

# The Leader.

"The one Idea which History exhibits as evermore developing itself into greater distinctness is the Idea of Humanity—the noble endeavour to throw down all the barriers erected between men by prejudice and one-sided views; and by setting aside the distinctions of Religion, Country, and Colour, to treat the whole Human race as one brotherhood, having one great object—the free development of our spiritual nature."—*Humboldt's Cosmos.*

## Contents:

NEWS OF THE WEEK—	PAGE
The Week in Parliament .....	574
Lord Malmesbury and Mr. Mather .....	579
Alderman Salomons' Victorious .....	579
Police Interference in Bonner's Fields .....	579
Letters from Paris .....	580
Continental Notes .....	580
Election Matters .....	581
Miss Catherine Hayes in Chancery .....	582
"The Diggings!" .....	582
Cork Exhibition .....	582
Mr. F. O. Ward on "Reciprocal	

Taxation," and the "Bankruptcy Check." .....	583
Thomas Francis Meagher .....	583
"Green; very Green!" .....	584
Railway Collisions .....	584
Murder by Poison .....	584
New British Export .....	584
Miscellaneous .....	584
Health of London during the Week .....	585
Births, Marriages, and Deaths .....	585
POSTSCRIPT .....	585

PUBLIC AFFAIRS—	
M. le Comte de Malmesbury, his Allies and Accomplices .....	586
A New Ministry on the Tapis .....	587
Malmesbury's Magnum Opus Re- edited .....	588
A Spooner-ful at Bedtime, occa- sionally .....	589
Popular Self-Defence .....	588
The Plague of Beans .....	589
Notes for the Elections .....	589
Beauties of the Protectionist Writers and Orators .....	589

LITERATURE—	
Mrs. Romer's <i>Filia Dolorosa</i> .....	590
Natural History of Animals .....	591
PORTFOLIO—	
Comte's Positive Philosophy .....	592
THE ARTS—	
Hamlet and the German Actors .....	593
The Vampire and the English Drama .....	594
Notes Theatrical .....	595
COMMERCIAL AFFAIRS—	
Markets, Advertisements, &c. ....	595-596

VOL. III. No. 117.]

SATURDAY, JUNE 19, 1852.

[PRICE SIXPENCE.]

## News of the Week.

MALMESBURY must be thrown overboard, to save the Ministry; that is the one fact made evident by the events of the week; and it is a fact tolerably predetermined, we believe, not only by his political opponents, but of course with more rancour by his political friends. The two scrapes into which he has brought the Cabinet, happening together, thoroughly exposed before the public, transcending the toleration of the two Houses in which they are debated, have settled the matter. The accidents of his position conspire with his own conduct. The personal friendship, for example, of Mr. Scarlett, in Florence, with the Duke of Casigliano and "the other side" in the "Mather affair," although a matter for which Lord Malmesbury cannot be deemed responsible, contributes to deepen the colour in which he has already appeared.

Lord John Russell has taken advantage of the Mather scandal to use it as a party weapon, and condescending to appear amongst the grievance tribunes of a Supply night, he makes a grand attack upon the Foreign Administration in particular, and upon the Derby Administration in general. In the Mather part of his oration, he had an easy task—the logic, the statesmanship, the style of Lord Malmesbury's own composition, simply recited, operated as the wit and sarcasm of the reciter. Mr. Osborne supported Lord John's steady Foot with his light Cavalry; Lord Dudley Stuart dashed in the face of the Commons the painful contrast of American efficiency in defence of American citizens abroad; and Lord Palmerston, giving a broader scope to the debate, recorded a warning that the immediate question, involving the nominal independence of small states like Tuscany, virtually under the protection of larger states like Austria, must necessarily be handled at no distant day. The fact of the case made out on the side of the Opposition, was to exhibit the Ministry as vulgar and inefficient, to make Englishmen vexed and ashamed with their own position abroad, and to prepare the mind for troublous times, when real energy will be needed.

The retorts of Mr. Disraeli and Lord Stanley for the inefficiencies of the past Government, were not without effect as mere debate return blows; but they were more than compensated by the ludicrous irrelevancy of Lord Granby's episodic thesis on Protection.

Lord Malmesbury stands confessed in the matter  
[COUNTRY EDITION.]

of the convention with France, as incapable of proceeding with his own plan, or of understanding his own case. On Tuesday, last week, his bill was first explained in its real nature to the Lords; under the pressure of objections made by Law Lords and experienced statesmen, in spite of his defences and excuses, he found it necessary to change his position, and to advance sweeping amendments on the Friday. On the Monday, he comes before the House, confessing that his previous assurances were based on a mistake, asking leave to withdraw his bill altogether, "for the present," and begging that there might be "no discussion" on the subject. The House permitted him to withdraw the bill without discussing it, and he left the debate as a trespasser leaves the presence of men before whom he has made a full confession after detection.

Mr. Anstey endeavoured to bring before the House of Commons the case of the British Missionaries in Hungary, seized by Austria; but he did not possess sufficient hold of the House to command its attention. The House was counted out.

In connexion with these eccentricities in our foreign administration, the public will note with some anxiety the announcement in the *Morning Herald*,—"We understand that the Government have taken means to prevent, by our naval power, any efforts that may be attempted by American adventurers against the Virgin Islands." The announcement is as ugly in its political aspect, as it is in its literary composition, and we hope as incorrect. To prevent efforts that may be attempted by adventurers, is not a very intelligible process; but the exercise of naval power against Americans is a process which Englishmen ought not to trust to the Malmesbury Cabinet. Americans will, at all events, bear in mind the distinction which we have so often repeated to them—that *Downing-street is not England*.

The presentation of a petition from New South Wales, calling her Majesty "a trustee of the public lands," and challenging British right to tax the colony, is an historical event. It calls Boston to mind.

Most successful in mischief, Lord Derby has succeeded in spoiling Lord John's Corrupt Practices at Elections Bill, by preventing inquiry, except upon a joint address from both Houses. The bill was not of the best quality, but it is now simply worthless.

Mr. Spooner has suffered his Maynooth motion to be bandied about by adjournments, speaking

against time, divisions on collateral subjects, re-adjournments, and delays of every kind, until, at last, to confess the truth, unless we were to search the journals of the House, we could not tell exactly what has become of it in technical sense: practically and avowedly he has given it up "for the session," that is for ever, as far as he is concerned.

There is some movement in election affairs, still, however, without any material change. The prevalent peculiarity is an overplus of liberal candidates in all quarters. Here and there we see a coalition of the two great parties in the State, who are keeping up the farce of contest in St. Stephen's the better to secure their reciprocal alternation in office. In Leicester, for example, Whig and Tory are conspiring against the Radicals, Sir Joshua Walsley and Richard Gardner. Sir Joshua may not go so far in social reform as we of *The Leader*; but he has manfully stood his ground in an expression of Radical policy commanding the largest public assent, and a town like Leicester is bound not to see itself thwarted in securing a representative of its own views, by the combinations of men alien to its real feelings.

A negative step has been made this week in the Jew question. Mr. Salomons, after a technical defeat, has obtained a substantial victory. After a verdict in a former action pronouncing him liable to penalties for voting in the House of Commons without having taken the abjuration oath, a new trial, in the Court of Exchequer, to enforce penalties, is defeated by the loose manner in which the informer brought his evidence before the Court. Upholding the letter of the law strictly, in the penal case, according to the true constitutional spirit of the law, Lord Chief Baron Pollock mainly influenced to that result.

The fête of the Cork Exhibition, extremely agreeable and creditable to the City of the West, has been usefully signalized by the emphatic approbation which the Lord Lieutenant bestowed upon the Queen's college. He visited it in person, and expressed his approval in plain English, beyond all mistake. The "godless" college indeed supplies, in its broad and liberal education, the most powerful, as it is the most inoffensive antagonism to Maynooth; and it is important that its practical merits should have received this public and official recognition from the Irish representative of "the last of the Conservative Cabinets."

The French ruler pretends to arrest a financial crisis by taxes on horses, dogs, and paper; whilst he refuses to reduce a devouring army, and incites

his ministers to profusion. The tax on paper is at least consistent with the obscurantism that holds authority and knowledge irreconcilable. In order to render the expression of public opinion, on which the Elect of the people reposes, more sincere and complete, abolition of trial by jury (that inconvenient form of opposition) is threatened. Resignations and arrests make up the sum of news from France. The House of Orleans have appealed: whatever the issue, it will be fatal to the confiscator.

The latest intelligence from Burmah is meagre, but very unsatisfactory. Our forces were maintaining their ground, but the men had no shelter under which to sleep! While conquering the Burmese, they are exposed by the negligence of their own commanders to destruction by the climate. Is this an instance of the efficiency which has been boasted for General Godwin? Is this the justification of his appointment by routine, though he had passed the average years of man? Is he in fault, or what commissary is it that deserves hanging?

#### THE WEEK IN PARLIAMENT.

LORD JOHN RUSSELL gave notice last week that he would, before the House went into Committee of Supply, on Monday, "call the attention of the House to the case of Mr. Mather, and," he added afterwards, "generally to the present state of public affairs." The afterthought was, as will be seen, a clog upon the primal thought, and afforded the Chancellor of the Exchequer ground for a telling electioneering reply. But everybody, except the respective "Buncombes" of the rival members, felt that the whole of the interest lay in the single and simple subject first announced. We shall, therefore, divide the debate into two parts, taking first

#### THE OUTRAGE UPON MR. MATHER.

LORD JOHN RUSSELL intimated at the outset his unwillingness to question the foreign policy of the Government; and alleged as his excuse for doing so now, the spontaneous production of the papers in the Mather case by the Government; and also that, as the correspondence was on the table, if it were not noticed now, it would be considered too late to notice it next session.

He then entered upon the case, by pointing out the contradictory nature of the story of the outrage, as narrated by Mr. Erskine Mather, and the Florentines, and by the Austrian officers; stating, however, in a subsequent portion of his speech, that the "Mathers had been unexceptionable, plain, and straightforward in their story." According to the latter, it was an "unprovoked and brutal outrage;" according to the Austrians, represented on this occasion by Radetzki, an "accident." What did Lord Malmesbury do?

"It never seemed to have occurred to the Government to ask to have the facts ascertained. While, on the one hand, Mr. Mather and his witnesses concurred in one story,—that this unfortunate young man had been struck and was staggering under the blow, and had scarcely recovered himself, when he received the cut from the sword,—the statement is quite as positive, on the other hand, that, in fact, it was the act of this gentleman which provoked the outrage."

And this was the more remarkable, as Marshal Radetzki, who furnished the Austrian account of the affair, relied exclusively upon military evidence, "seemed to set at naught anything like civil testimony, and to conclude that nothing but the testimony of soldiers was worth anything."

Then he thought that her Majesty's Ministers ought to say either that this was a most "unprovoked assault," or that it was an accidental encounter; but to his astonishment, Lord Malmesbury took both views! Writing to the Tuscan court, he said:—

"Now the evidence which has thus been obtained conclusively establishes that a most unprovoked outrage was committed on an unarmed and unoffending British subject by an officer in command of a military party acting for Tuscan purposes in the Tuscan dominions."

But when he wrote to the Earl of Westmoreland, at Vienna, Lord Malmesbury agreed that it was "caused by a concurrence of fortuitous and unfortunate circumstances," in which, added Count Buol, "no nationality was concerned." Thus, what was an "unprovoked outrage," when the noble lord the Foreign Secretary wrote to Florence, became an "unfortunate accident" when he wrote to Vienna; and his mind being in that undecided state, it was no wonder that the Government should have behaved not very consistently with regard to the reparation they should exact.

Having delivered this telling blow at Lord Malmesbury, Lord John Russell turned to Lord Granville's conduct of the case, and declared that he took a true view of it, holding both Tuscan and Austrian Governments responsible, and demanding ample reparation for the injury.

"Now, I must say, that I think Mr. Mather placed the case in the hands of Lord Granville, and of course, also, in the hands of Lord Granville's successor, in as fair a manner as he possibly could. He took certain objections

—very reasonable objections—to placing the case before a Tuscan court of law; but he said that he and his son were entirely in the hands of the Government, and if the Government deemed it best, for reasons of state, to take such a course, he did not object. Now, nothing could be more honourable than that position. His son had suffered a great deal; he himself had gone through great anxiety at Florence, where he found his son suffering seriously from the injury. But he claims nothing for himself; he says, 'Do you prescribe a course, and though it may not be that which I think desirable, I shall be willing to submit; your course will be my course.' Now, I say no one could stand in a better position than Mr. Mather. Lord Malmesbury, however, has contrived that Mr. Mather, who was the object of the inquiry, and Mr. Scarlett, the person who endeavoured to obtain justice for him, should be the only persons to suffer. (Hear, hear.) He has so contrived matters that, while the Austrian officer gets off with some *éclat*, Mr. Mather's character is injured, and Mr. Scarlett has a very cruel censure passed upon him. (Hear, hear.)"

Lord John then showed how improperly Lord Malmesbury had acted in asking Mr. Mather to fix the amount of the sum which would atone for the injury done to his son. In doing so he told a story, inadvertently complimenting Lord Palmerston, to the great delight of the Opposition.

"I remember a case in which the noble lord, the member for Tiverton, was called upon to make a demand. A British merchant in South America had been imprisoned; the noble lord asked the Queen's Advocate what ought to be given to him as compensation. The Queen's Advocate said that twenty pounds a day was the sum which ought to be paid. The noble lord wrote immediately to the American government and asked for that sum. The merchant himself thought the sum should be much greater; but the noble lord, who understood the business of his department—(cheers)—did not say, 'You, a private merchant, should tell me exactly what reparation you require,' but he said, 'I will settle the matter after consulting persons competent to give me an opinion on the subject.'"

Lord Malmesbury had not done anything like this. He had, after much pressing insistence, obtained Mr. Mather's estimate, and had then written to the Tuscan Government that he thought the sum exorbitant!

"And this is the way the Secretary of State obtains redress for a cruelly injured man! (Cheers.) He puts him in the situation of a person proceeding for money, and only anxious to obtain a large sum from the Tuscan Government. He spoke of Mr. Mather as asking an exorbitant sum, and thus the character of Mr. Mather is injured, and injured by that very person who ought to have undertaken his defence, and obtained redress for him! (Cheers.) Lord Malmesbury ought to have written to Florence that Mr. Mather would never have thought of naming a sum as reparation for the injury his son had sustained, and that he would not name a sum until he desired him to do so. But Lord Malmesbury left it to be understood at Florence, as if there were a demand on the part of Mr. Mather of what was most unreasonable and out of the question. (Hear, hear.)"

He criticised Lord Malmesbury not less severely for not having given definite instructions to Mr. Scarlett.

"If Mr. Scarlett had received instructions he would have asked for what he had been told, and would not have taken a farthing or a word less; and be it observed all this time that to the Austrian Government the most conciliatory dispositions are expressed. They are not asked to take any steps on the subject, even after the communications made by the Tuscan Government. I have said that the first demand was properly made to them, but when they said that 'the Austrian army are beyond our power, we have signed a convention with them by which no Austrian officer can be brought to trial for any offence in the Tuscan courts,' I think that the Austrian Government became responsible for the conduct of their military, and to them a proper requirement for reparation may be made. If it comes to this, that an Austrian officer may wantonly cut down a man because he supposes some insult has been offered to him, let that be declared. But, as it is, every Englishman who goes to Italy and meets there with Austrian soldiers—and, unfortunately, there are Austrian soldiers in too many of the States of Italy (cheers)—in the States of the Church, the Papal States, and the Tuscan States—every Englishman is exposed to everything that an Austrian officer thinks proper to inflict upon him, and he is then to be told that he is to have no redress, according to the mode in which the Government have carried on this affair. Only the other day I was told that a non-commissioned officer had been severely punished in one of the towns of Italy according to the Austrian code. Although this case was simple enough, and neither the Austrian Government nor the Tuscan Government were ready to resist any reasonable demands, yet such has been the mode in which Lord Malmesbury has conducted this transaction, that you have exposed yourself to the ridicule and contempt on the part of foreign Governments."

And he wound up the subject with these energetic but party sentiments.

"All I can say on the subject is, that I will not take the course which Lord Derby did when he saw reason to censure the conduct of the late Government in regard to the affairs of Greece, but I will content myself with protesting against what has been done in Mr. Mather's case in terms similar to those which his lordship then employed. Lord Derby said on that occasion:—'Surely it becomes the British Legislature to step forward and say that the Foreign-office of England is not England—that the high-minded, generous feeling, of this great people is opposed to measures such as have been taken by the Government of the country—that we separate our actions from theirs—our feelings from theirs—our views of justice and good faith from theirs.' I also take leave to separate my feelings—my notions of justice and good faith—from the course which the Government has pursued in this case. (Hear, hear.) I beg leave to enter my protest against conduct which seems to me to degrade this Government in the eyes of Europe—against conduct which does not

degrade this country, because the country takes far better and higher views than its Government of what is due to its character. I trust, however, it will be recollected that in the present state of the continent of Europe this is almost the only country in which a free expression of opinion can take place. It is almost the only country in which a free press and free discussions in the Legislature can fairly be said to make themselves felt, because, although the forms of constitutional government exist in several States of Europe, those forms are in some cases so perverted, while other countries in which they are not perverted, and where real liberty exists, are so small and so dependent on their more powerful neighbours, that no bold and loud expression of public opinion can take place in them. No such addresses as are delivered in our Legislature, and no such publications as that which, to his immortal honour, the right hon. member for the University of Oxford issued from the press last year (cheers), can be made or put forth, at present, in any other country of Europe. Under these circumstances, it more especially behoves us to keep our character unharmed and our honour untarnished. It becomes us, if we have occasion to ask for redress from a foreign Government, to proceed mildly and with temper; but, at the same time, to insist on that which we really think due to us. (Hear, hear.) It would be an inestimable loss, not to this country alone, but to all the world, if our character as a great and independent nation should be in any degree impaired. I trust, therefore, that before the noble lord at the head of the Foreign-office again writes such despatches as these, he will consider how great is the charge that has been entrusted to him, and that he will not lightly commit the great interests and the high character of this nation by heedless expressions. (Cheers.)"

LORD STANLEY (the Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs) replied on behalf of the Government; but he made only a lame defence. He explained the discrepancy between the despatches to Florence and those to Vienna, by asserting that there were two ways of looking at the question; one was in reference to the "Government and the country," and the other to the individual. As regarded the former, the outrage might be termed "accidental," as no insult was intended to England. But that, he contended, did not prevent it being true, in a personal point of view, that the outrage was "brutal and unprovoked." He declared that to have demanded reparation from the Austrian Government would have been to acknowledge Austrian rule in Tuscany. After an allusion to the attack on Haynau, he paid a well deserved compliment to Mr. Mather:—

"The noble lord had referred at considerable length to the nature of the reparation awarded to Mr. Mather, and had argued that the transactions of the British Government had a tendency to damage that gentleman's character. The Government certainly had no intention to inflict such damage, and if that were the case, he must say the Government ought to take, and would take, the earliest opportunity of bearing testimony to the character of Mr. Mather. (Hear, hear.) Mr. Mather, in the whole transaction, had suffered much pain, anxiety, and annoyance, and if under feelings naturally excited he had not at all times done justice to the conduct of the Government, that was no reason why the Government should not do justice to him. (Hear, hear.) He admitted the difficult position in which that gentleman was put by the demand made on him to state his own compensation for the insult; but he thought that there was some misapprehension on Mr. Mather's part. Mr. Mather's view appeared to be that an Englishman having received a premeditated insult on the part of a foreign Government, upon that Government a fine should be inflicted, he would not say proportionate, for it was difficult to measure an injury by money, but sufficient to express the sense of the English Government on the subject. He was willing to believe that that was Mr. Mather's view, and therefore he did not in that case think the demand of £5000 exorbitant or unreasonable. But if the question was treated as a personal, and not an international one, and that compensation equal to the injury suffered was to be asked, then he thought the demand of £5000 would be, in that light, utterly unreasonable, and beyond what could be expected." (Hear, hear.)

The next speaker was Mr. OSBORNE, who charged into the subject in his usual dashing style. He first showed that the Austrians held Tuscany under a convention, the main provision of which was that the occupation should not be terminated without the consent of both parties; equivalent to permanent possession for Austria. Then entering on the main charge, he pointed out how Lord Malmesbury had insisted that Mr. Mather should estimate the injury inflicted on his son.

"Lord Malmesbury then, in the true spirit of a pedlar, asked, 'What will you take for your injury?' (Hear.) Lord Malmesbury therefore suggested pecuniary compensation—a suggestion which was accepted by Mr. Mather with pain and reluctance. (Hear.) But on Mr. Mather naming £5000, for which he stated his reasons, Lord Malmesbury, behind his back, and without giving him any information on the point, wrote a letter to Mr. Scarlett, designating this as an exorbitant demand, and naming £1,000 as the sum for which a British subject might be cut down in the streets of Florence. (Cheers and laughter.) Lord Malmesbury in one of his despatches stated that the sum named by Mr. Mather was exorbitant, but that the sum named by Mr. Mather was what he got. Mr. Scarlett would be able to judge 'what could be got.' (Hear, hear.) If the noble lord below him (Lord Palmerston) had written such a despatch when he presided with distinction and honour over the foreign affairs of this country, what would have been said by the then Opposition? (Hear, hear.) 'A pecuniary compensation is at least tangible,' said Lord Malmesbury to Mr. Scarlett, 'you must hold firm language.' Firm language, indeed!



on the theme of 'what can be got.' (Cheers and laughter.) That was in the true spirit of the peddling instinct which presided over the Foreign-office."

Stung by the sarcasms of Mr. Osborne, Lord STANLEY rose and declared that Government had no intention of damaging Mr. Mather's character; whereupon Mr. OSBORNE retorted that "if Mr. Mather was satisfied with that apology at the eleventh hour he was not the man he took him for." As to the responsible Government—

"It was the Austrian Government they were bound to call upon to show Lieutenant Forsthüher was justified in his conduct, and, if they failed to do so, then to demand some mark of their regret for what had occurred; but the Austrians, so far from expressing contrition, had commended Lieutenant Forsthüher's conduct, and he was going about Florence as a sort of hero, as 'the man who had cut down the Englishman.' ('No, no.') Yes, he knew it to be the case; and it was said Lord Malmesbury had given Lieutenant Forsthüher 'a step.' (A laugh.)

The only man who showed well in the case, and kept up the character of the country, was Mr. Mather.

"He regretted very much the question had been brought before the House in its present shape, and that he was prevented by some form of the House from moving a direct vote of censure on Lord Malmesbury for trifling with the honour of the country, and for having disgraced us in the eyes of the whole continent of Europe." (Cries of "Move, move!")

Passing over Lord GRANBY, who made a mad Protectionist speech, and did not touch upon the Mather question, we find Lord PALMERSTON on his legs, insisting that debates on Protection were a waste of time; that protection was dead—that no doubt its death and burial would be duly registered at the ensuing election; and that Lord Granby's speech was a "convenient diversion" of the debate from the damaging topic of the outrage upon Mr. Mather. The noble lord then continued—

"I must confess I have read with anything but feelings of satisfaction the papers which have been laid on the table of this House with respect to the affair of Mr. Mather. (Hear, hear.) I own, sir, that for the sake of the country—for the character of the country, I wish the whole of this correspondence had been very different. (Hear, hear.) I am sorry to say that that observation applies to the whole case, from the beginning to the end of it; for I must own it seems to me that it was not a comedy but a tragedy of *All in the Wrong*. I must say that I find much to criticise in the conduct of almost all the parties concerned, except Mr. Mather and his son. (Hear.) I think the late Government took a wrong view of the case. ('Hear, hear,' from the Ministerial benches.) I think, also, the present Government took a wrong view of it, and I am sorry to say that our *Chargé d'Affaires* at Florence took a wrong view of it too. What is the course which in the case of a personal outrage committed upon a British subject abroad—what is the course which I think the British Government ought to have pursued? Why, it is the first duty of the Government to ascertain clearly the facts of the case—to ascertain clearly the character of the injury which the British subject has sustained, and how far he was in the wrong, or if not in the wrong, how far those by whom the injury was inflicted were to blame. Well, Sir, having done that, if the Government find that an outrage has been committed, reparation ought to be demanded. That reparation may consist, first, in a demand for the punishment of the offender, and next also in a demand for compensation to the sufferer. (Hear.) Upon these points it has been always the practice for the Secretary of State to consult the Queen's Advocate, to lay the facts of the case before him, to ask him what, according to his view and his knowledge of the habits of courts of justice in other countries, what might be a fit sum to demand for pecuniary compensation; how far, according to international law, the Government would be justified in asking for the punishment of the wrong doer. That does not appear to have been done by either Government in this case. But the first question which arises, is what was the injury inflicted, or was there any injury inflicted? I think no man who has read these papers can hesitate one moment in acknowledging that a grievous injury was committed (cheers); that a British subject was exposed to a most violent, a most cowardly outrage, for which no adequate, in fact no provocation whatever, was given. A British subject was accompanying a band of music in the streets of Florence, and he was struck, first by a sword by one officer, then by the fist of another, and then, in a cowardly manner, was cut down with the sword of the officer who first assaulted him. Now, what is the feeling of different countries with regard to an attack by an armed against an unarmed man? (Cheers.) Why, Sir, we all know the old anecdote of the English butcher, who, while employed in the avocation of his profession, was struck by a man with whom he had words, and whom he reproached with the good old English sentiment, 'Why, what a mean, cowardly fellow you must be to strike a man who has a knife in his hand, and who cannot return the blow.' (Hear, and laughter.) That is the English feeling. (Cheers.) What is the French feeling? (Hear.) Why, Sir, many of us know that there was a distinguished officer in the British service in the cavalry, who had lost an arm, but who served in the Peninsular war, mutilated as he then was. In an action in which he was engaged, he got into the *mêlée*, and a French officer rode up to him, and was going to cut him down. But the Frenchman saw that his opponent had only one arm, and, seeing that, he dropped his sabre point (cheers), and passed on to seek out an opponent with whom he might contend on equal terms. That is the French feeling. (Cheers.) Then, I shall be told that this case is a proof of the Aus-

trian feeling in such matters. Sir, I don't believe any such thing. (Hear, hear.) My conviction is that the cowardly conduct of that lieutenant who cut down, without provocation, an unarmed British subject, has met with as much disapproval and disavowal on the part of his comrades in Tuscany, as they in their service dare show by their conduct towards their officers. I am persuaded that if Marshal Radetzky had known the true facts of the case at the time when he said that the officer was fully justified in what he did,—I am fully convinced that such a brave man would have sympathized with Prince Schwarzenberg, who, when appealed to by the Earl of Westmoreland, who said to him, 'We are both soldiers, and never raised our sword against an unarmed man,' replied, 'No; such a thing could never have happened to either of us';—I am persuaded that had Marshal Radetzky known the truth of the matter, he would never have written the despatch which we find among these papers; for, whatever we may think of the policy which is pursued by the Austrian Government, no man who knows the Austrian people and army can for a moment doubt their generosity and universal courage."

He then declared, as his own opinion, that had the Austrian Government been applied to they would have given ample redress. And he further animadverted on the fact, that Mr. Scarlett had been left without definite instructions, both by the late and the present Government, as to what kind of reparation he should demand; and he condemned as unusual the act of Lord Malmesbury in calling on the sufferer to assess his own damages. Nor was he less severe on Lord Malmesbury for "forcing Mr. Mather to name a sum against his inclination and against his protest, and then showing him up to the Tuscan Government as being exorbitant in his demand." He censured Mr. Scarlett for the manner in which he executed his office; and coming to the Stratfords, gave the following interesting exposition of their case:—

"But the fact, in regard to these Mr. Stratfords, is, that they were accused of that which was in itself an offence—that is to say, they had in their house a private printing press, which is prohibited by the law of Tuscany, and it was shown that with this printing press they had printed papers inveighing against the Government for the purpose of distribution. No doubt they had incurred the liability to punishment, but they were tried by an Austrian court-martial at Leghorn. Well, the Government, when I was a member of it, protested against this proceeding. We consulted our legal advisers, and found that by the fundamental law of Tuscany even the Tuscan Government could not establish martial law to the suppression of the ordinary tribunals, much less those of a foreign garrison acting under the orders of a foreign Government. We protested, both at Florence and at Vienna, against the competency of the court, and against, therefore, the validity of the sentence; and I presume, from what I have heard to-night, that that protest was insisted upon, that its force had been admitted, and that these two young men were to be liberated in consequence of the incompetency of the court and the invalidity of the sentence: therefore, their release, while it was no great satisfaction to Mr. Mather, was, diplomatically speaking, not, I think, a fair arrangement, inasmuch as we should have had them released without it."

He contended, that if any pecuniary compensation was to be demanded, the sum of 500*l.* was "altogether inadequate." One thing, he insisted, that Mr. Scarlett had not done. He had not surrendered, he had only waived the discussion of the principle of the responsibility of the Tuscan Government. And then, said the speaker,—

"I think, if the Government were not satisfied with the amount which the Tuscan Government offered, the more handy way of dealing with that case would have been to say, 'We take the money in our sense; and remember, that if ever the same thing happen again, we will compel you to give us what we think ample compensation; and we don't care a pin what you say about your non-responsibility—we will make you responsible.' (Cheers.)

As to suspending relations with Tuscany, or inflicting any punishment on its governors, that would be making it the whipping-boy of Austria.

"If you wanted to inflict a practical lesson, I think it would have been better read by applying it to Austria. The practical lesson read to Tuscany was this—and it is applicable to all small States—you say to Tuscany, You possess practically an independence, but you have nevertheless let in a foreign garrison, over which you have no control; we will teach you to do that again, for we will make you pay for the conduct of that garrison. No doubt there is a moral in that, but I am not sure that greater European good could not have been accomplished by reading a lesson to the other party, and by saying to great Powers, If you take advantage of your superior force to impose upon a smaller Power, and occupy and garrison that small State, you shall continue responsible for the conduct of that garrison, and if that garrison misbehaves itself towards English subjects we shall come to you instead of to the weak Power which you have overruled and overborne. Both lessons are good, but in a European sense, that would have been best." (Cheers.)

The peroration of his speech is so remarkable at this juncture of affairs, that it is as well the reader should peruse it entire.

"I am very much interested, as the Government naturally are, in the independence of Tuscany, and I must say these papers do call for serious attention on the part of the Government to the unfortunate condition of large portions of the Italian States. (Loud cries of "Hear.") The Italians are a people endowed with very great and eminent qualities; they are gifted with great natural ability; they have shown in former times that they are not inferior as statesmen and in political knowledge and capacity to the people of any other part of Europe. I apprehend their qualities remain the same, though the cultivation of those powers by the possession of opportunities of employing them are not the same as they possessed in former periods. It is lamentable to see the

present state of Tuscany, the Roman States, and of Naples. It is difficult to say where the greatest misgovernment prevails. (Loud cries of "Hear.") It has been said of Austria that they wished the people of Italy should draw a comparison favourable to them between the condition of the States which they govern and those which other Governments administer; but, like the gentleman from the sister island, who complained of his bootmaker that, whereas he had ordered him to make one larger than the other, the bootmaker had made it less than the other (laughter), so the Government of Austria, instead of making a comparison in such guise that the Italians should think the Lombards and the Venetians are better governed than the rest, only compels them to think that the other territories are worse governed than the other States. (Cheers.) This is, I say, lamentable, and I do not believe there is another example in modern times of such a system of cruelty, tyranny, and violence of every sort as exists in the Neapolitan and Roman States. (Cheers.) It is a disgrace to modern Europe. The position of affairs in Tuscany is not so bad, but the public there are exposed continually to acts of violence from a foreign garrison, for which they have no redress, and which, if committed in England, would arouse the indignation of every man from one end of the kingdom to the other. (Cheers.) This occupation of the Italian States, especially of Tuscany, by foreign troops, did not escape the attention of the late Government. It is evident that that occupation cannot cease except by common consent between the Government of France and the Government of Austria. France would not withdraw until Austria has evacuated Tuscany and the Legations, which it cannot be expected to do until the French have retired from Rome. We have been told that nothing could be done until the month of May had passed, and there was much force in the arguments and statements then made. But May has now gone by. I do intreat Her Majesty's Government to turn their minds to this question. It is one which really concerns—not merely the happiness and welfare of a most interesting part of Europe—but which also involves great international questions, and which deeply affects the balance of power in Europe. (Cheers.) I should hope that Her Majesty's Government, being on good and friendly terms with the two Governments mainly interested in a decision upon that matter, will exert that influence that justly belongs to the Government of this great country, and will endeavour to persuade the Governments of France and Austria to put an end to the anomalous and irregular state of things which now prevails in so great a part of the Italian peninsula. (Cheers.) I shall be told that the condition of the Roman States is such that, if the French garrison were to retire, a great revolution and disturbance would take place. But let me remind the House of what passed in 1831 and 1832, when the five powers of Austria, Prussia, Russia, France, and England, gave to the then Pope advice with regard to the improvement of the internal organization of his Government, which, if it had been acted upon and carried out, would have secured the tranquillity of the States which he governs. (Hear.) Some such arrangement might now with advantage be adopted. I shall be told, perhaps, that some steps are already taken with that object, but I feel that they are practically illusive, and that no practical step has been taken with the view to those improvements which were then recommended, and which are now more wanted than ever. (Hear, hear.) I ought, perhaps, to apologize to the House for the time during which I have occupied its attention. (Loud cheers.) I am sure, however, that the subject I have mentioned is one that must engage the sympathy of every man in this country; and I am persuaded that if Her Majesty's Government will take it up in the spirit in which I think they are disposed to act, great good will result to Europe from their endeavours." (Much cheering.)

Mr. DISRAELI then took up the cudgels, and valiantly defended his obnoxious colleague.

He denied that the national feeling was involved in the outrage at Florence, and he added, although "it was an outrageous, a wanton, and a cruel act (cheers) it was still an accidental one." He defended Lord Malmesbury at all points; and fully adopted the course pursued by him, making a merit of the demand for redress being made to Tuscany, as, if it had been made to Austria, that would have been a virtual acknowledgment of Austrian supremacy in that state." He, in common with the Opposition speakers, applauded Mr. Mather—to a certain extent.

"I will not say one word that would cheapen the conduct or character of Mr. Mather. I have no reason to believe that he is otherwise than a respectable Englishman, and was placed under circumstances of great difficulty, and which, from his previous habits of life, he was unaccustomed to, and had little experience of. He appears to me to have conducted himself with discretion and good sense, and any attempt to criticise his conduct or his character would, I think, be not only wanting in good taste but in good feeling. (Hear, hear.)"

And after uttering this eulogy, he turned round to the House, and asked them to view the case as "men of the world, and members of Parliament." He thought Lord Malmesbury had acted with great propriety in requesting Mr. Mather to state the sum at which he valued the injury, and in demanding pecuniary reparation. Neither was there any "infirmary of purpose" about Lord Malmesbury's conduct—it had been "perfectly proper." And he wound up with some remarks in reply to Lord Palmerston's peroration.

"The noble lord has called our attention to the state of Italy, and he only does justice to the feelings of the Government when he assumes that they look with great interest and some anxiety to that important country. But he spoke in a tone as if the Government were responsible for the state of affairs there. The state of Italy is no worse than we found it. The noble lord has been making these speeches on the state of Italy for a considerable time, and very just are his observations, and very ingenious his policy; but the state of Italy has not been improved hitherto by



the counsel or conduct of the noble lord. (Hear.) Not only has he made speeches on the state of Italy, but he has sent some of his friends on missions to that country (hear, and laughter), and when we find that, notwithstanding the vast ability of the noble lord, and his great experience and eloquence, the state of Italy is rather aggravated than not, I can assure the noble lord that the Government is sensible that they must proceed in such affairs with very great deliberation."

Mr. Erskine Mather had, he said, behaved with such good feeling throughout the transaction, that every one must feel for him. It was a painful subject, but the former Government were responsible for the position of affairs in which Mr. Mather was so much concerned.

Lord DUDLEY STUART brought the debate to a close by criticising the speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and pointing out America as an example of conduct in the case of outrages on her citizens.

Of course, beyond the speech-making, the debate had no practical result.

#### GENERAL POLICY OF MINISTERS.

We have observed that Lord John Russell appended a review of the general policy of Ministers to the animadversions he made on the Mather case, on Monday evening. For the sake of perspicuity we have separated these dissimilar topics, and now present our readers with that portion of the debate which assumed the form of an indictment of Ministers.

Lord JOHN RUSSELL reverted to the relative positions of the Ministry and the Opposition after his fall. He told the House, what it had been told fifty times before, that Ministers, urged by the Opposition, had undertaken not to press any but essential measures, and to make the session as short as possible. It was also attempted to extort from them some declaration of their future policy. In regard to the former, said Lord John, I cannot say that we obtained very full satisfaction (laughter); and with respect to the latter, we have been totally and entirely disappointed. He then ran through the precedents of what other ministers had done on acceding to office—showing how Lord Grey, in 1832, and Sir Robert Peel, in 1834, and Lord Melbourne in 1841, had made full statements of their intentions. But the present Ministers had only been curious to conceal their intentions and their policy. (Cheers.) He insisted that nothing like an answer had been given to the question, did or did not Ministers intend to pursue the policy of Sir Robert Peel; and he accused Lord Derby and Mr. Disraeli of being highly favourable to a fixed duty on corn. Then he described the budget speech, and adverted, with a laughing accompaniment from the House, to Lord Derby's famous Mansion House speech, understood to be a supplement to the budget oration. He pointed out how expositions of policy, many and various, had been made by divers members of the Ministry.

"Then we have a number of gentlemen supporters of the Government, who go down to the country and say that they wish above all things that no new corn laws shall be imposed; and a gentleman who stood the other day before the electors at Maidstone as a Derbyite, said he rejoiced that we have at length got an honest Government, and that there is no chance of an imposition of a tax upon bread, or of that blessing being in any way taken from the people. (Hear, hear.) I am reminded by an honourable friend near me, that the present candidate for Greenwich—a Derbyite, too—marches about the town with the big loaf before him—(laughter)—promising that the present Government is to give a large loaf and cheap bread. (Continued laughter.) That certainly was most ambiguous. It did seem at last that we had something like light, when the right hon. gentleman the Chancellor of the Exchequer addressed his constituents, and told them that the time for the restoration of the protective duties of 1846 was past, that the spirit of the age was opposed to them, and that no minister could safely oppose the spirit of the epoch in which he lives. (Cheers.) That is a wise maxim. (Laughter.) The only thing which astonishes us is that this light should have been so long in reaching the right hon. gentleman. (Laughter.)"

Commenting on Mr. Disraeli's manifesto to Buckinghamshire, Lord John pointed to the assertion it contained, that the rent of land had decreased by five millions, in consequence of the income-tax and the repeal of the corn laws; and he declared, that if it was proposed to tax the community to make good that loss, nothing could be more preposterous. As to the promised "revision of taxation," would that satisfy the farmers, who had been told that if Lord Derby could be got into office they should have Protection? And he claimed for the late Government the main of the government measures, except the Militia Bill, which was certainly their own, and from which they would derive all the credit such a measure deserved.

He then fastened on the policy of ministers regarding education, showing how they proposed to disturb the mixed system prevailing in Ireland, and alter the management clauses of the National School Society. And he charged them with obtaining the grant for education, and then presenting their new minute to the House. He wound up by a general attack.

"I may say that the Government suffered from the mode in which they have proceeded to occupy office in the present state of affairs. We all know that some loss of political reputation occurred to them when, last year, they were invited by the Crown to occupy office, and they declared themselves unable to fill the several offices of the Government. Soon after that it was publicly announced that they had made their dispositions, and that they had the means of forming a Government when called upon to do so. (Hear, hear.) That announcement turned out to be correct; for it appeared that a very learned and eminent person had consented to occupy the office of Lord

Chancellor, and that several country gentlemen, abandoning the agreeable pursuits and easy business which belongs to an English country gentleman (a laugh), were ready to assume the terrible responsibilities of office (laughter), so that a Government could be formed. But there was one thing which they seem to have entirely forgotten, (hear, hear)—that was, what were the principles on which they were to act. (Laughter and cheers.) I suppose they thought the principles of a Government a trifle. (Renewed laughter.) They have been wanting in fixed opinions on any subject. Accordingly, no sooner does an hon. gentleman propose any subject, than they are ready to agree to his proposals. (Hear, hear.) An hon. gentleman opposite proceeds to raise the question of Maynooth. They allow that dangerous question to be raised, and they say, 'We are quite ready to agree to the motion for inquiry, though we have no present intention of abolishing Maynooth; and thus they allow Ireland to be agitated, though it is clear that no inquiry can take place. Another gentleman wants to have an alteration in the management clauses on education. The Government are quite ready to let him have the alteration he seeks for. A part of the church of Ireland is desirous of an alteration in the Irish education; the Government says, 'By all means; you are quite right.' It is only for somebody to start some project or some crude notion, and the Government is at once ready to agree to it, and says, 'Here is a fair question to consider; we do not agree that it can be carried into effect at once, but we think it quite right that the question should be agitated.' (Cheers.) Why, sir, this is offering a premium for agitation on all subjects. I have stated that it was our object to obtain an assurance that the parliament should be dissolved as speedily as possible consistent with public business, and also to obtain some explanation of the policy of the Government. That explanation we certainly have not obtained; but we have obtained that which I think is quite sufficient. We have obtained enough to entitle my right hon. friend the member for Ripon to say that the question before us is, whether you have confidence in the Earl of Derby's Government, or whether you have not. (Cheers.) I know some hon. gentlemen think my right hon. friend (Sir James Graham) very unreasonable, who think with Sir Lucius O'Trigger, who, when told by Captain Absolute that he differed with him as to the opinions he expressed, replied that it was most extraordinary that he happened at that moment to be expressing no opinions whatever. Hon. gentlemen may quarrel with his right hon. friend (Sir James Graham), but their only ground of quarrel was, that they had no opinions whatever. (Laughter.) With great deference to them, I think that in this country, in England, that is quite a sufficient reason for my right hon. friend's distrust. (Hear.) This country can only be satisfied when it has men ruling it who have some principle and some opinions. It seems a very popular thing to say to the country, you have only to express your opinions on this or on that subject, that if we get a majority in favour of the corn-laws they shall be re-enacted, or that if the majority is in favour of free-trade, the present policy shall be carried out. That seems a popular question; but depend upon it the country will decide only upon the clear and intelligible question, 'Will you, or will you not, place your confidence in a Government which has no opinions, no principles, and which is ready to act upon any wind.' (Loud cheering.)

The succeeding speakers confined themselves to the Mather case, until the Marquis of GRANBY rose, and, amidst roars of laughter, jeers, and cries of "Oh, oh!" proceeded to unfold a mummy protectionists speech, gravely asserting that "no class could be in a state of prosperity;" that Jamaica was "reduced to barbarism;" and other similar curious opinions. After a burst of derisive laughter at his extravagant expressions, he continued—

"Ah! they might laugh, and he was sorry to be obliged to say it; but this he did say—that if it were a fact that the large proprietors were the sufferers, there would soon be a retracing of our steps, and he would not now be advocating in that House this course. ('Oh, oh!' laughter, and cheers.) The battle was not at all between the agricultural and the manufacturing interests. No, the battle that had to be fought was between capital and labour; between industry and idleness; between the man who worked and the man who had already made or got a fortune. (Cheers and laughter.) Yes; the working classes were getting educated; were beginning to think for themselves on this subject. (Cheers and counter cheers.) The noble lord (Lord J. Russell) might talk theories; but if he went into the street and asked a labouring man about cheap bread, he would get an answer that it was of little value to the working man to hear of a sixpenny loaf, when he had only fourpence in his pocket. (Contemptuous laughter from the Free-traders.) Aye; and they must listen to the labourer. (Ironical cheers.) They (the Free-traders) used odd phrases; they said to the Government, 'You dare not propose a duty on corn.' Dare! Not if they had the people with them? as he was sure they would have." (Cheers and counter cheers.)

Why could he not rise in that House without exciting the ridicule of its members?

The next speaker was Lord PALMERSTON, who devoted a few energetic words to the protection, and then passed to the foreign question.

Then the CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER, first defending Lord Malmesbury, pleaded to the indictment of Lord John Russell.

He began by saying that he could not follow the "amiable example" of Lord Stanley, and leave Lord John unnoticed, nor could he leave the reply entirely to his noble friend, Lord Granby (laughter); then he continued:—"I am bound myself to notice the elaborate attack of the noble lord. The noble lord has taken a review of what has occurred during the brief period that we have sat on these benches. We have heard from him a statement of

that kind before this session. The very first night that I had the honour to take my seat the noble lord rose, and opened his batteries. (Laughter, and 'Hear, hear.') The noble lord has sometimes resorted to the attack, but his drum has been muffled, and his fire has been slack. (Laughter, and 'Hear, hear.') And now we have his last effort, but I believe that it is a forlorn hope, and that he will not take the citadel." (Renewed laughter.)

He repudiated Lord John's insinuation that he (Mr. Disraeli) had advocated the re-imposition of duties on corn as compensation for reduced rents. What he really said was, that property, the value of which was depreciated, and unjustly taxed, had a legitimate claim for redress and relief. (Loud cheers.)

"The noble lord has also stated that he is not aware, although I have referred to the great things that the present Government has done (and of which I was not conscious that I had), that we have really done anything of any consequence except the passing of the Militia Bill—which he could not pass. (Loud laughter.) 'What,' says the noble lord, 'is the Militia Bill?—I make you a present of that; and the next great measure on which you plume yourselves so much, you only stole it from our commission; and when you introduced it you made such changes in it, that had it not been for my trusty friend the right hon. member for Tiverton, you would have marred all its beauties.' (Laughter.) But if these bills for the reform of Chancery pass, they will in my mind confer one of the greatest blessings which society has experienced; and no matter who may be the minister and what may be the parliament—neither the parliament nor the minister that passed it will be forgotten. (Loud cheers.) But there is something more. I remember that on the 15th of March, when the noble lord appeared in the new Opposition of which he was the recognised leader, he came forward and said, that it was incumbent on me to declare the measures which it had been thought necessary to pass; and when I mentioned that measure of Chancery reform in the catalogue of those I meant to try, the noble lord received the intimation with a derisive scoff. (Cheers.) He was supported by all the sections of that new Opposition, and, more than all, by that section which, though the following is small, make up for bulk of numbers by their fidelity—by those that follow the noble lord the member for Tiverton, who said that he trusted the country would not be embarked in a Chancery suit. (Laughter.) Well, there is a prospect of that bill being carried; but I do not claim any great credit for it, except that when a chance was offered us to do this great good to the country I did it, in spite of the noble lord the member for Tiverton. (Loud cheers.)"

He unmercifully lashed Lord John for his indignation respecting the alleged tampering with education.

"I am here to defend the conduct of the Government. The noble lord says that for party—nay, for a higher object—for hustings purposes, we have been tampering with the established system of education. (Cries of hear, hear.) Yes, you shall hear. (Cheers and laughter.) The noble lord cannot hear of education and religion being used for party purposes. Does he remember the appropriation clause? (Cheers.)"

And then he pointed to more than one case in which the Whig Government had introduced clauses after the educational vote of the year had been taken.

Turning from this subject, he defied anybody to quote any speech or sentence he had ever made or uttered which recommended a recurrence to the corn-laws which were in force before 1846.

"When we come to this question of a fixed duty, on which you have talked so much, I say I will not pin my career, my political career, on what is not a principle but a measure. I should be very glad as a financier if there was a moderate fixed duty on corn. I admit that, and I see plenty of great authorities opposite me who have often and often advocated it. But if I find by circumstances which I do not wish now particularly to describe—(ironical cheers)—by acts which I have no wish now to denounce, that a fiscal proposition is invested with a peculiar odium, that it would be one of the unwise things a minister could do to propose such a tax, whether rightly or wrongly, I cannot see that I am bound to propose it. Why, I could offer authorities in favour of duties on corn, not from my own bench, but from writings you perpetually quoted—men whose political opinions entirely agree with yours, distinguished writers, members of the political economy club, not merely the writings of Mr. McCulloch, and whom once you always quoted, though now you shrink from his authority, but to the writings of Col. Torrens, to the pages of Mr. Mill. I might appeal to scientific pages, and you would find it difficult to quote others against me; but in governing mankind we must look to something beyond mere scientific propriety; and if a measure, though it may be recommended by the highest scientific authority, is one that the popular will repudiates, I do not think that any minister is bound to propose it."

He stated the ministerial views to be the reconciliation of the producer and consumer, which was effected, he said, "when you have not permitted the consumer to flourish by placing unjust taxes on the producer, while at the same time you are resolved to support no tax which would give to the producer an unjust and artificial price for his production."

And he terminated a spirited speech as follows:—

"I believe the country will support those views—I believe that that temperate policy will be ratified by the country. The noble lord the member for the City of London talks of our being a party without a principle. Well, he seems to be in Opposition without a cry. (Cheers.) He confesses that nothing is left—no opinion, no movement, no agitation whatever is left. The noble lord, with the imagination of a poet—for he is still a poet—at his last gasp, to my great surprise, discovered a resource—something we must rally round; we must rally round the apothegm of that profound gentleman the member for Ripon. That right hon. gentleman has emblazoned on his standard the inscription, 'No confidence in the Derby



ministry.' (Cheers.) Why, a year ago, upon that same standard was emblazoned 'Do not trust the noble lord the member for the city.' (Cheers.) Sir, we shall survive that want of confidence; and if the only way in which the noble lord thinks he can make the present government unpopular, if the only mode by which he thinks he can upset the present administration is by showing to the country that it does not possess the confidence of the right hon. baronet the member for Ripon, why, then, sir, I must express my hearty confidence that at this time next year we shall still have the honour of serving her Majesty." (Loud cheers.)

#### THE MILITIA BILL IN THE "LORDS."

Lord DERBY moved the second reading of the Militia Bill on Tuesday. His speech was but a long and elaborate repetition of those statements and arguments which were made by Ministers in the House of Commons. But we note one thing which it is desirable to register—the Ministerial estimate of M. Bonaparte.

"On the first occasion upon which I had the honour of addressing your lordships' House in the character of a Minister of the Crown, I took occasion to express the belief which I then entertained—a belief which subsequent circumstances have tended still further to increase and strengthen—in the personal pacific disposition of the present ruler of the French Republic. (Hear.) If you ask me, therefore, whether upon any anticipation of hostile proceedings from the personal disposition of the Prince President I am inclined to call for any additional means of defence, I answer that inquiry with the most distinct and absolute negative. If, however, you go on to ask me whether I consider that the state of France and of the continent of Europe is so firmly established, and so free from the liability of interruption as to render it safe and possible for us to rely for that which may take place in that or in other countries upon the actual disposition of the existing ruler of that country, then I confess I must express with much more qualification the degree of confidence which, with regard to the personal disposition of the French President, I have no hesitation in expressing."

Having exonerated M. Bonaparte, he insinuated that the people of France were hostile to this country, and therefore was this bill needed. The main of his speech consisted of a description of the provisions of the bill, and criticisms of the measure of the late Government.

Lord LANSDOWNE, on behalf of the Whig Opposition, imitated Lord Derby, and urged for the hundredth time the objections of Mr. Rich and Lord John Russell. But the bill, though inefficient as a measure of national defence, would be better than no bill. He made, however, the following important admission:—

*"He thought it expedient that by slow degrees the people of this country should be trained to the use of arms, so that they might be fit to aid in the defence of a town, or to occupy a garrison in case of an emergency."*

But at the same time he declared for the formation of an "army of reserve;" in fact, "an increase of the standing army;" as the "best and most efficient of all remedies."

The remarkable speech of the night was made by the DUKE OF WELLINGTON. He said:—

"I am certainly the last man to have any hesitation of opinion as to the relative advantages of meeting an enemy with disciplined or with undisciplined or half-disciplined troops. The things are not to be compared at all. (Hear, hear.) With disciplined troops you are acting with a certain degree of confidence that what they are ordered to perform they will perform. (Hear, hear.) With undisciplined troops you can have no such confidence; on the contrary, the chances are that they will do the very reverse of what they are ordered to do. ('Hear, hear,' and a laugh.) But we must look a little at the state in which we stand at the present moment. (Hear, hear.) This country is at peace with the whole world, except in certain parts, or on the frontiers of its own distant dominions, with which operations of war are carried on by means of our peace establishment. You are now providing for a peace establishment; you are at peace with the whole world; you are providing for a peace establishment. I say that peace establishment ought to have been effectually provided for long ago. (Cheers.) If it had been, we should not have needed now to be told, as we have been by the noble marquis, about the number of days and weeks it will take to train the militia recruits, of about the futility of expecting anything to the purpose from troops with their three weeks', or their six weeks', or what time it may be, training. We have never, up to this moment, maintained a proper peace establishment,—that's the real truth (hear, hear); and we are now in that position in which we find ourselves forced to form a peace establishment such as this country requires. (Hear.) I tell you that for the last ten years you have never had in your army more men than enough to relieve the sentries on duty of your stations in the different parts of the world (hear, hear); such is the state of your peace establishment at the present time; such has been the state of your peace establishment for the last ten years. (Hear, hear.) You have been carrying on war in all parts of the globe, in the different stations, by means of this peace establishment; you have now a war at the Cape, still continuing, which you carry on with your peace establishment; yet on that peace establishment I tell you you have not more men than are enough to relieve the sentries at the different stations in all parts of the world, and to relieve the different regiments in the tropics and elsewhere, after services there—of how long do you suppose?—of, in some cases, 25 years, in none less than 10 years (hear, hear); and, after which, you give them 5 years at home, nominally—for it

is only nominally in a great many cases. There were, for instance, the last troops who were sent out to the Cape; instead of keeping them five years at home, after their long service abroad, I was obliged to send them out after they had only been 18 months at home. (Hear, hear.) My lords, I tell you you've never had a proper peace establishment all this time. We are still at peace with all the world; let us, then, have a peace establishment—our constitutional peace establishment; and, when you have got that, see what you will do next. The noble marquis, my noble friend, if he will allow me so to call him, says he thinks he should prefer an army of reserve. An army of reserve! What is an army of reserve? (Hear, hear.) Is it an army to cost less than 40% each man all round? If he thinks that possible, I tell him that we can have no such thing. (Hear, hear.) But what I desire—and I believe it is a desire the most moderate that can be formed—is, that you shall give us, in the first instance, the old constitutional peace establishment. (Hear, hear.) When we have got that, then you may do what you please. The noble marquis says, very truly, that these 50,000, or 80,000, or 150,000 militiamen won't be fit for service in 6 months, or 12 months, or 18 months; but I say, they'll be fit, at all events, for some service; and certainly they'll enable us to employ in the field others who are fit for service (hear, hear); and in time they will themselves become fit for service. In the last war we had in service several regiments of English militia, and they were in as high a state of discipline, and as fit for service as any men I ever saw in my life. (Hear.) It was quite impossible to have a body of troops in higher order, or in higher discipline, or more fit for discipline than these bodies of British militia were at the commencement of the present century up to 1810; they were as fine corps as ever were seen (hear, hear); and, I say, no doubt these bodies of 50,000 men or 80,000 men, whatever the number may be, will be so too, in the course of time. (Hear, hear.) Everything has its beginning, and this is a commencement. You must make a beginning here, and see that it will take some months before you can form reserve regiments. (Hear, hear.) The armies of England, who have served the country so well, are your lordships so mistaken as to suppose that they were ever composed of more than one-third of real British subjects—of natives of this island? No such thing. (Hear, hear.) Look at the East Indies. Not more than one-third of the soldiers there are such British subjects. Look at the Peninsula; not one-third of the men employed there were ever British soldiers. Yet I beg your lordships to observe what services those soldiers performed. (Hear, hear.) They fought great battles against the finest troops in the world; they went prepared to face everything—ay, and to be successful against everything, or this country would not have borne with them. (Hear, hear.) Not one-third of those armies were British troops, but they were brave troops, and not merely brave—for I believe every man is brave—but well-organized troops. Take the battle of Waterloo (hear, hear); look at the number of British troops at that battle. I can tell your lordships that in that battle there were 16 battalions of Hanoverian militia, just formed, under the command of the late Hanoverian ambassador here—Count Kielmansegge—who behaved most admirably (hear, hear); and there were many other foreign troops who nobly aided us in that battle, avowedly the battle of giants (hear, hear), whose operations helped to bring about the victory which was followed by the peace of Europe, that has now lasted for 32 or 34 years. (Hear, hear.) I say that however much I admire highly-disciplined troops, and most especially British disciplined troops, I tell you you must not suppose that others cannot become so too (hear, hear); and no doubt, if you begin with the formation of corps under this Act of Parliament, they will in time become what their predecessors in the militia were; and if ever they do become what the former militia were, you may rely on it they will perform all the services they may be required to perform. (Hear, hear.) I recommend you to adopt this measure as the commencement of a completion of the peace establishment. (Hear, hear.) It will give you a constitutional force; it will not be, at first, or for some time, everything we could desire, but by degrees it will become what you want—an efficient auxiliary force to the regular army. (Hear, hear.)"

Lord GREY followed the line marked out by Lord Lansdowne. But he also made one useful admission.

"About the time his noble friend made his proposal there was a general disposition throughout the country to form rifle corps. Applications were received from many quarters for leave to do so, and it was agreed that these rifle corps should be recognised on the condition that they were recommended by the lord-lieutenants of the counties to which they belonged, and that they found their own arms. He had reason to believe that upon these terms volunteer corps would have been formed to a great extent; and, while they would have relieved the counties in which they were from a militia, they would have added to the safety and security of the country. Rifle practice would have become the amusement of young men, just like the use of the bow in the days of our ancestors; and by this means they would have had a very effective description of force indeed, with whom the mere mercenaries to be raised under the present Militia Bill could not for a moment be compared. (Hear.) By the electric telegraph and railroads they could have in the course of forty-eight hours after invasion a very large proportion of those volunteers collected; and though they might not be able to execute compact manoeuvres, or stand the shock of battle before the disciplined troops of France or Russia, yet surely these young men of England, supporting such regular troops and artillery as they had at their disposal, would be a formidable force in a case of emergency. (Hear, hear.) The Government, he believed, had refused the service of volunteers lest they should interfere with the voluntary enlistment of men for the militia; but he must say that that view was founded on an entire misconception. They could not conceive that men able to find their own arms would volunteer into the militia for five years per-

manent service. They might be able to form their militia without the ballot, but it would be by persons very different from these, and he believed, therefore, they had committed a great error by refusing the volunteer corps."

He wound up by objecting to the Bill, that it would leave the country in a worse state of defence than if no Bill had been passed. Lord ELLESMERE supported the bill, and it was read a second time without a division or a hostile motion.

The bill went quietly through committee on Thursday.

#### LORD MALMESBURY ABANDONS HIS BONAPARTIST CONVENTION BILL.

Lord BROUGHAM (who had previously attempted, but without success, to bring this subject before the house on Monday) said, their lordships would have saved some three quarters of an hour by permitting his question to have been put and answered with a simple "yea" or "nay." He referred to the state of the French law, and repeated that it was as he had stated it to be last week. He implored his noble friends opposite, before the next stage of the bill, to reconsider the propriety, which he would strongly urge upon them, of withdrawing the measure. (Hear, hear.) They had the best possible opportunity of doing so, on account of the total change in the law of France which had taken place upon the very subject of extradition since the convention was entered into. (Hear, hear.)

The Earl of MALMESBURY said, he had come down to the House intending to inform their lordships at the proper moment that the Government had thought fit, at present, to withdraw this bill. (Cheers.) After what the noble and learned lord had said, he scarcely need refer to his own statement on Friday night, as to the law of France. That statement had originated in an error of the person who wrote the despatch on this subject—an error which our ambassador at Paris had requested him to explain in the way he had done. Before leaving the subject he wished to state that it would be extremely dangerous to continue the act of Parliament under the new law which had been passed in France. (Hear, hear.) In the first place, they could not properly understand the full bearing of that measure. As far as he understood it at present, the French Government meant to claim any criminal in any part of the world wherever he had committed an offence, even if that offence were not committed on French ground.

Lord BROUGHAM—And though the party be not a Frenchman?

Lord MALMESBURY—Just so.

Lord BROUGHAM—An Englishman, in London even, would be liable under it.

Lord MALMESBURY wished to avoid any discussion on the provisions of the French law; but he had meant to take the earliest opportunity of informing their lordships that the Government intended to withdraw the bill.

Lord BROUGHAM said, that nothing could be more satisfactory than this course, and nothing could be more complete than the justification of the noble earl for so acting. He could do no other, after finding that he had been misinformed as to the actual state of the French law. The new law was, that an Englishman, for an offence committed in London, or alleged to be so committed, might be brought to trial in France, and dealt with by the French authorities. (Hear, hear.) It was not for the first time that a law of this sort was propounded in France; it was in a great measure the same under the Emperor Napoleon, in 1808, when France, England, and Europe were in totally different circumstances. Since then, owing to that diversity of circumstances, the law had been a dead letter; but it was now revived, and with a very material extension, having reference to misdemeanours as well as other crimes.

Lord LYNDHURST said, that by the existing French law, supposing the bill before the House to have been carried, an Englishman might have been apprehended here after he had been in Paris. (Hear, hear.)

#### CORRUPT PRACTICES AT ELECTIONS BILL.

In the HOUSE OF LORDS this bill was very much damaged by ministerial amendments. There was a smart discussion on Monday before the House went into committee, on the motion of Lord LANSDOWNE.

Lord DERBY proposed as an amendment to the first clause, that the words, "Address of the House of Commons," should be omitted; and the words, "A Joint Address of both Houses of Parliament," be substituted; an amendment which would prevent the House of Commons from proceeding to inquire into any alleged corrupt practices at elections without the consent of the Upper House. The amendment was vigorously opposed, but on a division it was carried by 78 to 34.

On clause 6, which gave the commissioners power to inquire whether there had been corrupt practices at elections "for such a period retrospectively as they



should think proper," the clause mentioning as one subject for inquiry "whether any corrupt practice by way of treating has been carried on at any such election," Lord DERBY proposed to strike out the words "for such a period retrospectively as they should think proper," and to introduce words providing that if the commissioners found that there had been corrupt practices at the election which was the subject of the report of the committee, they might inquire into the next previous election, and so on in like manner from election to election, as far back as they should think fit, until they reached an election where, upon inquiry, they found no corrupt practices to exist, and then they should not inquire further back. He also proposed to strike out the words relating to treating.

The amendments, limiting the period to which the inquiry was to be carried back were agreed to without a division; but the amendment, that the words extending the inquiry to treating be struck out, was carried by 68 to 35.

The remaining clauses were then agreed to, and their lordships resumed.

#### CRIME AND OUTRAGE, IRELAND.

Mr. NAPIER, at the morning sitting on Tuesday, moved for leave to bring in a bill to continue an act of the 11th and 12th years of her present Majesty, for the better prevention of crime and outrage in certain parts of Ireland.

"The present Act was of that nature. It was passed when a crime of a peculiar character was prevalent in Ireland, and which the ordinary law of the land could not cope with. It gave a power to the Lord Lieutenant, under especial circumstances, to proclaim any particular locality; and then he sent down an additional police force to that locality, at the expense of the locality. There was nothing coercive or severe in that. The act then applied the provisions of the Whiteboy Acts to the districts so proclaimed. That code in itself applied only to those portions of the country which were in an insurrectionary state; but by the Act which he now wished to prolong it was made to apply to districts that were proclaimed. One of its most valuable provisions was the making persons who harboured criminals amenable to justice. The act also enabled the Lord Lieutenant to call upon persons to surrender their arms; and no persons were allowed to have arms in their possession unless they were licensed."

Mr. Napier drew an appalling picture of the agrarian outrages—which had doubled in number since 1847—the threatening notices, the murders for which no conviction could be obtained, juries being, he said, intimidated from performing their duties. In this state of things, when the ordinary law was insufficient for the protection of life and property, the House, he thought, would incur a fearful responsibility if it refused to continue this act for a limited period.

Mr. LAWLESS should oppose the introduction of such a bill, unaccompanied by any measure for ameliorating the condition of Ireland. Mr. F. SCULLY opposed the bill on the ground of the severity of its provisions, and because the outrages against which it was directed arose from the disordered relations between landlord and tenant, for which remedial measures had been promised in 1847, but the promise had not yet been redeemed. Mr. S. CRAWFORD likewise called for remedial measures before coercive ones were enacted. The whole cause of agrarian outrages in Ireland, he believed, was to be found in the disordered relations between landlord and tenant. Mr. ANSTEE followed in the same line.

Mr. KNOX complained that the present Government, notwithstanding former professions, had introduced no measures for the redress of the grievances of Ireland, except this coercive measure, against the severe penalties of which he inveighed. He disputed the accuracy of the statistics of crime adduced by Mr. Napier, which were at variance with a recent official return laid before the committee, showing a decrease of crime; and contended that no case had been made out for a bill like this, which, he observed, taught landlords in Ireland to rely upon the legislation of that House instead of, as in England, upon their own conduct.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER denied that this was a measure of coercion; it was a measure of police, which was expiring, and the condition of Ireland required its continuance. With respect to remedial measures, such measures, he said, had been already prepared by the Government; but he asked whether any member, looking at the position of the ministry and the temper of the House generally in the transaction of public business, could really say that it had been in their power to introduce them. The Government could not incur the responsibility of letting this Act expire, which would release great criminals; but the bill was to continue only until next December, so that the subject must be reconsidered in the ensuing Parliament.

Upon a division, the motion for leave to bring in the bill was carried by 140 against 19.

The House then adjourned until the evening; when there was a

#### "COUNT OUT."

Mr. ANSTEE was making a statement of the case of the Scotch missionaries expelled from Hungary by the Austrian Government, when

Mr. PLOWDEN, a conservative, moved that the House be counted. This was done, and there were found to be only thirty-seven members present, eight Conservatives and twenty-nine Liberals, and the House stood adjourned accordingly.

Mr. ANSTEE complained, on Wednesday, of several irregularities in taking divisions, and among other things alluded to the "count out."

"Ministers were last night planning a count out for the purpose of stifling a discussion on Lord Malmesbury's conduct; but there were considerably more than forty members present when an hon. member moved that the House be counted; the hon. member for Montrose noticed that there were gentlemen present actually hiding themselves; there were three members of the Government behind the Speaker's chair. He (Mr. Anstee) wished to ask whether the House had no power to compel the presence of hon. members at the table or in their places for the purpose of being counted when within the House, as the House and the chair had power to compel their presence at the table, or in the House, in order to have their votes recorded? If not, he gave notice that he should propose a standing order to prevent the recurrence of such disgraceful proceedings."

The SPEAKER stated the rule of the House with respect to the voting of members.

"No member had a right to vote unless he were in the House and had heard the question put. Before the question was put and a division taken, it was the duty of the Sergeant-at-Arms to clear the door and the lobby. If once occurred that a member was found in the lobby after it had been cleared. He was called to the table and asked if he had heard the question put. He said that he had not, and the Sergeant-at-Arms was then directed that the hon. member might withdraw. With respect to the third question, the hon. member knew that whenever an hon. member took notice that there were not forty members present the House was incompetent to transact business. The doors were not locked, but were kept open; and, till the Speaker actually counted the House, every member was entitled to withdraw. If there were 100 members in the lobby, there was no power to enforce their attendance. His attention had been rather irregularly called by the hon. member for Montrose to members behind the chair, because no hon. member had a right to address the chair under those circumstances; but he (the Speaker) actually counted twice over. The rule, however, was, that no member could be counted unless he were actually within the House, and the chair had no authority to order his attendance. (Hear, hear.)"

#### MAYNOOTH.

The wretched squabble about the College of Maynooth has been kept up all the week. On Monday, or rather on Tuesday morning, at half-past two, a.m., Mr. SPOONER made an effort to obtain either a continuance of the debate or a division. Finding he was likely to be beaten, he declared that he should consider all votes given for the adjournment of the House as given *against* his motion for inquiry. This of course called forth a storm of protests.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said, that if the House did not agree to the adjournment, the hon. member opposite (Mr. V. Scully) would be in possession of the House and would continue his speech. It was then his (the Chancellor of the Exchequer's) intention, with the greatest respect for that hon. member, to go home. (Shouts of laughter.)

Sir B. HALL said, that if the debate was to be resumed that night, he should be very happy to pair off with the right hon. gentleman opposite (the Chancellor of the Exchequer), and go home too. (Laughter.) But if the hon. member for North Warwickshire wished the debate proceeded with, he ought to stay and listen to the hon. gentleman. (Hear, hear.) If he remembered rightly, the hon. member (Mr. V. Scully) left off his speech at the year 1814; he had, therefore, thirty-eight years still to go on with. (Renewed laughter.)

The motion for the adjournment of the House was then lost by 103 to 29; whereupon Mr. SPOONER said the vote indicated the feeling of the House. Mr. GLADSTONE protested, "on behalf of the meaning of words," against that construction. After some further idle talk the House adjourned at three o'clock.

But the next day, like the promptings of a guilty conscience, the motion came up again. In vain members tried to obtain some specific reply from Mr. Spooner. All he would say was that he took the division of the preceding night as a division on the main question, and that he had no intention of giving any notice at all of what he should do with the order of the day for resuming the debate. And so the matter stands.

#### MR. FEARGUS O'CONNOR.

In consequence of the medical certificates, Miss Harriette Browne O'Connor, the sister of the honourable member for Nottingham, petitioned the House to allow her brother to be placed in a lunatic asylum. Accordingly, a select committee was appointed, on Tuesday, and on Wednesday Mr. WALPOLE brought up its report, which was to the following effect:—

"The select committee appointed to inquire into the facts contained in the petition of Harriette Browne O'Connor, stating her belief that her brother, Mr. Feargus O'Connor, is of unsound mind, and praying that he may be discharged from custody, in order that he may be immediately placed in confinement under proper medical treatment, have considered the matter to them referred, and agreed to the following report:—Your committee have inquired into the facts contained in the petition presented by Miss Harriette Browne O'Connor, praying that Mr. Feargus O'Connor, being a lunatic, may be discharged from custody, in order that he may be immediately placed in confinement under proper medical treatment, and they find that the same are true. It appears by the evidence of Mr. Lawrence and Dr. Tweedie that they have separately visited and personally examined Mr. Feargus O'Connor, and they have each of them certified according to the statute that he is of unsound mind, and a proper person to be confined. It further appears by the evidence of the petitioner, that she has requested Dr. Tooke to receive her brother into his private asylum at Chiswick, and that Dr. Tooke is willing to do so, according to the arrangements which have been made for that purpose. The petitioner is the nearest relative of Mr. O'Connor in England, and she has signed the order required by the statute requesting Dr. Tooke to receive Mr. O'Connor as a patient into his house. Your committee have thought it right to ask Dr. Tooke and Miss O'Connor whether they would be willing to give an undertaking that Mr. O'Connor should not be removed from Dr. Tooke's asylum, without previously obtaining the permission of the House, and they have given such undertaking accordingly. Under these circumstances, your committee beg leave to recommend to the House that Mr. Feargus O'Connor be discharged from the custody of the Sergeant-at-Arms, in order that he may be forthwith removed into the asylum of Dr. Tooke, who is willing to take the necessary steps for conveying him there immediately."

Mr. GOULBURN observed, that it was stated in the report that certain parties had entered into an understanding that Mr. O'Connor should not be removed from the lunatic asylum without leave of the House. He wished to know whether that was intended to apply to the present session only? Mr. WALPOLE replied in the affirmative.

It was then moved, and agreed to, that Mr. O'Connor be discharged from the custody of the Sergeant-at-Arms without payment of fees.

#### MISCELLANEOUS.

The doings in both Houses on Thursday were of a very miscellaneous character. The Lords rejected a bill withdrawing from the jurisdiction of the Ecclesiastical Courts certain criminal offences, such as brawling in the church, and the like, by 68 to 45; on the ground, mainly, that it was piecemeal reform. The Copyhold Enfranchisement Bill went through Committee—the Lord Chancellor approving.

In the House of Commons, among other matters, there was an important petition from New South Wales; the purport of which was as follows:—

"The Council declared it a duty they owed to themselves and to posterity to record their deep dissatisfaction with the constitution of the 14th of Victoria, c. 76. They were dissatisfied with the administration of the waste lands and of the revenues generally of the colony, and they found to their great regret, that the land schedules were increased instead of being abolished. As the last act of their legislative existence, no other course was left to them than to protest against the imperial policy; to declare and remonstrate against it, and to enter that protest and declaration upon three grounds. They declared, first, that the Imperial Parliament had no power to tax the people of New South Wales, or to appropriate their revenues, but that all taxation should be made by the colonial Legislature; next, that the revenues arising from the public lands, of which her Majesty was trustee, could only be appropriated to the use of the colony; thirdly, that the Customs and other branches of revenue should be subject to the same control; fourthly, that the action of the Legislative Council should not be fettered by interference from the Parliament at home; and, fifthly, that no colonial bills should be reserved for the sanction of her Majesty, unless such as affected her crown and dignity. In conclusion, they declared they were prepared, if entrusted with their own lands and revenues, to provide for all the expenses of the colony, exclusive only of the governor's salary." (Hear, hear.)

Lord Naas presented the petition; Mr. Gladstone drew attention to it. The members of the Government took exception to the phrase "as a trustee"—referring to the Queen—and a discussion arose upon it. Finally, it was ordered to lie on the table.

The Metropolitan Water Supply Bill went through committee, and the Burial Bill was read a second time.

At length, after a steady opposition to the land clauses from Sir William Molesworth, the New Zealand Government Bill was read a third time, and passed.

ROMAN CATHOLIC PROCESSIONS.—A Royal proclamation appeared in the *London Gazette* of Tuesday, warning all those whom it might concern, that the law forbidding Roman Catholic processions would, in future, be strictly enforced. This gave rise to questions from Mr. KNOX, who asked whether Government intended to publish the Proclamation in the *Dublin Gazette*, and to prosecute priests for doing what had been connived at over since 1829. Mr. WALPOLE said, that two months ago the Government heard of a procession in Ireland, in which a Roman Catholic bishop took part, and they sent a friendly intimation to the bishop, pointing out to him the pro-



visions of the statute of George IV., and expressing a hope that he had so acted without any intention of violating the law, otherwise it would be the duty of the Government to put the law in force. Since then he had not heard of any repetition of the offence in Ireland, and therefore it was not the intention of the Government to give a special warning, by publishing the proclamation in the *Dublin Gazette*, unless a similar occurrence should take place. The law, he added, had not, as Mr. Keogh assumed, lain dormant; but it had come to the knowledge of the Government that Roman Catholics in this country were going to renew those processions along the highways, which had been done away for three hundred years, by marching from village to village with banners and emblems of their faith in honour of the Virgin Mary; and one procession had taken place, which moved for four miles along the high road, consisting of one hundred and fifty persons, with banners, emblems, crucifixes, and images. He had no hesitation in saying that such a procession must give much annoyance to others of her Majesty's subjects; and the Government thought it right to prevent such a violation of the law, in which instance danger actually existed of a breach of the peace. If the law in this respect were not observed, its violation must necessarily draw down punishment on those who, after this warning, wilfully infringed it.

**MILITARY INTIMIDATION.**—The Secretary-at-War read a letter of explanation on Monday, in reference to the charge brought against General Thomas by Mr. Crawford, of employing his influence to coerce the vote of Sergeant McKinley, a pensioner, at the late Enniskillen election. Canvassing on behalf of Mr. Whiteside was admitted, but the alleged intimidation was denied. Mr. Secretary Walpole considered General Thomas had acted with imprudence, but had not been guilty of intimidation. Sir Edward Blakeney has cautioned General Thomas to be more careful in future.

#### LORD MALMESBURY AND MR. MATHER.

The following additional letter from Mr. Scarlett was published on Wednesday:—

"THE HON. P. C. SCARLETT TO THE EARL OF MALMESBURY.—(Received June 11.)

"Florence, June 1, 1852.  
"MY LORD,—Having recovered sufficiently to dictate a letter, I will now give your Lordship an account of my reasons for accepting 1000 francsconi as an indemnity to Mr. Mather.

"In the first place, it was extremely difficult to prevent the Tuscan Government from coupling the offer of payment with a protest against the principle of responsibility. The only way by which I could avoid this dilemma was to propose that all discussion about responsibility should be waived, and that the Government should simply compensate Mr. Mather for the injury done to him.

"To this suggestion the Ministers at last agreed, and this point gained, I considered the amount of compensation of secondary importance, provided it were sufficient to mark distinctly the disposition of the Tuscan Government to show sympathy with the British subjects who may suffer similar outrages, by complying with the demands of her Majesty's Government.

"In the second place, I bore in mind that Mr. Mather had himself rejected the idea of any pecuniary indemnity while at Florence, and declared emphatically that his object was to vindicate the national honour.

"I am happy, also, to have reason to believe that the extent of the injury was less than has been supposed, and there is no probability that if Mr. Mather's case had been submitted regularly to a Tuscan tribunal, as it might have been had the Austrian officer been amenable to Tuscan law, so large a sum as 1000 francsconi would have been awarded.

"Thirdly—However unjustifiable, in the eyes of civilized nations, are the severe regulations of the Austrian military service, it must not be forgotten that by Mr. Mather's own admission, his tone and manner towards the officer on duty at the head of his troops, previous to the assault, were, to say the least, highly imprudent, and that to his own indiscretion must be partly attributed the misfortune which befel him.

"Lastly—I thought it right to take the advantage of the opportunity which presented itself of obtaining the liberation of the two Stratfords, thus concluding all matters of difference between the British and Tuscan Governments.

"Trusting that your Lordship and her Majesty's Government will approve of my proceedings, I have, &c.,  
(Signed) "P. CAMPBELL SCARLETT."

#### ALDERMAN SALOMONS VICTORIOUS.

An attorney named Chubb renewed the legal persecution of Mr. Alderman Salomons, by bringing an action in the Court of Exchequer on Monday for the recovery of 1500*l.*, consisting of penalties for having illegally voted three times in the House of Commons as member for Greenwich. The plaintiff's counsel, Mr. Edwin James, Q.C., narrated the facts of the former action, which had been brought for a similar object, in which the Court had decided that the defendant was liable, but in which the plaintiff had ultimately taken the verdict for one penalty only. This action, he endeavoured to show, had been friendly and collusive; but the Chief Baron stopped him, saying that it would be sufficient to go into these matters when the defendant set up this former action as a defence.

Mr. John Abel Smith, M.P., was called to prove the proceedings in the House of Commons; but on the objection of Mr. Willes, the defendant's counsel, and on the Chief Baron informing Mr. Smith that he could not be compelled to give evidence of

the proceedings of the House of Commons without the leave of the House, Mr. Smith consequently declined to answer any further questions on the subject.

A clerk in the House of Commons produced a printed book, containing the journal and votes of the House; but as he had not examined that particular copy with the original, it was rejected as inadmissible.

Sir Denis Le Marchant, Clerk of the House of Commons, proved that Mr. Salomons, in taking the oaths, had omitted the magic words, "on the true faith of a Christian."

Mr. Gray remembered the voting of Alderman Salomons. "The vote is given first, and then it is recorded. He voted in the ordinary way in which a member votes. He came up in the lobby and caused his name to be inscribed in the Division List. He voted as a member three times on three divisions."

Lord Marcus Hill, M.P., who acted as teller on the night in question was next called; but a similar objection being taken to his evidence as to that of Mr. John Abel Smith, he declined to answer any questions as to the proceedings of the House.

Mr. James urged that Lord Marcus Hill, as a teller, was included in the leave given by the House to its officers, and therefore might give evidence; but the Chief Baron held that he was not an officer of the House.

Mr. James Jenkins, an attorney, was next called. He knew Alderman Salomons. He heard him state at a meeting at the City of London Tavern, called on the subject of the Jewish disabilities, that he had voted in the House, and that if the view taken by his opponents was correct, he had incurred severe penalties.

Mr. Gray was then recalled, and produced the original book kept by the clerk, containing the record of the proceedings of the House, and the entries of the three votes in question.

Mr. Willes, in addressing the jury on behalf of the defendant, complained bitterly of the manner in which Mr. James, the counsel for the plaintiff, had opened his case, in endeavouring to excite a prejudice against the defendant. It was not Mr. Willes's intention to set up the other action as a defence; but he maintained that the latter was a *bona fide* action, brought for the purpose of trying the question of law. The present action, however, was that of a mere informer, brought for the purpose of extortion. At all events, it was clear that the plaintiff could only recover for one penalty.

The Chief Baron said he should so direct the jury. However many times a member might vote in one day without having taken the proper oaths, he would only subject himself to one penalty, of 500*l.*

Mr. James said he took a different view of the case, and should tender a bill of exceptions to such a direction.

Mr. Willes said he had thought at one time that these proceedings had been instigated by some one who was anxious, on public grounds, to raise the question a second time; but he was now convinced that the action was that of a mere common informer, and that being the case, he was sure that the jury would look narrowly at the evidence, and reject the plaintiff's case unless it was established by the clearest proof. He then submitted, that but for the evidence of Mr. Jenkin, who was introduced as a joint conspirator with the defendant in the first place, and then assumed the part of a spy and informer, there was no evidence on which the jury could rely for proof of the fact that Mr. Alderman Salomons had committed any act, which would subject him to this penalty. Much evidence had been offered and rejected, and that which had been received and would be left to their unprejudiced consideration by the learned judge was, he asserted, wholly insufficient to satisfy the jury that the defendant had voted; and unless that was made out by direct testimony, they were bound to return a verdict for the defendant, and so defeat the informer.

The Chief Baron in summing up, again gave it as his opinion that only one penalty could be recovered, arriving at that conclusion from the analogy of this case, both with other penal statutes which had been similarly interpreted, and with the law affecting the right of voting in the House of Lords. He observed, that the topic which the plaintiff's counsel had introduced was totally irrelevant, and had been brought in most unnecessarily and improperly. The previous action not having been pleaded, could not now be set up in defence by the defendant.

"At the same time he must observe that he knew no social obligation on a man in the position of the defendant, who had done an act subjecting him to a penalty, to submit to the mercy of the first informer, especially when the penalty was incurred in the open vindication of what the defendant *bona fide* believed to be the law of the land and his rights. The Chief Baron afterwards proceeded to direct

the attention of the jury to the question, whether Mr. Alderman Salomons had been proved by legal and sufficient evidence to have voted on the 21st of July in the House of Commons. As this was an action under a highly penal statute to recover a large penalty, and not an ordinary action for money, they ought to expect from the plaintiff direct and clear proof of the allegations in his declaration—the principal of which was, that the defendant had voted. This gave rise to the question, "In what did voting consist?" At first, from the evidence of Mr. Gray, the Clerk of the House, he (Sir F. Pollock) would have inferred that a member voted when he entered the House from the lobby after a division; but on consideration he should say that it was not so. Neither did the act of putting down the name constitute the act of voting, in his opinion. It was the act of leaving the House after the question had been put which constituted the act of voting. That was his very strong opinion; but it was difficult to say that a man had voted unless you could show how he voted, and though there was evidence here of three divisions, and the defendant's name had been inscribed as many times in the list by Mr. Gray as having voted, still there was no proof that he was in the House when the question was put, nor that he left it on the division taking place to go into the lobby for the purpose of voting; so that in his opinion there was not that clear proof which ought to have been given, and might have been given, on the part of the plaintiff. But it was for the jury to decide that."

Sir F. Pollock was not aware that the plaintiff had given evidence of any arrangements in the House which would make it certain that Mr. Salomons had left the House in order to proceed to the division. The jury might have no moral doubt of the fact, but they ought to find for the defendant, unless they were satisfied, not by reasoning and inference, but by actual legal proof, of the commission by the defendant of the offence imputed to him.

The Jury retired for five minutes, and on their returning, their foreman, who, it is said, was of the Jewish persuasion, announced a verdict for the defendant. Both parties tendered bills of exceptions to the summing up of the Chief Baron.

#### POLICE INTERFERENCE IN BONNER'S FIELDS.

THE subjoined correspondence with the Secretary of State has been handed to us, and we readily give it publicity.

10, Patriot Square, Victoria Park,  
16th May, 1852.

SIR,—I most respectfully inform you, that on Sunday (this 16th inst.) an injudicious, and, in my opinion in common with others, an illegal interference with the rights of Englishmen took place, by the forcible prevention by the police of persons assembling in Bonner's Fields to converse with each other—to exhort and address each other on social, political, and religious subjects, as by the laws and customs of this country they have a right to do.

The superintendent of the K division professed to act by the orders of the Commissioners of Police, which, if so, makes this interference a most grievous wrong requiring to be redressed, and such proceedings for the future prevented.

I most respectfully inquire of you whether the order to interfere was issued direct from the Home Office, and by what law, or pretence of law, such interference has taken place.

I am, Sir, respectfully yours,  
JAS. SAVAGE.

To the Hon. — Walpole,  
Her Majesty's Secretary of State  
for the Home Department.

To which the following reply (not answer) was received on the 1st of June:—

Whitehall, 31st May, 1852.

SIR,—I am directed by Mr. Secretary Walpole to acknowledge the receipt of your complaint of the interference of the police to prevent persons assembling in Bonner's Fields on Sundays; and to inform you that Mr. Walpole has inquired into the facts of the case, and is of opinion that the interference of the police was not improper.

I am, Sir, your obedient servant,  
S. J. H. JOLLIFFE.

Mr. James Savage,  
10, Patriot Square, Victoria Park.

QY.—Will the opinion of the Home Secretary be considered by the people of this country a sufficient warrant for proceedings not sanctioned by law, and subversive of their rights?

J. S.

As our readers know, mounted and foot police, armed with swords, dispersed the people assembled to preach and teach. On May 23, the Sunday following the arbitrary reply of Mr. Walpole, who simply informed the members for the Tower Hamlets that no one would be allowed to preach there, the fields presented a remarkable spectacle. "Several thousands of persons," says the *Daily News*, "were walking about, who, the moment the police had vacated any spot, collected there in groups, discussing and conversing, till the police came again and dispersed them. Two speakers began to address the people; and, on being forcibly removed by the police, requested to be taken into custody: but the police averred that their orders were to arrest nobody. This denial of an opportunity to test the legality of the prohibition was perplexing. It was difficult to see how any kind of public meeting, on any day of the week, could be secure from repres-

sion, at the mere will of the Government, or of the police, if this invasion of a supposed right were submitted to; and it was decided to meet every Sunday as usual, till the question was settled in one way or another, and to do as much in the way of assemblage and speaking as the police could not prevent. There, then, may be seen any Sunday thousands of persons walking about, in order to obey the order to keep moving, and discussing and reading aloud as they walk."

#### LETTERS FROM PARIS.

[FROM OUR OWN CORRESPONDENT.]

LETTER XXV.

Paris, Tuesday Evening, 15th June, 1852.

LOUIS BONAPARTE has had the projected laws for levying additional taxes laid before the Legislative Body. The proposed laws consist of a duty on carriages, a legacy duty, and an exorbitant duty on paper and alcohol. The effect of the tax upon paper will be to increase the cost of that article some 25 to 30 per cent., and is consequently a serious blow struck at the numerous dependents upon the paper trade, such as printers, book-sellers, and engravers. The duty on alcohol, which was to have commenced in January, 1853, will begin on the 1st of August. The pecuniary necessities of the Elysée are most urgent.

These measures were discussed by the Council of State, in Bonaparte's presence, last Friday, and were warmly opposed by M. Boinvilliers. He said it was unworthy a strong Government to have recourse to systems of vague, indefinite, and uncertain taxation; that such means should be left for weak Governments. The last words made a visible impression upon Louis Bonaparte, who forthwith reminded the debaters of what he had done in the cause of order. He then explained his theory of taxation, from which it appeared that he advocated that the great weight of taxation should be borne by the rich. The Council of State did not fail to perceive that Louis Bonaparte's aim was not so much to raise a revenue as to make himself popular. A member of the Council of State then rose, and suggested to Bonaparte that he should, for consistency's sake, withdraw the proposed duty on alcohol and salt, which affected principally the poorer classes. The proposed duty on salt, which produced but little return, was accordingly withdrawn. That on alcohol, which is expected to yield a revenue of twenty millions, was maintained. These fiscal measures met with a poor reception in the Legislative Body. The reading of the bills was several times interrupted by the murmurs of the Assembly, which seemed to have shaken off its usual apathy. The question before the Assembly required an immediate decision. Were the members, with a view to save time, and to be able to pass the bills before the end of the session, which terminates on the 28th of June, to refer these projects of law to the Committee on the Budget, or should they nominate a fresh committee, which, owing to the loss of time it would entail, would be equivalent to an indefinite adjournment. A great number of deputies demanded to be heard in favour of the latter course, which was eventually adopted by a large majority. The fate of these untoward projected laws seems to be foretold in the reception already given them by the Legislative Body. The deputies are determined to reject them.

The Council of State had another sitting on Saturday, at which Louis Bonaparte was not present, to consider the detached clauses of the project of law on the departmental and communal organization. The Government project was rejected, the present law will therefore be provisionally maintained. The Council of State then went through the numerous amendments proposed by the Legislative Body in the Budget of 1853. Some of the amendments proposed a reduction of 30,000 men in the army, and of twenty-six millions in the Budget. The amendments were opposed by the ministers, and one of them, Persigny, warmly attacked the Committee on the Budget. After having complained of the hostility of the committee, he said, "We know the means adopted by these dexterous gentlemen to be admitted into the Committee." Bonaparte is not less annoyed than his ministers. Apropos of the reduction of the army by 30,000 men, as proposed by the committee, he some time since said, "If they vote this diminution, I will decree an increase of a hundred thousand men, and we shall see who will carry the day then." In reply to Bonaparte's threats, the committee on the Budget adopted the Mérode amendment exempting the Orleans property from auction duty, effecting thereby a saving of 1,800,000 francs, which would otherwise have reached the coffers of the State.

The appeal instituted by the Government against the decision of the Tribunal of the Seine, which had declared its competency to take cognizance of the decree of the 22nd January confiscating the Orleans property,

will be brought before the Council of State this day (Tuesday). M. Cornudet will read the report, which decides, as I stated three weeks ago, in favour of the competency of the ordinary tribunals. M. Reverchon had been designated as the Government Commissary, but Bonaparte, having heard that he was prepared to decide favourably as to the competency, quashed the appointment, and named M. Maigne in his stead. The Council of State was beset in this affair by incessant intrigues. I have already alluded to this subject in a former letter. Louis Bonaparte threatened personal violence against a certain number of the members, and spoke of dismissing every Councillor of State who should vote against the Government in this affair. I suppose, nevertheless, the Council of State will do its duty, and that, notwithstanding Bonaparte's threats, it will reject the arbitrary pretensions of the Government.

The truckling policy of Louis Bonaparte, as regards the clergy and the foreign powers, continues. To conciliate the good graces of Russia, he has just issued a decree withdrawing from the Polish refugees the relief which France had given them for twenty years. The motives of this decree are set forth in the most hypocritical verbiage. To deserve the good graces of the clergy, Bonaparte has authorized the procession of the *Fete-Dieu* through the streets of all the towns. Nay, more, orders have been given to the troops to accompany these processions. In several towns the inhabitants have derisively sent wax candles to the officers, telling them that wax tapers are the only swords they are worthy to wear. Of course the clergy are daily becoming more audacious. For some time past they have recommended, through their organ the *Univers*, the suppression of Ancient History and Letters. Homer, Herodotus, Sophocles, Pindar, Aristotle, Plato, Demosthenes, Cicero, Virgil, Horace, Tacitus, &c., are proscribed by the fiery organs of the priests, who object to these books being put into the hands of young people. This insane proscription is not confined to ancient classics, it extends to Bossuet and Fenelon among the moderns. Bossuet, the eagle of Meaux, and Fenelon, the swan of Cambray, are rejected as Gallican by these infuriated ultra-montanists. The dispute at this moment is raging most violently: French bishops are thundering forth their bulls one against another.

The refusals to take the oath still prevail. A third of the departmental and municipal councillors throughout France have resigned, and it is expected that the proportion will reach half the whole number of these functionaries. In the list of "resigned" professors, must be added Barthélémy St. Hilaire, of the Museum of Natural History; Chomel, of the Ecole de Médecine; Catalan, Professor of Mathematics, St. Louis College; Gourgeon, Professor of History at Bordeaux, who have all refused to take the oath.

The Legitimists, on their side, obeying the summons of the Comte de Chambord, are withdrawing the oath they had already taken. The Comte de Villiers, among others, sent in his resignation, in the following terms:—"Being desirous of following the advice which comes to us from the exiled, I have addressed a letter to the Mayor of St. Nazaire, containing my resignation of the office of municipal councillor of that commune, and withdrawing the oath I took a month ago." Bonaparte had, in some localities, caused citizens to be prosecuted before the tribunals for refusing the oath: M. Verney, ex-President of the Tribunal of Commerce at Evreux, was amongst the number. He had been accused of having excited the hatred and contempt of the people against the Government; but was acquitted. Bonaparte's *procureur* (public accuser) appealed to the Court of Appeal of Rouen, which, on Saturday, pronounced another acquittal of M. Verney, and condemned Bonaparte to pay the costs.

The spirit of opposition, as you perceive, is gradually extending in France, and everything is being organized for resistance. The republican party has at length succeeded in re-organizing itself, and, in a very short time, you will find it once more at work. As for the Legitimists and Orleansists, the *fusion* is complete between the heads, and cannot fail shortly to extend to the ranks of the respective parties. The Princes of the House of Orleans have overcome the opposition of the Duchess of Orleans, and have adhered unconditionally to the absolute supremacy of the Comte de Chambord.\*

Persecutions and arrests have re-commenced with renewed vigour. The journeymen hatters had appointed delegates to collect a subscription in aid of their proscribed brethren. Fifteen of these delegates were arrested last Friday, at Bléneau, in the Yonne. Several insurgents, who had been set at liberty, were re-captured on the 9th of June, and sent off to Algiers immediately. Six others were removed from the same

\* We repeat our reservation of last week, as to the acceptance of the fusion at Claremont.—[Ed. of Leader.]

commune on the next day, and forwarded to the same destination. At Perpignan, the wife of an unfortunate political exile had died of a broken heart; more than 2000 citizens followed her to the grave. The authorities, viewing this as a culpable manifestation, arrested twenty-five persons for having been present on the occasion. S.

#### CONTINENTAL NOTES.

THE following is the report of the proceedings in the appeal of the Orleans family against the Confiscation Decrees:—

##### "COUNCIL OF STATE.

"Public Sitting of the 15th of June.

"M. Baroche, President.

##### "THE PROPERTY OF THE ORLEANS FAMILY.

"The Council was this whole day occupied in the consideration of the question brought before it by the Prefect of the Seine, respecting the judgment in which the Seine Civil Tribunal of First Instance, in the early part of last May, declared its competency to take cognizance of the decrees dated the 22d of last January, relative to the property belonging to the Orleans family. In conformity with the organic decree of the Council of State, the sitting of to-day consisted of the members of the opposite section, and of an equal number selected from amongst the other sections. The sitting was opened at half-past ten, when there were but a very few auditors present; but shortly afterwards the audience increased rapidly, and at one o'clock the hall was so densely crowded, that a large number of persons were compelled to take refuge in the outer gallery.

"The President having called upon the reporter.

"M. Leon Cornudet read his report, in which were related the circumstances that led to the dispute, and briefly stated the arguments which had been urged either for or against the competency of the tribunal; but the report did not conclude with any recommendation.

"M. Paul Fabre followed the reporter, and in his pleading maintained that the competency of the tribunal had been clearly established. In conclusion, he submitted to the Council as the basis of the discussion the two following questions:—

"1. Have the Princes of Orleans, from 1830 to 1852 been the legitimate proprietors of the estates of Monceaux and Neuilly?

"2. In case they were recognised as the legitimate proprietors of said estates from 1830 to 1852, have they ceased to be so in virtue of the decree of the 22nd January?

"M. Maigne, Government Commissary, demanded the confirmation of the decree so far as related to the property comprised in the grant of August 7, 1830; and that it should be annulled so far as respected the property descended to the Orleans family from Princess Adelaide."

At half-past three the public were desired to withdraw while the Council were in deliberation.

At the sitting of the *Corps Legislatif* on Tuesday the Tobacco Monopoly Bill was renewed for ten years; and 170,000f. were voted for the restoration of the Church of St. Ouen, at Rouen.

At the Zollverein conference on the 7th inst. Prussia formally declined the idea of a customs' union with Austria. Prussia states numerous arguments, which force it to decline, for an indefinite length of time, the idea of a customs' union with the imperial states. The proportion of production and consumption in the two territories is too different; the mode of dividing the common revenue, as proposed in the Vienna draft, is too faulty; the Austrian state monopolies would, in spite of the union, prevent free intercourse, and so forth. As regards a treaty of commerce, the declaration repeats that the Prussian Government is very willing to effect one, and fully convinced of its high utility; but, until the Zollverein shall have been reconstructed, and the one contracting party thereby called into definite existence, it would be waste of time to negotiate, particularly as the business of renewing the Zollverein involves the discussion of so many weighty points, and must occupy so much time, that the task dare not be incumbered by adding all the difficulties of a treaty with Austria. With reference to this argumentation the official Dresden *Gazette* makes some remarks, which indicate the mode in which the coalition Governments are inclined to meet the declaration in question. "The Prussian declaration," it says, "is a renewed refusal; but its tenour gives room rather for the hope of an agreement than for the fear of a breach. Prussia enters for the first time on the merits of the case, and this, indeed, may be regarded as the commencement of a negotiation; the argumentation brought forward imposes on the Prussian Government the duty of relinquishing its resistance as soon as its reasoning against the expediency of entering on the treaty with Austria shall have been refuted. On the other hand, the *Post Ampt Gazette* of the 14th says:—"Count de Buol Schauenstein, Austrian Minister of Foreign Affairs, has had delivered to Baron de Manteuffel a note, dated the 23rd ult., announcing to him that all negotiations relative to the Commercial and Customs' question were broken off. This note was written in reply to a despatch of M. de Manteuffel, who had requested a positive declaration. The Cabinet of Vienna has also declared to the Governments of the coalition of Darmstadt that it will no longer negotiate with Prussia."

The representation of Schiller's "William Tell" has been prohibited at Trieste.

Germany is threaded in almost all directions by members of the Imperial Russian family, who travel so quickly, and change their place of residence so often, as to render it difficult to follow their movements. The Emperor continues, meantime, at Warsaw, which is the scene of grand reviews and fêtes.

The *Weser Gazette* contains a rumour which, however absurd, is important as a revelation of the aims and tendencies of the *parti prêtre* throughout the continent. Belgium is, in this instance, the locale of their operations,



where "important events, not precisely the suppression, but certainly great modifications of the constitution," are said to be preparing. The objects of these modifications are, it is stated, the repeal of several laws passed by the Liberal ministry, the increase of the royal power, and the admission of the catholic party to offices of state, from which they are at present excluded.

The wish is father to the thought, but the realization, we believe, very distant.

The Second Chamber of the Duchy of Hesse has received a message from the Government, relieving it from the duty of deliberating upon a bill for regulating the press, inasmuch as a press law for all Germany will soon be promulgated by the German Diet.

Whenever Frederick William of Prussia rises to the surface of "Prussian Intelligence" we always seem to find him—drinking a toast. "To-day," says a Breslau correspondence of a daily journal, dated the 12th inst.—"To-day the King and Queen visited the Exhibition of Industry. After having inspected it in detail, his Majesty retired to take some refreshment, when he took the opportunity of drinking 'Success to the Silesian Industrial Exhibition.'"

The young Emperor of Austria's progress in Hungary is like all royal and imperial progresses, a succession of triumphs.

"I forbear," writes the correspondent of the *Morning Chronicle*, "loading your columns with the particulars of the grand doings in Pesth, as reported in the Government papers. Reviews, dinners, grand receptions, state visits to the national theatre of Hungary, and illuminations everywhere, seem to be the order of the day, as long as his Majesty chooses to accept this kind of homage. One reads of nothing but enthusiastic *Eljens*, popular *fêtes*, national costumes, music, high prices, and revelling. According to the papers, the Emperor has met, and continues to meet, with a perfect ovation at every step he takes among his loyal Hungarians, who, we are assured, have come to their senses, and resolved completely to forsake their evil ways."

The Danish Government disavows all loans and debts made by the Schleswig-Holstein (revolutionary) Government, and declares them as in no way binding on the State.

The subjoined extract from the correspondence of the *Daily News* gives a fair notion of the manner in which justice is administered at Naples. The political trials for the affair of May 15, 1848, are still dragging on: and the nature and method of the evidence for the accusation is thus described:—

"One of the most glaring instances of the means used to incriminate the accused came out from a soldier, a certain Carpentieri, brother of the celebrated paid denouncer of that name. He stated that on the 14th and 15th of May he had seen all the prisoners forming and fighting at the barricades (one of the accused, M. Leopardi, was at Turin at that time). After this assertion, a prisoner, M. Viscusi, rose and presented the court with 'a certificate of service,' signed by the colonel of this witness's regiment, and General Saluzzi, which proved that the soldier Carpentieri, on the 14th and 15th of May, was on duty in the barracks! The court was obliged to accept this document, because it was a military declaration.

"Another witness declared he had seen one of the prisoners kill 50 Swiss soldiers on the 15th of May, whereupon the accused reminded the court that the official report stated that only 45 Swiss had fallen on that day.

"Such is the character of most of the evidence brought forward by the crown. Whether any or all of the accused under trial did or did not take part in the events of May 15 is a question; one thing, however, is quite certain, that the means employed to prove their guilt is the most degrading and illegal that could be employed in a court of justice.

"More than one prisoner has declared to the court that they knew their fate; but that which has alarmed the accused most, is the retirement of his Majesty to Gaeta, where he refuses audiences. So, should the prisoners be condemned to death, no one would be permitted to approach the throne on behalf of the unhappy victims of the constitution of 1848."

The Queen of Portugal returned to Lisbon on the 2nd instant, and on the 4th went in state to the cathedral, to a *Te Deum* in thanksgiving for her safe arrival. Her appearance caused little enthusiasm on the part of the people.

#### ELECTION MATTERS.

##### LONDON.

**FINSBURY.**—There will be a contest for this borough, as Mr. Wakley has definitively declined to come forward again. Mr. Alderman Challis continues to canvass, through his friends. His opinions are not very clearly made out in his communications with the electors.

**SOUTHWARK.**—A meeting of the electors was held, on Wednesday evening, in New Newton-street, Bermondsey. Sir William Molesworth addressed the meeting, and, referring to the objections made against him, he said that he could never vote for the disendowment of Maynooth while the Protestant church in Ireland continued to be endowed. He opposed the Militia Bill, and was in favour of reduction in our naval and military establishments. "He dreaded and abhorred war, but at the same time he was not a Peace Society man, for he would prefer to fight than to suffer an insult to be given to our country by the mightiest foreign potentate."

**WESTMINSTER.**—The Carlton Club intend to start Lord Muidstone (the son of the Earl of Winchelsea, and the rejected of Newark), for the representation of Westminster.

##### ENGLAND AND WALES.

**BEDFORD.**—Mr. Chisholm Anstey has come forward!

**BODMIN.**—Captain Vivian, late "second" to Mr. Smythe in the Weybridge duel, has addressed a letter to his constituents retiring from the representation. He quotes Dr. Johnson and Lord Kaimes, the Scotch jurist, as extenuators of affairs of honour, and enumerates a whole list of eminent statesmen as participators in them, winding up by lamenting the sacrifice of the dearest ambition of his life, and by sorrowfully renouncing all prospect of political connexion with Bodmin.

**CHESTER.**—The Honourable W. O. Stanley has taken the field as a candidate for this city. The ground will be contested with him by Mr. Samuel Holmes, of Liverpool. Mr. Holmes is a professed Derbyite, and one of the most active opponents of Mr. Cardwell; yet he throws over Protection in his address to the electors of Chester.

**DEVONPORT.**—Sir George Berkeley has issued an address to this constituency, in which the following passage occurs:—

"Having been brought up in, and having become from conviction firmly attached to, the Protestant religion as established in this country, I rejoice to find that her Majesty's ministers have felt it their duty to support an inquiry into the system of education at Maynooth, and you may rest assured that no efforts shall be wanting on my part to maintain and support the principles of our holy and revered Protestant faith in all their integrity.

"With a firm conviction that the repeal of the corn-laws has caused great distress among a large and influential body of the community, I am one of those who consider the relief to be afforded to this body ought to result from a readjustment of the taxation of the country. I am not, therefore, prepared to assist in any measure which would have for its object a reimposition of a duty on foreign corn."

A fourth candidate, Sir John Heron Maxwell, Bart., Lieutenant R.N., has made his appearance. He announces himself a supporter of the Government, an opponent of Maynooth, and one who, while deeply regretting the sudden alteration of our commercial system in 1846, cannot on any pretence admit of a return to a duty on foreign corn.

**GLOUCESTERSHIRE.**—Mr. Robert B. Hale, in his address soliciting re-election, says:—

"I shall oppose any aggressive attack upon the established church, and am not prepared to sanction any additional grant of public money to the church of Rome; and while I shall give my uncompromising opposition to any rash innovations upon our ancient constitution, I shall always cheerfully support any measures of useful improvement. I beg to state that on this occasion, as well as on the last, I stand in an entirely independent position in soliciting your support."

**HARWICH.**—Captain Warburton, R.A., a liberal, has accepted an invitation to stand for the representation of this borough.

**HERTFORD.**—Mr. Charles Dimsdale has been brought forward by the Marquis of Salisbury as a candidate for this county, the marquis having abandoned Lord Mahon. Mr. Dimsdale commenced his canvass as a Protectionist, but has now declared his intention of opposing "every attempt to impose a tax on the bread of the people." The Marquis of Salisbury is a member of the Derby ministry.

**HIGH WYCOMBE.**—Sir G. H. Dashwood, and Mr. M. S. Smith will stand for this borough. At a meeting of electors on Wednesday week it was determined to support, as the colleague of Sir G. H. Dashwood, a candidate who would support Mr. Hume's motion for an amendment of the national representation, vote by ballot, triennial Parliaments, and a more equitable arrangement of electoral districts.

**KING'S LYNN.**—Mr. Robert Pashley, Q.C., who is in favour of Parliamentary reform, extension of the suffrage, and vote by ballot, will contest this borough against Lord Stanley and Lord Jocelyn. Mr. Pashley was one of the candidates for York.

**LANCASHIRE (SOUTH).**—It appears that the Derbyites will dispute this constituency, although the attempt was abandoned some months ago. The Derbyites seem to have opened up an unexpected vein of gold. In reply to the question, "Have you the candidates?" it was replied a few days since, "No, but we have the money." However, the candidates have now appeared in the persons of Sir Thomas Hesketh, and Captain Egerton, a son of Lord Ellesmere.

**LIVERPOOL.**—At a meeting of the Dissenters of this city, held on Friday week, it was unanimously resolved to support Mr. Cardwell and Mr. Ewart. It is said that this decides the contest, as it was upon the support of this body that Mr. Mackenzie, as a champion of Protestantism, chiefly relied. The chairman of the meeting above mentioned observed, amidst the cheers of the audience, "Their (the Government) main stock-in-trade is the endowment of the College of Maynooth—a subject on which Mr. Mackenzie must be very much at home, and with which he cannot fail to be thoroughly

acquainted, having more than once changed his mind about it, and consequently taken a very comprehensive and commanding view of it in all its bearings."

**MACCLESFIELD.**—There are three candidates for this borough, Mr. Brocklehurst and Mr. John Williams, the present members, who are both Liberals, and Mr. C. E. Egerton, a "Derbyite." Mr. Brocklehurst is said to be sure of his return. Mr. Egerton contested Chester in 1850 as a Protectionist, but he is said to have vast wealth, which he declares he will use in every "legitimate" manner towards obtaining his return.

**MARLBOROUGH.**—Lord Ernest Bruce and Mr. Henry Baring have issued a joint address to their constituents. They stick to Free-trade. In general they say, "we desire to continue our support to the steady and progressive march of Conservative improvement; opposed to all reaction and all retrogression, which sooner or later inevitably lead to revolution."

**NORFOLK (EAST).**—Mr. Edmond Wodehouse and Mr. H. N. Burroughs have issued a joint address to their constituents, expressing a desire to give a general support to the present Government, believing "that the maintenance or abandonment of the principles upon which the real liberties of this great country depend are involved in the question of the support which may be given to those ministers." They express their confidence in the sincerity of Lord Derby's professions to remedy or, at least, to alleviate the distress now affecting the agricultural classes.

**RIPON.**—Mr. Augustus Newton, formerly an inhabitant of this pocket borough, has come forward, supported by the Anti-Corn Law League, to contest the seat. He declares in favour of Free-trade in its fullest extent, household suffrage, vote by ballot, triennial parliaments, and "thorough reform" in general.

**WINDSOR.**—In response to a requisition of the electors, Mr. Samson Ricardo, of Titniss Park, Sunning Hill, a mild Radical, has consented to offer himself as a candidate. In his address he states that he has no confidence in the present ministry.

**YORKSHIRE (NORTH RIDING).**—The Honourable Octavius Duncombe and Mr. E. S. Cayley, the present members for this division of the county, have issued addresses offering themselves for re-election. Mr. Duncombe says,—

"Looking to the future, I cannot advise my brother agriculturists to expect the re-enactment of a corn law as existed previous to the year 1846, but we have a right to demand that which I have every reason to believe the present Government are prepared to propose, namely, some well-matured and comprehensive measure or measures (at the earliest period after the new Parliament has assembled) by which the taxation of the country may be more fairly proportioned, agriculture relieved, and the laborious and honest exertions of the farmer more amply remunerated. If aggressions are made on our holy religion, as a Protestant I am determined to resist them. I have no desire, however, to obstruct improvement or conceal defect; and, I wish to afford to all who differ from me the fullest exercise of their opinions consistent with safety to our Constitution in Church and State."

Mr. Cayley has also issued an address, obscurely discoursing of prices, wages, and the increase of gold, suggesting a fair distribution of taxation.

##### SCOTLAND.

**EDINBURGH.**—A meeting of the "original" Liberal committee of the electors of Edinburgh, was held on Monday, for the purpose of signifying their repentance. Mr. A. Black, the bookseller, and ex-Lord Provost of the city, proposed Mr. Macaulay as a candidate, and alluded to the tendency of the present state of constituencies, while increasing the number of members of Parliament of good ordinary business habits; to diminish the number of statesmen who, by deep study and complete leisure, by thorough knowledge of the governments and legislation of ancient and modern States, of the causes of their rise and prosperity, and of their decline and fall, are best qualified to act as legislators for a great empire, whose acuteness and training enable them to solve the intricate problems of political science. Such a statesman the committee were desirous to have it in their power to recommend to the electors. Frequent inquiries had been made of the members of the sub-committee, whether it was not possible to secure the services of Mr. Macaulay. From his decided statement, when formerly rejected by Edinburgh, that he would not again offer himself as a candidate for Parliament, it had been thought hopeless to apply to him. But although he would not run the risk of a second rejection, yet, if the constituency of Edinburgh elected him, Mr. Black could pledge his word, that Mr. Macaulay would represent them in Parliament. It was accordingly resolved by the committee, to bring forward Mr. Macaulay, and to take all necessary steps for securing his return.

##### IRELAND.

**NEW ROSS.**—Sir Thomas Redington, with a few of his friends, arrived in this town on the 13th of this month, to commence his canvass. Their entrance even

into the suburbs of the town was not unnoticed by the mob, who, under the lead of Mr. Duffy and the Rev. Mr. Doyle, collected under the windows of the house where Sir Thomas is represented as having taken refuge. The latter, however, contrived to slip off while Father Doyle was addressing the crowd, and arrived safely at his own committee-rooms. His enemies, however, followed him to his new retreat, and while he was addressing his friends outside, Mr. Duffy took possession of a draper's window next door, where, by the support of the sign of a woolpack, he was able to confront Sir Thomas. Mr. Duffy, under the fire of an eye-glass with which Sir Thomas was quietly ogling him, now tried to make himself heard, but his voice was drowned in the uproar. The mob were meanwhile entertained by the bye-play of Father Doyle, who hung on by the woolpack, and exhibited a variety of antics. Sir Thomas was then escorted out of the town by the police, but they were unable to protect him from the volleys of missiles with which the mob greeted him. The town throughout the day was at the mercy of the mob, who rendered the streets unsafe to any but friends of Mr. Duffy. Every pane of glass in the large house occupied by Sir Thomas Redington's committee was broken, and the lower windows in the principal part of the town had to be closed nearly all day. The mob kept up their sports till past midnight. The police were quite kept under. On the 13th the mob were still paramount, though the military were called out, and ordered to keep the rioters at bay with fixed bayonets. The reading of the Riot Act was also ineffectual. The *Dublin Daily Express* truthfully (!) and impartially observes, "Young Ireland and Socialism were the order of the day."

On Tuesday a troop of the 3rd Dragoon Guards and a considerable body of the constabulary were brought from Kilkenny.

#### MISS CATHERINE HAYES IN CHANCERY.

MISS CATHERINE HAYES, in the month of November, 1850, entered into an agreement with Mr. J. F. Beale, the music-seller, to go to America in the month of September ensuing, and perform there, for a period of five months, on certain terms. Miss Hayes, after this arrangement, spent some months in Italy, and, returning to England in April, 1851, with a reputation much increased, felt some dissatisfaction with the terms of her agreement, which was accordingly modified. Miss Hayes was to have 650*l.* per month, besides her expenses, and a proportionate share of the profits, a penalty of 3000*l.* being provided for non-performance of the contract. In the month of June then ensuing, Mr. Beale transferred the benefit of his contract to Mr. Wardwell, of New York. In the month of August, Miss Hayes proceeded to America, accompanied by Dr. Joy, as the agent and manager of Mr. Beale. She continued her performances, according to the agreement, till November, on the 14th of which month she wrote to Mr. Beale, declining to act any longer under the agreement, on the ground, that the conduct of Dr. Joy to her had become so obnoxious as to be intolerable. She offered, at the same time, to pay such portion of the penalty of 3000*l.*, as might appear to be due from her on a settlement of the accounts. About the same time, Wardwell found himself unable to perform his agreement with Mr. Beale, and, before Miss Hayes had broken off her agreement, as above stated, the contract again was transferred, Wardwell assigning it to Anthony, as security for a debt. It is also stated that Miss Hayes, soon after her letter of the 14th of November, proceeded to Albany, under a new agreement with Wardwell. Under these circumstances, Anthony took proceedings, in the Court of New York, against Mr. Beale, at the same time suing out a process of attachment in the Lord Mayor's Court, to attach any monies belonging to Beale which might be in the hands of Miss Hayes. Mr. Beale also obtained a similar attachment, upon the sum of 3000*l.*, and lying in the Union Bank of London, belonging to Miss Hayes, and, at the same time, commenced proceedings against her in the American courts. Miss Hayes, thus exposed to attack on both sides, has applied to the Court of Chancery to restrain the Union Bank from paying out the 3000*l.*, and also to restrain Mr. Beale from continuing his proceedings, either in the Lord Mayor's courts or in the American courts. The case came before Sir James Parker, on Saturday last. An attempt was made to found a claim for relief on the ground of the contract having been obtained by fraud and misrepresentation, but this fell to the ground, from the entire absence of proof. The charge made against Dr. Joy was also very strongly contradicted. It was urged, on behalf of Mr. Beale, that there had been collusion between Miss Hayes and Wardwell, and, from an affidavit made by Dr. Joy, it appeared that Miss Hayes had broken her contract on the instigation of Wardwell, he offering both to indemnify her against

her liability to Mr. Beale, and to engage her on more lucrative terms. Sir James Parker, in giving his judgment, said that this would have been a case of interpleader, and that Miss Hayes would have been entitled to the relief usually given in such cases, if she could have fulfilled the usual condition, by making an affidavit that there was no collusion between her and Wardwell. So far as he (Sir J. Parker) could judge, from the evidence before him, Miss Hayes could not make such an affidavit. Under the circumstances, he declined making any order.

#### "THE DIGGINGS!"

THE merchant ship *Vimeira* arrived at Portsmouth on the 12th of this month, from Sydney, bringing gold of the value of 55,000*l.*, and intelligence from the colony as late as the 10th of March. The yield of gold both at Sydney and Port Philip was daily increasing, and thousands were flocking in search of it. "Emigrants" (?) were coming in abundantly from California and the South Sea Islands, and hundreds of Americans were seen going to the diggings. New Zealand had been bitten with the mania. The new settlement of Canterbury was said to be deserted, and Wellington and Auckland were almost in the same condition. The agricultural interests had not yet suffered, it was said, but at Port Philip labour was becoming very scarce.

It is stated in the *Sydney Herald* of the 6th of March, that though it is only ten months since the richness of the mines was discovered, yet the colonies of New South Wales and Victoria have each shipped gold to the value of about 1,000,000*l.* The correspondent of this journal further says—

"We rejoice to add that this million of gold produced in New South Wales has been gathered without any serious detriment to our other interests, and with the least possible disturbance of public order and tranquillity. Our corn-fields have still been cultivated, our sheep have still been shorn. The admirable order which has all along been maintained at our diggings, not by military restraint, but by the good sense and moral rectitude of the great mass of the diggers themselves, is indeed a just cause of pride to the colonists, and ought to encourage thousands of our fellow-subjects at home to come out and help us."

"We need their help. Our flocks and herds are increasing, while the labour market is exhausted. Wages have consequently advanced at rates averaging on the whole somewhat about 30 per cent. We have ample employment for many thousands of emigrants, provided they be men who really give a good day's work for a good day's wages. We do not want idlers, neither do we want any more of that swarming class of young gentlemen who can do nothing but sit on a stool and handle a quill: of these we have always more than enough. But persons accustomed to hard work, whether mechanical or rural, and persons having money to invest, whether of large amount or small, will find in New South Wales a finer opening than any other part of the world presents, or than was ever before presented."

Great excitement has been occasioned by the discovery of gold at Fingal. It is expected that by digging to some depth below the surface, this mine might be made very productive. Victoria seems the grand point of rendezvous of the diggers, and around that place it is said that the gold turns up like earth itself. The Government assay office in South Australia is now in operation, 2910 ounces being deposited on the first day.

*Extract from a Private Letter, dated Adelaide, January 31st.*

"Besides, there is so little doing here that nearly the whole of those who wished to remain have, in self-defence, been obliged to quit. Men have gone by thousands; numbers have been away, and returned for their wives and families. I know eight personally who left two months ago in company: they have returned together this week. The smallest sum brought was 300*l.*, the largest above 900*l.* The wives, the children, and themselves, are as busy as bees, and they will be off in a swarm the week end. The question most frequently asked is, 'When are you going to the diggings?' How sick I am of hearing the word. The common cry is, 'It's no use stopping here.' Blindly-street is desolate; nearly all the shops are closed; bets are made that in a fortnight from this there will not be one shop open; and I am inclined to think there will not be. \* \* \* You are far away, and must doubt much you hear, but I see and know so much that is really truth, that do you know, woman though I am, I have been often in the mind to start, not from any sudden impulse, but from reflection. I don't see why I should not. If I could leave London-bridge, get through France, and without knowing a word of the language scramble across Italy to Venice, I don't see what's to stop me. \* \* \* The hay will not be got in for the want of hands, and the people have been so thinned that many kinds of farm produce cannot be sold; and yet all that can be taken to market brings large prices, but labour costs so much. What the end of all this will be is beyond my notions. I might give a thousand guesses, and they would all be wrong. I can only state facts. J— is mad to be away: it is the incessant theme of his conversation: he has argued me out of his youth being a reason why he should not; he says he's as big and as strong as he ever will be; besides, if there is as much gold as will pay the National Debt, it will be a poor look-out if he cannot get nuggets enough to pay you, as far as gold can represent gratitude. However, I have agreed that he shall go. For the paper I send you with

this is the last but two that will be issued, and he will be out of employment: no men to set the type, no men to print it after that time, and scarcely any to read it even now. He goes with Mr. H., the clerk, and some others."

#### CORK EXHIBITION.

LORD and Lady Eglinton opened the Cork Exhibition, on Thursday week. The ceremony was begun by the performance of the Hallelujah Chorus, with an organ accompaniment. Then the executive committee read an address to his Excellency, and his Excellency replied. After that the recorder of Cork read the address of the corporation of Cork, and his Excellency blandly retorted the compliments it conveyed, adding to the honour the inestimable gift of a title of knighthood, changing plain William into Sir William Hackett, by a slap with the vice-regal sword. Having gracefully performed this office, the knightly viceroy declared the Exhibition opened, wishing it, of course, all the success it deserved.

Next came an appropriate ode composed by Mr. Waller, known to the readers of the *Dublin University Magazine* as "Slingsby," set to music by Dr. Stewart. Lord Eglinton and his suit then paraded round the building, and retired, after an anthem, bearing the extraordinary title of "May the Queen live for ever," had been performed.

Altogether, the opening has been most successful; natives and visitors being in a state of exuberant delight. Cork is crowded: all the spare beds and extempore sleeping places being full.

The correspondent of the *Morning Herald* describes himself as being one of seventy who tenant a ball-room filled up with boxes. No. 40 converses with No. 41, and No. 60 shrieks out "Order, gentlemen, do go to sleep;" whereupon No. 40 complains of the impropriety of calling a gentleman to order in his own house. The conversation continues, and nobody gets any attentions from "balmy sleep, nature's kind nurse."

After the Lord-Lieutenant had opened the Exhibition, he and his Countess visited the Cork College. In the large hall, which was filled with a good audience, the President of the College read a congratulatory address to Lord Eglinton, speaking warmly of the state and prospects of the College.

Lord Eglinton replied, praising, in the following terms, the system of education there pursued:—

"The superiority of the system pursued here, and the diversity of the branches of learning which are taught under this college, are well worthy of the inspection of any one to whom the cause of education is dear; and it is most gratifying to find that the intellectual progress of the pupils affords so undeniable a proof of the efficiency of the tuition, and their good conduct so fair a prospect of their becoming hereafter useful and honourable members of the community."

"It is by such institutions as this, and by disseminating among the people such education as the circumstances of the times will admit of, that we must look to the internal well-being of our country, and to its future position among nations."

In the evening a banquet was held in a large pavilion erected for the purpose in the grounds attached to the Exhibition buildings. A large number of noblemen and distinguished guests were present. The chairman, Sir William Hackett, proposed the health of the Lord-Lieutenant.

Lord Eglinton congratulated himself on having to inaugurate an undertaking from which he hoped so beneficial a result. He referred with satisfaction to the fact of the present Exhibition affording a display of the products of their own country. He praised the genius of Ireland, and enumerated many names of great men who had sprung from her stock. He continued—

"Gentlemen, it is not by strife and party contention—it is not by religious or political dissension—it is not by outrage and murder—that the regeneration of Ireland is to be accomplished (cries of 'Hear, and cheers'); it is because of all this that misfortunes have come upon her—that so many of her sons have had to seek a refuge on other shores—that so many of her houses are untenanted—that so much of her rich land is uncultivated. (Cheers.) Endowed with everything that ought to make her great and prosperous, she has been miserable and poor, because she has been disunited. (Hear.) It is by the merging of all party feeling in the one great object, your country's welfare—it is by holding out the hand of friendship to your fellow-countrymen—it is by preserving order and tranquillity among yourselves, that you will see happy faces—full haggards and empty barracks (great cheering)—that you will see your harbours filled, British capital flowing in, and railway enterprise carried through every corner of the country." (Loud cheers.)

And again:—

"I have alluded to railway enterprise because I believe it is one of those things which conduce most to the prosperity of any country; but I believe that no country, from its peculiar circumstances, exists to which it would be a greater blessing than, if it were carried out, it would be to this country. (Hear, hear, and cheers.) And I believe that if the plan which emanated from the capacious mind of the greatest of God's creatures I ever met (Lord G. Bentinck) had been carried out, we should have seen Ireland happy." (Hear, hear, and loud cheers.)

He went on to say that he held it to be his duty to



encourage railway enterprise in Ireland, and, referring to a deputation headed by Sir Edward M'Donald, which had had an interview with him soon after his arrival in Dublin, respecting the amount of interest charged by Government on loans made to railways in Ireland, he stated that Government had returned a favourable reply to his representations upon the subject, and that the interest on such loans would be reduced to four per cent., with the option of converting them into a terminable annuity.

On Friday the Viceregal party visited Queenstown. The weather was brilliant. The scene up the river was very animated: guns were fired, flags displayed, and immense gaiety everywhere. In the evening there was a ball in the banqueting pavilion; and the next morning, having paid a farewell visit to the Exhibition, the Viceroy set out for Dublin.

#### MR. F. O. WARD ON "RECIPROCAL TAXATION," AND THE "BANKRUPTCY CHECK."

WE continue the publication of Mr. Ward's important letters on the "Retail Question;" and we would particularly direct the attention of our readers to the "Industrial parallels" by which he demonstrates the financial superiority of the humbler handicrafts to those great manufacturing enterprises hitherto regarded as of paramount importance, and as alone requiring legislative regulation. Mr. Ward's comparison of "cotton lords and washerwomen," first as individuals, and subsequently as classes, is extremely striking and instructive; and the power and originality of these preliminary expositions dispose us to augur favourably of the remedial measures which this able thinker promises to develop, so soon as public opinion is sufficiently awakened to the magnitude of the evils requiring cure. His appeal to the metropolitan press for a fair degree of publicity and discussion, is one to which we, for our part, respond with pleasure; and we are glad to observe so many of the London journals giving to Mr. Ward's opinions the prominence and consideration which they deserve.

#### THE RETAIL QUESTION — "RECIPROCAL TAXATION," AND "THE BANKRUPTCY CHECK."

(To the Editor of the Morning Herald.)

SIR,—My attention has just been called to your second leader-against the recent decision of Lord Campbell, Dr. Milman, and Mr. Grote, in respect of the retail book trade, and against my letter on retail trade in general; to the influence of which letter you attribute the more "cruel" portions of the honourable arbitrators' judgment.

It is not for me to defend the able and eminent men whose "humanity," on this occasion, you impugn; but, on my own behalf, I am anxious once again to disclaim the visionary schemes of "weeding out tradesmen," "abolishing competition," "clearing away 50,000 London householders," and "fixing the price of all goods by statute," which you still attribute to me, notwithstanding my reiterated disavowals.

I have pointed out the ruinous extravagance of our London distributive system, and contrasted its pecuniary results with those of the more economical arrangements in partial operation at Paris; but I have expressly declined for the present to base any practical proposal on this comparison, well knowing that the discussion of remedies is always premature and useless, unless preceded by ample proof and general recognition of the evils requiring cure.

Should I succeed so far as to prepare public opinion for the profitable consideration of a measure adapted to relieve us from our present ruinous expenditure on duplicate retail establishments, I shall propose, as the next subject for discussion, that course which seems to me best adapted to the existing conditions of London trade and traders. You will then find me, I believe, as little disposed as yourself for abrupt or Utopian changes, such as would require the "sudden invention of new employments for 50,000 super-seded tradesmen;" and the "visionary aspirations" you enumerate, with all their hypothetical results, will appear to have been less my dreams than your own. You will also find my abhorrence of monopoly, and my reliance on competition to secure low prices, by no means inferior to yours, notwithstanding my conviction, founded on carefully observed facts, that competition with recklessly multiplied establishments invariably issues in coalitions which, in their effects on price to the consumer, are equivalent to monopoly; though they may leave the trader's profits still reduced, by subdivision, to bare subsistence point.

Let me add that, in seeking to mitigate these evils, I keep especially in view the interests of the retailers themselves, of whom thousands now pass a miserable existence in futile struggles for impossible success—sinking, through the slow tortures of gradual ruin, to final bankruptcy and despair. No man who has pondered, as I have, over the horrors of the *bankruptcy check*—the cankering heart-ache long hidden beneath a smiling exterior—the sickness of hope deferred—the feverish gambling for retrieval of still accumulating loss—the gradual approach of the fatal term—and, sharpest pang of all, the long-delayed disclosure of their beggary to the horror-stricken wife and family—no kind-hearted man, I say, could desire the continuance of such a limitation, even were it effectual, to the undue multiplicity of retailers: nor are those who, in their impartial solicitude for the interests of the public and the traders, advocate a regime at once more mild and more effective, justly amenable, in my opinion, to the charge of "inhumanity."

Reverting, however, to the preliminary question whether

or not I have exaggerated the exhaustive nature of the drain on the public purse involved in this *reciprocal taxation*, I beg permission to point out, in conclusion, that the annual establishment charges of 1000 needless shops (at 500*l.* average cost each) would equal the amount of a 5*s.* duty on the corn consumed by the whole London population (estimating this at one quarter per head per annum). Or, to bring the same fact more closely home to the ratepayers' apprehension, 1000 superfluous retail shops are equivalent, in their pressure on our resources, to a rate of 10*d.* in the pound on the entire house rental of the metropolis.

I have the honour to be, Sir,

With much consideration,

Your obedient servant,

F. O. WARD.

#### INDUSTRIAL PARALLELS:—COTTON LORDS AND WASHERWOMEN — JOINT-STOCK LEVIATHANS AND RETAIL FRY.

(To the Editor of the Morning Herald.)

SIR,—I should willingly accept the character and quality of a "benevolent visionary" in such excellent company as that of Lord Campbell, Dr. Milman, and Mr. Grote, were I not really in hope to "accomplish the good" which you regard as Utopian, by mitigating the evils which you consider past relief.

My hopes, however, are more limited, and my remedies less radical, than your last able leader assumes them to be.

For I hold that, in the social as in the individual body, it is possible to palliate by *alterative* medicines, many ailments for which *drastic* treatment would be dangerous, and *absolute cure* is impossible. It is one thing to point out a morbid overgrowth, whether in the system of a man or a community,—to estimate its exhaustive drain on the economy, and to devise means for checking its increase; it is quite another thing to propose its abrupt excision, or to promise, by remedial measures of any kind, its *total* dispersion. The same candour which has induced you to withdraw the charge of "inhumanity" will dispose you also, I trust, to distinguish between my cautious inductions of facts, and other men's hasty deductions therefrom; so that the charge of "visionary speculation" may attach henceforth to the real offenders.

But I would run the risk of far harsher denunciations than any to be expected from your courtesy for the chance of fixing public attention on the real and startling magnitude of the charges resulting from our present random multiplication of retail shops and other petty establishments in London: charges unconsciously imposed on each other by overcrowded trades, and which I have therefore ventured to designate "*Reciprocal Taxation*."

Statesmen are apt to overlook the fact that of our aggregate national resources, personal and pecuniary, the proportion engaged in the humbler handicrafts and trades vastly exceeds the proportion embarked in our great industrial enterprises.

Let me exemplify this by an extreme and somewhat striking comparison.

Picture to yourself, on one hand, an individual washerwoman, with her tubs, her soap, her irons, and her mangle; and on the other hand, a Manchester cotton lord, with his colossal factory, his costly machinery, and his 1000 or 1500 operatives. It is scarcely possible to conceive a more marked and incontestable social predominance than that of the second over the first of these two individuals.

But if now we change the point of view, and, instead of two *individuals*, contemplate two *classes*, we find ourselves constrained to reverse our estimate, and to recognise the lowly *washing-interest* superior to the lordly *cotton-interest*, as well in the extent of its total operations as in the magnitude of its collective revenues.

This sounds like a paradox, but it is a simple fact, and one susceptible of easy demonstration. Take for this purpose a unit of production, as, for example, a shirt, and compare the relative pecuniary importance of the operations, textile and detergent, of which it is the subject.

The manufacture of a working man's shirt costs (on an average and in round figures) as follows:—

	s.	d.
Cotton, at 6 <i>d.</i> per lb. . . . .	0	8
Spinning . . . . .	0	2½
Weaving . . . . .	0	3
Bleaching and profit . . . . .	0	1½
Cost of material . . . . .	1	3
Making up . . . . .	0	9

Total manufacturing cost . . . . . 2 0

The washing of such a shirt is performed, on an average, 40 times, at a cost of a penny each time, which gives, as its

s. d.

Total washing cost . . . . . 3 4

or 66 per cent. more than the manufacturing cost.

A like proportion holds between the costlier textile and detergent operations of which a gentleman's shirt is the subject; and the comparison, when extended to cheaper articles of attire, is, of course, still less favourable to the commonly-assumed superiority of cotton lords to laundresses. The total washing bills of the metropolis, at the low average of 1*s.* per head per week (adopted on careful computation by Mr. Bullar), amount to no less than 5,000,000*l.* per annum; a sum exceeding by upwards of 2,000,000*l.* the estimated annual revenue drawn from London by the cotton manufacturers.

If the export trade in cotton twist and calico be taken into the account, so also, to keep the comparison fair, must the detergent operations of our foreign customers; and we thus arrive at irrefragable proof that the wash-tubs of the world outweigh, in their aggregate importance, the spinning-jennies and the power-looms.

If, therefore, by undue multiplication of establishments, the apparently petty operations of the laundress, are rendered costlier than they need be by only 10 per cent., the resources of the Londoners are more heavily taxed than

by a rise of like amount in the price of cotton—a rise which would fill all Manchester with gloom, and call forth the lamentations of the entire press.

If, on the other hand, by any regulation of the washerwomen's trade, heretofore carried on utterly at random, these surplus charges could be diminished 10 per cent., a saving of no less than 500,000*l.* a year would be secured to the population of London. As this sum equals the produce of a tenpenny rate on the entire house rental of the metropolis (assessed, as you are aware, at 12,000,000*l.* per annum), every householder may reckon his share of possible economy, and his proportion of actual loss, by this single item of what I have ventured to call "*Reciprocal Taxation*."

To the question, "How is this social disorder to be met?" I pledge myself to reply to the best of my ability, at the risk and peril of my own reputation, if only the press will fairly aid me in directing public attention to the facts on which I rely, and in obtaining that general recognition of the evil which is essential to profitable discussion of the cure.

Meanwhile, with these undeniable facts before me, I am bound to declare my opinion that our cotton manufactures and other "great commercial interests" attract a disproportionate share of attention. Cotton-spinning, for example, has been the subject of reiterated parliamentary inquiries, and statute after statute has been enacted for its regulation; but if the washerwoman's craft were brought forward with a view to similar amelioration, its aggregate superiority would certainly fail to protect it from the supercilious disregard of the legislature.

Grant me space for another Industrial Parallel, which I can condense within narrower compass than the last.

The great water-rate question, which has agitated the metropolis for the last half-century, calling forth year after year the anxious inquiries of parliament, and the elaborate disquisitions of the press, is a question of about 400,000*l.* per annum, that being, in round figures, the total water-rental of London. Nay, as there is no hope of reducing the charges of the monopolist water companies more than half, we may consider 200,000*l.* a year as the whole subject-matter of our protracted water-rate contest.

Now, 200,000*l.* per annum is but just equal to the collective amount of the surplus or saveable establishment charges imposed on the London public by the maintenance of 400 retail shops beyond the number required, whether for the distribution of books, bread, spirits and beer, or any other commodity.

If, for example, we could do away with 400 of our 5000 London gin-palaces, we should secure as large a reduction of charges as would result from the consolidation of the great monopolist water companies, and the fair adjustment of their extortionate rates.

Again, the reduction of the bakers' shops in London to such a proportion with the population as now *actually obtains at Paris*, would benefit us more than twice as much, in a pecuniary sense, as the downfall of the above-mentioned colossal monopoly, which has survived half a century of hostile agitation.

Let me guard myself here, however, once more, against being supposed to believe that such large reductions *could* be effected abruptly, or *ought* to be so effected, if they could. My present object is only to prove the prodigious aggregate pressure of "*Reciprocal Taxation*" which we incur by our present random multiplication of establishments *severally* insignificant and obscure.

Parliament is obviously not alive to this fact. For, while retail trade of every description is left to sprout at random, with no other limitation than the equally painful and inadequate "*bankruptcy check*," the regulation of our *relatively* trivial water-rates has occupied parliamentary committees session after session, at a cost to the companies (and therefore ultimately to the public) of at least 1000*l.* a day.

I submit it to the impartial judgment of those whose duty it is to guide public opinion, whether the pecuniary importance of the *retail question*, considered in the light of the foregoing facts, is not equal (at least) to that of the much-mooted water question—nay, even of the cotton manufacture itself? Let but thus much be conceded to me, and fairly impressed upon public opinion, and I will endeavour to show how the pressure of this "*reciprocal taxation*" may be diminished for *all* classes, without detriment to the legitimate interests of *any*.

Meanwhile, I remain, Sir, with much deference,

Your obedient servant,

F. O. WARD.

#### THOMAS FRANCIS MEAGHER.

The most eloquent of the Irish exiles of '48 arrived in New York on the 26th of May. How he escaped is rather smartly narrated in the New York papers:—

"Mr. Meagher had the partial liberty of a ticket of leave at the time of his escape, but did not violate its condition. It ran as follows:—'I undertake not to escape from the colony so long as I hold this ticket of leave.' Having made previous preparations for his flight, a fleet horse saddled in his stable, and well armed with pistols, he addressed a letter to the magistrate of Ross, about twenty miles distant, and a township of the district out of which he was not permitted to go. The place in which he resided was the wild bush. In this letter he returned his ticket of leave, and said he would remain at his house that day till twelve o'clock, when the leave expired, in order to give the authorities an opportunity of arresting him, if they could. When the magistrate read the letter he was astounded, and he immediately ordered the chief of police, who happened to be present, to proceed at once to arrest him. The chief of police replied he would not do any such thing, as he was an Irishman, and that young gentleman was an Irishman. 'But you must do it,' retorted the magistrate. 'Faith, I will not,' replied the Irishman; 'I will resign first.' 'But I will not accept your resignation.' 'Then if you do not, you may let it alone, but I will not arrest young Meagher.' The magis-



trate gave it up as a bad case, and rode immediately to another station in search of police. Meantime the Irish chief of police set out for the mines, and thought he could make more money in digging gold than in arresting brave Irish patriots. Such is one of the first fruits of the gold discovery in Australia—the escape of the brilliant Meagher. Gold, after all, is useful in its way. Meagher waited for six hours after the time, in order not to give the British authorities any excuse for saying he had violated his pledge. He was accompanied and assisted by three young English settlers, who supplied him with horses and had horses themselves. They proposed to wait till the police came, and kill them. But Meagher thought it unnecessary to shed blood, but waited till the police came, and kept his friends waiting at a short distance. The moment the police entered the house, he passed out at another door, and, mounting his horse, came round to the front of the house, and within pistol-shot of them, and told them to arrest him if they could. In the next moment he put spurs to his horse, and, with his friends, was soon out of sight. They travelled over 180 miles without halt, having relays of horses on the way. They at length reached unmolested a lonely spot upon the sea-coast, where, according to previous arrangements, a whale-boat was in waiting, and bore him off in safety.

When it became known in New York that Meagher was there, detachments of the Irish militia regiments, accompanied by their bands, marched up to his residence in succession, and serenaded him.

### "GREEN; VERY GREEN."

It is not often that a story illustrative of human simplicity in all its purity comes before us. But here is one, the hero of which is an extremely verdant Cantab.

Edwin Ricketts and George Shaw, two respectably-dressed men, were placed at the bar before Mr. D'Eyncourt, on Thursday, charged with the following extraordinary robbery upon Mr. William Ellice East, a graduate of St. John's College, Cambridge:—

The prosecutor stated—I reside at Cambridge, but on Monday, the 10th inst., I came to London upon business, after the completion of which I returned towards the Shore-ditch station of the Eastern Counties Railway, in order to return home by the train. While walking along Shore-ditch, at twenty minutes to the time that the train would start, I met the prisoner Shaw, who stopped me, and placing his hand upon my shoulder mysteriously whispered in my ear, "Would you like to buy some good cigars? I can show you some very nice ones that are not often to be met with." I told him I did not want any, but he persisted in his importunities, and I at length consented to purchase some, and went with him for a distance, perhaps, of a hundred yards, when he pointed out a beer-shop to me, and said, "That is where I am in the habit of keeping them." He then took me into the house, and showed me into a room upon the ground-floor, and having asked me to drink with him, inquired what I would take. I did not altogether like the look either of him or the place, and decisively declined his invitation; upon which he took me kindly by the hand, and said, "Don't be afraid of me, sir; I am not going to harm you," and again pressed me to drink with him, but nothing was brought into the room, and I again declined to drink, as before. He then intimated that he also dealt privately in gloves and handkerchiefs as well as cigars, and saying that he would go and fetch them, left the room, and, to my surprise, locked the door after him. I waited for a few minutes without his coming back, when a second man came into the room through another door, who had three playing cards and some books in his hand. Three other men then came in—Ricketts was one of them. The first man then spoke to the others, and wanted them to buy his books; he spread out his three cards upon the table, and said that any one who guessed right should have one of his books for sixpence. Some betting then went on between them, and I saw money pass from one to the other, but I was not spoken to by any of them. Ricketts then took a chain resembling gold off his neck, which he deposited with the man with the cards, and soon after some gold was paid to Ricketts by the man with the cards. One of the men first put down a silver watch and chain to the card-man, and speedily lost it. This was an old man, and when he lost he stamped his foot violently in aggravation, and seemed very much vexed. Ricketts seemed pleased with his success, and asked me if he should play for me: his words were, "Will you try yourself, or shall I try for you?" I said, "No, certainly not, for I must be off by the train, if the man with the cigars is not back quickly." Ricketts then went on playing, saying, "I shall win some money for the gentleman I know;" but I said nothing, as I was uncertain whether he meant me. He won money at first, but said nothing to me, nor did he offer what he had won to me. He then went on and lost some. I then looked at my watch, and finding it near four o'clock, when the train went, I said, "I must be going now," and rose for that purpose. The man with the cards then demanded the money he had won from Ricketts, amounting, as they said, to 15s. or 20s., upon which Ricketts turned to me and said, "Now, sir, you must pay up." I said I should certainly do nothing of the kind, and he replied, that if I had won from him he should have paid me, and that as I had lost I must pay him. I then became very much alarmed, and moved towards the door to get out, when Ricketts and the others surrounded me, including the old man who had lost, and all exclaimed together, "You must pay—you must pay, sir." I then became very much frightened, and unresistingly gave up my gold watch and chain from my neck, the rings off my fingers, and upwards of 2s. in gold and silver. Ricketts himself took my watch out of my waistcoat pocket, and gave it to the man with the cards. I permitted the old man to strip the rings from my fingers, which went the same way, and then one of the men took my purse out of my pocket, emptied the contents out into his hand, and then coolly restored me the empty purse, which I now produce. The whole of them then left the place,

Ricketts alone remaining; I was so alarmed that I can't say whether the door was locked or not, but they all went out by the one I came in at. As soon as they had got out Ricketts laid hold of my arm, and expressed his regret that he had been so unfortunate as to lose for me, and said if I would wait he would show me where the men were. He still kept his hand upon me, although I tried all I could to get away from him after the others who had got my property. We at last went out into Shore-ditch, and, not seeing anything of the men, I asked him where they were, upon which he pretended to treat me as an entire stranger, and coolly asked me what I was talking about. I then left him and went to the station, where I gave information of the manner in which I had been robbed, and an accurate description of all the men. I saw the two prisoners yesterday at the Hampton Races, just as they came on the heath, with, as I believe, one of the other men I mentioned. I had just before seen the card-man, playing on the back of a board on the racecourse, not far from where I saw the prisoners. I knew them at once, and gave them into the custody of an officer, who took them, but I have not seen either my watch, chain, or rings since.

The men were remanded by Mr. D'Eyncourt, in order that the evidence against them may be completed.

### RAILWAY COLLISIONS.

A passenger train, consisting of four carriages, left Aylesbury on Friday afternoon, at a quarter to two o'clock, to meet the London train at Cheddington, on the London and North Western railway. The train was proceeding at a pace of between twenty-five and twenty-eight miles an hour, when, on approaching within a mile-and-a-half of Cheddington, the engine, from some cause not yet ascertained, suddenly ran off the line, breaking away from the tender, and tearing up the rails, and after running about a hundred yards, it passed through a hedge into a field, where it fell on its side. The tender and two foremost carriages ran off the line on the other side. The guard, George Allen, was thrown from his seat, and died in a short time, having sustained internal injuries beyond any remedy. The engine driver kept his place on the engine till it overturned, and seems to have escaped unhurt. There were fifteen passengers in the train, none of whom were seriously injured.

There seems to be sufficient reason for believing that the accident arose from some obstruction placed upon the rails. Two or three times chains have been laid over the rails in this neighbourhood, for the purpose of throwing trains off the line, which attempts have been frustrated by the vigilance of the engine drivers. Some time ago, a man who is now in Aylesbury gaol under sentence of two years imprisonment, placed sixteen chains and a rail upon this line, apparently for the purpose of stopping the goods train, to give an opportunity for plunder. It so happened that an express train passed the spot first, at a rate of about fifty or sixty miles an hour, the speed of which was sufficient to sweep off the obstacle.

The jury before whom this matter was investigated returned the following special verdict:—"We find that the deceased, George Allen, came by his death on Friday, June the 11th, by accidental circumstances, in consequence of the engine of the train of which he was the guard jumping off the line of the Aylesbury railway. The jury think that, owing to the clay subsoil, the rails and sleepers require constant attendance and care, and that it appears from the evidence that there is not in places sufficient ballast above the clay. That the bearings are too far apart, the jury considering that there should be another sleeper under each rail. That no satisfactory reason appearing in the evidence for the engine getting off the rails, the jury are unable to come to any other conclusion than that there was some defect connected with the rails or the sleepers in the neighbourhood of the accident."

A ballast train from Birmingham passed the Rugby station about eleven o'clock on Monday morning, and was followed in half-an-hour by a coal train, which overtook the former in the Kilsby tunnel. From some cause yet unknown, the signals which are usually given by the policemen stationed at this tunnel, whose duty it is to prevent any train entering the tunnel before a preceding train has left it, were omitted. The coal train accordingly entered the tunnel at its usual pace, and came upon the other train, scarcely allowing time for the engineer and stoker to reverse the engine and jump off. A number of plate-layers were seated upon some of the trucks of the former train, most of whom were thrown off and more or less injured. One man, named Williams, was found jammed in between two of the carriages and terribly mutilated. He died soon after. The two constables stationed at the tunnel are both in custody.

### MURDER BY POISON.

A COLLIER, named Nicholls, was married eighteen years ago to a woman named Elizabeth Lawrenson, now called Bet Brush, who is still living. They separated soon after, and about ten years ago Nicholls married a widow named Ann Connolly; for which act of bigamy he was sentenced to six months' imprisonment. Since the expiration of this term he has lived with Mrs. Connolly as her husband, and they have had three children, two of whom are still living.

Last Saturday Nicholls, on returning from his work, produced from his pocket two cakes, saying to his wife (his second wife), "See, Nancy, I found two very nice cakes this morning." The cakes had a tempting look, and were divided among the family, including Sarah and Ann, the two children above mentioned, and a daughter of Mrs. Connolly by a former husband, named Mary. Mrs. Connolly and her daughter Mary afterwards left the house to make some purchase. On their return in about half an hour they met Nicholls, who came towards them, "staggering, and looking quite wild." Mrs. Connolly exclaimed, "Oh dear, Mary, does he not look as if he were drunk?" On meeting them, he told them he had been poisoned by eating the cakes, as well as Sarah and Ann, and another child named Broxon, who seems to have had

a piece of the cake from one of the children. Mary went home to look after the children, while Mrs. Connolly went with Nicholls to the surgery of Mr. Fisher. Mr. Fisher at once recognised the symptoms denoting the presence of arsenic, and sent the woman home with medicine for the children, while he administered a strong antidote to Nicholls. On visiting the house, Mr. Fisher found the girls, Sarah and Ann, as well as the child Broxon, all sick. A woman of the name of Morris and her child, who happened to get some of the cake, were both taken sick, but soon after recovered.

Towards the night Nicholls and the two little girls grew worse, and Mrs. Connolly and Mary also were taken ill. Early on Sunday morning Nicholls rapidly became worse, and died about half past four. Broxon died during the same day. In the evening of Sunday Mrs. Connolly and the three girls were recovering, though the two youngest were still very weak.

Nicholls, up to the time of his death, had a conviction on his mind that his former wife was the cause of the mischief. The account he gave Mrs. Connolly during his illness was this:—As he was going to his work on Saturday morning about half-past four, he found the cakes lying in his path, wrapped in a piece of clean white calico. At that moment there were but two persons in the street besides himself, a man about thirty yards before him, and a woman midway between them on the opposite side of the street. He thought that the woman must have dropped the cakes, as it seemed that the man could not well have walked over them without noticing them. She looked over her shoulder twice, and he thought it was "Bet." He followed her about a hundred and fifty yards, when she turned off another way, and he thought no more about it.

Elizabeth Nicholls, alias Bet Brush, has been apprehended, as well as a man named Thomas Hughes, with whom she has been cohabiting, and who is believed to be the man seen by Nicholls when he found the cakes. A few days before these events a woman applied to a druggist in the neighbourhood for some arsenic, which he refused to sell her. The druggist believes this woman to have been Bet Brush, but cannot positively identify her.

### NEW BRITISH EXPORT.

BIRMINGHAM, great officina of the most genuine and the most spurious, carries out the "genius of the epoch" in devising a new export. Considerable cargoes of "gold dust" are going out, as ballast, to Australia, for re-exportation to this country. The Brummagem gold will yield profitable returns.

### MISCELLANEOUS.

Count D'Orsay has at length been suitably provided for, by an appointment to the highly responsible office of *Superintendent of Fine Arts* "to Louis Napoleon himself," at a salary of 1000*l.* per annum, and Board and Lodging to boot. His onerous duties will consist in spending 12,000*l.* a-year on pictures, statues, and other refined sources of enjoyment—all strictly moral, of course! It has been asked, whether the Count's office will include the purchase of lay figures, and the engagement of models?

Mr. N. S. Dodge, who has arrived by the *Baltic* from New York, has brought two packages for Her Majesty's Board of Ordnance, containing some guns and pistols of American manufacture.

A passenger fell from St. Paul's wharf on Saturday afternoon as he was stepping to the pier. The Reverend James O'Reilly, of St. Peter's, Walworth, seeing that the poor man was being fast carried down by the tide, gallantly leaped into the water and held him up until the life-buoy was thrown to their assistance.

In a Convocation held, on Tuesday, at Oxford, it was unanimously resolved to accept the donation, proffered by Mrs. Fielding, of Lancaster, of the very valuable herbarium collected by the late Henry Borrow Fielding, Esq., together with his botanical library; it was agreed also to devote a sum not exceeding 2000*l.* for the maintaining and adding to the collection, and an additional sum not exceeding 1250*l.* for providing a suitable building in the botanical garden for the reception of the herbarium and books connected with it.

The Hahnemann Hospital will have its first Concert on Monday next. This establishment, having its origin in the persevering exertions of Lord Robert Grosvenor, its president, and in W. Leaf, Esq., appears to be in a prospering condition, and well supported by the public. A school of medicine has been this year attached to it; and the Concert announced for Monday, patronized by a great number of distinguished persons, and having the assistance of the best artists, promises a brilliant attendance.

It has been arranged that the meeting of the British Association for the Advancement of Science is to commence on the 1st September, at Belfast. All the sections into which the Association divides itself for convenience of discussion, will hold their sittings under one roof, the excellent building of Queen's College, which, as well as all the public buildings in Belfast likely to be useful in this great gathering of British science, has been placed at the disposal of the managing committee.

At a meeting of the friends and admirers of the late Thomas Moore, held at Lansdowne-house, on Tuesday last, a letter was read from Lord Charlemont, stating that, at a previous meeting, it had been resolved to erect a public monument to the memory of the poet in his native city, Dublin. It was then resolved that a subscription should be raised in Great Britain in furtherance of the object, and the following noblemen and gentlemen were appointed a committee to carry it out:—Lords Lansdowne, Clarendon, Fortescue, Wicklow, Carlisle, Shelburne, John Russell, and Montague, and Messrs. Macaulay and Longman. Mr. Longman consented to act as treasurer.



Prince Frederick of Prussia fell from his horse in Warsaw and broke his arm.

The *Standard* says, that through the exertions of Lord A. Loftus, Her Majesty's *chargé d'affaires* at Baden, the Grand Duke has pardoned Mr. Lassau, a British subject, who was condemned to two months imprisonment for publicly defaming the Grand Ducal authority.

The Geographical Society of Paris has awarded two silver medals to Dr. Krapf, and Mr. J. Rebman, two missionaries of the African Missionary Society, for the discovery of a snowy mountain in Eastern Africa, about three degrees south of the line, named Mount Kilimandjaro. Dr. Krapf has since visited another range about two degrees northward, where he has discovered another mountain still loftier—Mount Kenia, which appears to be the Mount Arangos of Hoking, otherwise named the Mountain of the Moon.

A colliery explosion has taken place near Bilston, and five men and four horses have perished.

A half-finished shell exploded at the laboratory of the Artillery Corps near Portsmouth, just as Major-General Simpson was inspecting the place. The Sergeant had his leg broken in two places, and three other men and two officers were hurt.

The Honourable Miss Godolphin Osborne, daughter of Lord Godolphin, was robbed near the seat of her father, in Cambridgeshire, while walking in the fields. The highwayman appeared first as a beggar, and as money was denied him, he declared he would have money's worth—pointing to a bracelet on the lady's arm. Miss Osborne did not readily yield, but gradually unclasping it, looked steadily at the thief. He snatched it, and ran off. She, however, was able to describe him so well, that he was apprehended shortly after by the servants.

Mr. George Thompson, an iron and coal master of Wrexham, in his 83rd year, was riding over his estate at Mineru, yesterday week; as he was passing over a branch of the Shrewsbury and Chester railway, a train came up, the engine of which struck him and his poney to a considerable distance. He died in a few hours.

Mr. Thomas Ashton, a partner in a Manchester house, was driving from Manchester to Hyde on Thursday week, and on approaching a bridge over a brook at Gorton, his horse came to a stand-still. Mr. Ashton endeavoured to urge the horse on, but it made a sudden bolt to one side, and clearing the fence, rushed down a steep bank of great depth. Mr. Ashton suffered a compound fracture of one leg, from which however it is hoped he will recover without amputation. The horse managed to escape without injury.

A vessel, called a "monkey," named the *Isabella*, was lying off Caen's-wharf, near the Globe-stairs, Rotherhithe, on Tuesday, having on board Mrs. Whitlock, the captain's wife, with her infant child, and a friend named Mary Castle. About midnight a large steamer, passing down the river at a rapid pace, produced a swell in the water sufficient to completely cover the small vessel. Mrs. Whitlock was on deck at the time, and screaming out, "Save, oh save us!" ran into the cabin, and as she was taking up her child the water poured in with such violence that none were able to escape. The vessel sank in a few minutes. On the tide running down, the three bodies were found.

A fire was observed on Wednesday night about nine o'clock, in some large premises belonging to Messrs. Hubback and Sons, wholesale oil and colourmen, in Upper East Smithfield. The building was filled with oil, turpentine, and saltpetre, and other inflammable articles used in the trade. The firemen were soon on the spot, but not before the whole building was on fire. The spectacle is described as very splendid, the different colours, as they burnt, giving a succession of hues to the flames. A great supply of water was afforded, but it was not till midnight that the fire was brought under.

A fire broke out about four o'clock on Tuesday morning in a house belonging to Mr. Richard Lambert, in Union Mews, near the Middlesex Hospital. The inmates escaped in time, but the fire extended to the two adjoining houses. The fire-escape from Portland-place was no sooner brought than two or three persons were seen at the windows, whence volumes of smoke were issuing. The conductor rapidly ascended to the second floor window, while a policeman took the third floor, and two women and an infant were brought down. It is said that they would soon have been suffocated had they remained. The fire-engines being brought the fire was at length put out, after considerable damage had been done to the three houses.

Mr. Henry Tommoy, the man who was charged with uttering a threat to shoot the Lord Chancellor, was liberated on bail on Saturday.

Two Irish labourers named Michael and Peter Scanlan, have been sentenced to death in Edinburgh, for the murder of an old woman in the parish of Kettle, in Fifeshire.

The Honourable Alfred Crofton, one of the Pages of Honour to the Queen, and about eighteen years of age, complained to Mr. Hardwick that a girl named Kate Howard had, among other annoyances, broken his pipe. She accosted him in the Haymarket, on Tuesday night, about twelve o'clock, and considering that her advances were not met with the due degree of courtesy, she pushed him about, and eventually knocked his pipe out of his mouth. She was fined ten shillings.

According to the *Herts Guardian*, the villages about Soham, in Cambridgeshire, are rapidly being deserted by their little tradesmen, small tenant farmers, and labourers, some of whom are emigrating every week.

It appears that up to Saturday last 126 public bills had been introduced in the present session, of which 20 had received the Royal assent; 42 were introduced by the Derby Ministry (now in progress), 11 by the Russell Ministry (now in progress), 31 by private members of both Houses, and 22 bills had been withdrawn or rejected.

A humorous instance of the betting mania and its consequences is narrated in a letter to the *Times*:—"A friend of mine," says the writer, "arrived in London the week

before last at a fashionable hotel; he was informed by his servant that the greatest consternation prevailed in the lower regions, as the waiters, and the porters, and the boots, had risked their accumulations, and lost them upon Hobbie Noble for the Derby. The chambermaid, however, having fortunately some Yorkshire connexion, had escaped the general crash, and had won seven pounds on Daniel O'Rourke. My friend instantly decamped, as he had no idea, he said, of the male servants paying their debts of honour out of his dressing-case; and even if the housemaid had run, as the expression goes, into money by the Derby, he had very great misgivings but that she would lose back her winnings and something more at Ascot. As Ascot was near at hand he thought, very wisely, there was no time to be lost, and he repaired to a quiet lodging where the maid-servant was not acquainted with the merits of Daniel O'Rourke."

#### HEALTH OF LONDON DURING THE WEEK.

THE mortality of the metropolitan districts, which in the previous week rose to 1000, declined in the week that ended last Saturday to 898. In the ten weeks corresponding to last week of the years 1842-51 the average number of deaths was 872, which, with a correction for increase of population, becomes 959. The present return therefore exhibits an amount less than the estimated number by 61.

In the table of fatal causes it appears that the class of zymotic or epidemic diseases numbers 209 cases, which nearly coincides with the corrected average; tubercular diseases, including phthisis, 181 cases; diseases of the organs of respiration, 110, which is also near the usual amount of the season. In the week that ended May 15, bronchitis was reported as having been fatal to 79 persons; thereafter it declined, and the uniformity of its rate of mortality during the four weeks that followed deserves notice. In the week ending 22nd May, 50 deaths were referred to it, in the next week 49; and in each of the two following also 49. Pneumonia exhibits a decrease, having been fatal in the last two weeks in 58 and 43 cases respectively.

Last week the births of 692 boys and 622 girls, in all 1314 children, were registered in London. The average number in seven corresponding weeks of 1845-51 was 1282.

#### BIRTHS, MARRIAGES, AND DEATHS.

##### BIRTHS.

On the 6th inst., at 49, Berkeley-square, London, the Lady Harriet Duncombe: a son.

On the 7th inst., at 7, Great Cumberland-street, Hyde-park, the wife of Thomas Chambers, Esq., barrister-at-law: a daughter.

On the 9th inst., at Stoneywood-house, Aberdeenshire, the wife of Alexander Pirie, Jun., Esq.: a daughter.

On the 11th inst., at Elham, near Canterbury, Kent, the wife of Robert Rigden, Jun., Esq.: a son.

On the 11th inst., Mrs. Ebenezer Syme, 5, Sussex-terrace, New Battersea, London: a son.

On the 13th inst., at Grace Dieu Manor, the lady of Ambrose Lisle Phillips, Esq.: a son.

On the 13th inst., at Stourton-hall, the wife of Joseph Livesey, Esq.: a son.

##### MARRIAGES.

On the 4th inst., Ada Gordon Cumming, eldest daughter of Sir William G. Cumming, Bart., of Altyre, and grand-daughter of the Duke of Argyll, to Capt. William Cresswell, of the 11th Hussars.

On the 10th inst., at St. Mary Abbot's, Sir Charles Smith, K.C.B., of Pendryfryn, in the county of Carnarvon, to Caroline, eldest daughter of the late R. Croft, Esq., of Castle Croft.

On the 10th inst. (by special license), at Barnwood Church, the Hon. Mr. Justice Stevenson, one of the judges of the Supreme Court in Jamaica, to Caroline Octavia, youngest daughter of the late Joseph Seymour Biscoe, Esq., formerly of Pend-hill, in the county of Surrey.

On the 12th inst., at St. James's Church, Piccadilly, Captain Alfred R. Margary, 54th Regiment, to Georgiana, eldest daughter of the late T. G. Adams, Esq., of 38, Chester-terrace, Regent's-park.

On the 12th inst., at St. Mary's, Bryanston-square, Count Alfred Edouard, son of Lieutenant-General Count de Bylandt, K.O.H., &c., to Anne Charlotte, youngest daughter of T. P. Vokes, Esq., late Chief Magistrate of Police, Limerick, Ireland.

On Monday, the 14th inst., at the Collegiate Church of St. Nicholas, Galway, Horace Ximenes, Esq., Lieutenant, 8th (the King's) Regiment, second son of the late Lieutenant-General Sir David Ximenes, K.C.H., to Mary, eldest daughter of N. E. Browne, Esq., and grand-daughter of the late Major M. P. Browne, of Woodstock, in the county of Mayo.

On the 15th inst., at St. Mary's, Bryanston-square, the Hon. and Rev. William Henry Spencer, fourth son of the late Lord Churchill, and rector of Stoke Climsland, Cornwall, to Louisa Mercer, third daughter of the late Sir William and Lady Louisa Call, of Whiteford-house, Cornwall.

##### DEATHS.

In her 73rd year, at the residence of her brother, Rev. N. F. Bruce, D.D., Frances La Roque, daughter of the late Barwick Bruce, M.D., of the island of Barbadoes, and grand-daughter of the Hon. J. O. Bruce, one of the judges in that island.

On the 31st ult., at Addison-terrace, Notting-hill, London, Robert Gould Rennie, aged three years, eldest son of John Rennie, Esq., J.P., followed on the 5th inst. by his father, aged 35; and on the 7th by his mother, Susan, aged 28, and on the 10th by Mary Gould, eldest and third daughters of the Rev. John Gould, B.D., rector of Beaconsfield, Bucks, all of malignant scarlet fever.

On Thursday, the 3rd inst., at the Convent of the Sisters of Mercy, Nottingham, in her 33rd year, Miss Vavasour, daughter of the late Hon. Sir Edward Vavasour, Bart., of Hazlewood-castle, Yorkshire, and grand-daughter of Charles, 10th Lord Stourton.

In the town of Carrick-on-Shannon, Ireland, on the 4th inst., Henry Hamilton, Esq., M.D., aged 66, late surgeon of her Majesty's 13th Light Infantry, in which distinguished corps Dr. Hamilton served throughout the Burmese war.

On the 7th inst., at Como, in Northern Italy, the Honourable and Reverend Henry Edward Taylor, aged 84, fourth son of the first Earl of Beattie.

On the 10th inst., at No. 14, Gray's-inn-square, Andrew Thomson, Jun., Esq., of Glasgow, teacher of dancing to the royal children.

On the 11th inst., at her residence, No. 7, Grosvenor-place, Lady Foulis, relict of Sir William Foulis, Baronet.

On the 12th inst., at Bearsted-house, in Kent, Charles Wayth, Esq., late a Major in the army, Captain in the 17th Light Dragoons, many years staff-captain and second in command at the cavalry depot at Maidstone, and Justice of the peace for Kent, aged 83.

#### TO READERS AND CORRESPONDENTS.

It is impossible to acknowledge the mass of letters we receive. Their insertion is often delayed, owing to a press of matter; and when omitted it is frequently from reasons quite independent of the merits of the communication. No notice can be taken of anonymous communications. Whatsoever is intended for insertion must be authenticated by the name and address of the writer; not necessarily for publication, but as a guarantee of his good faith. We cannot undertake to return rejected communications. All letters for the Editor should be addressed to 10, Wellington-street, Strand, London. Communications should always be legibly written, and on one side of the paper only. If long, it increases the difficulty of finding space for them. "K's" letter on a recent disturbance at Norwich is under consideration.

[The following appeared in our Second Edition of last week.]

#### Postscript.

SATURDAY, June 12.

LORD MALMESBURY again brought forward his extraordinary bill respecting the surrender of Frenchmen charged with criminal acts, last night. Since the preceding discussion, he had somewhat modified its provisions, but they are still of a very suspicious nature. He had one arrangement to propose, which he hoped would meet the "jealous fear" of noble lords, "as to the liberty of the subject."

"At first, it was proposed to surrender a prisoner immediately after his arrest, if the magistrates were satisfied with his identity. Instead of this, he would propose that the Secretary of State should not issue a warrant for detention until there was reasonable cause to be satisfied of the identity of the accused, and that on no account should he be surrendered to the French Government without having first the *pièce d'accusation* or *mise en accusation* with a certificate from the Juge d'Instruction—that officer being a judge independent of the executive. He was promised by the French Ambassador that a law exactly analogous to this should be passed in France. (Hear, hear.) He saw a noble earl smile; but, if they did not believe in the honour of a gentleman nothing could be done—they could make no convention at all. Governments must have faith in one another. At all events, Her Majesty's Government had this hold over the Government with which it entered into a convention, that the convention could not be put in motion until both parties were agreed. If, therefore, the provisions and stipulations of the French Government were not fulfilled, the convention could not be put in force."

Lord CAMPBELL thought the proposition less inconvenient than that originally proposed.

"If the Juge d'Instruction were not removable, that would make the proposition less objectionable, but still he should feel some hesitation in giving entire credence to what that judge might say. He thought the convention would be unobjectionable, if it were required that reasonable proof should be given to the Secretary of State that the person accused was really guilty and ought to be given up; but if Parliament agreed to what amounted to giving the executive power to deliver up without such reasonable proof any French citizen in this country, then England would no longer be that asylum which it hitherto had been. (Hear, hear.)"

Lord BROUGHAM concurred in looking upon the *mise en accusation* with suspicion, until he knew its effect. If the Juge d'Instruction only looked at the *pièces d'accusation*, and reported on them, then his certificate would be very unsatisfactory ground to proceed upon. Upon which Lord MALMESBURY observed that it was the result of a judicial inquiry before judges of a superior order to the Juge d'Instruction.

Lord ABERDEEN renewed his opposition. He wanted to know what prevented the French government now from furnishing the *mise en accusation*? to which he received no reply.

"If the production of the *mise en accusation* were sufficient proof, then no change in the terms of the existing convention would be required. He thought it would be a dangerous proceeding to depart from the principle of insisting upon sufficient proof of guilt being afforded as would warrant the arrest and trial of the person accused, if the offence had been committed in this country. Hitherto the laws of this country had afforded to foreigners the same protection as to natives, and now it was proposed to make an entirely new provision as respected foreigners. If, however, the *mise en accusation* of the Juge d'Instruction afforded that sufficient proof which was at present required, he should have no objection to the proposal of the noble earl."

The LORD CHANCELLOR mentioned that the proposition now made had been approved of by the late Government; but it was neither the desire of the present or of the late Government, to deliver up French subjects without proper cause, or to abandon the duty of hospitality to refugees of all nations under proper rules and regulations. Lord GRANVILLE supported the bill. With respect to the protection which ought to be given to political refugees, there was a clause in the convention providing for that; and, if further security could be suggested, he would willingly agree to its adoption.

Lord CRANWORTH made a critical speech, pointing out how a judicial examination in this country, the pro-



duction of witnesses, &c., would entail expense, and render the convention inoperative. Still something analogous to the evidence required by English law ought to be demanded. He could not say whether the *mise en accusation* would meet that demand. Lord BEAUMONT observed, that by the new convention the President of France was to issue his decree for the surrender of Englishmen charged with crime, "if he found due cause;" and he thought the same discretion ought to be given to the English Government. He trusted the present bill would not be proceeded with; but the Duke of ARGYLL thought that the security which all were anxious to obtain with regard to political offenders would be gained to a certain extent if the Secretary of State were intrusted with a discretionary power; and he thought it a matter of primary importance that the Secretary of State should have such a power.

After this the House went into committee. The Earl of ABERDEEN and Lord BEAUMONT thought that before the House proceeded, they ought to know how the bill really stood, as the proposed amendments were not yet printed. Lord DERBY replied, that one of the amendments would be to enable the contracting parties to make the convention consonant with the act; further alleging, that the convention had been drawn up by some of the ablest lawyers of both countries; and pettishly insinuating that if half-a-dozen conventions were framed, there would be objections to every one. The Earl of ABERDEEN, somewhat nettled, retorted that the existing convention had been drawn up by men quite as able as they who had drawn up the new one; and yet it had failed. As to the amendments, he must see them before he could judge of them. It was something new in legislation, what had no existence, and to say that their lordships must either approve or disapprove of that with respect to which they had no means of judging. (Hear.)

The LORD CHANCELLOR explained, that their lordships were called upon to decide the extent to which they would give effect to a treaty which had actually been made by her Majesty, by the advice of her servants, and what was proposed by the proviso was, that if a supplementary treaty should be agreed to in order to bring the principal treaty within the limits which their lordships had agreed upon, it should be taken to be part and portion of the said treaty. It would be perfectly optional both with her Majesty and the French Government to concur or not in the proposed supplementary treaty. (Hear, hear.)

The upshot of the discussion was, that the Bill passed through committee with Lord Malmesbury's amendments!

NOTE.—The correspondent of the *Daily News*, writing from Paris on Thursday, furnishes the following important paragraph:—

"I observe in the English papers arrived to-day, a feature in the debate of the Lords, on Tuesday night, which needs some comment from this side of the Channel. In reply to Lord Brougham's description of the law just passed by the Corps Legislatif, Lord Malmesbury stated that Lord Brougham was quite mistaken, and that the bill just passed was confined entirely to Frenchmen. Now, the fact is, that the mistake lies with the foreign secretary, and not with Lord Brougham, whose account of the bill was perfectly accurate. In effect, you will find in the *Moniteur* of to-day, a report of the debate in the Corps Legislatif, which took place on the 4th of June; for here the debates are published commonly a week after they are held. Now, the 6th article of the law is as follows:—

Every foreigner who, out of the French territory has been guilty of a crime either against the public weal of France, or against a Frenchman, may, if he come to France, be there arrested, and judged according to the French laws.

In respect to misdemeanours (*délits*), the prosecution will only take place in the case and under the conditions determined between France and the foreign powers by diplomatic treaties.

It is of the highest importance that this should be rightly understood; and possibly Lord Malmesbury will, when better informed, give some explanation tending to correct his mistake, which is the less excusable, as he reproaches Lord Brougham roundly with a blunder, after the latter had given an excellent and faithful description of the law.

The House of Commons held a morning sitting yesterday. After nominating a select committee to prepare the militia estimates, Mr. SLANEY, taking advantage of the order for going into committee of supply, moved, for the last time, that a department standing committee, or unpaid commission, be appointed to consider, suggest, and report from time to time, preventive and remedial measures to benefit the social condition of the working classes. He urged with much earnestness the necessity of a plan like that he proposed, for the remedy of evils which were yearly becoming more and more aggravated, and for promoting the education and preserving the health of the working classes, and assisting their industrial efforts. This im-

portant object, he believed, might be accomplished, without cost, by voluntary agency.

Lord ROBERT GROSVENOR seconded the motion. It was further supported by Mr. S. CARTER and Captain SCOBELL, and opposed by Mr. PACE and Mr. PHILIP HOWARD.

Mr. WALPOLE, in stating the views of the Government, acknowledged the zeal and benevolence which Mr. Slaney had always manifested towards the working classes. If he (Mr. Walpole) thought the motion would at all contribute to the improvement of their social condition, on the part of the Government he would not resist it; but he feared it would be not only useless, but detrimental to those classes. The motion had two objects—to obtain information, and to suggest specific remedies. As to the first, he doubted whether more or better information than had been already collected by Parliamentary committees could be acquired by a standing committee, or unpaid commission, consisting of two or three members, who would perhaps take up particular opinions. With regard to the other object, he thought that individuals ought not to be encouraged to look to the Government or Parliament alone for aid, instead of relying upon their own exertions; and there was a chance that the adoption of this motion would encourage such an idea. With these views, he was sorry to say that, if the motion was pressed to a division, he must give a negative vote.

But he was spared the pain. Mr. SLANEY withdrew the motion.

The Committee of Supply consumed the remainder of the morning sitting, and in the evening the House was mainly in committee on the Improvement of the Jurisdiction of Equity Bill.

The usual telegraphic despatch from Trieste, with dates from Bombay to the 12th of May, reached town yesterday. Nothing was known relative to the future movements of the expedition, nor of the enemy's proceedings in the neighbourhood of Rangoon. An advance of the British troops upon Prome was, however, regarded as very improbable. It was reported that a revolution had occurred at Ava, but the report requires confirmation. On the night of the 14th, the Burmese attempted to retake Martaban, but were repulsed with loss. Provisions were scarce and of bad quality.

Lord Mandeville, the sitting member for Bowdley, was yesterday elected member for Huntingdonshire. Our readers will remember him as the young gentleman who performed such wonderful variations on the root *facio*, and proposed to "rebuken evils" in his election address.

The election of scholars for the Merchant Tailors' school took place yesterday. In the evening there was a mighty banquet, followed by the usual speech-making, from a company composed of well-known public men. The novelty of the evening, perhaps, was the appearance of the Bishop of Michigan, who, with transatlantic fervour, informed the public that the "Church of England was the hope of the world."

The Australasian Pacific Mail Steam Packet Company, the shares of which have recently been allotted, is organized to supply a link in first-class screw-steam navigation with our gold-bearing colonies, which will bring them within sixty days of Southampton. A monthly communication will be thus established by the existing Royal Mail Company's steam packets (the shares of which are now at 17½ premium), to the Isthmus of Panama, crossing it by the railway now completing there, and thence by this company's splendid steamers across the Pacific Ocean to New Zealand and Australia. Nineteen days will suffice for the passage from England to Chagros, one for crossing the Isthmus, and thirty-eight more from Panama to Sydney. The high business character of the gentlemen who are associated in the direction of this company, comprising the leading directors and chairmen of the working mail steamship companies now successfully navigating the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, assures its proper management; and the amazing tide of navigation now set in from Great Britain, and even from the United States, to our prolific virgin gold regions in Australia, demand this the last link wanting in the steam circumnavigation of the globe. The great demand for the shares (upwards of 40,000 having been applied for), proves that the public duly estimate the true value of this great national undertaking.

The death of M. Pradier, the most eminent of the French sculptors of the present day, is a severe loss to the arts, and his loss is deeply regretted by the whole of the artistical world. It appears that on Friday last M. Pradier was in his usual state of health, and that there was no reason to suppose that he was so near the termination of his earthly career. On that day he went to Bungeval, near St. Germain, accompanied by his daughter, and two of his pupils, to pass the day with M. Eugene Forcade. Soon after his arrival the party went out to walk, but had not proceeded many yards when M. Pradier was struck with apoplexy. He was at once carried back to the house, and medical aid was immediately sent for, but it was of no avail. M. Pradier died that evening at ten o'clock, having remained from the moment in a stupor from which he never recovered. The works of M. Pradier are known to all Europe, and will immortalize his name. He was peculiar for the grace and beauty of his female figures—a *specialité* in which he had no living rival, and in which he is not surpassed by any sculptor of modern times. M. Pradier was fifty-four years of age.—*Daily News*.

# The Leader

SATURDAY, JUNE 19, 1852.

## Public Affairs.

There is nothing so revolutionary, because there is nothing so unnatural and convulsive, as the strain to keep things fixed when all the world is by the very law of its creation in eternal progress.—DR. ARNOLD.

### M. LE COMTE DE MALMESBURY, HIS ALLIES, AND ACCOMPLICES.

UNHAPPILY, the principle which seems to have actuated Lord Malmesbury in Florence and in Vienna, is illustrated by his conduct in Paris. We saw him last week endeavouring to persuade the Peers to pass a statute, which bore every characteristic of a *projet de loi* of Louis Napoleon's Government. We next saw him, against the argument of Lord Brougham, assuring the Peers that the corresponding *projet de loi*, already accepted by the French legislative corps, did not render French or English subjects in Paris amenable for offences committed in England against the French Government; his assurance being contradicted by the simultaneous enforcement of that very law in Paris. We saw him under these aspects: this week we have a new appearance.

On Friday, Lord Malmesbury appeared before the House of Lords, offering an amended version of his Surrender of Criminals Convention with France Bill, under which he proposed that the Secretary of State should not issue a warrant for the detention of a prisoner immediately after his arrest, but should allow delay, in order to be satisfied of the identity of the accused. This was no real concession. On the previous debate, the Peers had not objected to giving up a criminal without proof of identity, but to giving him up without proof that he had been criminal in a sense of the word at least *analogous* to the English meaning. The English Peers required, in short, that the convention should be one to give up offenders against the criminal law, and not mere offenders against the dominant political faction. They objected, for example, to give up a General Cavaignac, under some constructive pretence that he was an ordinary criminal; and although it might be proved, ten times over, that he was the General Cavaignac intended by the French police, still their objection would hold good.

Lord Malmesbury's concession, however, has one very important meaning,—it proves, beyond mistake, that he did not understand the objection of the Peers,—that he could not enter into the feelings of English Barons, refusing to give up a political refugee claimed by the Government pursuing him. "Hitherto," says Lord Aberdeen, "the laws of this country have afforded to foreigners the same protection as to natives, and now it is proposed to make a new provision as respects foreigners": now it is evident, from the very nature of his concession, that Lord Malmesbury could not understand the objection to this innovation.

With a *naïveté* in the same spirit, he expressed "a desire that a discretionary power should be vested in the Secretary of State," he himself being Secretary for the time being. He assured the House that "he had a promise from the French ambassador, that a law exactly analogous to this bill should be passed in France;" and, seeing a Peer smile at the proposal to set the promise of a French official against a British statute, he observed,—"Nothing could be done if they did not believe in the honour of a gentleman." He made a still more enticing promise: "If their lordships would give him such power as would enable him to alter the present law, and to enter into a new convention, such convention could be drawn up with the French ambassador in twenty-four hours; and he was authorized by that ambassador to say, that the amendments Lord Malmesbury now proposed, the French Government were prepared to accede, and sign a convention accordingly." Having shown the spirit in which he was acting, Lord Malmesbury



still had the face to ask the English House of Peers to leave him to settle, in this summary fashion, the matter with the French ambassador, —to leave *them* power to arrange the laws of this country in such behalf! We repeat, not only is the claim the most impudent which we ever remember to have been advanced in a British Parliament, but it is also the most remarkable instance of personal unconsciousness, as to the position in which a public man stood, that we ever remember to have witnessed.

In one short week, however, the scandal had become too great even for the apathy and optimism of the English Parliament. On Monday, Lord Malmesbury was compelled to withdraw the bill, for the present. He confessed, in the Mather case, that he had sanctioned Mr. Scarlett's surrender of principle through inadvertence; he now confessed that he had been mistaken in the French law; only as Mr. Scarlett had misled him in the Tuscan affair, so the French ambassador had misled him in the Parisian affair. He went so far as to confess, that "even yet he did not understand the full bearing of the French law," on the strength of which he had been inviting the British Peers to legislate! "As far as I do understand it at present," he said, "it would seem to give the French Government a power to reclaim any criminal from any part of the world wherever he committed the offence—though it was not committed on French ground, and though the party were not a Frenchman."

"Yes," said Lord Brougham: "an Englishman in London." "I will beg to suggest," interrupted Lord Malmesbury, "that we should have no discussion at present upon this bill." Certainly not: the less said about it the better; and, Lord Malmesbury having confessed what he denied last week, their Lordships did agree, accordingly, to hush up the matter for the moment.

The two cases of the French law and the Mather outrage, are not so disconnected as careless observers might suspect. We do not mean to aver, indeed, for we should have no proof of the assertion, that there is any express or organized connexion between the two cases, but we do mean to say that they are separate parts of one great system, which we have long since emphatically denounced, and which is making manifest progress on the continent. The Austrian soldiery occupy Tuscany under a convention which prevents their being withdrawn excepting by the consent of both parties; in other words, Tuscany cannot cast off the protectorate of Austria. We have seen that the arbitrary and deadly rules of the Austrian service are enforced even against British subjects in the Tuscan capital. The law recently passed by Louis Napoleon's legislature, renders all persons, whether French subjects or foreigners, in France or out of it, liable to the power of French law, whenever the French Government can seize them, either in person or by proxy; and we have seen an English Minister, who boasts of the super-excellent understanding that now subsists with the French Government, asking the English Peers, by a statute of their own, to meet the degrading despotism of France half way, and to extend Napoleonic law to this country. It is quite evident that the French Government contemplates a kind of grand Police League, including the whole of Europe, and transferring to the police law that control of contumacious patriots, which has hitherto been exercised by Austria, through the instrumentality of her bayonets; and France has already found, by the accidents of our ministerial crises, a Minister in an English Cabinet willing to bring England within that police law.

But, we say, the Cabinet which Lord Malmesbury has irremediably disgraced by his public acts, cannot shuffle off the responsibility for its own share in those acts, by dismissing him. The Prime Minister must have known whom he was selecting as Foreign Minister, since Lord Malmesbury's special unsuitness for that post had been publicly challenged: the French Ministerial press had put forth its damnable congratulations that a personal friend of Louis Napoleon's had been appointed as her Majesty's Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, on the recommendation of Lord Derby. If the accusation implied in that terrible praise had been false—if Lord Derby had known that his friend and colleague would disprove the suspicion by his conduct, he would have been quite justified in making the appointment; but his friend and colleague has trebly confirmed the accusation by his conduct, and the

event has gone far to prove that Lord Derby appointed the volunteer agent of the French Government as her Majesty's Secretary of State, in no ignorance, but with a deliberate choice and intention. It may be true that Lord Malmesbury was only intended to act *ad interim* until the arrival of Lord Stratford; but at such a time, even a provisional appointment entails its grave responsibility, and Lord Derby must be answerable for the consequences of giving Lord Malmesbury his brief hour, to debase the reputation, to sell the honour, and to prostitute the influence of England abroad.

Nay, the public has a right to infer the spirit of the Government from the selection of its colleague for so prominent a post at a time so critical; and the Police League, for which Lord Malmesbury was the ready tool, may be inferred to have the good wishes of the Derby Cabinet. The British public will remember, even if Lord Malmesbury be *Glenelg'd*, that the Cabinet which displayed its spirit in selecting him, still retains the conduct of our foreign affairs.

Lord Palmerston has taken fit occasion to point out a subject of the utmost moment—the position of the smaller Italian States, which claim the immunities of independence, and enjoy the impunities of dependence upon Austria; a position not only fatal to the growth, but to the maintenance even of the liberty or national independence in Europe. The question is not to be set aside by the taunt, that Lord Palmerston himself had interfered in Italian affairs without absolute success. Everybody now knows, and we even rejoice to find, that in the last Cabinet Lord Palmerston was not a free agent. Whatever his shortcomings or ambiguities may have been, the question itself still remains unsolved, and still looms every day more menacing to the future of Europe. But that is not all. The Governments of Europe are more than ever keeping their interests divorced from those of their peoples; they are step by step re-arranging the dynastic geography of the continent; and Downing Street, still acting secretly and apart from England, is helping them in that combination. The territory of Neuchâtel is at this moment dragged back under the power of Prussia, herself forced to belong to the Austrian Police League. The Downing Street which is aiding that oppression, in the name of "England," and with the power of the Empire, is, in fact, Lord Malmesbury; and will be, even after he is *Glenelg'd*, the Malmesbury-making Cabinet.

Again, on the other side of the world, important questions, such as the free navigation of the St. Lawrence, are mooted between the English and American Governments—that is to say, between Downing Street and Washington. At present, Malmesbury is able to act in the name, and with the power of "England;" and, even after he is *Glenelg'd*, the Malmesbury-making Cabinet will have the power to act and speak in the name of England, against the people of England and America.

Talk of the present Government as "Conservative"! It is the most subversive of old English ideas, the most arbitrary, and the most imbecile, the most hostile to the Peace of the World, the most derogatory to the good name of England, the most hazardous to the safety of the Empire, that we have ever had. However brief may be its existence, it will have lived too long.

#### A NEW MINISTRY ON THE TAPIS.

We are not authorized to state that her Majesty has "sent for" Mr. Ex-sheriff Nicoll; and we are convinced that the statement would at least be premature; but our readers will be able to judge as to the probability of such an occurrence from what we are enabled to state.

When the resignation of Lord John Russell placed the conduct of public affairs in the hands of Lord Derby, the public hailed with satisfaction the chance which then appeared to offer itself, of trying the long promised revival of the old nobility and landed interest plan of government. Having for the time used up all the genuine popular demands which the old Whigs had been educated to accept, the Whig Government endeavoured to carry on public business by the help of falling into this or that "interest." At first it was the Irish and O'Connell interest; but that not proving specific enough, the Liberal Ministry took up with the factory interest. Having got all that it wanted out of the Liberal Ministry, the factory interest became a less pro-

fitable connexion to that distinguished party; and latterly, the interest most cultivated has been that which may be called the Election-agency interest, to which Lord John offered a great tribute or sacrifice in his last "Parliamentary Representation Bill" for promoting election contests and other business profitable to the interest in question. This speculation having come to an end, as we have said, public affairs were transferred to Lord Derby, who immediately issued circulars by his agents to "the old nobility" interest, the landed interest, the shipping interest, and several of the larger commercial interests, which rested their expectations of profit more immediately on a renewal of Protection. But the "old nobility" dodge has not succeeded; the young nobility not answering to sample. "Runnymede," who proves himself able to appreciate the spirit of the old barons, is a gentleman who traces his descent from Venice; but our young nobility cannot be induced to stir up their ambitions higher than Newmarket or the clubs. The reader will perceive the reason for the allusion with which we commenced, when he observes how necessary it has become to extend the basis of political combinations; and we are betraying no secret when we say, that if the next Ministry, to follow out the direction and tendencies of its predecessors, must issue its manifesto, announcing its anxieties on behalf of interests more specific than any which have hitherto been addressed by political leaders.

Free trade has had its day, is accomplished, and has no longer any official vocation; the old corporate interests are superannuated; and it is evident that the dominant influence of the day is the retail interest, as represented by the advertising classes. The next Ministry therefore, extending its basis beyond even the bounds of Manchester, will take Regent-street, Fleet-street, and Cornhill, into the coalition. It was probably from some vague intimation of the kind, but confounding persons, that a foreign journal recently spoke of Lord John Russell's address "to the electors of the Strand."

As at present advised, we shall not be rash in anticipating that the address of the next Minister will commence by avowing that no statesman can safely disregard the "genius of the epoch;" and that accordingly he has accepted the gracious commands of his Sovereign on the basis of recognizing the claims of "the Eureka shirt" interest, and of giving that position in the council's empire which it has already attained in public confidence to the Registered Paletôt.

At this delightful season of the year, too large a number of the population is rendering its testimony to the practical benefits of Rowland's Kalydor for that to be any longer excluded from official alliance, especially since Macassar has already established itself on the Treasury bench.

If our national institutions have found their maintenance less in the obstinate adherence to old abuses than in gradual and conservative reforms, the new ministry will place its trust for the future in "Mineral Succedaneum," and will expect to consolidate the shattered parts of the empire with "Anodyne cement."

The progress of Insurance Companies will be alluded to with proper emphasis and amplitude, and no doubt will be suffered to remain as to the intention of the ministry to canvass for the support of all those valuable institutions.

Our import trade has always formed a paramount object of attention with the statesman, but it will be reserved to the new Cabinet to greet with its proper recognition, "The Standard, or Natural Sherry," which has already taken its place amongst public influences. The Chancellor of the Exchequer will not fail to form his budget with an eye to the "Money to be advanced to any amount, on the most reasonable terms;" while Newfoundland and the salt-fish interest will rejoice to see the first admission of Harvey's Sauce into a ministerial programme.

It has been rumoured in circles usually well informed, that the new ministry is not regarded with much favour at Court, but will have to encounter difficulties such as those that Sir Robert Peel overcame,—a rumour, the truth of which may be estimated by the fact, that the new ministry will not be without the support of "The Old Windsor soap."

Political questions have come to an end; but the formation of this ministry,—a happy sequel to the idea of the Crystal Palace,—solves the question of the dead-lock, and supplies us at

once with an administration and a policy suited to the progress of the age. Its success is to be calculated from the elements of its own constitution.

A ministry appealing, as this must, "To Persons about to Marry"—a very numerous class, we understand; appealing as it does "To Advertisers,"—the vast interest which exercises a peremptory sway over the whole press; appealing as it does to all classes,—to the nobility, gentry, and public in general,—cannot but succeed in that which has been the despair of every preceding ministry, in uniting all classes under the dominion of the national spirit, the shopkeeping persuasion.

We understand that the ministry will be joined as an ally, if not as a colleague, by Mr. Eisenberg; who, like the Duke of Wellington, carries in his pocket the signatures of half the nobility, to say nothing of the excellent footing on which he stands with Louis Napoleon Bonaparte. Possibly, though it must be a matter of some delicacy in the asking, Mr. Eisenberg might waive any objection that he would naturally entertain against taking the post vacated by Lord Malmesbury.

This happy idea restores the conduct of public affairs to harmony with the "great facts" of the age. The Barons have had their day; the country gentry have had their Bill of Rights, and have killed their own mutton long ago; the Church, which took to itself what it asked for the poor, belongs essentially to a past æra; even the merchant interest passed its zenith under Sir Robert Peel; but the true union is consummated for our day in the union of Shop and State.

#### MALMESBURY'S MAGNUM OPUS RE-EDITED.

It has only been by degrees that the true nature of Lord Malmesbury's administration has become known to the English public; even the Mather story has become intelligible, bit by bit, and it has needed constant recapitulation, in order to fit it to more developed knowledge.

A detachment of Austrian soldiers is passing along the street, to relieve guard; the street is crowded, and two English youths, nineteen and seventeen years of age, endeavouring to cross the street in the midst of a crowd, pass between the band and the detachment; while in that position, one of them is pushed by the sword of an officer, and then by the officer's left hand; as he is getting out of the way, he is struck in the face by a second officer; and, turning round, as any English youth would, to ask the meaning of the attack, he is cut down with the sabre. In these particulars, both variations of the story agree; but there is one point of difference. He turned round, says Marshal Radetzky, in the action of an English boxer: the civilians who witnessed the occurrence, distinctly deny that they saw anything of the kind.

It is remarkable that their evidence, which appears to have been taken, is totally set aside, whilst the report of an officer on duty appears to be equivalent to a revelation, in the estimate of Marshal Radetzky. But, it is still more remarkable that the English Minister, the Earl of Malmesbury, Her Majesty's Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, absolutely admits Marshal Radetzky's account as final and sufficient, and, on the strength of it, pronounces the occurrence to be "an accident," unstained by personal or national animosity.

The reason for the action of Lieutenant Forsthuber must be admitted as a sufficient motive. In England, we are at first surprised to see an officer applauded for striking an unarmed man; and Lord Palmerston relates, in Parliament, two anecdotes, showing that the possession of a weapon has been considered, both by a brave Englishman and a brave Frenchman, to be an absolute disqualification for contest with an unarmed man; to Lord Westmoreland, Prince Schwarzenberg reciprocally boasted of a similar feeling; but, when Lieutenant Forsthuber, "fearing to be exposed to a dishonouring insult, from which it necessarily behoved him to secure himself," struck Mr. Erskine Mather "a blow on the head with the edge of his sabre," Marshal Radetzky pronounces that "he was perfectly right," and that "he absolutely did nothing but what he was bound to do, to defend himself from an outrage, and its inevitable consequences." Now, we believe there is no nation under the sun, not even the calumniated Neapolitan nation, whose conduct is otherwise than brave; and therefore the conduct of the Austrian Lieutenant, backed

by the approval of his chief, would be simply a puzzle to the English reader, if he were not informed of an absolute rule in the Austrian service, that every Austrian officer who receives a blow, must kill the man who gives it, or be subject to degradation. That is the rule, inflexible as the doom of destiny, which neither the Marshal nor the Lieutenant could gainsay; but it is not the rule applicable to English subjects; and the surprising fact is, not that it should receive the acquiescence of Austria, but that it should receive the submission of an English Minister, on behalf of an English subject, on territory not Austrian. For we always are to remember that Mr. Mather had not placed himself within the pale of Austrian laws by entering Tuscan territory; and that, therefore, the rule of Austrian law was not to be accepted in his case, by the Minister of the English Government.

Anticipating the treatment which he is to receive from his own Government, Lord Malmesbury has disavowed his diplomatic agent in Tuscany, Mr. Scarlett, not because he had accepted an inadequate compensation,—Lord Malmesbury had already blown upon that part of the case, by his own instructions; not because he had mixed up the claims of the Mathers with that of the Stratfords; but, says Lord Malmesbury, because he had abandoned the principle of Tuscan responsibility. Now, as Lord Palmerston has shown, Mr. Scarlett had not abandoned that principle: he had simply waived its discussion; and Lord Malmesbury had acquiesced in that waiver. But the mixture of the two cases, which Lord Malmesbury sanctions, was, in itself, absurd, as Lord Palmerston demonstrates. The Stratfords had a right to release, on the ground that they had been convicted by an illegal tribunal,—an Austrian court-martial on Tuscan territory, which has no claim to be recognised by the British Government. Lord Malmesbury's agent, therefore, cruelly as he has been reprimanded on wrong grounds, has gratuitously yielded an important principle in the case of the Stratfords, and has fawningly accepted a degrading compromise in the case of the Mathers; in both respects with Lord Malmesbury's express sanction.

The case is not over yet. Lord Malmesbury has begun again; but we are much mistaken if Mr. Mather, the sound-hearted, does not still keep a watch for Englishmen over our own English Foreign Secretary.

#### A SPOONER-FUL AT BEDTIME, OCCASIONALLY.

"If you flog my Jew," cried the German postillion, "I'll flog yours." "If you won't read my County Polls Bill a third time," cried Lord Robert Grosvenor, "I'll move the adjournment of your Maynooth debate;" and on that motion the House voted.

It was a critical hour, and great was the judgment needed in Spooner. He had much in his favour. He was the champion chosen to uphold a cause specially and avowedly favoured by Derby, though not by Disraeli; he was strong in the sense of exclusive righteousness: "Dieu et mon Derby" might have been his motto. Thrice had he forced the House to entertain the question: and although taunted with the inevitable necessity of leaving the inquiry after all till "next session," he had succeeded in pushing it forward. In vain, practical but discreet members tried to shirk the uncomely but "Protestant" intolerance; in vain Disraeli was forced to admit his reluctance, and to swallow it; in vain generous politicians urged the House openly to set the subject aside. Thus far Spooner had succeeded.

But now came his dark hour. It was far beyond the midnight of Monday—nearly three o'clock on Tuesday morning. The House had been sitting, exclusively of a two-hours rest, for nearly thirteen hours, and had been discussing every variety of subjects, including more than one Irish question. Mr. Scully was in possession of the house, and, on a previous night, had spent three hours in bringing the history of Maynooth down to 1814; still, therefore, having thirty-eight recent years to work upon. Mr. Disraeli, whom it was so desirable to have present at the division, declared that, if Mr. Scully should resume the debate, with all his respect for that honourable gentleman, it was his own intention to go home; and Mr. Sidney Herbert kindly counselled Mr. Spooner not to press the motion at that hour. But in a spirit of obstinacy, offering a lugubrious and saintly parody on "We

won't go home till morning," Mr. Spooner insisted on keeping watch even after the dawn had streaked with russet the proceedings of the Honourable House. In the intoxication of the hour, the saints still determined to make a night of it, and 103 choice spirits out-voted the 29 sober men who were for adjourning.

But then came the most singular proposition ever made to Parliament. The most singular, we say advisedly, although we have Lord Malmesbury's *projet de loi* full in our recollection. Mr. Spooner proposed to regard that vote as one "indicating the feeling of the House"—in other words, to record it historically as if it were a vote on the main question! To such a slippery footing had the Anti-Maynooth cause sunk, that its champion asked to be allowed to consider a vote on adjournment, as a vote on the main question of the grant!

The plea advanced by Mr. Newdegate was, if possible, more extraordinary. "He considered that the time for fair discussion was over, and, therefore, he had given notice above a week ago that they would take a division on the main question." The application of this argument to Mr. Spooner's proposition is strange; but the principle involved is wonderful. Adopt it, and we should see discussions divorced from divisions—the discussion taken at one time, and the division weeks afterwards. The next step would be for the House generally to go on discussing throughout the session, and for the champions of any particular "cause" to take the division when it pleased them—when the House was in the mood, or the numbers would suit. In this way every side might secure a majority. Ultimately an old suggestion might be adopted, and the division of employments might be carried out by doing all the discussion in one House, and the divisions in the other. And it is Conservative Mr. Newdegate who proposes the first step towards that plan for converting the House of Lords to some useful purpose!

After all, perhaps, Mr. Spooner's plan is the simpler: it is to take any division you please, and consider it as the one on your own motion.

But the House is not yet ripe for that proposition, nor green enough for adhesion to Spooner as a leader: he, the Anti-Maynooth blaze, and the session, all go out in the socket together. As heroes of old were translated to the stars in a cloud, so Spooner is lost to the eyes of the faithful in a smoke.

#### POPULAR SELF-DEFENCE.

THE progress of opinion on the subject of national self-defence is satisfactory. Some time since, we saw Mr. Disraeli advancing the Militia Bill as a commencement in the re-arming of the people; Lord Palmerston had previously deprecated distrust of the people; and now we find Lord Lansdowne pronouncing it "expedient that by slow degrees the people of this country should be trained to the use of arms." The Duke of Wellington upholds a militia as a "constitutional" force, and as a needful part of a peace establishment. And Lord Grey defends the expediency of encouraging volunteer corps.

A system of volunteer corps is a necessary complement of a militia, and is distinct from volunteer enlistment in the militia. The United States presents the best example of a true militia system—a vast majority of volunteer corps spontaneously formed; and a militia in which any man not enrolled in a "uniform company" is liable to serve. When Lord Lansdowne is "informed that even the recently raised regiments of the United States militia show themselves anything but qualified for active military service," somebody must be mystifying the Marquis. What are "the recently raised regiments?" Zachary Taylor could tell him of one disqualification which the militiamen exhibited for military routine in Mexico—they did not know when they were beaten. So they went on as if they were victorious; and in the end, singularly enough, it proved just as good!

The United States also exemplify our frequent remark, that a system of volunteers and militia, including the whole people, is not favourable to disorder. Where public opinion and the possession of overwhelming physical force are identically coincident with the great bulk of the nation, neither faction nor invasion, neither invader nor traitor, can surprise the State. The militiamen and volunteers of the American republic have won its victories, defended its institutions, voted in its elections, and guided its policy. The Union





is free and independent, without fear of surprise, because it would be impossible to surprise or put down everybody at a blow.

#### THE PLAGUE OF BEANS.

"RUSTICUS," writing to the sympathetic *Herald*, announces a disease in the bean crop, similar to that which destroyed the potatoes. "A week ago all was well—to-day acres upon acres are being ploughed up for turnips." It is a judgment, he infers, for national sins—that is, for sins committed by the nation collectively.

Popery-toleration is the first of these sins that occurs to Rusticus. If a partial toleration of Popery draws upon England such inflictions in potatoes and beans, what ought to be the state of agriculture in Catholic Europe? How painful ought to be the health of cabbages under Louis Napoleon; how harrowing the condition of Spanish onions under Donna Isabella; or that of lentils under Donna Maria de Gloria! Indeed, by this interpretation, farming business ought to be impossible under the Romish clergy; and profane Protectionists in England might desire nothing better than a continuance of doctrinal error in corn-growing countries, which would be as good as the most stringent corn-laws for us.

Another national sin we cannot so confidently deny—"the neglect of social evils." There are judgments—the inevitable punishment for breaking "the laws of Nature and of the God of Nature;" and certain breaches of those laws do have a direct effect upon agriculture. The Sanitary Reformers have shown us, that by the neglect of one social evil—society consenting to a filthy apathy such as would drive any individual "from society"—we heap life-destroying poison under and around our abodes, and neglect to carry back to the soil that which human life has borrowed from it. It is a double impiety: we obey not, for human life, the laws of Nature and of the God of Nature; and we starve the ground from which we have drawn our sustenance. The neglected ground is revenged upon us, in poisoned food. Our neglect is a sin, and the consequence is a judgment.

We will not let our poor work, and the poor vex us and multiply: we keep them off the land, and the towns grow vast pest-houses, physical and moral. We keep around us the refuse of human life, natural food of the land, and the land keeps from us the food of human life, giving us filthy refuse where we thought to grow food. If we obey not, we are not strong; if we minister not, we are not sustained.

#### NOTES FOR THE ELECTIONS.

##### II.

##### NEW POLICY FOR THE PEOPLE.

THE coming elections might be turned to some permanent account, if some definite notions of political action could be agreed upon by those who seek political reform. The people are instructed as to principle, to a great extent, but they are impotent because they are divided. It is necessary to unite them on broad grounds. To do this the sacrifice of opinion is needful. It is idle to say they must put aside "minor differences." The differences are not *minor*. They are profound, and it will prove a mistake to underrate them. Great sacrifices of opinion are needed, and the sooner they are asked for openly and plainly the better. A habit has grown up of calling those "minor differences of opinion" which we happen not to care about—but they are matters of conscience to others, and not to recognise them as such, is to outrage others in the name of conciliation. This is not the way to bring about unity.

By way of illustrating the question of the present, let us take the case of the extension of the Suffrage, that being best understood by the majority of the people. The old mode of forming associations to carry that point is evidently worn out. Unity on that question is, on the popular doctrine, impossible. If we except the National and Parliamentary Financial Reform Association, you cannot assemble in the metropolis, nor in any town in the empire, one hundred men, capable of saying what they mean, and of meaning what they say, who can agree on any programme of popular reform. There are plenty of able men, but they are men of "uncompromising principle." Everybody will go for everything, and the result is, that the "mass" go for nothing. Some are waiting for the "Coming Man." That man will never "come"—he will be *invented* when there is anything for him to do. Leadership wise or unwise is out of the question. The authority of a man has been exploded, and we have no intelligent political obedience substituted in its place. Your old Radical was your model of a Reformer, he exploded wrong and right together.

You go into a public meeting, and you find the great Swaggles upon the platform. Swaggles is an "independent" man. He belongs to no party. He is led by nobody. Everybody "truckles to expediency"—everybody is "dishonest" except Swaggles. But the crowning virtue of Swaggles is, that he trusts nobody. He is under the delusion, that the eye of the Government, and the eye of the Press are constantly upon him. He is the great terror of Downing Street, whose doings he is always exposing. The "Manchester School" sleeps with one eye open in order to watch Swaggles. The middle class are always trying to catch him in their net. He is the subject of a universal conspiracy. If he receives a parcel which was despatched untied—Colonel Mayne has taken the string off. If a letter is posted to him unpaid, the Chancellor of the Exchequer has abstracted the stamp for his private use. If he cannot unfasten his window-shutter in the morning, he concludes that no less an enemy than Lord John Russell has been round and scotched it. Swaggles, in fine, is the type of political distrust, and as suspicion is ever infectious, his whole party have caught the disease. This man is no exaggeration. Among the people who most need it there is no trust. Rulers know this very well. They may resolve upon what they please—there will be no "people's party," either in the House of Commons, or out of it, for some time to come, capable of disturbing their conclusions.

The policy of the future which may result in combined action, will probably have these leading features:—

I. Associations will arise out of personal groups, who have the capacity of a common purpose, and of political obedience to it.

II. The groups will be pledged individually to act in concert with all who seek similar objects—without which pledge no union at the present day is worth anything.

III. These Local Societies will hold themselves free and ready to act with, or ally themselves to the *strongest party*, whenever and *wherever* such party shall appear.

Suppose three or four intelligent persons thought it worth their while to seek an Extension of the Suffrage. They would ally themselves to some existing association near them. If none exist, their business would be to induce the most likely persons in their locality, who had influence and capacity, to take the lead in forming one. If none can be found, let them agree among themselves to form a Home Suffrage Committee—or by any intelligible name, neither repulsive, pretending, or worn out. At present there is great prejudice in favour of names which everybody detests. The objects might be set forth as follows:—

I. The Extension of the Suffrage to all men (not open to the usual objections of minority, insanity, and crime,) resident for a reasonable period in any borough, city, or county. The elections to be under the option of the Ballot, and the Representation to be better apportioned to population.

II. Creating a Registry of such of the Working Class and others (accessible to this committee), who are willing to act in concert with all seeking similar objects.

Such an extension of the Suffrage as this indicated, is all which is likely to be obtained in the *next* Reform Bill. Not thinking it well to treat Members of Parliament as children, (an impertinence they always resent) the *details* of this measure are mainly left to their judgment: and those who think we have nothing to hope from their liberality, will do well to remember, that we shall take little by attempted *dictation* on this head. The measure of Suffrage sought in the above "object," is, indeed, *less* than many will think it right to ask, but it is also *more* than many will think it right to concede—without whose consent such a measure as this cannot be peaceably obtained. Therefore moderation of demand, at the popular extreme of society, entitles the people to the concessions necessary at the other extreme—and prescribes a measure of "practical" justice.

Objecting to finesse with the Government, the supposed committee, of whom we are speaking, would ask precisely for what it expects to get. Restricting its solicitation to the least extension that ought to be conceded, its claims will, probably, be respected as an earnest one, and treated as a *real* one.

At the same time, the hope would not be concealed, that the Parliament elected by Home Suffrage, would enact such supplementary measures as might be necessary to perfect a popular constitution, and to bring within the pale of the franchise all eligible persons, not included in a simple Home Suffrage.

There is, perhaps, some chance for those being listened to who profess nothing but what they believe, and who (as Leigh Hunt has somewhere said) "believe nothing that the wise may disapprove," and who demand nothing but that which seems reasonable and practical,—who seek to build up no Utopian "system," but to supply an actual want of the nation, to offer a supply within its opportunities and means of realization.

Those acquainted with the persons who make up the

bulk of our "popular" meetings, especially the clamorous and obstructive part, know very well that not one in twenty, probably not one in a hundred, is a *registered* member of any political association. Now it is not too much to expect, that every man who claims political rights publicly, should put upon record, annually, somewhere or other, under some name or other, in connexion with some party or other, his desire, and subscribe some sum, small or large, in testimony that he is willing to be at some personal trouble to attain what he clamours for so loudly.

Organization is a word not understood by the "people" of this country. Of "discipline," they have no idea, and no experience. Of these high things, we cannot speak. But the simple act of personal registry may be made an inexorable requirement, and *nobody has a right to be listened to in public*, who has not performed this first act of a Reformer, who means what he says.

Our committee, therefore, proposes to create a Registry of all the working class,—of those, at least, whom it is able to reach, of those who are prepared to give practical proof of their fitness for the exercise of the suffrage, by acting in concert (in a generous spirit of nationality which recognises the interests of the whole people) with all who go in the same direction. Tired of that "fraternity" which has resulted, hitherto, in violent antagonisms, this committee will respect the independent convictions of those who may feel bound to oppose it; but, at the same time, no such respect, nor any favour to friends, however bound to it by past alliances, will debar it from taking the most energetic and direct means to attain full victory for its principles. Yet, however steadfast in the prosecution of its own object, this committee would offer no obstruction to any who seek less or more: but rather encounter the suspicions and jealousies which have divided sincere Reformers, by a spirit of generous construction towards others, and of patient self-reliance in the zeal and conviction of its own members.

If, in the metropolis and in the provinces, those persons having alliances and personal friends, or some public influence, will assemble them together,—that is, as many as can agree to promote objects such as those now indicated, and in the spirit indicated, and proceed to bring all other accessible individuals to the same way of thinking and acting, *Auxiliary* associations will arise in every place, and the whole of the people who could be relied upon would be *registered*. It would matter nothing under what various names (always provided they were sensible) these committees were known; they would have a *common* object, and be animated by *one* spirit. This is not a scheme for discussion or talk, but for collecting together the existing opinion upon this subject, and organizing it for action. These groups once in operation, they could be summoned for aggregate action, whenever the aggregate expression of their opinion was wanted.

The National and Parliamentary Reform Association might do this. Sir Joshua Walmsley, Mr. Hume, or Mr. Cobden, were he so disposed, might, at any time, *command* the whole of these Associations, which would exist but for action on the Government. Whoever arose and proved himself the ablest general, or whoever could anywhere form a strong party, likely to carry the point with the nation, would have, by preference, the leadership. As victory always goes with the strongest, *ceteris paribus*, so the people ought to be ready to follow the strongest party who mean the *right thing*. Independent centres, with capacity for simultaneous action, is the want of the day. Individual movement is energetic and unembarrassed, and it creates a field for the Commander to occupy. At present, the "Coming Man" has *nowhither* to come to. In this way we may prepare for organization. Improvise the materials—it will soon get direction.

Animated by some definite idea, members of Parliament may be usefully influenced at the approaching elections. At present, they pay little attention to the "popular demand," because that demand is inarticulate, or gives forth an uncertain sound.

ION.

#### BEAUTIES OF THE PROTECTIONIST WRITERS AND ORATORS.

LORD JOHN RUSSELL is not celebrated for his syntax, but he is not vulgar in his phrase, nor often incorrect in his choice of epithets; and as a critic, he shines when Protectionist composition comes under his satire. It is delightful to see the gusto with which he asks how, as Lord Malmesbury supposes, a man may be "cut down in Hyde Park, by accidentally hustling a violent soldier."

Admitting that Malmesbury is easy game, let us pass to a more distinguished person, who says that, for all his eloquence, Lord Palmerston had only "aggravated the state of Italy!" It is the company that does it: the most accomplished of writers cannot keep company with Malmesburies, and not contract shocking habits of style. By the way, the *Standard* is learned and ingenious; it defends Lord Derby, whichever way his vane points, and extracts promises of Protection from *Diarrhœa*: we should like to see how it could defend Malmesbury's style.

## Literature.

Critics are not the legislators, but the judges and police of literature. They do not make laws—they interpret and try to enforce them.—*Edinburgh Review*.

If any proof were needed of the almost inevitable misunderstanding which awaits all who treat of subjects intimately affecting the interests and passions of men, the history of our Journal would suffice. *Toleration* has been our animating principle: free speech and free thought our watchwords. Unfortunately, *Toleration* is commonly understood like the Irishman's reciprocity, "all on one side." Each section claims it for itself, and denies it to the rest. We, who claim it for ourselves and for others, incur the suspicion of all.

It is assuredly arrogating nothing that any reader will refuse, if we say that our dogmatic convictions on the subject of Religion have been plainly, markedly, unequivocally expressed, over and over again; so plainly, that although many may hesitate as to whether they clearly understand what our system is, at any rate they know that it is distinctly opposed to all forms of Orthodoxy. In our earlier days, while reviewing NEWMAN and FOXTON, we were reproached by the orthodox for our "infidelity;" and reproached by one class of freethinkers for our "sentimental religion." SMITH was in terror, JONES sneered at our want of "courage." The sum total of the impression, however, was, that we were sufficiently free and liberal to deserve liberal support.

Then came the Catholic furor. True to our own principles, we took the lead, and unhesitatingly sided with the Catholics, claiming for them the right to their own Religion, and all the forms or measures they deemed necessary to its active operation. The consequence was curious: we were accused of "having gone over to the Church;" and plain hints of "Jesuits" reached our ears. To be suspected of Catholicism was more dangerous than to be accused of infidelity.

Having been classed as Catholics, we next found ourselves attacked for supporting the Church of England, because we sided with Archdeacon DENISON in his call for Convocation. Hating compromise, abatement, weakness, of whatsoever kind, and (since there was a Church believed in by Englishmen not without the ordinary indications of sanity) wishing that Church to have its action unfettered, we claimed for it what we had claimed for the Catholics, and the cry was, "Oh, the *Leader* has turned round!"

So we went on, till the Patagonian Missionary defence drew down upon us the reproach of having abetted an absurdity, and having failed in our office in not attacking such an instance of superstition and fanaticism. This week we have received a letter, which has called forth the present remarks, and we print it to give an explanation to our friends of our supposed inconsistency:—

SIR,—I have been a reader and warm supporter of the *Leader* from the very first, on account of the liberal tone of its political and social sentiments; and have often noticed, with surprise, the great amount of attention it pays to Church matters; from which, and the language used, an inference is to be drawn that the *Leader* is a supporter of a State-paid church.

Of late, too, I have observed, with deep regret, that this extraordinary inconsistency in a liberal journal has assumed a more than usual marked appearance, which makes me fear for the stability and usefulness of almost the only really liberal and high-toned newspaper amongst the "Weeklies," and of which I had formed great hopes.

I regret this, especially, because of your admirable views of foreign politics; and I write this to say that there are others besides myself, who think that some explanation of this singular circumstance is due to your Radical and free-thinking readers, who form, I suspect, the bulk of your supporters, few of whom, I imagine, are to be found in the church you trouble yourself so much about.

Yours respectfully,

A. K.

To those friends who are in doubt we would simply say: The inconsistency with which we are reproached would have *prima facie* evidence to those who only read particular articles which from time to time appear; and upon this evidence we may be convicted of Catholicism, Patagonianism, Church-of-Englandism; but no readers of the *Leader*, more especially on all topics where dogmatic differences come into question, can mistake our position. The only perplexity lies in our impartiality; our consistency has the aspect of inconsistency, because, consistently with our own principles, we are frequently claiming liberty for doctrines and forms inconsistent with each other. That form of "liberalism" which spends all its liberality on its own sect, and claims toleration while insulting its antagonists, is not ours. That form of "freedom" which, not content with believing in its own sincerity, deems its self-assertion necessary to be accompanied by an insinuation that all who express contrary opinions are fools or hypocrites, is a Freedom so despotic in spirit that we protest against it. Freedom, as we conceive it, is liberty of thought, liberty of act; therefore, whatever a man believes he may express, and express in whatever way he finds fitting; the only limitation being that he must not entrench on the liberty of others.

Is a classical education desirable? The question has been frequently and hotly debated, with the exaggeration customary in such party questions. Those whose interests and *amour propre* are implicated in the study of the Classics, of course abound in arguments to prove the utility of Greek and Latin; those who have been deprived of these pretended benefits, and yet do not greatly suffer from the deficiency, are eloquent and sarcastic against Greek and Latin: but both sides have exaggerated. It is not easy to make the uneducated perceive the advantages of classical education, simply because

these advantages, though real, are not, for the most part, *substantial*, and when they are, can be compensated from other sources. Having devoted laborious years to classic authors, we are not disposed to undervalue the result, and yet severe truth compels the avowal that, while we think it desirable an accurate knowledge of Greek and Latin should be preserved, it should be made a *special* study (like Numismatics), not the basis of general education.

The question has, however, taken a new turn in France lately. It has become complicated with the religious question. The newspapers are discussing whether Religion is not injured by this basis of Pagan learning. Bishops and Cardinals enter the arena. The Bishop of Orleans is in favour of the ancients, the Cardinal Gousset and the Bishop of Montauban against them. It is amusing to read the absurdities put forth on both sides; but the assailants of classical education, to be consistent, should proclaim the dogma of the Caliph Omar, on burning the Alexandrian Library—"All books that contain anything contrary to the Bible to be burnt as false; all books agreeing with the Bible to be burnt as superfluous."

## MRS. ROMER'S FILIA DOLOROSA.

*Filia Dolorosa. Memoirs of Marie Thérèse, Duchess of Angoulême, the Last of the Dauphines.* By Mrs. Romer, author of "A Pilgrimage to the Temples and Tombs of Egypt." Two vols. Bentley.

UNDER the somewhat affected title of *Filia Dolorosa*, and in a somewhat affected style—rose-pink style—these two volumes present an interesting picture of the career of that unfortunate *Madame Royale*, daughter of Louis XVI. and Marie Antoinette, who shared the captivity of her parents in *Le Temple*, who was thrice an exile, and who lived through the Revolution of '89, the two Restorations, and the Revolution of '30, buffeted about the world, and always a figure of pathetic interest. Those who have read her memoirs in the Berville collection, or who have followed with any patience the history of France during the period, 1779-1830, will in all probability still find something in these volumes that has escaped their notice, and at any rate will not be sorry to find such a mass of details thus gathered into one continuous narrative; while to the less instructed public the volumes will have the charm of novelty, no less than of biographical arrangement.

Mrs. Romer began this work, but "severe indisposition" forced her to relinquish it into the hands of Dr. Doran. So much is stated in the preface; but as no indication of authorship exists in the text, we are left undecided where the blame and where the praise should fall. That rose-pink style, before alluded to, pervades the work; so also does the ineffable commonplace of the penny-a-liner, which critics are bound to protest against. When a man is hurriedly writing a report, to be printed almost before the ink is dry, he may be allowed to talk of "beings wearing the form of man," and to use similar stereotyped phrases; but a writer preparing a work of Belles Lettres, in which style is of consequence, has no such excuse, and should have no pardon from those who care for the English language. The great characteristic of this style is its evasiveness: it always shirks the plain, direct phrase, without reaching any felicity of paraphrase. We see the effort of style, but not the style—e.g., "There was a library for learned leisure therein to be luxurious, and it looked into laughing gardens wherein that same leisure might disport itself." The writer, doubtless, believed he had delicately touched the right note there; what say you, reader, to two volumes of such elegancies?

If the style might have been better, and the whole tone of thought less shallow and circulating libraryish, there is, nevertheless, sufficient praise claimed by the interest of the narrative, and the diligence with which it has been compiled. The stories of the three pretenders are extremely curious, and we especially refer the reader to them as to striking examples of the passionate credulity manifested by the masses when their imagination is appealed to. For those who wish to see how the grossest imposture will be greedily accepted as sacred truth, in defiance of all evidence but the believer's own prepossessions, these chapters are unusually curious. Our space admits of no quotation from these chapters, and to abridge them would be to destroy their interest. We will select, in preference, a passage from the chapter on the first Restoration.

"It was a brilliant May day that saw them enter Paris. The Duchess had left it secretly by night, a poor terrified girl, half distrusting the course she was compelled to take. She re-entered it on the 3rd of May, 1814, beneath a mid-day sun; and triumph seemed to be seated everywhere but on her own features. Her eyes were yet red with weeping, and some observant republican, who witnessed her entry, and who marked the inflamed lids that covered the calm yet sad blue and white of the eyes beneath them, exultingly exclaimed that the Duchess was a good republican after all, and that her very eyes bore the old tricolour. That she was more popular with the multitude than the King himself, was made manifest by the number of political squibs that were fired against the monarch even on that day of his entry. The clergy distrusted him, as being more given to philosophy than religion; while the populace did not believe he was so free a thinker as his partisans declared him to be. Varnhagen von Ense says the general feeling towards him was cold and suspicious; even the Royalists, adds the German journalist, 'at least the most ardent among them, had rather trust their affairs in the hands of the Count d'Artois and of the Duchess of Angoulême than in those of the King.' For the moment, however, all went as merry as a marriage bell; and Louis, seated on the right of his niece, in a royal carriage drawn by eight milk-white steeds, passed on to Notre Dame, and bowed good-humouredly to the people from that seat from which gout and other infirmities would not permit him to rise. For a people who loved to see their supreme master on horseback, a King who came in search of popularity could not have been less externally fitted to find that which he sought. Seated in the same carriage were the Prince of Condé and the Duke de Bourbon; on either side rode the Count d'Artois, as gallantly as though he was still wearing his youth in the park of Versailles, and the Duke de Berri, whose almost rudeness of character and lack of courtesy were little calculated to win the affections of a then courteous people. It is confessed that the popular shout of the day was in honour of 'Madame.' The people seemed anxious to



make some reparation for all the cruel sufferings to which they had subjected her in her youth; and when they cheered her on her way to the great altar of Notre Dame, it was perhaps with the feeling that she was thitherward passing, not alone to return thanks for herself, but as a mediatrix to pray for pardon for them. In front of that altar, during the whole period of the religious ceremony, she remained prostrate, unobservant of the gorgeous display around her, and, in the centre of the countless and brilliant crowd, as much alone as though she were standing solitary in a desert, communing in her heart with God.

"She needed all the strength that He who is the source of it could give; for on leaving the Cathedral she had to repair to the Tuilleries—to that house of her parents which she had not seen since that fatal 10th of August, when she had left it with those who were never to cross its threshold again, and traversing the garden which was to them as the valley of the shadow of death, went to ask succour of that Assembly, who, pledging themselves to give it, consigned those who asked it to hard captivity and unjust death. Of the five royal supplicants of that day one alone survived; and she, again to reach the palace from which she had been thrust, had made a wide and weary pilgrimage. She had stood face to face with death, had endured a mortal agony cruel as violent death itself, had been shut up in a dungeon, had sighed through a long exile, and wandered from court to court, from refuge to refuge; and after all, here she was once more, in sight of—nay, her feet upon—the very threshold from which she had been driven, with all she loved. There stood there to receive her two hundred beautiful girls and women attired in white, on which the Bourbon lily was profusely embroidered. The son of one of them, a boy of the age of the Dauphin when he and his sister, hand in hand, had fled from this spot, addressed to her a few words of welcome. She was deeply moved, and was quite unable to reply, the return was so different from the departure;—ah! if there had been the same love then. The sense of the contrast overcame her; and when this fair escort of two hundred ladies fell on their knees, asking the 'daughter of St. Louis' to bless them as she passed, and, as they knelt, allowing her again to see that staircase by which she had descended with her mother, memory became too much for her, and yielding to emotions born of the past as much as of the present, she fell to the ground in a swoon, oppressed alike with the pain of old griefs and actual joy. It was long before she recovered; and when at length she was restored to consciousness, and found herself once more in the boudoir which had been the favourite apartment of the Queen her mother, she counted in her heart those who were wanting to this day of joy, and, bursting forth into convulsive sobs, she hurried from a chamber so prolific of sad memories."

#### NATURAL HISTORY OF ANIMALS.

*The Natural History of Animals*: being the Substance of Lectures delivered before the Royal Institution. By T. Rymer Jones, F.R.S. 2 vols. Van Voorst.

##### [SECOND ARTICLE.]

WE return to these volumes for a more specific description of their contents. They are but the commencement of a work which, when completed, will stand alone in our language as a popular exposition of the organization and functions of the animal world. Comparative anatomy, the most fascinating of studies, is here brought within the reach of the general reader, who is not harassed by technical terms, rising like barriers between the subject and his understanding. The first volume embraces a description of the Zoophytes, Polypes, Infusoria, Sea Nettles, Annelida, &c.; the second is devoted to the large class of Insects. In following Mr. Rymer Jones, the reader follows the ascending scale of Nature, from simple to complex forms, and learns something of the great life of our universe so prodigally manifest. As we have repeatedly said, the great error of Naturalists and Physiologists has been the neglect of Nature's own progressive Method, and the almost universal commencing with the study of man and the higher animals, instead of ascending to that study through the simpler forms of life. This *History of Animals* will suggest a better route.

It is excessively difficult to define what an animal is, when we cease considering the higher types, and endeavour to trace the origin of animal life; for at what seems the boundary line we find an inextricable entanglement of vegetable with animal life, so that the name of zoophyte (animal-plant) has to be given to these equivocal creatures—a bad name, let us observe in passing, because, to say the least, it *inverts* the order of Nature; if the composite term must be allowed, let us more correctly choose phytozoon (plant-animal), which keeps Nature's progression from vegetable to animal distinctly in view. Nor is this criticism purely technical, for recent inquiries tend to make manifest that some of these creatures are true vegetables at the earlier and animals at the later stages of their existence. When some definition of an animal is secured, the important step of classification is to be taken. That proposed by Linnæus has been set aside for the superior, yet imperfect classification of Cuvier—viz., Vertebrata, Mollusca, Articulata, Radiata. The inherent defect of this classification is, that it misses the one true principle of arranging all the forms of life according to the dominant and co-ordinating condition—i. e., the *nervous system*. And according to this principle Professor Owen has arranged animals into *Acrita*, wherein no distinct trace of nerve is visible; *Nematonura*, wherein the threads of nerve begin to appear; *Homogangliata*, wherein the nervous centres (ganglia, or small brains,) appear arranged in two parallel series, each pair a repetition of the others; *Heterogangliata*, wherein the ganglia become more varied both in form and in distribution, implying greater complexity of structure in the animal; and finally *Vertebrata*, wherein the ganglia are once more arranged in a parallel series, but inclosed in a bony or cartilaginous column.

The transcendental anatomists have another classification. We will give that proposed by Carus, as one useful for the student to bear in mind. He begins with *Oozoa*, or those simple forms of life which may be called eggs; they consist of a mere albuminous globule without distinct organs (Zoophytes, Infusoria, Radiata.) Next come the *Corporozoa*, or animals with bodies; the vitelline sac becomes an intestine; the stomach and genital organs form the essential portions of the abdomen, in antagonism to which the lungs and central organs of circulation are developed. Abdomen and thorax thus constitute in the idea of a trunk the most important organs. Hence the *Corporozoa* are divided into *Gas-*

*terozoa*, in whom the abdominal region predominates (as Mollusca), and *Thoracozoa*, in whom the thoracic development begins—Articulata. After these come the *Cephalozoa*, in whom the head is developed—i. e., the animal organs and nervous system. These *Cephalozoa* are divided into four sub-kingdoms, like those of the Vertebrata; thus, *Cephalo-acidozoa* (Fishes), in whom the genital organs have the primitive ovarian form; *Cephalo-gasterozoa* (Reptiles), in whom the abdominal organs are developed; *Cephalo-thoracozoa* (Birds), in whom the thorax is developed; and finally *Cephalo-cephalozoa* (Mammalia), in whom the head is developed.

Mr. Rymer Jones adopts Owen's classification. After a lucid and entertaining description of Sponges, and Fungi, he enters upon the *Acrita*, and devotes some hundred pages to their marvels. Read this, for example:—

"We may well suppose that it would be a beautiful and a wonderful sight, could we contemplate, in its native locality, a mass of mandrepore, even of the dimensions here delineated, covered with its living investment, and feeding itself by the agency of countless mouths, each endowed with separate life and distinct power of action; slowly precipitating from the surrounding sea cretaceous particles wherewith to build its stony fabric; gradually constructing, layer by layer, and stratum upon stratum, the elaborately-formed polypary, or skeleton peculiar to its species. But let us not circumscribe our ideas within these petty limits: rather let us give our fancy free scope; for widely indeed must we stretch our imagination if we are at all to appreciate the importance of the class of animals we are now considering. Let us endeavour to picture to ourselves an extent of the bed of the ocean, spacious as these realms that we inhabit, carpeted with living plants; every blade of grass and every flower instinct with life, and all the vast expanse busily engaged in deriving from the surrounding water materials for subsistence: let us consider that, from age to age, the wide-spread scene is building up, by constant precipitation from the sea, a rocky territory, co-extensive with itself, and then we shall perceive that, in the course of time, even these almost unknown members of the animal creation may perform achievements at which the boldest mind is startled when it comes to survey what they have accomplished. Gradually, the accumulating pile rises towards the surface of the sea, and, at length, after the lapse of ages, portions of the rocky fabric show themselves above the waves. Here further growth is checked; the polyps cannot live beyond the point where water freely reaches them, from whence they may derive the means of nutriment, and thus they perish. Still the structure reared becomes a nucleus round which materials may be gathered; and the multitudes of zoophytes, still living and still acting, swell its bulk, and add continually materials near the edge of the increasing reef. The storm tears up the dirt and sand and sea-weed from the deep to heap it on the summit of the nascent island. Animal and vegetable substances are slowly, but constantly, thrown upon the new-formed rock, and, being entangled among the coral, perish. These decay, and, by decomposition, form a mould fit to support the growth of plants. Seeds arrive, brought there by accident, or by the visits of migrating birds, which, soon taking root, become the germs of future vegetation, till, at length, islands, both broad and long, and richly wooded, stretch where all was once deep sea. Man comes at last, and with him fit inhabitants to people these new countries—regions snatched from ocean by the silent toil of beings such as those we have described."

We cannot follow him in his account of the progressive development of the Polypes, or his equally interesting chapter on Infusoria. They must be consulted and studied. As he says—

"Take any drop of water from the stagnant pools around us, from our rivers, from our lakes, or from the vast ocean itself, and place it under your microscope; you will find therein countless living beings, moving in all directions with considerable swiftness, apparently gifted with sagacity, for they readily elude each other in the active dance they keep up. And since they never come into rude contact, obviously exercise volition and sensation in guiding their movements.

"Increase the power of your glasses and you will soon perceive, inhabiting the same drop, other animals, compared to which the former were elephantine in their dimensions, equally vivacious and equally gifted. Exhaust the art of the optician, strain your eye to the utmost, until the aching sense refuses to perceive the little quivering movement that indicates the presence of life, and you will find that you have not exhausted Nature in the descending scale. Perfect as our optical instruments now are, we need not be long in convincing ourselves that there are animals around us so small that, in all probability, human perseverance will fail in enabling us accurately to detect their forms, much less fully to understand their organization!

"Vain, indeed, would it be to attempt by words to give anything like a definite notion of the minuteness of some of these multitudinous races. Let me ask the reader to divide an inch into 22,000 parts, and appreciate mentally the value of each division: having done so, and not till then, shall we have a standard sufficiently minute to enable us to measure the microscopic beings, upon the consideration of which we are now entering.

"Neither is it easy to give the student of nature, who has not accurately investigated the subject for himself, adequate conceptions relative to the numbers in which the Infusoria sometimes crowd the waters they frequent; but let him take his microscope, and the means of making a rough estimate, at least, are easily at his disposal. He will soon perceive that the animalcule-inhabitants of a drop of putrid water, possessing, as many of them do, dimensions not larger than the 1-2000th part of a line, swim so close together that the intervals separating them are not greater than their own bodies. The matter, therefore, becomes a question for arithmetic to solve, and we will pause to make the calculation.

"The *Monas termo*, for example,—a creature that might be pardonably regarded as an embodiment of the mathematical point, almost literally without either length or breadth or thickness—has been calculated to measure about the 22,000th part of an inch in its transverse diameter; and in water taken from the surface of many putrid infusions, they are crowded as closely as we have stated above. We may, therefore, safely say, that, swimming at ordinary distances apart, 10,000 of them would be contained in a linear space, one inch in length, and consequently a cubic inch of such water will thus contain more living and active organized beings than there are human inhabitants upon the whole surface of this globe! However astounding such a fact may seem when first enunciated, none is more easily demonstrated with the assistance of a good microscope.\*

\* In an address lately delivered before the Microscopical Society of London, Professor Owen, the president, in allusion to researches such as those, observed that, in Creation, "everything is great or small only by comparison. The telescope teaches us that our



All Ehrenberg's researches are here epitomized, and some of his rash statements corrected. *Apologies* of corrections, we are doubtless carrying superfluous coals to Newcastle in directing Mr. Rymer Jones's attention to the statement at p. 148, with respect to the mouth of the *Tenia*; but although he is in all probability aware that the result of M. Blanchard's researches is, that no oral orifice is to be found in the *Tenia*, yet his readers may not be acquainted therewith. The first volume of this *History of Animals* was published in 1845, and at that date there was no suspicion of this fact.

Mr. Rymer Jones indulges, as we remarked last week, in a strain of rhetoric which, while it will certainly captivate many, must make all philosophers shake their heads; he indulges also in that sort of inverse anthropomorphism which consists in interpreting all the phenomena of animal life by the human standard, and speculates as to whether insects have scent or taste, although deficient in the organs of scent and taste. All these portions of his work we object to; but were they ten times as numerous, they could not prevent our high enjoyment of his delightful volumes, which we most cordially recommend. The illustrations (upwards of two hundred) are executed with that finish and beauty which distinguishes all that Mr. Van Voorst publishes.

## Portfolia.

We should do our utmost to encourage the Beautiful, for the Useful encourage itself.—GÖTTE.

### COMTE'S POSITIVE PHILOSOPHY.

By G. H. LEWES.

#### PART XII.—Position and Method of Chemistry.

WE have still to occupy ourselves with the general considerations forming the prolegomena to Chemistry, and notably with its position in the hierarchy of the sciences and its Method.

I am sometimes disposed to make this capital distinction between Physics and Chemistry:—In Physics (celestial and terrestrial) we study the laws of motion *communicated*; in Chemistry (inorganic and organic) the laws of motion *excited*. In purely physical phenomena we see a force communicated from one body to another; but in chemical phenomena we see a force combining with another force to excite a change in both, the result of which is unlike either.

I content myself with indicating this distinction, and turn to Comte for further light as to the position of Chemistry in the scientific hierarchy. The position he assigns to it seems to him a good illustration of the fact that his classification does not rest on arbitrary assumptions, but is in truth the faithful *resumé* of the points of harmony inherent in the sciences, and manifested naturally by their common development. No one, indeed, of the positions in the encyclopedical scale, seems so naturally and so appropriately occupied as that of Chemistry between Physics and Physiology. Who could now fail to see that, in several essential parts, and, above all, in the important series of electro-chemical phenomena, Chemistry is in immediate contact with the ensemble of Physics, of which, in appearance, it constitutes a simple prolongation; and, again, that at its other extremity it is in some sort connected, by the no less fundamental study of organic combinations, with general Physiology, of which it establishes, so to speak, the primary foundations? These relations are so very close that, in more than one particular case, Chemists who had not mastered the true philosophy of the sciences, could not venture to decide whether the subject really fell within their province, or whether it belonged to Physics or Physiology.

Chemical phenomena are more complex than physical and less general. We have physical effects without chemical, but no chemical effects unaccompanied with co-existent physical. Hence, too, Chemistry is indirectly subordinated to Astronomy, and even to Mathematics. As far as respects doctrine, the connexion is indeed small. Chemical questions cannot be treated among mathematical doctrines;\* and in *abstract* Chemistry there is little reference to Astronomy. In *concrete* Chemistry, i. e. in the application of chemical knowledge to the natural history of the globe, the connexion between Astronomy and Chemistry is much more apparent. As respects Method, Mathematics and Astronomy have had a great influence on the cultivation of Chemistry. From the study of mathematical phenomena, of rationality, precision, and consistency, have been obtained habits. Although mathematics are less needful to the chemist than to the natural philosopher, the evil effects of the want of those habits, owing to a defective mathematical education, may be seen in most chemical speculations. Astronomy being the great type of scientific perfection, its influence is the more needed in Chemistry, because the phenomena are increased in complexity. Astronomy is calculated, much more than Physics, to show Chemists the radical inanity of all metaphysical explanations, and to make manifest the true characteristics of their science. Comte also shows here, but more fully in his lecture on Physiology, how that science must be based upon and follow in the wake of Chemistry. He next proceeds to

world is but an atom, and none know better than microscopical observers that every atom is a world. If the astronomer be led from the contemplation of the countless orbs that traverse boundless space, to the adoration of the Creator in His almightiness; so the observation of the perfections of His minutest works, which, though invisible to ordinary ken, unfold new perfections with every increased power of observing them, ought to impress us with a lively sense of that all-caring-for and all-seeing Providence, without whom not a sparrow falls to the ground and by whom every hair of the head is numbered."

\* This was true in 1838, when Comte wrote; but now chemical questions are beginning to be susceptible of purely mathematical treatment.

estimate the general perfection of chemical science, as respects method and doctrine.

As to Method, physical philosophy has approximated much nearer than chemical philosophy to the complete state of positivity. If the first still presents, with respect to the theory of hypotheses, a *quasi*-metaphysical character, there is no exaggeration in saying that the second continues in some respects essentially metaphysical in spirit, by reason of its more difficult and more tardy development. The doctrine of *affinities*, although now rapidly losing its hold, is even more ontological than that of the *fluids* and imaginary *ethers*. If the electrical fluid and the luminous ether are really nothing but materialized entities; are these affinities anything else at bottom than perfectly pure entities, as vague and indetermined as those of the scholastic philosophy of the middle ages? The pretended solutions which we have been in the habit of deducing from them, evidently possesses the essential characteristic of metaphysical explanations—the *simple and naïve reproduction, in abstract terms, of the very statement of the phenomenon*. The accelerated development of chemical observations during the last fifty years, which will doubtless soon discredit for ever this false philosophy, has hitherto only modified it in such a way as to show its radical nullity with irresistible evidence. When affinities were regarded as absolute and invariable, their employment in the explanation of phenomena, although of necessity always illusory, had at least a more imposing appearance. But since facts have compelled us to conceive affinities as, on the contrary, eminently *variable* and dependent upon a multitude of different circumstances, their use could no longer be continued, without speedily becoming, by this single change, more plainly futile and almost childish. Thus, for example, it was known for a long time that at a certain temperature iron decomposed water or protoxide of hydrogen; and yet it was afterwards discovered that, under the mere influence of a higher temperature, hydrogen in its turn decomposed oxide of iron. What, then, can signify the order of affinity which we believed we had established between iron and hydrogen towards oxygen?

The state of education at the time explain how men of genius like Berthollet could entertain such notions as that of *elective* affinities. It is to those metaphysical habits that we owe the doctrine of *predisposing* affinity, employed even by the great Berzelius. For example, when sulphuric acid determines the decomposition of water by iron, at ordinary temperatures, so as to disengage hydrogen, the metaphysical explanation of the process is—That sulphuric acid has an affinity for oxide of iron which *tends* to form itself. Observe, the oxide of iron does not as yet exist; it exists only *after* the decomposition has taken place; so that on this doctrine of affinity we have the sympathetic action of one substance upon another substance not yet in existence, but called into existence by this sympathetic action! Even Liebig, who repudiates the notion of affinity as expressive of anything like *relationship*, has not emancipated himself sufficiently from the metaphysical condition to give up the notion of an inherent *tendency*.

As another example of metaphysical Chemistry let me cite the favourite notion of a *catalytic* force. The following passage, from Gregory's admirable *Handbook of Organic Chemistry*, expresses my views with authority:—

"The view adopted by Berzelius, according to which fermentation, and all the other phenomena of chemical change produced by contact, are the results of a peculiar unknown force, the catalytic force, coming into action when certain bodies are placed in contact, appears unphilosophical, as in the first place, assuming the existence of a new force where known forces would suffice to explain the facts; and, secondly, as furnishing no real explanation, but merely acknowledging, indirectly, our inability to offer any such explanation. When we ascribe an effect to catalysis, we are only saying, in other words, that we cannot account for it; catalysis is thus merely a convenient term for all that we do not understand. And to the use of the word in this sense, namely, as a name for the agent which produces certain effects, the agent itself being unknown, there would be no objection, were it not that catalysis has been employed to account for phenomena not only different from each other, but actually of an opposite kind. For example, platinum, in causing the combination of oxygen and hydrogen, is said to act catalytically, and the action of oxide of manganese, or oxide of silver, in decomposing peroxide of hydrogen, that is, in causing the separation of oxygen and hydrogen, is also called catalytic. This example proves how loosely the word has been employed, and how vague are the views which have led to its introduction."

In accordance with the position of chemistry in the scientific hierarchy, the general plan of rational education for a chemist requires a preliminary study of mathematical philosophy, next of astronomical philosophy, and last of physics. We should remember, when speculating philosophically on this subject, that this doctrine of affinities is, in its original spirit, only an attempt (necessarily a vain one) to conceive the *hidden nature* of chemical phenomena, which is as radically inaccessible as the analogous essences we sought in former times to discover, by similar processes, in the case of more simple phenomena. And how can the chemist aid in ridding his science of these metaphysical ideas, without first mastering the more simple and now more positive sciences? How, if half-metaphysical as regards them, can he be positive in chemistry? Must not the individual, like the species, in its gradual development, extract positive conceptions from the simpler sciences first?

In respect of doctrine, chemistry is also inferior to physics. Chemical effects are still essentially incoherent, or at least feebly co-ordinated by a small number of partial and insufficient relations, in place of those laws, as certain as they are extensive and uniform, in which physics so justly glories. As to *prevision*, the true measure of the perfection of each

natural science, it is too evident that if it is already much more limited, more uncertain, and less precise in physics than in astronomy, the case is still worse with Chemistry. Most frequently, the issue of any chemical action can only be known by taking express account of the circumstances of the moment and, as it were, at the time the action is ended.

Let us now glance at the most distinguished of the philosophical properties of Chemistry, with reference to their direct bearing upon the fundamental education of human reason.

On this point, and in the first place, as to Method, Comte refers to the high philosophical utility of the arts of experiment and observation as practised in Chemistry. But there also exists in the system of positive method a very important part, too little appreciated as yet, and which Chemistry had the special function of bringing to the highest degree of perfection. I do not speak of the theory of classifications (sufficiently ill understood by chemists), but of the general art of rational Nomenclatures, which is altogether independent of it, and of which Chemistry by the very nature of its subject, must present more perfect models than any other fundamental science.

Attempts have often been made, especially since the reform of chemical language, and they are still daily made, to form a systematic nomenclature in Anatomy, in Pathology, and especially in Zoology. But whatever may be the real utility of these praiseworthy efforts, they have not, and never could have been, followed by a success like that of the illustrious founders of chemical nomenclature, even if they were better conceived and more rationally directed than they have hitherto been; for the nature of the phenomena peremptorily forbids it. It is not accidentally that chemical nomenclature is so perfect compared with all the others. In proportion as the phenomena increase in complexity, the objects are characterized by points of comparison at once more varied and less circumscribed. It consequently becomes more and more difficult to subject them in a manner sufficiently expressive to a uniform system of denominations, rational and at the same time abridged, and to have this system adapted really to facilitate the habitual combination of ideas. Were it that the organs and tissues of living bodies only differed among themselves in one single and capital point of view,—that diseases were sufficiently defined by their seat,—that zoological genera, or at least families, could be always formed on one principle completely homogeneous,—then we might conceive that the sciences would immediately allow of systematic nomenclatures as rational and as efficacious as that of chemistry. But, in reality, the profound diversity of the numerous aspects under which they present themselves, and which are almost never susceptible of being co-ordinated uniquely under one of them, evidently renders our arriving at such perfection both very difficult and little advantageous.

Among the sciences in which the immense multitude of subjects spontaneously gives rise, at their formation, to special nomenclatures, Chemistry is the only one where, from its nature, the phenomena are sufficiently simple and uniform, and at the same time sufficiently determined, to permit of a nomenclature at once clear, rapid, and complete, and thereby mightily contributing to the general progress of the science. The direct and ruling idea in chemistry is incontestibly that of *composition*; and the peculiar object of the science, as I have shown, is to make all chemical questions resolve themselves into one of composition. Hence, since the systematic name of each body would make its composition directly known to us, it can easily give us a general but correct notion of the ensemble of its chemical history; and afterwards serve to us as a faithful and concise summary of that ensemble; and from the very nature of the science, the nearer it progresses towards its final destination, the more will this double property of its nomenclature be inevitably developed.

Thus under this important point of view, Chemistry must be considered as eminently suited to develop, in the most special manner, one of those fundamental means of obtaining and using knowledge (so few in number) which together constitute the general power of the human mind. I have endeavoured to show very clearly the principal causes of the evident superiority which, in this respect, results from the very nature of chemical science. But although I required to do so, it is incontestible that the formation of systems of rational nomenclatures in the more complex sciences must possess a real and engrossing interest, notwithstanding that they are necessarily more difficult to establish there, and less efficacious in their use. I have only wished to put beyond all doubt, on this subject, the indispensable necessity of every class whatever of positive philosophers having recourse exclusively to chemistry for extracting the true principles and general spirit of the art of scientific nomenclatures. This is just in accordance with that fundamental rule, already carried out in so many other respects, in the *Cours de Philosophie Positive*—viz., that each logical artifice ought to be directly studied in that part of natural philosophy which offers the most spontaneous and most complete development of it, with the ultimate object of our being able to apply it, with proper modifications, to make more perfect the sciences less susceptible of it.

The eminent philosophical properties of Chemistry are still more remarkable in respect of Doctrine than of Method. Its development has contributed much to the emancipation of human reason from theological and metaphysical doctrines. If Chemistry, from increase of complexity, is defective in one of the two attributes which tend to that emancipation—namely, *prevision of phenomena*, it is—as a necessary and compensating consequence of the same fact—strikingly provided with the other—namely,

*the power of modifying them at our pleasure.* Neither can co-exist with the idea of a government by providential volitions.

Besides, Chemistry has aided in emancipating the human mind, by rectifying our primitive notions respecting the general economy of terrestrial nature. Although, since Aristotle, philosophers entertained the notion that the same elementary substances essentially reproduced themselves in the ensemble of all the great operations of nature, notwithstanding their apparent independence; nevertheless, it necessarily resulted from the utter impossibility of realizing this vague and metaphysical anticipation of the truth, that the universal dominion of the theological dogma of absolute *destruction* and *creation* kept its hold until the great epoch of that admirable development of chemical genius which forms the principal scientific characteristic of the last quarter of the eighteenth century. In fact, so long as we could take no account of gases, either as the elements or the products of chemical action, a great number of remarkable phenomena inevitably encouraged the belief in the annihilation or the actual production of matter in the general system of nature. Certain discoveries were requisite to establish beyond cavil the fundamental principle of the necessarily indefinite perpetuity of all matter; such, especially, were the decomposition of air and water, and afterwards the elementary analysis of vegetable and animal substances, and perhaps, too, at a later period, as the complement of those, the analysis of alkalies properly so called, and of earths. The tendency of those discoveries was irrevocably to substitute in all minds the positive notions of *decomposition* and *recomposition*, for the theological notions of *destruction* and of *creation*. A new light, also, was thereby thrown on vital phenomena. It was perceived that organic and inorganic matter were not radically different; and that vital transformations are, like all others, subordinated to chemical phenomena.

Comte concludes the chapter with his views respecting the divisions of chemistry. The science, he says, is still too much in the stage of its infancy, and too imperfect, to offer, of itself, a proper division. The *homogeneity* of its phenomena, so exceptional when contrasted with other sciences, makes a natural division of it little marked. It is clear, however, that in the meantime the division of chemistry into inorganic and organic, must be disregarded, as being irrational. Combinations cannot be classified in abstract chemistry according to their origin, as they may be in natural history. The two classes referred to are always mutually encroaching on each other. In reality, what is called organic chemistry is half chemical, half physiological.

Any rational division must be founded on the principle involved in the true definition of the science—that of composition and decomposition. Hence, in here applying the rule of always following the gradual complication of the phenomena, we see that, in dividing chemistry into its principal branches, we can be guided by only these two considerations.

1st. The increase of the number of the constituent compounds (whether mediate or immediate), according as the combinations formed by them are either binary or ternary, &c.

2nd. The degree of composition, lower or higher, of the immediate compounds, each of which, to take for example the case of a repeated dualism, can be decomposed a greater or less number of times into two others.

It may be questioned which of those two points of view ought to preponderate. According to Comte, the chief consideration belongs to the degree of composition, as it is a matter of more importance in the science than the multiplicity of the constituent compounds.

Having closed the general considerations, Comte proceeds in subsequent lectures to treat of Inorganic Chemistry in general, and of the doctrine of Definite Proportions, and of the Electro-chemical theory in particular. In these lectures, the student will, of course, note many details which in so rapidly advancing a science as Chemistry, assume a new aspect since 1838, when the lectures were published; but the *philosophy* of Chemistry he will there find set forth in large outlines. The Lecture devoted to Organic Chemistry is too important to be passed over in a phrase, and I will therefore devote the next paper to it.\*

## The Arts.

### HAMLET AND THE GERMAN ACTORS.

I ONCE had a maternal uncle (had, alas! *vixit!*), whose views on the drama were freely communicated to me in the high and buoyant days when five act tragedies in swelling verse were the dream and occupation of my life. He resided in Bungay, where he adorned a large domestic circle with all the virtues of a citizen, and earned the eternal gratitude of mankind by his improvements in soap!

In soap! Imagine VIVIAN in connexion with saponaceous commerce! But biography has no delicacy, and facts are shattering to all illusions; and the fact is as I state. This free-spoken uncle was an anticipation of the Fast School of Critics. He snored at five act dramas, and was merciless to mine. Shakspeare was his personal enemy. I think I see him now, rubbing his fat fingers through his scanty hair, as he authoritatively delivered himself of this favourite remark. "Hamlet, sir? If Hamlet were produced to-morrow *Hamlet* would be d—d, sir." After uttering that he would relapse into his chair, complacent, authoritative, obese.

I have since heard the remark from others, especially from actors, although, in *fact*, no play is so popular as Hamlet. It amuses thousands

\* I have to acknowledge, for the Comte Subscription Fund, 5s. from W. E. B.; and 2s. 6d. from H. C., both these being second subscriptions.



annually. It stimulates the minds of millions. Performed in barns, in minor theatres, and theatres royal, it always attracts. The lowest and most ignorant audiences delight in it: partly, no doubt, because of its profundity and sublimity—for the human soul can *feel* a grandeur which it cannot understand, and the dullest will listen with hushed awe and sympathy to those outpourings of a great meditative mind obstinately questioning fate and existence; to the lowest as the highest it is, *To be or not to be!* But Hamlet mainly delights the crowd by its wondrous dramatic and theatric art.

Consider for a moment the variety of its effects. The *Ghost*—the tyrannous murderer—the faithless wife and queen—the melancholy hero doomed to such an awful fate—the poor *Ophelia*, brokenhearted, and dying mad—the play within a play, entrapping the conscience of the King—the grave-diggers in ghastly mirth—the funeral of *Ophelia*, and the quarrel over her grave—and finally, the hurried bloody *dénouement*. Here are elements for several Fast dramas. Let us add thereto the passion and the poetry—let us note how Shakspeare by his art has made intensely interesting that which in other hands would have been insufferably tedious—I mean *Reverie*. Hamlet is a tragedy of Thought; there is as much reflection as action in it. It is the representation of a great *meditative* soul struggling against circumstance; and in this respect it is a theatrical paradox, for it makes Scepticism, Reverie, Reflection, *dramatic*. Here the *activity* of thought supplies the place of action, and hurries the audience along with it.

The peculiarity of Hamlet is its indissoluble union of refinement with horrors, of thought with tumult, of high and delicate poetry with gross theatrical effects. Only pause for a moment to consider the machinery of this play. What a tissue of horrors it is! the ghostly apparitions—the incestuous adultery and murder—*Hamlet* half mad—*Ophelia* raving mad—*Polonius* killed like a rat behind the arras—grave-diggers casting skulls upon the stage, and desecrating the churchyard with their ribaldry—a funeral interrupted by a furious quarrel between the two who loved the dead most dearly—murder planned—poisonings and stabbings to close this history,—and all these as the machinery for the most thoughtful and philosophic of poems! In this respect, as in so many others, it resembles *Faust*: that, also, is a poem wild, fantastic, brutal in its machinery; lofty, refined, and impassioned in its spirit.

I think, then, there is good reason for siding with fact against avuncular dogmatisms, and for declaring that Hamlet is not only a marvellous poem, but a great play. And this great play was performed here in London by the “great Germans,” who discovered Shakspeare, and who have taken out a patent for the correct appreciation of him. I have much to say on this hypothetical superiority of German appreciation; but for the present my business is with Herr Devrient; as the acknowledged *Hamlet* of Germany at this moment. The expectation raised was immense. Before venturing an opinion on the performance, it will be well to fix the point of view.

There are three capital aspects in the representation of *Hamlet*:—1st. The princely elegance of a sorrowing profoundly meditative man. 2nd. The fitful wildness of madness only half assumed. 3rd. The lover of *Ophelia*. On the first point there is no dispute. On the second and third points critics are not agreed. Now, did the occasion warrant it, I could prove *Hamlet* to be in such a state of cerebral excitement, that its outward manifestations should be those of madness, whether we consider him really mad or not; so that, as regards the actor, it matters very little what view he takes of this vexed question, he must depict the wildness and fitfulness proper to the scene, and not, as Charles Kean does, preserve the same settled gloom and contemplative quiet *after* the interview with the *Ghost* which served to express his mental condition *before* the interview. On this point I shall venture to repeat what two years ago I said when noticing Charles Kean's *Hamlet*:—

“At the opening of the play, Hamlet is grave with the gloom of a father's sudden death, and the gloom is deepened and embittered by the indelicate marriage of his mother with his uncle. The world has become weary, flat, stale, and unprofitable to him. Woman has, in the person of his mother, been smitten from the pedestal whereon his love had placed her, to fall down and worship, and her name has become the synonym of Frailty. Were it not that God had ‘set his canon ‘gainst self-slaughter,’ this gloom and bitterness would seek an issue in death; but he resolves to suffer all in silence. But this state of Hamlet's mind is only preparatory. It bears the same relation to the subsequent acts as the solemn, ghostly opening scenes, with their awful revelations, bear to the scenes of madness and crime which follow. The play opens on the platform of the castle at Elsinore. It is the depth of midnight; the sentinel pacing to and fro is nipped with cold, and shivering with vague terrors: not a mouse stirring! The silence is broken only by the regular footstep on the platform, and the hoarse sullen murmurs of the Baltic raving below. On this scene appears the Ghost. He reveals the crime which sent him from the world, and then the storm and terror of the play begins; then come the madness of Hamlet, the conviction of the King, the murder of Polonius, the ravings of Ophelia, Ophelia's funeral interrupted and disgraced by the quarrel, and, finally, the general massacre of the last scene! The same ascension from settled gloom to wild and whirling horror and madness may be seen in Hamlet. After the visitation of the Ghost, Hamlet is a *changed man*. His sorrowing nature has been ploughed to its depths by a horror so great that his distended brain refuses every alternate moment to credit it: the shock has unsettled his reason. If he is not mad, he is at any rate in such a state of irrepressible excitement that to feign madness seems the only possible relief to him. After the revelations of the Ghost, Hamlet must be in a totally different condition of mind from what he was before. That difference Charles Kean does not represent. The same gloom overshadows him when alone; the same expression of face accompanies him. Instead of the agonized soul of a son in presence of an adulterous mother and a murderous uncle, he exhibits the concentrated sorrow of the first act, diversified only by the outbreaks of assumed madness. He does not depict the hurrying agitation of thoughts that dare not settle on the one horror which, nevertheless, they cannot escape. The excitement, even as simple excitement, is not represented; and thus neither the meaning of the assumed madness, nor the effects of the Ghost's revelations, are apparent in his acting.”

According to the view taken of *Hamlet's* madness, his demeanour to-

wards *Ophelia* will be somewhat modified. That he loved her is clear enough; his treatment of her is not so clear if he were sane, though explicable upon the assumption of his derangement. At any rate, in their great scene there is a mingled tenderness and bitterness which affords the actor great scope: he should always *look* the contrary of what he utters, and his ferocity should have that restless wildness in it which would excuse it in her eyes. If he is assuming madness, he would wish her to believe him mad, and so interpret his harshness; if he is really mad, the wildness is natural.

I have thus established, as it were, some definite grounds of philosophic criticism on the representation of *Hamlet*. Setting details aside, I call your attention to the three central points in the character: if the actor rightly seize them, we may pass over imperfections of detail; if he miss them, no excellence of detail will compensate. And now I am prepared to answer the question, How did Emil Devrient succeed in *Hamlet*? Indifferently. The princely elegance was never represented; indeed I thought him ungainly, but those around me thought him graceful, so let him have the benefit of their admiration. The sorrowing of a profoundly meditative nature I caught no glimpse of; it was more like dyspepsia than sorrow, and as unlike meditation as it was unlike reality. In fact, the first scene was very inferior to that played by Charles Kean, who does represent the settled sorrow of *Hamlet*, if he represent little else. While, in his interview with the *Ghost*, Herr Devrient had more the demeanour of a frightened school-boy than of the sceptical student and affectionate son. Let me say, once for all, that I see no trace of superior intelligence in Emil Devrient's reading of his part, but very many evidences of careless, superficial interpretation, such as will bear no examination. There is too much of what may be called *haphazard emotion*—i.e., emotion not following a thorough study of identification with the character, but arising from a sort of guess at what should be the feeling of the moment. To give an example: He asks the players if they can perform a certain piece which he has in his eye, and moreover, if they will insert some dozen lines that he will write. I am ashamed to be forced into such an obvious remark as that *Hamlet* must be thoroughly aware of the peculiar bearing of the play he has chosen, and has already determined upon the use he will make of it to catch the conscience of the King; but I am forced to make the remark, because Herr Devrient, in the soliloquy which followed—

“O what a rogue and peasant slave am I,” &c.

made a great point of suddenly conceiving this idea of using the play as a means of testing the King; he smacked his forehead, paused a long while, tried to throw speculation into his eyes, and in low, mysterious accents announced to himself this very determination. Now this is what I call haphazard emotion. The slightest consideration of the character as a whole will serve to exhibit repeated instances of the same kind. Of all characters on the stage, *Hamlet* most demands from its performer a subtle sympathy and an appreciation of intellect, which certainly are not with Herr Devrient's nature. Whatever else there may be in his acting, there is not intense mental vigour. Were it not that space and time are wanting, I would undertake to go through any scene, and point out proofs of what I say. Having, however, expressed my opinion with a frankness demanded by the occasion, and by the enormous praise which has greeted Herr Devrient, with more hospitality than discernment, let me now turn to what was excellent in his performance.

The second aspect which the character presents—viz., that of *Hamlet* half mad, was forcibly given. Herr Devrient—probably according to German tradition—preserves the significant phrases addressed to the *Ghost*, “How now, old mole! dost work i' the earth so fast,” &c., and taking the plain hint given in such language, he represents the reason of *Hamlet* as completely unsettled by the revelations of the *Ghost*—he is the madman he affects to be. This one scene was sufficient to show that a new version of *Hamlet*, more consistent with the text, would be far more effective than our English versions. Herr Devrient was wild, fitful, and impressive. The change from the earlier manner was complete. Perhaps in the subsequent scenes a more intelligent actor would have been less monotonous in his wildness; but, at any rate, it was something to see the mad view of the part seriously taken up. As *Ophelia's* lover—the third aspect of the part—Herr Devrient wanted tenderness altogether (he always does), but he played without the harshness which usually spoils this scene; and, indeed, it only wanted a little tenderness to make it perfect. The elegance, the pathos, the fluctuating passion, and the thought of *Hamlet*, were but poorly represented; but, on the other hand, the madness was thoroughly grasped; and very many of the speeches which one has been accustomed to hear ranted and mouthed, were spoken with a naturalness far more effective. To sum up in a phrase: Herr Devrient has not a spark of *genius*, but he is a practised actor, capable of giving effect to certain passages; and his *Hamlet* has some scenes one can honestly praise, though not one passage that roused any enthusiasm in me.

The *Polonius* of Herr Limbach, on the contrary, was a fine piece of acting. He conceived *Polonius* rather as a stupid than a senile man, and in so far he erred, I think; nevertheless, this is almost hypercriticism on his excellent performance, which was admirable within its own limits. He was “made up” like a Vandeyke; and the unconscious garrulity and feebleness of intellect were *naïvely* and quietly hit off.

#### THE VAMPIRE AND THE ENGLISH DRAMA.

PERSONAL reasons, which are unnecessary to be stated here, prevent my offering an opinion on Mr. Bourcicault in his new character as actor. I content myself with recording his complete success in the new attempt, and quote the article on the *Vampire* from the *Times*, on account of its admirable and timely remarks on the present condition of our drama.

“We must regret that, while such progress has been made in the art of presenting dramatic works to the public, there should be a complete standstill in the poetical drama as a branch of literature. We have still several wits who shine in comic dramatic prose, but turn our eyes in what direction we may, we can only

come to the conclusion that the drama, as a poetical art, is all but lost. The carving and gilding of the frame have become more exquisite, but the picture it has adorned has generally been indifferent. Few men who can gain eminence in any other branch of literature, have recourse to dramatic writing; and even those who have made some figure in it, sink away as soon as they find a new opening for their talents. The laurels gained on the stage are so transient in their nature, that they fade almost as soon as they have reached the brow of the author. To gain a round of applause for a single night, to occupy a playbill for a few weeks, and then to repose till some turn of fortune shall bring another prize of equal dimensions, seems to be all that a dramatic author expects in the relations between himself and the public. In modern days, audiences go to the theatre simply to be amused, just as they would go to see a phantasmagoria, and their applause conveys no verdict that can be acceptable to a man of intellect. It simply denotes that for an hour or two they have been kept in a certain state of excitement, and it is often inconsistent with itself. We have no doubt that on many occasions when we have reported the 'thunders of applause' that have accompanied the first production of a work, and the visitor on a subsequent night has found a chilly, thin assemblage, chary of its approbation, this visitor has imagined the recorded success has existed less in fact than in our own imaginations. But the reverse has been the case. We read that in former times a triumphant first night was a victory gained. In the present day, the bouquet of the Monday may but augur the empty bench of the Saturday.

"The fact is not so much that 'friends' go to a theatre on certain critical occasions, for these would seldom bear up against the general voice of a house; but the persons who attend a theatre on the first night of a new play, take with them a far less amount of judgment than they would bring to bear upon a book, a picture, or a statue. Let any student of humanity observe the hearty roar of laughter that will be excited by a very small joke spoken on the stage, and the applause which will reward some exaggerated expression of sentiment, and ask himself whether any parallel result would be obtained from the reader of a novel or a magazine tale. It is no wonder that the magnates of literature are frightened away from the stage, when the highest honours—such as they are—are gained by means they would not condescend to use. Have we enlarged our psychological knowledge through the dramatist's personal experience?—have we seen any type of actual or ideal humanity?—have we seen the personages of history grouped together so as to give a significant visibility to the past? These are questions which are never asked by the ordinary class of playgoers. Have we been amused, is all they ask, and they ask it in the same sense as if they questioned themselves after a display of fireworks.

"The chief reform that is needed in audiences and critics (for the latter will often be more or less influenced by the former), would be effected by a determination to judge of theatrical productions by some other standard than that of stage conventionality. The course of literature has accumulated a large *répertoire* of old dramas, from which an expression may be found for almost every position incident to humanity. Love, hatred, jealousy, ambition—what you will—can be portrayed by a ready writer, without the slightest knowledge of actual nature, or without more imagination than is requisite to reproduce a metaphor—merely by the possession of a store of stage experience. Hence, through a series of years, has arisen a sort of spurious human nature peculiar to the stage, and scarcely at all modified by the changes in life outside the theatre walls. The conventions that exist in this imaginary world were laid down in the midst of circumstances that no longer exist, and the portraiture that in the first instance were real, because they were drawn from nature or from creative imagination, cease to be so altogether when they become portraiture from other portraiture. Nor is the spirit of convention confined to one side of the lamps. The audience are as much imbued with it as the dramatic writers. The rule of comparison by which they judge any transaction in life, or even any incident in a novel, is laid aside. They will honour a hero for expressions which, anywhere but on the stage, would suggest the notion of a strait jacket; and they will regard a valet or an abigail as entitled to their esteem for a pert recklessness, which, if it figured in their own domicile, would earn nothing but a month's warning. The whole thing has declined, the acting drama has become little more than the expression of stage conventionality, and a thorough revolution of some sort is required. The conventional drama has been drained to the very dregs, and to have a new living dramatic literature we must begin from a new beginning.

"Some critics who have wished to take a high ground with respect to the drama, have been especially severe on pieces of the *Corsican Brothers* school. We doubt whether they have hit the right nail on the head. The *Corsican Brothers* pretended to excite the shudder produced by a ghost story, and as the ghost-effects

were well managed, it answered its purpose. They were, at any rate, new of their kind; the ghostly personages were not a whit more unreal than the chevaliers, gallant peasants, nobles, knights, and what not, who so often in modern plays pretend to represent humanity, and the sympathy between the brothers gave something like a poetical tone to the whole. A melodrama, in which an idea is definitely worked out, is, after all, if well managed, a very respectable affair.

"We wish we could extend this praise to the new melodrama of *The Vampire*, in which a superstition, not unfamiliar to the stage, is worked up after a fashion recently attempted at Paris. The circumstance that a gentleman preserves his long life by sucking a young lady's blood once every hundred years, is of itself not very pleasing, but as we tolerated that Eastern notion thirty years ago, when it was represented as indigenous to the Highlands of Scotland, we do not see that we have any right to be squeamish now when it is located in Wales. Waving, then, all dislike to the Vampire's constitutional propensities, we rest our objection to the modern treatment on the want of development which is its result. The play is cut into three 'dramas'—as the acts are oddly named—which are separated from each other by intervals of an hundred years, so that the story extends from 1660 to 1860, i.e., eight years hence; but the functions performed by the Vampire and his manner of performing them, remain so precisely the same, that the fate of Alice, who becomes his victim in 1760, is almost the same as that of Lucy, who perishes in 1660, and the end of Ada in 1860 would be the same again did not the ghosts of Alice and Lucy burst from their tombs, and protect their young relative. In the way of scenery, everything has been done for the piece, and the complete change of costume and the aspects of a Welsh village, produce an agreeable variety. The effect of laying the deceased Vampire on a moonlit mountain—a warning dream of Alice, in which she beholds Lucy and other ancestors step from their portrait frames on the stage, and the rising of the two ghosts at the end, after the *Robert le Diable* fashion, are all admirably contrived. But in spite of accessories, the piece suffers from its plan; the characters being different in each act, with the single exception of the Vampire himself, are all slight and imperfectly developed, so that there is no concentrating point of interest. Thus the accumulation of horrors, which is pretty thick, becomes somewhat wearisome in the long run, and several of the audience evinced displeasure when the shroud-clad Lucy and Alice showed their grim figures in the moonlight. The only scene really worthy the pen of Mr. Bourcicault, who is, after all, one of the best of our modern comic writers, is a scene between a lawyer and an old lady, in the '1860' act, when they discover by certain documents, that a mesmeric gentleman stopping at their house, is the same as the unpleasant member of the Raby family, who turned Vampire two hundred years before. The lawyer was capitally played by Mr. Harley, and the terror of the couple was amusing enough.

"The success of Mr. Bourcicault as an actor—for he made his *début* as the *Vampire*—was far more unequivocal than that of the piece. The attitudes were well studied, the chilly aspect was carefully made up, and the few words of dialogue were judiciously spoken, so that throughout the whole piece he fully preserved his supernatural distinctiveness. He was generally called at the fall of the curtain."

#### NOTES THEATRICAL.

In a paragraph I must group the remainder of the theatrical news of the week. Signor Bettini, a robust, or rather robustious, tenor, made his appearance at HER MAJESTY'S, in *Ernani*, with mediocre success. Not much more can be said of Mdle. Angiolina Bosio, who appeared at the ROYAL ITALIAN OPERA, in *L'Elisir d'Amore*, without exciting more than tepid enthusiasm. She is pretty, graceful, and at ease on the stage. Her voice agreeable, though uncertain in its intonation, her execution facile without brilliancy. Signor Galvani, in a part Mario makes enchanting, was heard with silence, and what Mirabeau said of kings may be applied to actors—"The silence of the people is the lesson to kings." Signor Bartolini was very incompetent to *Belcore*. Ronconi alone carried the opera through; anything more vivaciously, spontaneously grotesque than his *Dulcamara* cannot be imagined.

Miss Laura Keane quits the *Lyceum* this week, and the drama at the same time. I hear she has a fine contralto voice, and is going to Italy for study. Her part in the *Chain of Events* will be sustained by Miss M. Oliver.

Buckstone took his benefit on Wednesday, and produced a five-act comedy, *The Foundlings*, on the occasion. I will report next week. On the same evening Henry Farren also took a benefit, and played *Richelieu*, for the first time. The season of benefits announces a close of the dramatic season. Hurrah!

VIVIAN.

OUR FOREIGN POLICY ON THE HUSTINGS.—What is wanted in England at present is a larger proportion of public and parliamentary men, animated with what may be called the international spirit. We must have more men in Parliament, possessing a competent knowledge of foreign questions, and deeply interested in them. Let this be remembered at the next elections. The right men to return at these elections are not those who know and pretend to care only about what is passing within England; but those who, besides knowing what is passing within England, observe and appreciate the great movement which is gathering without her, and gradually closing in upon her. Let tests and questions be devised for candidates, embodying the vital points of foreign politics—questions retrospective and questions prospective. Retrospective—as, for example, a question eliciting a candidate's opinion as to the Napoleonic *coup d'état*; a question eliciting his opinion as to the conduct of the British Government in the negotiations with France which preceded the occupation of Rome, and the restoration of the Pope by French troops; and a question, similarly framed, with regard to Hungary. Prospective—as, for example, a question pledging a candidate to a certain course of conduct, in the case of a repetition of the foreign demands with respect to refugees; or a question pledging him to a certain course of conduct should England ever again be in a position to vindicate practically in behalf of a foreign nation, her boasted

attachment to the doctrine of non-interference, as she might have done in the case of Rome; or a question involving the prospects of an alliance of England and America in behalf of liberty, and demanding an express answer as to how a candidate would act or advise, if, at any future time there were such and such a chance of a service to freedom, to be rendered by the common word or the common determination of both countries. It is desirable that such questions should be well studied and carefully framed beforehand, and also that there should be a common understanding among the friends of freedom over the country, as to the precise questions to be put everywhere, and the precise form in which they should be put.—*Monthly Record of the Friends of Italy.*

BOTH IN THE WRONG.—After all it is a pitiful controversy, this about the relative vices of rich and poor. Two school-boys taunting each other, with faults of which they were equally guilty, would best parody it. Whilst indignant Radicalism denounces "the vile aristocrats," these in their turn enlarge with horror on the brutality of the mob. Neither party sees its own sins. Neither party recognises in the other, itself in a different dress. Neither party can believe that it would do all the other does if placed in like circumstances. Yet a cool bystander finds nothing to choose between them; knows that these class recriminations are but the inflammatory symptoms of a uniformly-diffused immorality.—*Social Statics.*

## Commercial Affairs.

### MONEY MARKET AND CITY INTELLIGENCE. BRITISH FUNDS FOR THE PAST WEEK. (CLOSING PRICES.)

	Satur.	Mond.	Tues.	Wedn.	Thurs.	Frid.
Bank Stock	223½	100½	222½	222½	223½	.....
3 per Cent. Red.	100½	100½	100½	100½	100½	.....
3 per Cent. Con. Ans.	100½	100½	shut	shut	shut	.....
3 per Cent. Con., Ac.	.....	.....	99½	.....	.....	.....
3½ per Cent. An.	103	102½	103	103	103	.....
New 5 per Cents.	shut	shut	shut	.....	.....	.....
Long Ans., 1860	shut	shut	shut	6½	6½	.....
India Stock	shut	shut	shut	shut	.....	.....
Ditto Bonds, £1000	89	.....	89	.....	89	.....
Ditto, under £1000	89	89	.....	89	89	.....
Ex. Bills, £1000	68 p	70 p	70 p	71 p	68 p	.....
Ditto, £500	68 p	.....	70 p	71 p	68 p	.....
Ditto, Small	68 p	.....	69 p	71 p	68 p	.....

### FOREIGN FUNDS. (LAST OFFICIAL QUOTATION DURING THE WEEK ENDING THURSDAY EVENING.)

Austrian Scrip, 5 p. Ct., 3½ pm.	Mexican 5 p. Cents., 1840	32½
Austrian Bonds	Mexican 3 p. Cents.	26½
Brazilian 5 per Cents.	Peruvian Bonds, 1849	105
Buenos Ayres	Peruvian 3 per Cts. Def.	65
Buenos Ayres, Account,	Portuguese 4 per Cents.	38
June 30	Russian 4½ per Cents.	105
Dutch 2½ per Cents.	Spanish 3 per Cents.	48½
Dutch 4 per Cent. Certif.	Spanish 3 p. Cents. New	.....
Granada Deferred	Deferred	21½



## The Zoological Gardens,

REGENT'S PARK,

are Open to Visitors daily. The Collection now contains upwards of 1500 Specimens, including the HIPPOPOTAMUS presented by H.H. the Viceroy of Egypt, ELEPHANTS, RHINOCEROS, GIRAFFES and young, LEUCORYX and young, ELANDS, BONTOS, CAMELS, ZEBRAS, LIONS, TIGERS, JAGUARS, BEARS, OSTRICHES, and the ARTERYX presented by the Lieut.-Governor of New Zealand. All Visitors are now admitted to M.P. Gould's Collection of HUMMING BIRDS without any extra charge.

The Band of the First Life Guards will perform, by permission of Colonel Hall, on every SATURDAY, at Four o'clock, until further notice.

Admission, One Shilling. On MONDAYS, SIXPENCE.

**THE ROYAL EXHIBITION.**—A valuable newly-invented, very small, powerful WAISTCOAT POCKET GLASS, the size of a walnut, to discern minute objects at a distance of from four to five miles, which is found to be invaluable to Yachters, Sportsmen, Gentlemen, and Gamekeepers. Price 30s., sent free. — **TELESCOPES.** A new and most important invention in Telescopes, possessing such extraordinary powers, that some, 3½ inches, with an extra eye-piece, will show distinctly Jupiter's Moons, Saturn's Ring, and the Double Stars. They supersede every other kind, and are of all sizes, for the waistcoat pocket, Shooting, Military purposes, &c. Opera and Racecourse Glasses, with wonderful powers; a minute object can be clearly seen from ten to twelve miles distant. Invaluable, newly-invented Preserving Spectacles; invisible and all kinds of Acoustic Instruments for relief of extreme Deafness. — Messrs. S. and B. SOLOMONS, Opticians and Aurists, 39, Albemarle Street, Piccadilly, opposite the York Hotel.

**THE HAHNEMANN HOSPITAL,** for the TREATMENT OF PATIENTS on the HOMOEOPATHIC PRINCIPLE, No. 39, Bloomsbury Square. Supported by Voluntary Contributions.

President—The LORD ROBERT GROSVENOR, M.P.  
Treasurer—WILLIAM LEAF, Esq., 39, Old Change.

The Hospital is open for the reception of the necessitous poor suffering from acute diseases. Gratuitous advice is also given daily to Out-patients.

Subscriptions and Donations are earnestly solicited on behalf of the Hospital, and will be received by the Treasurer, William Leaf, Esq., 39, Old Change, or any Member of the Board, or may be paid into the account of "The Hahnemann Hospital," with Messrs. Glyn and Co., Bankers, Lombard-street; or Messrs. Drummond, Bankers, Charing-cross: advice of such payment being respectfully requested to be sent to the Treasurer for acknowledgment.

WILLIAM WARNE,

9, Gresham-street, West.

Hon. Secretary.

**GLENFIELD PATENT STARCH.**—Now USED IN THE ROYAL LAUNDRY. The Ladies are respectfully solicited to make a trial of the GLENFIELD PATENT DOUBLE-REFINED POWDER STARCH, which, for Domestic Use, now stands UNRIVALED. Sold Wholesale in London by Messrs. Pantin and Turner; Hooper Brothers; Batty and Feast; Croft and Innocent; Petty, Wood, and Co.; Twelvrees Brothers; R. Letchford and Co.; John Yates and Co.; Yates, Walton, and Turner; Clayton, Bland, and Co.; Field, Roberts, and Barber; A. Braden and Co.; Hicks Brothers; C. B. Williams and Co.; Sterry, Sterry, and Co.; Thomas Smelling; John Hynam; John Brewer; and Retail, by all Shopkeepers.

Agents wanted—apply to Mr. R. Wotherspoon, 40, Dunlop Street, Glasgow.

London Depôt:

Wotherspoon, Mackay, and Co., 40, King William Street, City.

**STEAM TO INDIA, CHINA, &c.**—Particulars of the regular Monthly Mail Steam Conveyance and of the additional lines of communication, now established by the Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Company with the East, &c. The Company book passengers, and receive goods and parcels as heretofore for CEYLON, MADRAS, CALCUTTA, PENANG, SINGAPORE, and HONG KONG, by their steamers, starting from SOUTHAMPTON on the 20th of every month, and from SUEZ on or about the 8th of the month.

The next extra Steamer will be dispatched from Southampton for Alexandria on the 3rd October next, in combination with an extra Steamer, to leave Calcutta on or about the 20th September. Passengers may be booked, and goods and parcels forwarded by these extra steamers to or from SOUTHAMPTON, ALEXANDRIA, ADEN, CEYLON, MADRAS, and CALCUTTA.

**BOMBAY.**—The Company will book passengers throughout from Southampton to Bombay by their steamers leaving England on the 20th July, and of alternate months thereafter, such passengers being conveyed from Aden to Bombay by their steamers appointed to leave Bombay on the 14th of July, and of alternate months thereafter, and affording, in connexion with the steamers leaving Calcutta on the 3rd of July, and of alternate months thereafter, direct conveyance for passengers, parcels, and goods from Bombay and Western India.

Passengers for Bombay can also proceed by this Company's Steamers of the 20th of the month to Malta, thence to Alexandria by her Majesty's steamers, and from Suez by the Honourable East India Company's steamers.

**MEDITERRANEAN.**—MALTA—On the 20th and 29th of every month. Constantinople—On the 29th of the month. Alexandria—On the 20th of the month. (The rates of passage money on these lines have been materially reduced.)

**SPAIN AND PORTUGAL.**—Vigo, Oporto, Lisbon, Cadiz, and Gibraltar, on the 7th, 17th, and 27th of the month.

N.B.—The Steam-ships of the Company now ply direct between Calcutta, Penang, Singapore, and Hong Kong, and between Hong Kong and Shanghai.

For further information and tariffs of the Company's recently revised and reduced rates of passage-money and freight, and for plans of the vessels, and to secure passages, &c., apply at the Company's Offices, 122, Leadenhall-street, London, and Oriental-place, Southampton.

**FOR PORT PHILIP, SYDNEY, and the GOLDEN REGIONS.**—The Australian Gold and General Mining and Emigration Company, 6, Austinfriars, will dispatch (monthly) first-class fast-sailing SHIPS of 1000 tons, from London to Australia. The ships will be ably manned and commanded, and will carry experienced Surgeons. The Provisions, Fittings, and Ventilation will be unexceptionable, combining comfort, regularity, and economy. For freight, passage, and particulars apply to C. J. Tripe, Superintendent of Shipping, at the Company's Offices; or to Tomlin and Co., 68, Cornhill.

## CLERICAL, MEDICAL, AND GENERAL LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY.

Persons of all ages, and in every station, may assure with this Society, and the Assured can reside in any part of Europe, the Holy Land, Egypt, Madeira, the Cape, Australia, New Zealand, and in most parts of North and South America, without extra charge.

### FIFTH DIVISION OF PROFITS.

The FIFTH BONUS was declared in January last, and the amount varied with the different ages, from 24½ to 55 per cent. on the Premiums paid, during the last Five Years; or from £5 to £12 10s. per cent. on the sum assured.

The small share of Profit divisible in future among the Shareholders being now provided for, without intrenching on the amount made by the regular business, the Assured will hereafter derive all the benefits obtainable from a Mutual Office, with, at the same time, complete freedom from liability, secured by means of an ample Proprietary Capital—thus combining, in the same office, all the advantages of both systems.

The Fund invested for the security and benefit of the Assured exceeds £850,000; and the Income is now upwards of £136,000 per annum.

Every description of Assurance may be effected, and for any sum from £50 to £10,000.

A copy of the last Report, setting forth full particulars, with a Prospectus, can now be obtained of any of the Society's agents, or by addressing a line to

GEO. H. PINCKARD, Resident Secretary.

99, Great Russell Street, Bloomsbury, London.

### EVERY HOUSEHOLDER HIS OWN BREWER.

**METROPOLITAN AND PROVINCIAL JOINT STOCK BREWERY COMPANY.** Incorporated by Act of Parliament. Capital, £200,000, in 40,000 Shares of £5 each, with power to increase it to £1,000,000.

Calls not exceeding 10s. per Share, and of which Three Months' notice must be given.

OFFICES, 13, UPPER WELLINGTON STREET, STRAND.

### DIRECTORS.

John Francis Bontems, Esq., Hemel Hempstead, Herts.  
Charles Henry Edmonds, Esq., Oakley Lodge, Chelsea.  
Joseph Hawkins, Esq., Bushey, Herts.  
Edward Vansittart Neale, Esq., 3, Old Square, Lincoln's Inn.  
Thomas Jones Saunders, Esq., Davies Street, Berkeley Square.  
Sidney Stevens, Esq., Bell Grove, Welling, Kent.

The Company is distinctly Co-operative, admitting Subscribers without liability, and the workmen to participate in the profits.

The Company is prepared to deliver, free of carriage in any part of London, its UNADULTERATED Ales, Porter, and Stout, in any quantities not less than four and a-half gallons, which the Company pledges itself to be made from Malt and Hops only.

The following are the prices:—

Strong Ales.....	12d., 14d., 16d., 18d., and 20d. per gallon.
Bitter Ales.....	10d., 12d., 14d., and 20d. "
Porter.....	10d. and 12d. "
Stout.....	14d., 16d., 18d., and 20d. "
Table Ale, and Bitter Table Ale.....	4d., 6d., 8d. & 10d. "

N.B.—A discount of 2s. in the pound for cash on delivery.—At present the Company does business only for cash.

### THE TRADE SUPPLIED.

Orders to be addressed to the Chief Office; or to the Branch Brewery, Brentford; or to Mr Richard Truran, the Company's Stores, 19, Walcott Place, Kennington.

Applications for Shares, or for further information, to be made to the manager,

Mr. WILLIAM STEVENS,

At the Office, 13, Upper Wellington Street, Strand.

**DISTRESSED NEEDLEWOMEN SOCIETY.**—The additional object of this Institution will be forthwith completed through the assistance of the real benefactress, supported by two noble ladies, and accommodation afforded for 60 inmates.

This establishment is founded on the principle of a finishing school similar in its methods to the Governesses' College, where teachers of proficiency are engaged to instruct in the various branches, such as millinery, dressmaking, embroidery, and all fancy needlework. A subscriber of one guinea is entitled to send a pupil for one month, who will be found board and lodging, combined with all the comforts of a parental home. Young persons leaving their situations can go into the home on the recommendation of a member. Should a situation be obtained the first week, the subscriber's claim upon the home will be considered fulfilled.

Benevolent persons who have no protégé of their own, and subscribe to the Institution, such contributions will go to the apprentice fund, the Committee having power to grant sums for orphans and others unable to find the means.

Further particulars will be announced in a few days. Already 200 ladies have requested their names to be added to the Committee. Needlewomen of every description wanted. Apply to Mr. Roper, founder of the Society. Office, 22, Newman-street, Oxford-street. To prevent disappointment observe the number.

## THE MINERS' OWN GOLD COMPANY, VICTORIA, AUSTRALIA.

In 20,000 Parts, or Shares, of £1 each.

### COMMITTEE OF MANAGEMENT.

Edward E. Allen, Esq., Steel-yard, Upper Thames Street.  
Thomas Hawkins, Esq., Norland Square, Notting Hill.  
John Avery, Esq., Cloudesley Square, Islington.  
John Jones, Esq., Norland Square, Notting Hill.  
H. W. Taylor, Esq., F.G.S., Winterslow Place, Vassal Road.

Bankers—Messrs. Strahan, Paul, Paul, and Bates, 217, Strand.  
Solicitor—A. J. Baylis, Esq., Red Cross Street.

Offices—25, Bucklersbury, Mansion House, London.

This Company unites in the strongest bonds of interest the Miner with the Shareholder.

A holder of 100 Shares may nominate any young man as a Miner, who will have a free passage and be found in provisions at the mines, whilst the Shareholder and Nominee will each receive 25 per cent. of the net profits.

Thousands of wealthy men in this country have friends and relatives to whom a lift to Australia at this time would prove a fortune, whilst they themselves might sit at home and participate in the profits, thus combining their own interest with an act of good service to their friends or kindred.

Young men taking 50 Shares, and working as Miners to have the same privileges, and 50 per cent. of the net profits.

Application for Shares or Prospectuses to be made to

WILLIAM JONES, Purser.

**A MOST Favourable Opportunity** is offered to parties willing to embark (free from liability) either a small or large sum in an important undertaking, which by reports from Practical and Scientific men is shown to promise very profitable results. Full particulars will be sent in answer to letters (free), enclosing two postage stamps for the reply, directed to J. T. S., 5, West Street, Finsbury Circus, London.

**MR. MECCHI, No. 4, LEADENHALL STREET, LONDON,** invites public attention to his display of Elegancies, suitable for use or for presentation. Those who inspected Mr. Mechi's display of Manufactures at the Great Exhibition, will be able to form a proper estimate of the general style and quality of his productions. He has endeavoured to combine, for those who study economy, cheapness with elegance, and in fact to give to the cheapest article he manufactures a pleasing form and style. For instance, the Shilling Penknives and Sixpenny Toothbrushes are as useful in their class as the Fifty Guinea Dressing Case. The external and internal fittings of his Premises have been much improved, so as to harmonize more completely with the progressive elegance of his Stock, and have been designed and carried out under his immediate plan and direction. — **ELEGANCIES for PRESENTATION, &c.** Ladies' and Gentlemen's Dressing Cases, from 17s. 6d. to £200. Work Boxes, from 10s. to £40. — Envelope Cases, from 6s. to £7. — Writing Desks, from 10s. to £55; and an infinite variety of articles in Papier Maché. — **LEADING ARTICLES for EVERY-DAY USE:** Table Cutlery of every description—Razors, Scissors, Penknives—Hair, Nail, and Tooth Brushes—Combs—Electro-plated Forks and Spoons of very superior character and finish. — Illustrated Catalogues gratis. N.B. All articles of Cutlery, &c., ground and repaired on the premises daily.

**FIRST-CLASS COMMERCIAL EDUCATION,** in a delightfully airy and healthy locality, a quarter-of-an-hour ride from London, and a pleasant walk from Epping Forest. Forty Guineas per Annum are the terms on which a married Clergyman, M.A., and Member of Senate of Cambridge, Boards and Educates a Private Class of Young Gentlemen. The utmost attention paid to the formation of religious, moral and intellectual character. Classical and Mathematical knowledge imparted to any extent of which the capacities admit; and a facility in reading and speaking Modern Languages acquired. The most approved system of Book-keeping, by single and double entry, taught. Drawing, Fencing, or any other accomplishment, if required.

For further particulars apply to the Rev. M.A., care of Baily Brothers, Stationers and Advertising Agents, Cornhill; and to the Carlton Library, 12, Regent Street, Waterloo Place.

**CHEAP EDITION OF THE OPERAS, SONNAMBULA and NORMA.**—Just published, 4s. each. Boosey's New Edition of these celebrated Operas, for the Pianoforte, perfect and complete, and beautifully engraved and printed. Also, the same in illuminated covers, gilt edges, 6s. each. The two Operas together will be sent postage free from the Publishers, T. Boosey and Co., 28, Holles Street.

**A SIGN and A WARNING, or ELECTRO-BIOLOGY EXPLAINED,** by REDIVIVUS. Just published, by William Horsell, Aldine Chambers, 13, Paternoster Row, price 6d.

**THE WESTMINSTER REVIEW,** NEW SERIES, No. III., price 6s. Annual Subscription, when paid to the Publisher in advance, £1; or if the work be delivered by post, £1 4s.

CONTENTS OF No. III., JULY, 1852.

- I. Secular Education.
- II. England's Forgotten Worthies.
- III. The Future of Geology.
- IV. Lord Jeffrey and the Edinburgh Review.
- V. The Tendencies of England.
- VI. The Lady Novelists.
- VII. The Political Life and Sentiments of Niebuhr.
- VIII. The Restoration of Belief.
- IX. Contemporary Literature of England.
- X. Contemporary Literature of America.
- XI. Contemporary Literature of Germany.
- XII. Contemporary Literature of France.

London: John Chapman, 142, Strand.

Just published, 2 vols. post 8vo, cloth, 21s.

### PERSONAL ADVENTURES OF

## "OUR OWN CORRESPONDENT"

### IN ITALY.

Showing how an active Campaigner can find good quarters when other men lie in the fields; good dinners whilst many are half starved; and good wine, though the king's staff be reduced to short rations.

By MICHAEL BURKE HONAN.

"These volumes are original, and not a reprint or *réchauffé* of my Correspondence from Italy to the 'Times.'—Preface.

"We do not know that since the days of Gil Blas a more diversified and dashing series of adventures has been set before the gentle reader. . . . His book is sure to be wildly popular."—Globe.

"A very amusing book."—Advertiser.

II.

This Day, 8vo, cloth, price 6s.

## NOTES ON THE NORTH-WESTERN PROVINCES OF INDIA.

By CHARLES RAIKES, Esq.

Magistrate and Collector of Mynpoorie.

III.

This Day, No. II., price One Shilling.

### TRACTS FOR ELECTORS ON

## FINANCE AND TRADE.

By R. TORRENS, Esq., F.R.S.

No. II.—On the question, "Should the Income-tax be continued, and the Import Duties diminished; or, Should the Income-tax be abolished, and the Import Duties on Non-necessaries be increased?"

London: Chapman and Hall, 103, Piccadilly.

LONDON: Printed by GEORGE HOOPER, (of No. 3, Portland Place Kensington, in the County of Middlesex,) at the Office of Messrs. SAVILL and EDWARDS, No. 4, Chandos Street, in the Parish of St. Paul, Covent Garden, in the same County; and Published by THOMSON LEIGH HUNT, (of Broadway House, Hammermith,) at THE LEADEN OFFICE, No. 10, WELLINGTON STREET, STRAND, in the Precinct of the Savoy, both in the same County.—SATURDAY, June 19, 1852.