambassadors of the highest powers on the Continent from France, he, therefore, communicated the Emperor's will, not to the Ministers of the minor states, as ordered, but previously to him whom his Majesty had specially excepted from such communication—Lord Cowley. The latter immediately sent by express to his Government this important menacing intelligence, and desired instructions in the event of the withdrawal or removal of his colleagues of Russia, Prussia, and Austria. He received in reply an order to demand his own passport, should the Emperor's threat in respect of the Ministers of the three northern powers be carried into execution.

With this order Lord Cowley acquainted M. Drouhin de Luys, who immediately sent for the Count de M——, whose influence with the Emperor is all-powerful. They repaired together to the Tuilleries, and being admitted to an audience succeeded in prevailing upon his Majesty to accept the recognition of Russia, Prussia, and Austria in the terms to which he had objected.

Many persons will express surprise at this inconsistency; but when they shall recollect the Emperor's saying, that "L'Empire c'est la paix"—that war with Austria, Russia, and Prussia, and possibly with England, might be the consequence of his adherence of his original determination, they will admit that passion and a hastily formed resolve should give way before reflection, sage advice, and consideration for the nation over which he has been called to rule.

Not one tittle of fear entered into the Emperor's motives for swallowing terms to which he had objected. The indignity which he saw in the omissions of which he complained, and which had been the result of calculation, and, if you will, of combination, was not, in fact, merely personal to himself. It was offered to the French nation, by thirty-nine-forty-six of which he had been elected. But although feeling keenly the personal insult conveyed in the gratuitous and silly impertinence of the coalesced sovereigns, he suppressed his indignation, through consideration for interests he was chosen to watch over; and, with a manhood that does him honor, recalled his objection to the affront contemplated by the imperial and royal triumvirate, apprehensive that if war were to ensue from his enemies would ascribe it to wounded *amour propre* only.

Such is the amount of the communication I have received from a quarter in which I have implicit confidence.

I will candidly confess, nevertheless, that in the present situation of the public mind in Germany, the conduct of Austria and Prussia in the affair seems incredible. Not because that they manifest hostility to France and a Bonaparte, but that those powers should allow themselves (Austria especially) to be duped by Russia. Sure in her position, rendered by the frightful nature of her climate almost insular, Russia would brave all the chances of a war kindled in Western Europe, certain that, terminate as it might, one advantage to herself would result—the exhaustion—at least weakening—of the power of Germany. Her vulnerable point—Poland—might incommode her in a general war, for France would proclaim the *propagande* almost of necessity; but the Poland of 1803 is not the Poland of 1793, nor the Poland of 1807, nor even the Poland of 1830-31. She has been drained of her purest blood, the noblesse (*grande et petite*)—for it was the noblesse who always struggled for the independence of their country—the people being only their aids in that heroic proceeding. Poland has been crushed and colonised, and she has been more than once deceived by France, and would consequently be less formidable in insurrection or revolt than at other periods. Hence Russia would run less risk of positive loss, even in

case of the complete triumph of the French over the coalition, than Prussia or Austria, while she would, by her new interference in Germany be advancing her grand principle, the absorption of the Danubian provinces of Austria, the Principalities; and finally Turkey, preparatory to her meditated conquest of India.

Austria and Prussia have, however, displayed, at comparatively recent periods, so much blindness and folly, that many persons will feel no surprise at this new proof of imbecility on their part; but that the British Government, in the present temper of the British nation, should evince a disposition to enter upon a new crusade against France, without even the Quixotic pretext for it by which the last one was sought to be justified, seems incredible. I feel incapable, therefore, of believing that the rumored instructions of Lord Aberdeen to Lord Cowley are correctly described.

That the Emperor of the French should commit himself, and afterwards recede or retract, is contrary to anything that we know of his character; yet that he has done so I am assured. In yielding to the counsel and advice of the persons above named, he has, therefore, established a new claim to credit for governing powers. His abnegation and self-denial are admirable; for he knew that had he appealed to the nation, in the circumstances, France would have risen as one man in defence of her independence and her honor.—*Correspondent of Dublin Telegraph.*

The *Moniteur* contains a long, bitter, and elaborate article on the commentaries made by the English and Belgian press upon the rights of the new French Emperor, forgetful of the services he has rendered to public order, and at a time when the Governments of Europe are endeavoring to maintain amicable relations between the different countries. The excesses of those journals, the writer in the *Moniteur* maintains, show how much it is for the repose of the world, and the general prosperity, that France should be presided over by the wisdom which now governs the state. Whilst acknowledging that the excesses formerly indulged in against the Emperor are becoming more rare, it is stated that the English journals, which are the most hostile to the new order of things, cannot resist the evidence of facts, and their language is consequently becoming more measured and more worthy. There are still some, however, who exhaust their vocabulary in abuse of the Emperor and prove that they are hostile to the true interests of their country, by the excess of their hostility and abuse.

Two labourers residing at Bercy, and employed at the railway de ceinture, have been arrested in a public house at Saint-Mandé, on Thursday, for using seditious language. When desired to desist by other persons in the house, they said they had already fought behind the barricades, and they would soon fight again. Ten operative stonecutters were tried before the police court of Paris on Friday for having combined to force their employers to reduce their hours of labor or to increase their wages. They were found guilty, and sentenced to imprisonment for periods varying from six to ten days, and to pay each a fine of 16*fr.*

It seems to us that France is again likely to be exposed to some sudden shock, which nothing but profound political skill and discretion can avoid.—*Wilmor and Smith.*

**THE ORLEANS PROPERTY.**—The whole of this property is, we believe, now alienated. The last sale as just taken place—that of the lands of Carteil, situate in the department of the Loire-Inférieure. Louis Philippe had purchased the property from the Marquis de Coislin for 1,300,000 francs. The price it has just fetched is 800,000 francs.

The following sketch of the future Empress is taken from the Paris correspondent of the *Times*:

"Eugenia de Montijos, Countess-Duchess of Théba, is about 26 years of age. Her mother, Donna Maria Manuela Kirkpatrick, of Clossburn, Countess Dowager of Montijos, Countess of Miranda, and Duchess of Penaconda, is the widow of the Count de Montijos, who was an officer of rank in the Spanish army.—The father of the Countess of Montijos had, I believe, been English Consul at Malaga at the period of her marriage. Her late husband belonged to one of the most ancient of the noble houses of Spain, and was related to the family of the Duke of Frias, the representative of the ancient Admirals of Castile, the Duke of Hijer, and others of the highest rank, and the house claims relationship with the descendants of the ancient kings of Aragon. The mother of the future Empress is first Lady of Honor to the Queen of Spain, and is a member of the Royal Order of Noble Ladies of Maria Louisa, to which most of the females of the Spanish aristocracy of the highest class belong. The Countess of Montijos' eldest daughter—she has, I believe, but two—is married to the Duke of Alba and Berwick, who has also inherited the ducal title of Linares. The present Duke of Alba is not descended from the celebrated Alba of Philip II. The family name of the latter was Toledo. The present duke descends from Marshal Berwick, the victor of Almanza, in the war of succession undertaken to establish the rule of the first Bourbon who reigned in Spain. It is unnecessary to say that Berwick was the illegitimate son of James II. by Arabella Churchill, and the son-in-law of the Countess of Montijos is allied, consequently, to the noble French family of Fitz-James. He signs his name, I believe, James Stuart, Duke y Berwick, y Alba, y Linares, and quarters the royal arms of England. The Countess of Théba possesses considerable personal attractions, but more in the style of English than of Spanish beauty. Her complexion is transparently fair, her features regular and yet full of expression. She is of middle stature or a little above it, with manners extremely winning. Her education is superior to that received generally by Spanish women who do no travel, and she is said to be what the Spaniards term *graciosa*, the French *Spirituelle*. Her paternal fortune is, without being considerable, yet suitable to the rank her family holds in Spain—that of Grandees of the first class. Her mother, the Countess of Montijos, has for years been at the head of the *haut ton* of Madrid; and her house

has, I believe, on more than one occasion, been honored by the presence of royalty; and those who are acquainted with Spanish manners well know that such an honor, from its rare occurrence, is the most appreciated in Spain. Formerly it was the custom to suspend a chain across the doorway of the house the King had visited, and the haughtiest Hidalgo of Castile pointed to that most expressive symbol of devotedness with pride. The receptions of the Countess of Montijos at Madrid comprised all that was most select, and the most distinguished in rank and eminence in Spanish society. To have been invited to the *Condessa de Montijos' tertulia* was considered as a sort of passport to all other society in Madrid. The English particularly, were always made welcome at her house, and for the last fourteen or fifteen years few English gentlemen, who have visited Madrid, will have forgotten these receptions. The family was wont to quit Madrid during the hot season, and generally passed the summer at Biarritz, or at some other watering-place in the South of France. They have, however, spent the last three winters, or the greater portion of them, in Paris.

"The Counts of Montijos and Théba are of the same origin as the Dukes of Medina Sidonia. They have the same family name, that of Guzman, and bear the same arms. The tradition of Spain is, that the family of Guzman was founded in Spain by an English knight of the name of Goodman, and who fought in the Moorish wars. The letter D is pronounced in Spain with a lisp, something like S—hence the name of Guzman. It is not the first time that a member of the illustrious family of Guzman mounted on a throne; in 1633 Dona Luiza Francisca de Guzman, daughter of Don Juan Peres de Guzman, eighth Duke of Medina Sidonia, married Don John, then Duke of Braganza, afterwards King of Portugal, the fourth of the name. The Countess of Montijos, mother of the future Empress, is of Scotch extraction. Her great-great-grandfather perished on the scaffold in 1745 in consequence of the part he took in the rebellion in favor of Charles Edward. His son emigrated, and settled at Ostend; the family afterwards passed into Spain, and settled in the south, where the Countess's father was residing, when the brother of the Count of Montijos (the Count of Théba), whose name is often mentioned during the war of independence, married her, and some time after succeeded to the title and estate of his elder brother, who died without issue. It is the etiquette in Spain that a grandee cannot marry without the assent of the sovereign, and it must be shown that the lady he intends marrying is pure in blood, that none of her ancestors ever exercised a degrading profession—in a word, that she is noble for a certain number of generations. The same condition is required from military men, and the certificates proving the fact are denominated the *limpieza de sangre* or *cleansing of the blood*. When the present Countess of Montijos married it appeared from certificates produced from Scotland that she belonged to the family of Kirkpatrick of Clossburn (not Glasburn), and that her ancestor had been created a Baron by Alexander II. of Scotland."

## BELGIUM.

On the 18th ult., the Chamber of Representatives resumed its labors. Ministers laid before the house a bill for the organisation of the army, which was ordered to be referred to a special committee, for the purpose of being reported on. A difficult and delicate question is that relating to the French officers in the Belgian service; but we have grounds for stating, that, undeterred by those difficulties, the Belgian Government is prepared to take steps for removing from the army those natives of France who did not enter it under special agreement, and who have refused to become naturalised Belgian citizens.

## PRUSSIA.

The Government had found it necessary in the course of last year to call the attention of the provincial authorities to the agency of Catholic missionaries in localities where Protestant populations had the preponderance, and to point out that where their public preaching was of a nature of itself, or by reason of the attendant circumstances, calculated to cause a breach of the peace, or where in any way a political or social misdemeanor was thereby committed, the authorities were required to interfere to prevent such occurrences, even, if necessary, by forbidding the missionaries the spot. Further, the Government had found reason to refuse a student of divinity its permission to visit the Collegium Germanicum at Rome (which it was empowered to do by an edict of the late King), and in general to refuse to Jesuits and other clerical persons who had studied in Jesuit establishments permission to take up their abode in Prussia. The motion made by the Baron von Waldhoff is for an address to the King, petitioning him to reverse these orders, on the ground that the first of them is in direct contravention of the 12th article of the Constitution, which guarantees the freedom of religious confession, the right of association for religious purposes, and of meeting for domestic and public religious exercise; and that the edict of the late King, which was made the ground of action in the second order, has been virtually repealed by certain articles of the Constitution quoted; and furthermore, that Ministers had themselves adopted this view in their own instructions to the provincial authorities on a previous occasion. The motion is signed by 73 Catholics and backed by 13 Polish members of the same persuasion, and if (as there seems some chance) the Left side, of about 100 strong, and any portion of the Right side and the Bethmann-Hollweg party should join them, they would be able to carry it against Ministers.—*Times.*

## AUSTRALIA.

The Melbourne Argus says that there is a market there for almost everything, with very high prices; and that there is little reason to fear a glut of the necessities of life, as the market for them is continually enlarging.

The Melbourne Herald, to illustrate the rapid advance in real estate in and around Melbourne, says, that building allotments, two roods each, were selling for £80 to £270 each; at which rate between forty and fifty thousand pounds worth was sold.—Premises in the town which two years ago cost £2,600, could not now be bought for £9,800.

## DR. CAHILL'S LETTER TO THE EARL OF CARLISLE.

The following is the triumphant answer of this distinguished Divine to the recently-published letter of the noble earl:—

TO THE RIGHT HON. THE EARL OF CARLISLE.

"I am aware that it is thought by many that, so far from the case of the Madiais being a solitary instance, the prisons of Italy are at this moment crowded with the victims of religious persecution. They have continually assured us that the old principle and codes of intolerance, once certainly (and I readily admit, not exclusively) attached to their Church, had fallen into practical desuetude, and were viewed by them with at least as much abhorrence as by ourselves. We gave them credit for the generous self-assertion. I will not waste your space by a reference to what is of so little moment as my own career; but I feel that on the whole, it has not lagged in sympathy for their just rights. What has since happened? A man is in danger of meeting with his death under a judicial sentence, for the offence of reading the Bible. The fact, as far as I yet know, is not controverted. It is known there are some—it is believed there are many—undergoing similar risks.

I must repeat, that upon the mode in which the Roman Catholic body at large treat these contemporary occurrences, their place in the estimation even of their most sincere well-wishers must largely depend."

*Extract of Lord Carlisle's Letter to the Leeds Mercury.*

Cambridge, Jan. 27, 1853.

My Lord Earl—I have been very much impressed indeed to learn from the London journals of yesterday morning, that your Lordship has allied your most respected name, and added the prestige of your exalted character to the insatiable calumniators of the Catholic creed; and that in the composed moments of a deliberate letter you have not only thought proper to make statements at variance with historical, legal, and ecclesiastical records, but even, as may be gathered from the above extract, to introduce half-assertions and covert insinuations, almost approaching to a sneer, below the dignity of Lord Morpeth, and the world-wide reputation of the Earl of Carlisle. Having followed, for many years, the influential language of your advocacy of my unhappy country, it is with great pain that I have read your authority quoted at Exeter Hall by the unrelenting enemies of Ireland; and although I should not have condescended to reply to the scandalous misstatements which issue like a foul torrent against Catholicity from the overflowing daily publications of this country, your name demands an immediate reply, and your long services to Ireland commands the most graceful answer, which personal respect and public gratitude can dictate.

You are well aware, my lord, that the writings of Voltaire, Diderot, D'Alembert, and Frederic of Prussia, with many others, deluged the eastern and southern parts of Europe during the latter part of the eighteenth century. These political and religious revolutionists proscribed all monarchical and Christian institutions; "liberty and equality" were the two principles which their disciples, published and advocated; and the united efforts of the most abandoned men that the world ever saw were concentrated in the unchristian sacrilegious, and treasonable combination to uproot "the altar and the throne." In order to carry out their principles of disorder, infidelity, and vengeance, they met together under the name of "a new and a higher degree of freemasonry, called Illuminism," and their places of meeting were so numerous, particularly in France, that Diderot was heard to say, "We have at this moment enrolled in our society upwards of six hundred thousand men, opposed to civil tyranny and Papal authority." The German Protestants followed in the wake of these revolutionists, and, under the pretext of holding meetings for religious worship, aided—as history asserts—the progress of the infidels against Catholicity. It was under these circumstances that both France and the Italian States took the alarm, and passed laws to protect the State and the Altar; and hence, in the year 1786, the Tuscan government enacted a law against "private conventicles," which prohibited any one to hold a meeting in his own house, or to form a meeting in the house of a third party, under any pretext whatever—even of religion, without the sanction and the written legal license of the civil authorities. Two points are therefore clear from these premises, namely,—this law, which was never before known in Tuscany, grew out of the acknowledged and patent danger of civil revolution; and secondly, that law had no reference whatever, either directly or indirectly, to forbidding the circulation of the Word of God, or punishing the reading of the Bible. Its object was definitely to refuse hiding-places to bands of sanguinary infidels, and to scatter the dens of perjured revolutionists. This is the law under which "the martyred Madiaii" have been condemned—a law, be it remembered, introduced for the first time into Tuscany in 1786, and framed not against the Word of God, but against perfidy; not against religion of any kind, but against blasphemy; not against liberty, either civil or religious, but to protect God and man from a scene of blood and devastation, which these monsters soon after enacted in the streets of Paris, in the autumn of 1791. The slaughter in that city on that disastrous day, the succeeding war of Europe, the blood spilled in Spain, Portugal, Germany, Russia, and Italy, and your own National Debt—all demonstrate the prudence of Tuscany in the laws of 1786, and prove, beyond all contradiction, that your lordship has made mis-statements in ascribing ecclesiastical tyranny in what you are pleased to call "the Roman Church" to the prudent and essential enactments of the Tuscan Government. The Catholic Church, therefore, has no necessity to retrace her steps: her office, at present, is rather to teach history to English lords, and to entreat poets that, before they make speeches to write letters, they will pay more attention to their loose statements, and be convinced that the applause of Leeds is a small compensation for the cutting and lasting irony of the Catholic historians of Europe.

I am now come, my lord, to the precise case at issue, viz., the verdict against the Madiaii; and I assert that they have not been visited by a "judicial sentence," as you are pleased to write, for the reading of the Bible. I regret, for the sake of your lordship, that you have written these words. Beyond all contradiction, you are unacquainted with the case, and, therefore your mis-statement is the result of very great culpability. Under a *decided ignorance* of the fact, you charge the Catholic Church with intolerance: you awaken bitter rancor in hearts not yet cooled down from a late religious burning frenzy which has had no