Christ had offered himself to the world, and in His Church, which he has established, he has offered himself to the nations in those things which were set forth in the Bible and preached by those who were commanded to declare Him. He gave up His life at the altar of sacrifice, and came up from the grave bringing with Him the hopes of all the faithful from the beginning to the end. We had dropped tears in commiseration of the sufferings of Jesus, we had seen Him as the resurrected Redeemer, and we had hope in Him. The preacher alluded to the resurrection and said that there was not a single fact in history so old as that, that was so perfect. However it might have been attempted to pervert the testimony as to this great event we had not on record a single instance of the writers and chroniclers of that day to destroy the truth of the resurrection. We had not a single instance to destroy the world's belief in the truth of Christ's resurrection. The glorious truth stands yet.

The communion was administered at the conclusion of the sermon.

BAPTISM AND ANNIVERSARY.

In the afternoon, at half-past two o'clock, there was a baptism of infants and adults, and at half-past three o'clock the forty-fourth missionary anniversary and Easter festival of the Sunday school took place. The exercises consisted of addresses, reading of the reports of officers, reception of offerings and emblems and distribution of premiums. Evening services were also held at the church.

ST. JAMES' (R. C.) CATHEDRAL.

Pontifical High Mass by Bishop Loughlin—Sermon by Rev. Father Sheridan.

A stranger in Brooklyn passing through Jay street would never suspect the low, dilapidated brick structure on the east side, about midway between Concord and Tillary streets, built in the form of a cross and surmounted with a wooden turret and spire of the proportions of a village church, to be the Roman Catholic Cathedral of the third city of the Union, containing in a population of 400,000 between 150,000 and 200,000 Catholics. Entering it, but for the high dark Gothic altar with stained glass windows on each side—one, before which is a small altar of the Blessed Virgin, exhibiting in the centre an exquisitely wrought monogram, in which the letters making up the name "Maria" appear in the single letter M; and the other, on the gospel side, behind the Bishop's chair, illustrated with the Episcopal insignia of mitre and crozier—he would still fall short of appreciating its important character. Here one sees little of the pomp and circumstance and solemn grandeur which the mind usually associates with

CATHEDRAL CEREMONIES,

while the imperfect day that struggles for entrance through small-paned windows, half closed by galleries, has but little association with the dim religious light of ancient minsters. Nor would the music contribute much to relieve the feeling of disappointment experienced by the stray visitor looking for imposing effects by these surroundings, being usually much inferior to that of many of the parish churches in the city, although in other respects, and, indeed, in the full measure of all needful requirements, the cathedral service, altar and otherwise, maintains its precedence. The present Bishop of this diocese, Bishop Loughlin, is eminently practical, of a quiet, unobtrusive nature, earnest and devoted to his charge. Since his installation he has mainly exerted himself in building churches and school houses, the care of the orphans, and other works of that description. He is now engaged in building a new cathedral, which, when completed, will be one of the finest in America; hence the neglect apparent in the present building.

Yesterday the services were of an

UNUSUALLY IMPOSING

character, comprising a Pontifical high mass and Papal benediction. Even with this display, however, there was lacking many of the esthetic effects which the mind naturally associates with such occasions of high ceremonial as the day when the Church seeks to illustrate the glory of her Founder in His resurrection, as well as her own joy in the great triumph. The music was about as usual, the mass sung (Mozart's Twelfth) being decidedly a too ambitious selection for the choir. It being, as we have said, a Pontifical mass, the Right Reverend Bishop was, of course, the celebrant; the Rev. Father Sheridan officiating as deacon, the Rev. Father Kiely as assistant deacon, and the Rev. Father O'Hare as sub-deacon. At the usual time after the first Gospel a sermon was preached by the Rev. Father Sheridan upon the gospel of the day. Father Sheridan is one of a new order, who are increasing here every year and are destined to exert a decided influence upon the Catholic Church. We refer to an order of American priests—that is, men who have been brought up and educated for the priesthood here, surrounded all their lives with the influences of republican ideas and American institutions and familiar from their early days with what the London *Times* sneeringly calls "our peculiar civilization." We do not look to see them less Catholic than the priests of France, Italy or Ireland—indeed, with the exception of the latter country, the Holy See has no such stanch supporters as the American clergy—but with their increase we may look to see distinctive features impressed upon the American Church by American civilization, as have in times past, with less of the spirit of holiness, marked the Gallican Church, the German Church and other branches of the Church Catholic.

Father Sheridan, in a few pointed sentences, drew attention to the greatness of the miracle commemorated in the festival of the resurrection—its literal and typical importance, and the lesson to be de[illegible] with an earnest exhortation to [illegible] who had not yet made their Easter duty to avail themselves of the opportunities afforded them.

The feature of the music was a duo, "O Salutaris," by J. Loretz, Jr., sung by Miss A. Rommanas, alto, and Mrs. J. Kiernan, soprano, as an anthem piece.

CHRIST EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

[illegible] by Rev. Dr. Partridge.

[illegible] congregation assembled in Christ Protestant Episcopal church, Bedford avenue, yesterday morning, despite the rain storm which prevailed, and the services were appropriate to the jubilant occasion. In front of the reading desk was suspended a cross made of beautiful camellias, surrounded with buds of every hue; suspended from the pulpit was an anchor constructed of choice exotics, gracefully festooned with variegated flowers, while in front of the chancel was placed a cluster of white lilies. The floral ornamentation was tasteful, but not elaborate, and the fragrant odor which the flowers emitted blended sweetly with the incense of prayer that ascended from the worshipping assembly. The musical selections were appropriate to the day, consisting of an anthem, "Christ Our Passover;" Glorias by Mozart; Te Deum in G, and Jubilate in [illegible] flat. Besides Mrs. Thatcher, soprano; Mr. [illegible]k, alto; George Ellard, tenor, and John Abb[illegible], basso—all of whom were in fine voice—there was a select chorus of twelve ladies and gentlemen which made the musical part of the service very effective. Mr. William Richardson presided at the organ. After the usual ritual service had been performed the rector, Rev. Dr. Partridge, delivered a short, practical discourse upon a theme suggested by the day, taking his text from the seventh verse of the twenty-eighth chapter of Matthew:—"Go quickly and tell His disciples that He is risen from the dead." In the course of his observations the reverend gentleman dwelt in glowing terms upon the surprise and joy manifested by the women and the disciples when they learned from the angels that Christ had vacated the sepulchre. Jesus himself met the holy women and told them to tell His disciples that they should see Him in Galilee. Saviour was ever merciful unto His people. [illegible] loved and encouraged all His followers, [illegible] the mourner's tears and gave them the assurance because He lived they would live also; and having sanctified the tomb and triumphed over the powers of darkness He became the first fruits of a glorious harvest, who should hear His voice and come forth from their sleeping dormitories to an immortality of blessedness and love. The resurrection of Jesus Christ from the grave was not merely a fact to be believed, but something deeply important to every one, and having a bearing upon the present and the future. Haste was enjoined upon the messengers to go and tell His disciples the glad tidings of the Lord's resurrection, and life good news should be wafted upon the wings of the wind until every nation and kingdom on the earth should hear it and be blessed by it. We should be thankful that we had the testimony of angels in this matter, and that the best news the world ever heard was conveyed by such worthy messengers, who always manifested a deep interest in the concerns of humanity. The next witnesses chosen by God to announce the resurrection were the pious women who had followed the Lord to Calvary; but, to crown all, Christ Himself appeared, saying "All hail," and breathing "Peace" upon them. This day of human hope will be celebrated as long as the sun and moon endure, until the coming of Jesus to judge the nations and gather together His redeemed children from every part of the world. Untold blessings were included in the word of "peace" which Jesus breathed upon His people—the peace of pardoned sin, the assurance that every trace of displeasure was removed from the face of our Heavenly Father—a peace which passeth all understanding and which the world could not give nor take away. Sorrow was soothed by it, joy tempered by it, sickness sanctified by it, death supported by it and robbed of all its terrors, so that we might leave our sainted dead with Christ, who is the resurrection and the life of His people, knowing that He will raise them up again in the last great day, when we shall see them and meet to be separated no more forever. In conclusion the rector enforced the practical lessons which the theme suggested, and expressed the hope that all his hearers might experience the purifying and transforming power which a heart belief of the great fact of Christ's resurrection was calculated to give.

Services appropriate to Easter were continued in the afternoon and evening. Rev. Mr. Babcock, the newly appointed and popular assistant minister, preaching the sermon.

CHURCH OF THE SACRED HEART.

A Thriving Young Parish—First Class Music by a Full Choir of Amateurs.

The new Catholic parish recently created by Bishop Loughlin, on the north side of Fort Greene, East Brooklyn, is already a great success. Pending the erection of the proposed magnificent church, a number of spirited parishioners, under the lead of Messrs. McGoldrick and Kelly, have purchased the elegant and commodious little edifice on Vanderbilt avenue, which was formerly a Methodist church, and converted it into a neat Catholic place of worship. They have also purchased a beautiful organ, on which Professor Weinstein, who has organized a first class amateur full choir, has been discoursing the sweetest strains of the great masters of Catholic music for several weeks past. The professor and his choir were prepared to afford the worshippers at the Church of the Sacred Heart a rare treat yesterday, and they were eminently successful. They sang Farmer's mass in B flat very finely, difficult as the rendering of such a piece was for amateurs. Professor Weinstein presided at the organ, with the Misses Weinstein and Martin as sopranos; the Misses Biddulph and Tully, altos; Messrs. McAuliffe and Pulvermacher, tenors, and Messrs. Harrington and Pulvermacher, bassos. The chorus did full justice to the training of Mr. Weinstein and Father McGivern, and the orchestral accompaniment, under the leadership of Mr. Ahrup, of the Marine Band, created a fine effect. The solo quartet of the choir sung Mozart's "Ave Verum" before the sermon, and during the offertory the choir rendered Lambillotte's Alleluia chorus with great power. The church was splendidly decorated with a profusion of flowers and evergreens, and the Rev. Father McGivern, the popular and energetic pastor, delivered an eloquent sermon on the Gospel of the day.

NEW JERSEY CHURCHES.

ST. PETER'S CHURCH, JERSEY CITY.

Sermon by the Rev. Father Beaudevin, S. J., on the Resurrection of Christ.

The ceremonies at St. Peter's church, Jersey City, were exceedingly solemn and impressive. At half-past ten o'clock a solemn high mass was celebrated, Father Frederiche being celebrant, Father McQuade deacon and Mr. John McCloskey sub-deacon. The sermon was preached by Father Beaudevin, whose text was:—"This is the day which the Lord has made: let us rejoice and be glad therein." It was on this day that our blessed Lord exhibited His power and came forth from the tomb bearing trophies of victory. It is the day of Christ's triumph over

THE POWERS OF DARKNESS.

It is on this day that our Lord is truly glorified before God and men. After having lain for three days in the bosom of the earth He arose in His might and achieved a complete triumph over the power of death. The enemies of Christ and His religion had, to all appearances, been successful, and well might many ask, Is this the Messiah that was to come? Is this He who was promised to our fathers as the Great Deliverer of mankind? There He hangs between two thieves, to all appearance more guilty than the companions of His agony. He had only twelve apostles, and one has betrayed Him, while the leader of all denied Him thrice. But in His resurrection He achieved a full triumph over His worst enemies, because He proved that He was the Messiah that was to come. Our Lord invited his enemies to do their worst, so that He might obtain His triumph; for He said, "I will rise again after three days." It was

THE GREATEST MIRACLE EVER PERFORMED,

that a man should raise himself when his soul was separated from his body. It was a proof that Christ was the master of the world. Let us remember that it our Lord triumphed on this day it was because He humbled Himself even unto the death of the cross. And let us remember that when our Lord once put off the habiliments of death He never died again. So should we arise from the grave of sin to the newness of life and never descend again into the depths of sin. In a word, our resurrection should be glorious, like that of our Divine Master.

The music was taken from Rossi's Mass in D. Professor Neuendorf secured a powerful cast, and the manner in which the mass was rendered was admirable. In the "Gloria" and "Credo" Miss Schmitz, the soprano, sustained several difficult passages with remarkable clearness and vigor. The "Qui Tollis," by the basso, Mr. Vierling, was a fine effort. Mr. Groschel, the tenor, also distinguished himself.

CHARTER ELECTIONS IN JERSEY.

Who Will Be Mayor of Jersey City?—The Erie Ring, the Bumsted Ring and the Politicians' Ring in the Contest.

If ever circumspection was needed in the choice of municipal officers in Jersey City it is just now. The city treasury has been for the past year a fat goose in the hands of the Ring, and they have plucked it till the very bones were left bare. The charter election will take place on Tuesday, the 9th inst., when a Mayor and Board of Aldermen will be elected. The primaries will be held this evening for the election of delegates to the city convention. The people want a Mayor who, to use the words of an old adage, can see with both eyes, and who will devote such time to the public business as will enable him not merely to discern what is passing in the different departments of the city government, but also the tendency of every scheme involving a large expenditure. Extravagant as are the provisions of "The Thieves' Charter," the several Boards can be crippled in every corrupt job by a vigilant Mayor. No swindling contracts should be signed. The efficacy of the veto power is almost entirely annulled under the existing charter, yet an active Mayor can publish messages setting forth the financial condition of the city from time to time, and if that course should be ineffectual he should summon public meetings and take counsel with the taxpayers to check everything that might savor of extravagance or fraud. Such a Mayor would indeed confer blessings on the municipality. With such an officer, aided by the Grand Jury and an irreproachable judiciary, municipal robbery would become a very unprofitable business.

The candidates for the Mayoralty are fewer than at any time within the past six years. The friends of the present incumbent, Mayor O'Neill, urge him to accept a renomination, but he has not yet announced his intention in the matter. Sidney B. Bevans, who proved a formidable rival last year, is again in the field. He has been confined to his bed for some weeks from an attack of pneumonia, but he is recovering rapidly. His supporters are active as well as numerous. Ex-Mayor Sawyer, of Hudson City, is also a candidate. Mr. Thomas Aldridge, ex-Recorder, is spoken of, and no better selection could be made. He was the foreman of the late Grand Jury, a body of men whose services to the plundered taxpayers will not be forgotten while gratitude finds a place in a single heart throughout the present generation. He is the man of all others who is acquainted with the fraudulent operations of the Ring, and he possesses the keen forestight, pluck and boldness to thwart corrupt projects.

As a matter of course the rings are actively engaged in this contest. One of the above-named candidates is said to be supported by Erie, whose money is being circulated by thousands of dollars, but in justice to the gentleman his name is withheld till he can publicly meet the charge, although it is based on the most reliable authority. It is also but simple justice to state that not one of the candidates named has a shadow of sympathy with the Ring which is plundering the city. From the Politicians' Ring Bevans will obtain more support than any of his rivals.

THE ASSAILANTS OF OFFICER TULLY.

James McNamee, otherwise known as "Stretch," because of his very long legs; William O'Brien, alias "Stitch," and Charles Clemens, who were arrested some weeks ago on suspicion of having taken part in the assault upon Officer Tully, of the Nineteenth precinct, were arraigned for examination yesterday at the Yorkville Police Court. Officer Tully was present, and testified that he was quite positive O'Brien had struck him, among others before he was rendered insensible, but as to what the others did he was not so clear. Clemens and McNamee were admitted to bail in $500 each to answer, while O'Brien was fully committed for trial without bail to answer at the General Sessions. Tully has fully recovered from his injuries.

THE CITY OF KINGSTON.

KINGSTON, N. Y., March 31, 1872.

The signing of the charter of the city of Kingston, which unites the two villages of Roondout and Kingston under one municipal government, was celebrated last evening by the ringing of bells, firing of cannon, illuminations and general rejoicing. The Board of Trustees of the two villages met and exchanged congratulations, and appointed Tuesday, April 16, for the municipal election to take place. The reorganization of the city will begin at once.

TOO TRAGIC FOR ROMANCE.

Faithful Unto Death—Aid Too Late.

BOSTON, Mass., March 31, 1872.

In a Boston boarding house, on Friday, the wife of Thomas Williams, mechanic, whom she had labored to support and nurse during a long and incurable illness, died in his presence from an overdose of laudanum taken to quiet her nerves and procure rest. The husband was unable to render aid or call for assistance, and expired himself next day. Mrs. Williams is said to have married against the consent of her parents, wealthy residents of Newport, who cast her off; but while both were dying a letter came offering the assistance too long withheld. The bodies were taken to Newport for burial.

THE WASHINGTON TREATY.

The American Reply to Earl Granville's Communication.

The Subject Before Both Houses of Parliament—Explanations of the Foreign Minister and Premier Gladstone—Comments of the London Press on America's Answer.

LONDON, March 19, 1872.

In the House of Lords last night the Washington Treaty, or, to be more explicit in the matter, the American reply to the communication of Lord Granville of February 3, was the subject of inquiry. The Earl of Malmesbury rose and desired to know when Her Majesty's government intends to lay before the House the despatch which had been received from the government of the United States. The Earl was, moreover, anxious to hear from the head of the Foreign Office what is the present state of the negotiations that are now going on with respect to the treaty. Earl Granville in response replied that the American reply had been received four days previous. "When I was leaving," continued Earl Granville, "the House I was informed that General Schenck was waiting for me at the Foreign office. I went over to him, and he presented me with a copy of the despatch which he had received from Mr. Fish. It appears to her Majesty's government that the document requires an answer, and, indeed, seems to invite one on the part of Her Majesty's government. Under these circumstances it is impossible for me to specify the exact time at which we can produce the correspondence or to state the exact condition of the negotiations. My lords, I fully appreciate what the noble Earl has said with regard to the anxiety which we must all feel on this important question. That anxiety is shared by Her Majesty's government, who are desirous to maintain the treaty, and they feel the very grave responsibility which lies upon them to maintain the dignity and the interests of this country."

In the House of Commons Mr. Gladstone informed the members of the reception of the American reply as follows:—

I take this opportunity of replying to the question put to me on Friday last by the right honorable gentleman the member for Buckinghamshire. The reply of the government of the United States to the communication of Lord Granville, dated the 3d of February, is dated the 27th of February, and was placed in the hands of Lord Granville on the 14th of March. This reply of the American government is couched in courteous and friendly terms. It does not accept our views, and, in the opinion of the government, it requires an an answer—which, indeed, the government of the United States appear to anticipate and to invite. The despatch, or letter—as I believe it should be termed—containing this reply on the part of Her Majesty's government, will, I hope, be sent to the American Minister in time for his usual or one of his usual modes of communication with his government, that is to say, on or before Thursday next. I understood the right honorable gentleman to put a question as to the mode in which the government of the Queen were disposed to deal with the American despatch, in respect of having it or not laying it before the two houses of Parliament; and I have to say that it would not, in our opinion, be consistent with the public interests that the incomplete correspondence which has taken place should be laid before Parliament at the present time. With respect to an apprehension which he appeared to express, and which I may, perhaps, interpret as part of the question, that it would be a matter of necessity for Parliament to deliberate upon the subject of the Treaty of Washington, with a view to some decisive issue, before the 15th day of April, I have to observe that it would be premature to assume at the present stage that there will of necessity be any interruption at or before that date in the proceedings contemplated by the treaty. As regards the production of the document, both the House of Representatives and the Senate of the United States, the latter of which, as the House is aware, occupies a peculiar and authoritative position in regard to the ratification of treaties, have, as we understand, declined to call upon the President for any information as to the tenor of his communications with the British government, and we both hope and anticipate that the House of Commons will, under the existing circumstances, observe a similar forbearance. We shall on our part be most desirous of giving any information we possess to Parliament at the earliest moment the public interest will permit. I have only to add that while on the one hand we continue to be most anxious to maintain and carry out the Treaty of Washington, on the other I trust we shall be found not to fail in that sense of the state and nature of the case which the honor of this country may demand.

Comments of the English Press on the American Reply.

The London *Times*, of the 19th, commenting on the statements made by Lord Granville and Mr. Gladstone in Parliament the night previous, concludes as follows:—

* * * It is not impossible, but all the prudence shown by the Foreign Secretary during the Franco-Prussian war and in the Black Sea negotiations will be necessary to prevent our floundering deeper and deeper through excessive hopefulness that we shall find land at length, and that things may still go right. "As might have been foreseen from the first—that is, from the moment when it was found that the two parties had not understood each other," these words of M. John Lemoinne, in the *Debats* of yesterday, express the judgment of a competent person holding an impartial position on the extreme improbability—we may say hopelessness—of bridging over the difference of construction revealed by the appearance of the American case. Any person capable of freeing his mind from the effect of the circumstances about him must have arrived at the same conclusion. Our opinion has never been concealed, not because we are pleased to take a pessimist view of the emergency, but because we have foreseen and deprecated the possibility of entangling ourselves more and more in a mesh that cannot be uncelled, and because we have desired that the failure of the Alabama Arbitration might do as little damage as possible to other interests. It must be remembered that the Treaty of Washington covers much more than a reference of the Alabama Claims to the Tribunal at Geneva. It provides for the settlement by the Commission at Washington of private claims "not growing out of the acts" of the Alabama and her consorts. It provides for the settlement of the fishery disputes, the free navigation of the St. Lawrence and the canals, and, finally, for the submission of the San Juan dispute to the arbitration of the Emperor of Germany. All these matters are included in one document, and yet the form of the treaty indicates an intention to regard each as independent of the other. The settlement of the fisheries question, for example, is accompanied by a stipulation for the payment of the difference in the value of the rights to be dealt with, it is made subject to co-operation of the Dominion and Colonial Parliaments, and is limited for a term of ten years, and until it shall be put an end to by notice on either side. The San Juan Arbitration, again, stands by itself. Everything, indeed, points to the conclusion that the different parts of the treaty are each valid independently of the others, but we do not know whether this opinion would be approved by the United States government. In recognizing the too great probability that the Alabama Arbitration will lapse, the judgment of the Cabinet of Washington on the effect such a lapse would have on the rest of the treaty ought, therefore, to be ascertained. The Executive government could not, indeed, do more than declare their own opinion that the several parts of the treaty are not inseparably bound up together—if such be their view—for the Senate might at any time protest that they had ratified the Convention as a whole. At the same time we are bound, if only out of respect to the Emperor of Germany, to come to an understanding with the United States government on this point, so as to save His Majesty from the mortification of delivering a judgment which may be repudiated on grounds of which he can have no cognizance. As it is, we are drifting on, not knowing what may happen, and, so far as we know, not making any preparation for an emergency which seems inevitable. When that occurs which, as M. Lemoinne writes, "might have been foreseen from the first," shall we have the satisfaction of being able to say that we have used the interval so that the abortive result of the Alabama arbitration may involve us in no new embarrassments, and not bring to an end with it the promised settlement of other difficulties we had hopefully anticipated?

The *Morning Post* of the 19th, commenting on the statement made by the Premier, says that "although Mr. Gladstone has told us very little, that little is of grave import." * * * It is well known that great progress has already been made in the preparation of the English counter case, and as it must be printed before being delivered at Geneva, on the 15th of April, it will probably be completed before Earl Granville's despatch comes under the consideration of President Grant's Cabinet. We are therefore in this very equivocal position, that while, through the ordinary diplomatic channels, Great Britain is protesting against being supposed to have entered into a most preposterous engagement she is, at the same time, through her recognized agents, treating that engagement as a binding one and appealing to a tribunal whose jurisdiction she disavows. Such a course of proceeding must strike most persons as inconsistent, undignified and absurd. It is one against which, if we are not mistaken, Parliament will protest. There is no desire on the part of any one to hamper the action of Her Majesty's government, but it is impossible that they can be permitted to pursue the policy indicated by the Prime Minister last evening free from criticism. Under ordinary circumstances considerable latitude should be allowed to the advisers of the Crown, and Parliament should not be hasty in demanding the production of documents while a correspondence is still incomplete. But whatever may be the confidence which Parliament may be prepared to repose in Her Majesty's government, there is an overpowering desire not only to know on what basis the pending negotiation is being carried on, but also the course on which the government have resolved in respect to further proceedings under the Treaty of Washington. The few words spoken by Mr. Gladstone last night indicate a weak and vacillating disposition which will find no favor with the country. The universal feeling is that once for all we should state that under no circumstances can we assent to the interpretation put on the Treaty of Washington by the government of the United States, and that unless some means are taken to limit the inquiry before the arbitrators so as to exclude the preposterous demands to which we object we must abandon the treaty. There is, however, nothing in Mr. Gladstone's communication to the House of Commons to lead the public to suppose that such is the course on which he has determined.

The *Pall Mall Gazette* treats the subject in the following manner:—

* * * But what is meant by the despatch "appearing to require an answer," as both Lord Granville and Mr. Gladstone say? What is meant by Mr. Fish "seeming to invite," "appearing to anticipate" a reply? The language of Her Majesty's Ministers strongly suggests that the invitation is by no means direct, but, on the contrary is so indirect that, like the disputed passages in the treaty, it is a delicate matter of opinion. But it is of great importance whether the American government write as if they were willing to be convinced, or whether they simply say, "There is our answer—in strict opposition to your view of the matter; and now it is for you to declare what course you mean to take." This may be construed into a "seeming invitation" to controversy, but it infuses no hope into the dreary expectation that argument will be of any avail. For our own part we are distinctly of opinion that all controversy on that point is useless, and worse than useless; and we do not believe that the "invitation" is of such a character as to justify a belief that the Americans think differently. We may quite rely upon it, the matter is settled absolutely so far. The Cabinet of the United States will never be turned by any number of answers, however courteous or persuasive they may be, from their resolve to insist on a right under the treaty of presenting their consequential damages in some shape for arbitration. This being the case, we look with the utmost anxiety for the despatch which is to be our answer to Mr. Fish's obscure and careless invitation. And we are anxious for this reason. There is a talk of compromise. Although etiquette obliges the government to abstain from informing the Legislature of what they propose to say in answer to Mr. Fish, they have a newspaper at command in which they usually contrive to hint their policies in a dark, experimental manner. And from an article that appears in yesterday's edition of that journal, it seems that the government is busy with a way out of the difficulty which we suggested as sure to be propounded a fortnight ago. Suppose the British government accepts for the sake of peace another little dose of humiliation, and declares that while it repudiates the false interpretation of a treaty which would lead the country with an imposed that no nation would submit to "even at the point of death," it does not mind yielding the principle in a limited amicable way, that would not entail considerable payments? This is the suggestion set forth in yesterday's *Telegraph* as one that might bring the dispute to a happy termination. That journal says:—"Could the United States withdraw the pecuniary part of the indirect claims from their case—a thing all the more easy if no money is really expected—the English government might perhaps afford, for the sake of final settlement, to concede a point of form." Now there can be no doubt that the American government and the American people are really indifferent as to "the pecuniary part of the indirect claims." That may be proved out of the protocols and out of the whole body of comment that has appeared in the American press since the discussion arose. All that they desire is that the money paid to them shall, in some degree, apply to indirect losses, and so obtain for those losses sufficient recognition as just matter of compensation. The righteousness of the claim they insist on; the money they are indifferent to. But is the country prepared to fall in with this arrangement? Will it be honorable to ourselves to reject the claims as forced and unjust so long as they seem onerous, but to admit them as soon as it is discovered that they will be made light for us in a pecuniary sense? It is not unfrequently said that Mr. Fish's despatch hints pretty broadly that "money is no object;" but is nothing out the money an object to us? This is a question of the gravest import, and we only wish the country had some assurance that the policy indicated by the ministerial paper is not favored by the Ministry itself.

The London *Standard* concludes an article on the treaty as follows:—

The American government notoriously did not expect to get anything by the claim for consequential damages. It was not foolish enough to expect that any arbitrators would hold either that the Alabama and her consorts caused the prolongation of the war, or that, if they did, England could be called upon to pay for a consequence so remote. But it wished to present to the court in full its whole case, its entire grounds of resentment against England, and perhaps imagined that the supposed encouragement given to the Confederacy might operate in aggravation of general damages. If, therefore, the Americans are allowed to complain, it is possible that some means might be found of arranging that they should not press this claim. The despatch is said to contain an instruction to that effect. Now, it is obvious that the mode suggested in certain quarters of limiting the maximum of damages by common consent will not suffice. Not only could England not agree to pay enormous damages—she cannot agree to pay damages on wrong grounds. She owes it to herself and to all neutral nations not to admit a claim which might be made on future occasions the precedent for demands that, as M. De Laveleye remarks, might be pressed home to the utter ruin of a minor State. Our government is bound to exclude altogether the possibility of damages for the prolongation of the war. But if this can be done we are not bound to be very particular as to the mode of doing it. It is suggested that the Senate having accepted the treaty as including these claims, the President cannot agree not to press them, or that if he did, the Senate might afterwards cause them to be renewed in diplomatic form, on the ground that it had not assented to their withdrawal. Now, in the first place, the American constitution leaves the conduct of diplomatic negotiations and arbitrations to the Executive, though the consent of the Senate is necessary to a formal convention; and if the President chooses to instruct his representatives at Geneva simply to notify to the arbitrators that their case is not to be interpreted as claiming consequential damages, the Senate cannot interfere with him. Nor does it concern us whether his conduct be constitutional or not. If the arbitration can go on, and a judgment be given, without our allowing the submission of the consequential claims, we may leave the President to account as he can to the Senate afterwards. We need not be afraid of anything the latter can do. It could not prevent the execution of the awards of the various commissions; it could not oblige President Grant to reopen the dispute; and in the infinitely improbable case that the consequential claims should be revived by his successors, a peremptory refusal to discuss them would be approved by the entire world, America not excepted. If, then, the President and his advisers are willing to give us any assurance on which we can rely, that the claims for damages on account of the prolongation of the war, and so forth, shall not be preferred, or shall form no part of the subject of the award, it would, in our opinion, be perfectly safe for our government to accept that assurance without scrupulously inquiring into the limits of the constitutional authority respectively exercised by the President and by the Senate. We fear that there is little hope of any such concession on the part of the American Executive. But still there are symptoms which seem to point to the possibility of such a solution; and, if it be possible, no chimerical fears of the possible hostility of the Senate, no scruples with regard to constitutional questions which do not concern us, should prevent our government from embracing the opportunity of bringing the matter to an amicable and honorable, if not in all respects a satisfactory, settlement.

The London *Telegraph* thus expresses itself on the ministerial statements in both Houses of Parliament on the night of the 18th:—

* * * But if Mr. Gladstone and Lord Granville were prudently reticent in their statements last night, it cannot be said that they failed to satisfy public curiosity, or even to allay public anxiety. They told us that the American note requires, anticipates, invites a reply, and the Premier especially was significantly emphatic in his caution that it would be premature to assume at present any interruption in the course of the negotiations contemplated by the Treaty of Washington. Both of these indications as to the line which the diplomatic controversy is taking are of high importance; indeed, they may be said to shed a new light of hopefulness upon the affair of the indirect claims. It is now evident, beyond all doubt, that the American government does not take up the defiant position which, from the utterances of some transatlantic journals, we might have been led to apprehend. It is also apparent that the Ministers at Washington are quite prepared for what may prove to be a protracted negotiation on the point whether or not the indirect claims can, in consistency with the treaty, be urged at Geneva. We could easily conceive a very different and a very much more untoward condition of affairs. Either country might brusquely and irritatingly plead that the question at issue was one of simple yes or no; but happily both cabinets take a different view of the responsibilities which devolve upon them, as charged with the welfare of two great peoples. We may be certain that the despatch sent in rejoinder to the American reply will not be less amicable in tone. Will not less clearly state the desire of England for a friendly arrangement of the difficulty, than the original note of Lord Granville, which has drawn forth so promising a response from the other side. It is not for us now to speculate on the tenor of the English despatch, which in a couple of days will be in General Schenck's hands. We may, however, put aside the fancy that any mode of extrication from a dilemma which is equally embarrassing for both governments can be either proposed or accepted off-hand. The dates fixed by the treaty for the presentation of cases and counter cases, for the closing of replies and the perfecting of evidence, are, like the Court of Arbitration itself, really dependent on the will of the two sovereign Powers which have agreed on this mode of settling their difference. If they can come, by diplomatic correspondence, to an understanding on the point which now bars the road of all reference whatever to the Court, the times and seasons of that Court's transacting business will become a matter of easy arrangement. That consideration should weigh with the public of both countries to curb impatience, and to make endurable the prospect of even a considerable postponement of the solution we all fervently desire to see attained. *Festina lente* is a sound and safe motto when such vast interests are at stake as those which hang on the issue of the present controversy. Already the mere lapse of days is calming down most appreciably the popular sentiment on both sides of the Atlantic; so we are the more encouraged to hope that temperate argument and friendly desire to attain a settlement by which the interests and honor of both nations can be saved will in due time dissipate all the adventitious difficulties that have been heaped up about the controversy. We venture to predict that in a little time the vast chasm which so lately seemed to yawn between the positions of the two Powers will be found to have visibly narrowed; and when the difficulty is seen in its true proportions the solution will more readily suggest itself.

A French Opinion of the Washington Treaty.

The following article, signed by M. John Lemoinne, appeared in the *Debats* of the 18th of March:—

The reply of the United States government has arrived in England, and it bears out the anticipations which have been expressed on both sides. There has been a misunderstanding in the negotiation and in the terms of the Treaty. It was discovered at the moment when the Treaty was about to be carried out; neither party is disposed to yield, and as a last result everything must begin again upon fresh bases. We have already explained the position of affairs. England consented to submit to arbitrators the question of indemnity for direct and clearly defined damages. America thought itself warranted in adding to the claims for direct damages other cases intimated in number and unnamed in extent, of indirect damages, the first effect of which was to render England responsible for the prolongation of the war and liable for the expense which it had entailed. This simple little bill might possibly have attained proportions exceeding the ransom imposed upon France by Prussia; it might have reached ten milliards. In fact, it opened a field for all sorts of fantastic calculations. That is so true that the Americans have never seriously maintained the demand; throughout the controversy they have seemed to say, "it is a joke." It would appear that in its reply the United States government manifests a very conciliatory disposition; it would willingly arrange the difference, but it has not the power to do so. The interpretation which it has given to the treaty, and which it has submitted to the Geneva tribunal, is that which is acceptable by the public opinion of the United States, and it is therefore impossible for it to withdraw its claims. England, as we have said, categorically refuses to allow itself to be drawn from the legal ground which it has selected; it will not submit to the arbitrators questions which it never intended to refer to them, even although it knew beforehand that the decision would be in its favor. England can quote a precedent of twenty years' standing in its justification. In order to fix the boundaries between the States and the British Possessions in North America the two governments selected the King of Holland as an arbitrator. The King defined the boundary line; England accepted his decision, but the American government refused to do so, upon the ground that the question submitted to the arbitrator was to decide between two lines of position specially defined, and not to fix upon a third and different one. Fresh negotiations were required and a new treaty to settle that difference. It is probable that upon this occasion also it will be necessary to do everything over again. Seeing the evident disposition of both governments to arrive at an agreement we might conclude that such agreement is easy to attain. And it would be so, in fact, if the matter rested between the two governments, who could negotiate upon their sole responsibility by virtue of the right attaching to every executive power to conclude treaties. But the English government and the American government do not stand in the same position. In the United States a treaty concluded with a foreign Power to become valid requires the ratification of the Senate. It is that which imposes an obstacle to any amicable arrangement between the two governments. Several methods of settling the dispute have been suggested—for instance, to stipulate beforehand that the indemnities to be awarded shall not exceed a certain amount, or that the American representatives should declare that their demands for indirect damages are merely formal, and that the tribunal was not called upon seriously to consider them. But the English object, and not without reason, that such arrangement would not resolve the question; that they could not know whether the American Senate, having interpreted the treaty in any particular manner, would not say that its own government had exceeded their powers and would not rest upon the original demands. The President of the United States and his Cabinet may make a particular arrangement, but the English government cannot tell whether such arrangement or such new interpretation would be accepted by the Senate. In such an event nothing would be settled and nothing would be concluded, and England, which believed that it had got rid of this quarrel by the payment of some millions, might find it revived in the form of demands for indirect damages. The case is complicated by the proximity of the Presidential election in the United States, which precludes any candidate for the supreme office from allowing it to be said of him that he has abandoned the American claims upon England. This justice must be rendered to the English, they have not made the question one of party. They know that it is too serious an affair to be trifled with. It is a singular result that the Gladstone Ministry is at the same time shaken and strengthened by this question: it is shaken because it is a serious diplomatic check for it, and it is strengthened because no one wishes to undertake for it the task of getting out of this false position. Thus, as might have been foreseen from the first, that is from the moment when it was found that the two parties had not understood each other, it is probable that the affair will remain as it is; that the tribunal at Geneva will constitute itself formally and will summon the parties; that the representatives of the United States will declare themselves ready to appear to plead, but those of England will abstain, asserting that the questions submitted to the tribunal are not those which are specified in the convention. As a last resort fresh negotiations must be opened by fresh negotiators, and in the meantime the quarrel will remain open."

Proceedings in the House of Commons—Mr. Gladstone's Reply to the Questions Concerning New Proposals—The Treaty-Making Power of the Crown.

LONDON, March 21, 1872.

Last night the Washington Treaty was thus briefly alluded to:—

Mr. HORSMAN—In putting the question which stands in my name I wish to state that if it will be more convenient to the government that the answer should be limited to the terms of the despatch just going out, I shall be perfectly contented with that answer, postponing the remainder of the question to be answered after the meeting of the Cabinet, but I will leave it to my right honorable friend's discretion to answer it, if he thinks proper, in the terms in which it stands, viz., whether no can give an assurance to the House that, with reference to the Alabama Treaty, no new proposals shall be made or accepted by the British government as binding on this country until they shall have been made known to Parliament and an opportunity afforded for an expression of his opinion upon them.

Mr. GLADSTONE—I quite appreciate the courteous offer which my right honorable friend has made to limit the scope of his question to the despatch which, as I stated yesterday, is about to be sent to the American Minister for transmission to the American government by to-morrow's mail. I do not feel myself under the necessity of accepting that offer; but I necessarily answer the question without having had the opportunity of a formal consultation with the whole of my colleagues. I have had the opportunity of examining and redecting on its terms. I am quite sensible that the short notice of the question which has been put on the paper grows out of the necessity of the case and not out of any feeling upon the part of my right honorable friend. I feel myself sufficiently able to state generally the views of this government with respect to a question of this nature. I am unable to give the promise which my right honorable friend asks; but I can say, however, that I am by no means of opinion that Parliament ought to remain in substantial ignorance of the progress of the course of these great affairs, even while they are in their current stage. Parliament ought and must be informed of the spirit, the aim and the direction of the policy of the government, and Parliament has been informed, through the medium of the speech of the