

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	242
Letters from Paris	245
Continental Notes	246
Progress of the Italian Question—	
The Milan Insurrection	247
The Wellington Monument in	
Somersetshire	248
Yankee Challenge	249
The Ship Ericsson	250
Progress of Railway "Accidents" ...	250
Imperial Policy in Detail	250

Miscellaneous	250
Health of London during the Week	251
Births, Marriages, and Deaths	251

PUBLIC AFFAIRS—

Shall England Expel the Refugee	
Patriots?	252
Proposed Partition of Turkey.....	252
More Chapters from the Genesis of	
Parliament	253
Interdependence of Trades	253
The Church and the Emperor.....	254
Colonial and Oceanic Postage.....	254

The Dénatus of Louis Napoleon.....	254
"A Stranger" in Parliament	255
Report of the Oxford University	
Commission. III.	256
An Englishwoman's Voice for Italy	257
The Value of "On Dit"	257
Church Harmony in France	257
Unstamped Newspapers	257

OPEN COUNCIL—

The Recent Cowper-street Discus-	
sion	258
Unsectarian Support of the Madiai	251
The Sunday Reform Movement	251

LITERATURE—

Scrap Literature.....	259
The Plaint of Freedom	260
A Batch of New Books	261

PORTFOLIO—

The Rappites Exposed	261
----------------------------	-----

THE ARTS—

Gossip about the Theatres	263
---------------------------------	-----

COMMERCIAL AFFAIRS—

City Intelligence, Markets, Adver-	
tisements, &c.	263-264

VOL. IV. No. 155.]

SATURDAY, MARCH 12, 1853.

[PRICE SIXPENCE.]

News of the Week.

PERHAPS the most important piece of progress which Government has made this week, consists in the Pilotage Bill, introduced by Mr. Cardwell, to do away with many inconveniences which now obstruct the proceedings of the shipowner. This appears to be a more deliberate and complete step in the same direction, than Mr. Disraeli's promises with regard to Pilotage. Mr. Wilson's proposal for an inquiry into Assurance Associations, is in part justified by the grounds which he stated,—the number of projects, and the failure of several. But he scarcely concealed the fact, that he was animated by something more than distrust of the old companies, and almost a desire to "expose" the younger. Of course, the motives of the joint secretary to the Treasury are inscrutable, but it is well known that the old companies entertain great jealousy of the custom obtained by the new.

Notwithstanding Sir Frederick Thesiger and the Tory saint interest, Lord John Russell succeeded in carrying the second reading of his Jew Relief Bill last night, by 263 to 212. Although the subject is almost as stale as the weather, it was a spirited debate. Rougher times would be a Godsend to our men in political life, for truly there is stuff in some of them, if a life at the library fire did not let it smoulder so much like death.

Some other changes which private Members have attempted to force on Government have met with only partial success. Mr. Craufurd's attempt to abolish the County Courts in Scotland, and to assimilate the administration of the law to what, with some very cumbrous exceptions, it is in practice, has been referred to a select committee, Government showing no countenance. They deserve more credit for their resistance to Lord Clancarty's attempt at invading the system of National education in Ireland. The system was assailed by the Bishop of London and Lord Harrowby; it was defended by Lord Aberdeen, Lord Derby, the Bishop of Limerick, the Bishop of Norwich, and Lord Lansdowne; all of its champions being closely connected with Ireland, except Lord Aberdeen. The system, indeed, works admirably, and has already told upon the conduct, and therefore upon the condition, of the Irish people. Its very success, however, is a grievance to those who insist that "education without religion" cannot succeed.

The election committees have made havoc with seats, and havoc also with the reputations of some candidates. Amongst the members unseated have been Sir Frederic Smith for Chatham, where, as an official, he had received votes under expectation of patronage. Mr. Clay, and Lord Goderich for Hull,—where their agents had bribed without their privity; Mr. Horsfall for Derby,—where "W. B." had sent Mr. Flewker; and Mr. Mackinnon for Rye,—where there were festivities going on, well understood to the local managers, not to Mr. Mackinnon. The writs for Chatham and Hull are suspended, and Lord John has intimated a proposition that where the general conduct of a constituency comes substantively into question, there shall be a separate committee, besides the Election Committee, to inquire into the course of action which ought to be adopted. Perhaps the most remarkable result of these inquiries is the amount of disgust which they have excited; and their influence in promoting a remedy may be proportionately beneficial. The *Times* does not conceal "that they lead straight to the ballot, and Heaven knows what besides," meaning, we presume, very extended suffrage, if not a national suffrage. It is quite clear that the present electors are paid electors; that they have no judgment in the selection of Members; and that the House of Commons, or a considerable part thereof, is not elected by the people, or by the constituency, or by any recognised body. It is said that petitions against Members, although issued in a more wholesale way this year than usual, have been by no means levelled at all the doubtful seats; but perhaps it would not be a bad plan to apply the principle to the "Railway Director," who suggested to the *Times* that the guard of a train should not presume safety, and wait for a signal of danger, but that he should not go forward until he received a signal of safety. It would not be a bad plan to presume corruption in the case of every member, and by presenting a petition against every seat, to put the member upon proof of purity. Sad work might be made with the first House of Commons subjected to such a process; but if it is necessary to protect any one, it seems to be the Member, and those who desire to be elected only once for a session, instead of having to get in a second or even a third time; we may begin to perceive that with the ballot and a national suffrage, Members will have a chance not only of getting in, but of staying in.

Indian justice received important accessions in both Houses last night. John Bright, Disraeli, Ellenborough, Cobden, Derby, Hume, were not all who joined in the demand for a reconsideration of the Government resolve to legislate permanently; several of the best of the younger Members amongst the Liberals—such as J. B. Blackett, R. Phillimore, and Danby Seymour—came out independently on the same side. Government has not yet heard the last of this matter.

Lord Malmesbury has raised, in very threatening manner, a question in the House of Lords,—Whether or not Mazzini had been suffered to embark in the English frigate *Retribution*? Lord Aberdeen replied, that he had received no information, replying in a tone that seemed to say that he was glad not to enter further upon the subject. Official "England" would give a great deal to save the author of all the misery in Italy, the Emperor who orders the executions of innocent men, and the flogging of women; but she hesitates to afford protection to a fugitive patriot. We do not know in what manner the British navy could be better employed. The frigate *Retribution* is called "H. M. S."; but we all know that the three letters are only a form. The navy belongs to the Nation. The Queen and her ministers are, after all, but public servants; and if the nation approves of the escape afforded to Mazzini, there is no reason why the public servants should be ashamed of their work. If the British people were ashamed of seeing their ships employed thus, in bearing fugitive patriots to a place of safety, the duty would fall to other hands. An American frigate and corvette are on the shores of Italy, and would save the fugitives, if England declined to do so. But although England would be willing to share that pious work with America, we do not think she is as yet sunk so low as to desire to surrender it altogether.

Austria manages to make progress in tyranny, even on Italian grounds, where we might suppose her to have arrived at the end of her tether. The forced levies of money upon Milan have been followed by the wholesale confiscations of property belonging to any persons who remain beyond the boundary; a measure which sweeps into the exchequer the property of Lombard noblemen in Piedmont. More persons have undergone capital punishment, and "justice" has been satisfied by the castigation, amongst others, of a young girl Anna Celzera, aged twenty-two years, who has

been beaten in public with rods. Now, if the Italians submitted in quiet to treatment like this, would the countrymen of Hampden respect them? If it were our own case, would not the countrymen of Hampden continue to arise against their alien tyrant?

Great interest centres chiefly in Turkey, which is now openly menaced with partition. A memoir in the *Augsburg Gazette* divulges the plan, which is to give to Austria, Salonica and the Western half, and to Russia, Constantinople and the Eastern, the latter getting the lion's share. This would enable the Cossack to water his horses in the Adriatic; so that he is gradually coming towards the Thames by easy marches: that is, if Europe should permit Russia to take Constantinople. It is intimated in Paris that Europe will not permit the question to be settled without a general concurrence; but we may remark, that while the moderating influences of Europe at present remain perfectly passive, the aggressive principle remains in constant activity with the Absolutists; and we are not to expect that Austria and Russia will desist from their purpose, because it may displease England; who never enforces her own opinion. What have they to fear from a country which all but avows that it will suffer anything rather than go to war? The threat of war paralyses England; hence it is the threat which Austria and Russia are both able and willing to make as often as they please.

This short half of the month has been extremely fruitful in Railway "Accidents," which are becoming an "institution." As the *Times* observes, February closed with a frightful Ealing accident, which happened to an express train with a carriage full of Directors. On Wednesday, the second of March, on the Newcastle and Tynemouth line, the engine and tender leaped off an embankment, and the engine-driver was killed, the stoker mangled, and several passengers hurt. On Friday, the 4th of March, at Merstham, on the South Eastern line, a goods train ran into a ballast train standing on the line, and nine persons were seriously hurt. On the same day a train ran off the Manchester and Bolton line, four persons killed. On Wednesday, March the 9th, in a factory of the North Western Company, a boiler burst; five persons killed and many hurt. On the Wednesday, March 9th, at Mangotsfield, on the Bristol and Birmingham branch of the Midland line, an engine broke down, the train stopped, a return engine ran into it, two persons killed and several injured. On the South Wales Railway, a luggage-train and a passenger-train met, and the passengers escaped with life at the expense of severe hurts. Yet when Ministers are asked in Parliament whether they intend to take any steps for bringing responsibility home to the Managers of Railways, they express the fear that "Government intervention might diminish the sense of responsibility" which these Managers feel! How can that be possible?

THE WEEK IN PARLIAMENT.

NEITHER House has been very animated this week, either as regards the subject of its discussion or the mode of treating them. The only apparent exception was last night's debate on the second reading of the

JEWISH EMANCIPATION BILL.

Sir FREDERICK THIESIGER, who moved that the bill be read a second time that day six months, attempted to impart some novelty into the debate by raking up history to show that there were no Jews in England when the words "on the true faith of a Christian" were introduced. He also argued that the Jews have a right to civil but not to political rights; and he vamped up the worn-out argument that the admission of Jews would unchristianize the nation. Here a scene arose.

He saw no reason why they should admit a Jew an deicide a deist. Nay, why should they stop short of deists? There was a person who was wretched enough to be the subject of her Majesty's indignation, he might as well do away with all forms; let us make the entrance of the House smooth to all religions; let us declare that every subject of her Majesty is entitled to his civil rights. (Cheers from the Ministerial benches.) Then he undertook to cheer that they were not to shut the door against any one, whatever was his creed—(cheers)—that

they were to admit persons of all religions, and of no religion at all. (Continued cheers.) Well, that furnished him with an additional reason for opposing to the utmost of his power (loud cheers from the Opposition) this attempt to begin a course of mischief which he foresaw would be fatal in its consequences, and to prevent, if possible, the admission of the Jews. (Cheers.)

After Lord GRAMHAM had seconded the amendment, Mr. B. OSBORNE pitted those honourable members who resisted this motion by such miserable arguments as might have been used in the thirteenth century. It was pretended that the admission of Jews to the Legislature would unchristianize it, but, if so, the whole country must have been unchristianized long ago by their admission to municipal offices. He regarded this assertion in a country of religious liberty, as an insult to common sense. He considered that the question ought to be discussed, not on religious but political grounds. Take care that in trying to exclude the Jews you did not debar Christians from exercising their just rights as electors.

He thought they ought at once to simplify these oaths; they ought to carry out the recommendations of the commission which sat in 1845 on religious disabilities, and not to seek to split up the House into theological brigades. (Loud cheers.) The noble lord, the member for Grantham, seemed horrified at the idea of a Jewish brigade; but this was not the way to avoid it. He held that allegiance to the Queen, and the interests of their common country, should be their ruling principle, and that the House should not be split up into theological or casuistical sections. If they were Christians, they were bound to do as they would be done by; and when the honourable member for Stamford quoted Hollingsworth and other obscure writers, he would take the liberty to quote Bishop Newton, who said, "it is more fitting to strive to be the dispensers of the mercies of heaven, rather than the executioners of the cruelty of man." (Cheers.)

Mr. HENRY DRUMMOND used a singular argument.

He was told that every man had a right to worship God as he pleased; but he denied it point blank. (Laughter.) That assertion generally came from gentlemen who were called Bible Christians; but he should like to know in what part of the Bible they read that man was sent into the world to worship God in any way he liked. He thought from his small knowledge of the Scriptures that the way to worship God was most accurately prescribed and defined there; and how, then, durst any one worship Him in any way but that one way? Moreover, he found that the first gentleman who took his own way was what might be called a sort of independent or free church gentleman—and that was Cain. (Laughter.) It had been observed that the time was when Europe was bound together in one system, with Rome as the centre and faith as the talisman. Europe was still bound together; but now the centre was the Stock Exchange of London, and the talisman that bound it was not "credo," but "credit." (Laughter.) It was from the predominance of this feeling that a Jew had been returned by the rabble of London, partly out of contempt for that house, and partly to give a slap in the face to Christianity. (Laughter.)

Then came Mr. EDWARD BALL in support of the Bill, and Lord A. VANE against it, followed by Mr. SIDNEY HERBERT. He regarded the return of Baron Rothschild on three different occasions for the city of London as the best proof that public opinion was decidedly in favour of admitting Jews to Parliament. With respect to nationality, what was the Jew in effect but an Englishman? If there were anything in this argument, why admit converted Jews as they did? The small number of Jews formed an additional reason for considering their claims in a generous spirit. He took his stand on the broad principle that no British-born subject should be excluded from Parliament on the ground of his religious faith.

I should lament if any gentleman in this House, from such a principle as that, chose to set himself up as a systematic persecutor of the Jews. I know many gentlemen object to the word "persecution" being used in consequence of the refusal of political right, and it is said to be an exaggeration of the term; but it is not, because you persecute, though in a different manner, from that formerly adopted. I believe there is a more enlightened spirit abroad; but, at the same time, I cannot conceal from myself the fact that, owing to changed manners and a certain squeamishness on this point, we are obliged to substitute political disabilities for burnings, and so on—(Oh, oh, oh, from the Opposition, and hear, hear, hear, from the Ministerial benches)—just as we have substituted a more cautious and less destructive method of resenting an insult than our forefathers did, who ran a man through the body because he took the wall of him, or shot him with a pistol.

The House got very impatient while Mr. HENLEY delivered a weak speech; and he was followed by Lord JOHN RUSSELL, who alluded to a charge against himself that he had introduced this measure purely to gratify his own constituents, which he showed to be groundless—his interest in the question being of old standing. He could see no difference in principle between the excluders of the Jews and the persecutors of the Mahdini.

"This is undoubtedly—as the right hon. gentleman who spoke last said—this is a question of principle. I admit that there is a principle in opposition to this measure, but it is a principle which, for my own part, I cannot distinguish from the principle of religious persecution. Well then, I say, here are two principles opposed to each other; and honourable gentlemen must take their

stand upon either the one or the other. If they take their stand upon the one principle, it is the principle upon which all persecution has been justified, upon which all penalties have been imposed, and which has led to the dreadful scenes of civil war, of dissension, and of desolation, which have been witnessed from the earliest history of the world up to recent times. The other principle is the principle which has gradually grown as civilization has extended, which tends to peace, which tends to make men love one another, which induces them to live harmoniously in their families, which induces them to live in concord with the State, which leaves every man in the possession and independent exercise of his own religious convictions; and which thereby removing all penalties, removing all disabilities, removing all punishment from the profession of faith, does, I believe, conduce more than the severest inflictions, more than the fire and the rack, more than the most solemn oaths and declarations, to the diffusion of just opinion, and to the prevalence and supremacy of truth. (Cheers.) It is because I glory in those opinions—it is because I am not indifferent to the triumphs of Christianity, but because I believe that it will triumph in the greatest liberty and amidst the diversity of opinions; it is upon these grounds that I hope that that triumph will be aided by the removal of the last of those disabilities. (Cheers.)"

After some further discussion the House divided. The numbers were—

For the second reading.	263
Against it.	212

Majority in favour . . . 51

The bill was then read a second time.

The Earl of CLANCARTY devoted Monday evening to the performance of a duty not altogether unusual on the part of his Lordship, and perfectly harmless on the part of the public who have to suffer it. It is also our duty to narrate the scene in the Upper House, which we shall do with all convenient brevity and respect for the reader's patience. He will find one or two pearls on the road. The subject of the evening's debate was—

IRISH NATIONAL EDUCATION.

Lord Clancarty, in a speech above an hour long, moved for some returns. His speech contained three assertions, which were wonderfully varied in the setting forth. He maintained that the national system had failed, in respect of the religious effect it has produced on the people, the union of Roman Catholic and Protestant children in the same schools; and in obtaining local contributions for carrying out the system. Beside this, he fell foul of the report of the Commissioners, and tried hard to show that the number of children set down as attending the schools, was larger than the number of children who could attend the schools existing. He made great complaint that not the Bible only but Scripture extracts even were not suffered to be read in the schools; and that instead of the children having writing copies set them, such as "God save the Queen," they had "Hurrah for repeal," "St. Patrick was a gentleman."

Lord Clancarty found two supporters, who sustained his sweeping allegations, the Bishop of LONDON and Lord HARROWBY. The Bishop condemned the system as "vicious;" and especially he insisted that the mixed plan was impracticable. On this subject he said:—

"It was utterly impossible to carry out a system of combined education in such a country as Ireland. Looking at the antagonism of the two great parties, it was impossible to unite Catholics and Protestants, and give them a complete system of education which should satisfy the religious instructors of one or the other. And if they were to banish religious education from the schools, and leave it to the respective pastors to inculcate it at such times as they might think fit, they would make religion appear a matter of little or no importance—they would seem to treat it as the most indifferently part of education, which children might be left to acquire or not to acquire, according to the caprice of parents or the inclination of their spiritual instructors. The board of education in Ireland made exceedingly good selections from the word of God, but his objection was, that the poor and ignorant children were not taught that those selections were part of the Bible. As an illustration, he met a poor boy when travelling last year in Ireland, and he asked him some very elementary questions, and the boy answered those questions on the whole as well as a boy could be expected to do. He asked what was the first commandment, and the boy told him. He asked where he learnt that, and the boy said in the second book. 'But where did the second book learn it from?' 'Indeed, I don't know,' said the boy. 'Does it come from the Bible?' 'I don't know.' 'Do you ever read the Bible?' 'I cannot say that I do.' 'Did you ever hear of it?' 'No; I never did.' Such was the result of the conversation."

Lord HARROWBY suggested that there should be an inquiry into the fruits of this system of education.

On the other side, the amount of authority was overwhelming. The Earl of ABERDEEN, the Earl of DEBEN, the Earl of EGLINTON, the Earl of CLARENDON, the Bishop of NORWICH, and the Bishop of LIMERICK, all testified to the success of the system, and the fallacy of Lord Clancarty's statements. Lord Derby himself corrected the erroneous view taken of the Commissioners report. Lord Aberdeen, with great warmth, having attributed whatever might appear unsuccessful

in the carrying out of the system to the Protestant clergy who had withheld their support, the allegation was pretty generally sustained by the other speakers. Lord Derby, indeed, regretted only, and refused to condemn the course taken by the clergy. He also supported the suggestion for inquiry, somewhat recklessly thrown out by Lord Harrowby, saying, that it might be an inquiry partly into facts, and partly into "effects" on the people; and it appeared, from the speech of Lord Eglinton, that such an inquiry had been contemplated by the Derby Government. The Marquis of LANSDOWNE, who followed Lord Derby, forcibly objected to the proposed inquiry. It would rouse all the passions which they had so long thought to allay and control. It is remarkable that Lord Eglinton, according to his own confession, went to Ireland, prejudiced against the system; but, after a close examination of it, he has become one of its warmest supporters.

The most hearty defence of the national system was made by the Bishop of LIMERICK, who, in common with the other speakers, contended for the necessity of joint-secular and separate religious instruction, and a mixed administration. Besides this, he spoke as follows; his remarks being suggested by the accusation that the Bible was not allowed to be read in the schools, and the assertion that the reading of it should be compulsory:—

He yielded to no man in his veneration for the Scriptures. He took them to be the enlivening ray of his reason, as well as the purifying principle of his will, and he could say in sincerity and truth that they were dearer to him than thousands of gold or of silver; but he had yet to learn, because he believed all Scripture to have been written by inspiration, and to be eminently calculated to bless the human race—he had yet to learn, because he venerated the sacred volume as he did, that therefore he was at liberty to compel the reading of it, or, what was the same thing, that he was to debar thousands upon thousands of his fellow-creatures from the blessings of education because they were restricted from the liberty which he himself enjoyed. So had not taught, so had acted not, the great Head of our religion and His apostles. They had offered freely the word of life, but in no instance had they attempted to coerce men to its perusal.

The practical upshot of the debate is in favour of the national system; besides which, Lord Clancarty obtained an order for his returns.

MERCANTILE MARINE.

In the House of Commons, on Monday night, the House being in Committee on Pilotage, Mr. CARDWELL stated the views and intentions of Government, with regard to this subject.

It was notorious, he said, that from the peace down to the time of Mr. Huskisson there had been a positive diminution both in the amount of British tonnage and the numbers of British seamen. The effect of Mr. Huskisson's measures was to open a new career of prosperity to the shipping interest, which had been accelerated by the measures introduced and passed under the administration of Mr. Labouchere, when President of the Board of Trade, for establishing an examination for mates and masters of trading vessels, for relieving the merchant service from the contribution to Greenwich Hospital and other onerous taxes, and for providing comfortable sailors' homes. In reference to present measures, the attention of the Government had been directed to several subjects—the question of lights, that of passing tolls, that of manning merchant vessels, that of volunteering for the navy, that of salvage, that of desertion, that of fees to consuls, and that of pilotage. On the head of lights, he stated the present arrangements for the maintenance of lighthouses, under the management of the Trinity House in London, the Commissioners of Northern Lights in Scotland, and the Ballast Board in Dublin, and examined the manner in which this duty had been discharged, according to the most approved testimonies. The excellence of the administration of the British lighthouses had been acknowledged in the strongest terms by our greatest rivals, the United States; and since 1836 the debt of the Trinity House had been reduced from 1,250,000*l.* to 97,500*l.* What was the proper mode of providing for the mercantile marine those advantages of control over receipt and expenditure, and accountability to Parliament, which they so much desired? There were objections to consolidating the lights of Scotland and Ireland, as recommended by the committee of 1845, under the Trinity House. On the whole, it appeared to the Government that the best mode of securing effective responsibility in the Trinity House would be through some member of the Executive. The two great objects were parliamentary control and responsibility, and strict limitation of funds to the purposes to which they were appropriated. Having detailed at considerable length the communications which had passed between the Government and the Trinity House, he proceeded to the question of passing tolls. These the late Government had proposed to charge on the Consolidated Fund. He noticed the cases of Ramsgate, Whitby, Sunderland, and Newcastle, and the exorbitant taxation imposed on coals under existing regulations. Government were of opinion that it would not be prudent to impose this additional burden on the Consolidated Fund—an "injured interest" itself, if there were any. A careful inquiry into this subject was the course determined upon. Next he adverted to the Admiralty question—whether it was expedient to continue that restriction which required a British crew to consist of three-fourths British subjects and one-fourth foreigners. The restriction had never before been found so burdensome as at present; and it was not his opinion that the effect of a change would be found at all injurious to the interests of British seamen.

Government, therefore, did not propose to retain this restriction. He hoped the time would come when everybody would believe that to British seamanship as well as ship-building the maxims of free intercourse and competition might be applied. The next question was that of volunteering into the British navy, the importance of which was materially diminished by the concession on which, as he had just announced, Government were resolved. In the interest of the British seaman himself, it was not the intention of Government to abolish the existing practice, regarding it as in some sort a compensation for the services rendered by the royal navy to the mercantile marine. Government intended, however, to provide that in case of the shipowner sustaining pecuniary loss, compensation should be made to him from the Admiralty funds. Then there was salvage, which some persons wished to see entirely abolished. Government considered it only fair that the principle of reward for services rendered in cases of danger at sea should be maintained, but the law giving a peremptory lien on the ship, by which it might be detained in the Admiralty Court, was a distinct grievance. Arrangements were in progress, under the care of the First Lord of the Admiralty, by which the claim of lien might be released, and a bond executed, by which the shipowner would avoid the grievance of detention. On the subject of desertion, clauses were in preparation by which the evils at present complained of by shipowners would be removed. With regard to fees to consuls, they were all regulated by act of Parliament, in conformity with the recommendations of committees of inquiry. On this subject he was in communication with the Foreign Secretary, and he could assure the House that no obstacle would be interposed in any quarter to improvements which might be suggested. With respect to pilotage, the late Government had proposed to refer the subject to a committee, but the experience of committees and commissions on such questions was not very favourable. The grievances in the principal ports were sufficiently well ascertained; as, for instance, the absurd practice in the port of London of having different pilots up and down the river, thus employing two persons to do the work of one. The vested rights of pilots, superannuation funds, &c., would be preserved intact by the Government measure, and the principle of local jurisdiction would be adopted. He considered separately the cases of the three chief estuaries—the Thames, the Mersey, and the Severn—and the points by which the shipping of each would be most nearly affected. On the whole subject a very extensive and careful inquiry was indispensable, and in the marine officers of the Board of Trade and the various bodies of pilots through the kingdom, they possessed a self-acting inquiry, stringent and effective. The bill to be introduced would give to the different local bodies ample powers of self-reform, to reduce charges, to increase exemptions, to give new facilities, the only restriction imposed being to prevent what were intended as means of facilitation from being used in an opposite sense. A mediatorial power, not compulsory in its character, would be exercised by the Queen in Council. Thus a foundation would be laid for concurrence between local and central authorities, bringing the various functions and powers into harmonious combination, and he entertained very little doubt that before a twelvemonth elapsed the beneficial effects of the change would be sensibly felt. Merely to consolidate existing laws would be an ineffective and inadequate course; he invited them to consider, in a liberal spirit, the substantive changes he proposed. The right honourable gentleman concluded by moving for leave to bring in a bill for the improvement of the law of pilotage.

Leave was given to bring in the bill. Generally the statement of the President of the Board of Trade was received with satisfaction.

ESCAPE OF MAZZINI.

Lord MALMESBURY seems determined to acquire an extensive notoriety on all the questions he can. Having read in the papers that Mazzini had been received on board the *Retribution*, he asked, on Monday, whether the report was true? That was a simple thing; but the way he did it was quite peculiar. He made a short speech—a brief essay on the extent to which British hospitality should go—and he did so in the following words:—

"I wish to ask the noble earl at the head of the Government a question with regard to the truth of a report which appears in this day's newspapers, and also in the French journals, as to the fact of M. Mazzini having escaped from Lombardy and repaired to Genoa, where it is said that he was taken on board her Majesty's ship *Retribution*, and conveyed to Malta. I do not wish my reason for asking this question to be misunderstood. My noble friend behind me (the Earl of Derby), when he was at the head of the late Government, and I myself, took the opportunity of declaring, in our places in Parliament, that we should continue, while in office, to maintain as most sacred the right of this country to afford an asylum to political refugees; and I have not at all in the least changed my opinions from that moment to this; and I feel certain that no English Minister, whatever may be his opinions, will either have the will, or, if he have the will, will have the power, to induce Parliament to alter the laws of England in this respect. But assuming the report to which I have referred to be true, considering that the deck of an English man-of-war is the same as British soil, I think that if this agitator has been received on board of her Majesty's ship *Retribution*, when in no personal danger, it has been, to say the least of it, a most ill-judged act of humanity on the part of the captain. I feel certain that in Sardinia, where I am happy to say constitutional government exists, Mazzini, or any other refugee, would be in no danger of his life. He might, and probably would, receive orders to quit the country, because Sardinia, not being in the position of England, can hardly retain a number of refugees, odious to her neighbours, with safety to herself; but sup-

pose that he had gone to Sardinia, fleeing from the vengeance of Austria, he might have used the common conveyances for the public from these ports, and there was no possible obligation for making use of one of her Majesty's ships. Your lordships will see the inconvenience that must arise if her Majesty's ships are to be made mere packets to convey discomfited agitators and conspirators against her Majesty's allies to other ports of destination. Under the peculiar circumstances of this case, and seeing no necessity for receiving these refugees, if they have been received, on board of her Majesty's ship, I therefore wish to ask the noble earl whether the report to which I allude is true?"

Lord ABERDEEN'S reply could not have been a matter of congratulation to the apologist of Louis Napoleon. He said simply:—

"My lords, having recently expressed my sentiments on the subject of the protection afforded to political refugees, I do not deem it to be necessary for me now to enter upon that point. With respect to the question put to me by the noble earl, I am unable to give him any answer, as her Majesty's Government have received no information on the subject."

And there the matter ended.

AN OATH SUCCESSFULLY REFUSED.

During the pending investigation respecting the election for Southampton, which took place in the summer, a witness named Bower gave rise to a novel proceeding, as we learn from the Parliamentary report. On Wednesday,

Mr. H. HERBERT, as chairman of the Southampton Election Committee, reported to the House that on the preceding day a person of the name of Bower was tendered as a witness by the petitioners. On the New Testament being handed to him, he stated that he conscientiously objected to take an oath. He was asked whether he belonged to any sect—Moravian, Quaker, or Separatist? He replied that he was a Separatist, but, on the declaration provided for that sect by the Act of Parliament being read by the clerk, he declined to accept it, stating that what he had meant in saying that he was a Separatist was, that he had separated from all sects. Thereupon, under the authority of the Act, he was committed to the custody of the Sergeant-at-Arms; but the committee, unwilling to deal harshly with the person by reason of any conscientious scruples he might have, gave him until that morning to consider the matter over. Having that morning repeated his refusal to take any oath or declaration, he had been continued in the custody of the Sergeant-at-Arms, and Mr. H. Herbert now moved that Robert Edmund Bower be committed to the custody of the Sergeant-at-Arms, to be by him produced before the committee when required, and that the Speaker do issue his warrant accordingly.

Mr. HUME said that he should not object to the motion, under the pressure of time, but, anxious to make every allowance where scruples of conscience were really concerned, he should take the earliest opportunity of enabling the party to appear at the bar and explain what the grounds of his refusal were.

The motion was then agreed to. Subsequently, Bower was called up, and told that when he would take the oath he should be released. He steadily refused the conditions.

Mr. HERBERT presented a petition from Robert E. Bower, who had been committed to the custody of the sergeant-at-arms by the Southampton Election Committee, for refusing to take either an oath or a legal affirmation. The petitioner stated that he was convinced of the unlawfulness of oaths; while the provisions of the law with respect to the taking of affirmations only referred to two sects, to neither of which did he belong. He prayed that he might now either be set at liberty, or be allowed to take such an affirmation as he considered binding upon his conscience. Mr. Herbert would now move that the petitioner should be forthwith discharged from custody without the payment of fees. The circumstances of the case which he had reported to the House as chairman of the committee were these:—On Tuesday the petitioner, having been called, refused either to take an oath or make an affirmation, and the committee, on discussing the matter, felt that, strictly speaking, they were bound to order him instantly into the custody of the sergeant-at-arms. As, however, they believed that his scruples were *bona fide*, they did not exercise the power which they possessed under the Act of Parliament, until he had repeated his refusal on the following day. He had now petitioned to be liberated, and he hoped that the House would accede to a request which the committee would have made, even had he not petitioned.

Mr. STUART WORTLEY had no intention to oppose the motion; but he begged to call the attention of the Government to the unsatisfactory state of the law on the subject. It would be desirable to give a power to courts of justice, when they were satisfied the objection of a person to take an oath proceeded from conscientious motives, to take the evidence on affirmation.

Mr. BRIGHT begged to remind the House that the motion was, "without payment of fees."

The motion was then agreed to.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Lord ROBERT GROSVENOR beat the Government on Thursday. He moved for leave to bring in his annual bill, to repeal the annual and rather onerous duty levied on Attorneys and Solicitors. The motion was resisted by Mr. GLADSTONE, on the ground that it was the wrong time for proposing the abolition of a tax. The motion, however, was carried, by 219 to 167.

Mr. APSLEY PELLATT made an unsuccessful attempt, the same night, to get a committee to inquire into the subject of oaths. Mr. GLADSTONE again objected. The inquiry into the substitution of declarations for oaths was unnecessary, as it had given universal satisfaction; with respect to extending that substitution to courts of law, there was now a commission sitting on procedure, and that was the proper place for the inquiry; and, as to inquiry with the view to substituting one uniform declaration for the oaths now taken by members of Parliament, that was too important to be handed over to a select committee. There was a general concurrence with Mr. Gladstone, so the motion was withdrawn.

Mr. FITZROY has brought in a bill for the better prevention and punishment of aggravated assaults on women and children. This bill was received with very great satisfaction. Some members, however, and even the mover himself, wished that the penalty of "corporal punishment" had been extended to those gross and ruffianly exhibitions, which are absolutely too common in our police courts to attract that notice they demand.

ELECTION COMMITTEES.

The Parliamentary battue still continues. The committees have made some severe decisions this week; and there seems to be a strong desire to make a clean sweep of the really alarming mass of corruption brought to light.

CHATHAM.—The committee have decided after the strictest investigation:—

"That Sir J. Mark Frederick Smith is not duly elected a burgess to serve in the present Parliament for the borough of Chatham.

"That the last election for the said borough is a void election.

"That it was proved to the committee that Joseph Greathead, an elector at Chatham, had been bribed by a situation as letter-carrier in the General Post-Office, obtained by his son, Charles Greathead, by or through the influence of Sir Frederick Smith.

"That it was proved before the committee that a large number of the electors of the borough of Chatham are employed in her Majesty's dockyard and other public departments, and that they are under the influence of the Government for the time being, and that it appears there is no instance of a candidate being elected for the borough of Chatham who has not had the support of the Government.

"That, under these circumstances, it will be for the house to determine whether the right of returning a member should not in future be withdrawn from the borough of Chatham.

"That it is the opinion of the committee that there are strong grounds for believing that one Stephen Mount, in giving his evidence before the committee, was guilty of wilful and corrupt perjury."

Writ suspended until the 11th of April.

DERBY.—All the well known story of the Derby bribery, minus "W. B.," has been again before the public, on the petition against Mr. Horsfall. Our readers will remember that Mr. Flewker was intrusted with the secrets of the Horsfall, that is the Cox and "W. B." party; that he allowed the bribery machinery to get in motion; allowed Mr. Thomas Morgan to instal himself in the County Tavern, and Mr. Lund to bring him money; and that then he told all to the other side. Here is an account of the arrest of Morgan by Fern, the policeman, who performed that feat:—

On the morning of the election he went to the County Tavern, in consequence of instructions from the last witness. Certain signals were communicated to him. He went up stairs, and at the top met Kallow, who attempted to stop him, but witness put his finger to the side of his nose—(laughter)—upon which Kallow said, "That's all right." Witness also said, "It's all right; Radford sent me." Kallow allowed witness to go into the room, where he found Morgan before a table with a small book and two or three pieces of paper. He took Morgan into custody and searched him. In Morgan's pocket he found one 10*l.*, and six 5*l.* notes of the bank of England, and in his trouser's pockets a bag containing 134*l.* in sovereigns and half sovereigns, and the celebrated "W. B." letter. He also found four cards on Morgan, two of these cards had on them, "Mr. T. Morgan," and the other two, "Mr. T. Morgan, Chester." The pieces of paper he found on the table turned out to be bank notes. (Laughter.) Witness lodged Morgan in the lock-up. Asked his name and where he came from, and he replied it was on his card. Next day Morgan told witness he came from Shrewsbury, and not from Chester. Witness asked him why he put Chester on his card, and Morgan replied because he put expressed a wish to him that he should do so. Morgan also

stated to witness that the night before the election a man had brought him a bag of gold, and in the morning another, and some notes. The man who brought the money was a tallish thin man, dressed in drab clothes. It was nearly dark when he brought him the first money, and he therefore thought he should not know him again, unless he had some conversation with him. Witness knew Thomas Lund, who answered this description. Morgan told witness he paid the money away to persons who brought cheques. He entered the numbers of the cheques in his book, and the sums he paid for each, adding that "if they had not found his book they would have been bothered." Morgan said he did not know that the persons he gave the money to were voters, and that when he was coming from Shrewsbury he thought it was to act as a poll-clerk, and that if he had really known what they wanted him for he would have seen them hanged first. (Laughter.) Morgan also told witness that if he had been in the room two minutes earlier he would have seen a man in a brown coat who had paid away twice as much money as Morgan. Morgan also said Derby was a poor place; that they gave as much money for one vote at Shrewsbury as they gave at Derby for twenty. (Laughter.) The money the Derbyites had given him would not have lasted him two hours at Shrewsbury.

Cross-examined—Did not pump Morgan. Morgan indeed did not require pumping—(laughter)—for he had been imbibing that which was calculated to make him loquacious, i.e. brandy and water. (Laughter.) On their way to the lock-up they had two quarts of ale. The magistrates who took Morgan's statement were of both political parties. Morgan was confused and excited; and, on hearing the noise outside the court, said, "Tell 'em if I get free I'll give them a few barrels of ale." When witness arrested Morgan he fell, apparently stupefied, over the fireplace, and exclaimed, "Lord deliver us." (Laughter.)

The committee desired, but have been frustrated in obtaining evidence as to where the money came from; and Mr. Lund, who wore drab when he took money to Morgan, Mr. Cox, the go-between, who got the note to Frail from "W. B." at the Carlton, could not be found; and Henry Radford, of "horsenail" celebrity is ill in bed.

Mr. Horsfall was examined, and distinctly denies that he knew anything either directly or indirectly, about the illegal practices of his agents. He had remitted 800*l.* to Derby; his expenses were 579*l.*, and he had received the balance. The following is the report of the committee:—

"That Michael Thomas Bass, Esq., was duly elected as a burgess, at the last election, to serve in the present Parliament for the borough of Derby.

"That Thomas Berry Horsfall, Esq., was not duly elected to serve as a burgess in the present Parliament, at the last election for the borough of Derby.

"That Lawrence Heyworth, Esq., was duly elected, and ought to have been returned to serve as a burgess, at the last election for the borough of Derby.

"That the committee have altered the poll of the last election for the borough of Derby, by striking therefrom, as having received bribes at the said election, the names of William Harris, William Morley, Thomas Blake, Robert Walcup, Richard Walcup, Francis Radford, Thomas Taylor, Henry Needham, John Swan, Francis Staley, Charles Cockaigne, Edward Cockaigne, William Oliver, and Henry Sharrock.

"That Thomas Berry Horsfall was, by his agents, guilty of bribery at the last election for the borough of Derby, but it has been proved to the satisfaction of the committee that such bribery was altogether without the concurrence or privity of Mr. Horsfall.

"That William Harris was bribed by 3*l.*, William Morley by 2*l.*, and a supplementary payment of 1*l.* in October subsequently to the election. That Thomas Blake, Robert Walcup, Richard Walcup, Francis Radford, Thomas Taylor, Henry Needham, John Swan, Francis Staley, Charles Cockaigne, Edward Cockaigne, and Henry Sharrock, were bribed by 2*l.* each, and William Oliver by 1*l.*

"That Thomas Morgan seems to have been the person principally engaged in the above-mentioned acts of bribery, and that the funds for the same purpose appear to have been furnished to Morgan through the instrumentality of a person named Thomas Lund.

"That George Clayton, John Ford, and Alfred Akerman, were likewise engaged in those various acts of bribery and corruption.

"That it has been proved, as to several of the other parties, that, at former elections, they had received money for their votes, and the committee have reason to believe that such corrupt practices have been prevalent in the borough of Derby, and they desire to state their opinion that parties once reported to the House as guilty of bribery should be disqualified for the future for the exercise of any Parliamentary franchise.

"That it appears to the committee that the petition of William Pool, so far as regards the return of Michael Thomas Bass, Esq., is frivolous and vexatious."

The committee then separated.

HUDDERSFIELD.—At this borough the bribery took the form of beer and solids. Then there was the peculiar practice of "bottling up" electors. Of the first process take a random specimen.

Mr. Scarlett, brewer, at Huddersfield, admitted that he had sent out nine 36-gallon casks of ale, and three 24-gallon casks on the day of the election, and that an entry of 12*l.* for that ale, from Stansfield's committee, in his books, was in the handwriting of one of his clerks.

Joshua Hallawell deposed to forty gallons of ale coming to him, and to thirty gallons remaining, which he sold. His uncle had long promised his vote for Stansfield. The ale was called "Election ale."

William Radford, of the Fox and Grapes, Huddersfield,

a voter, examined—Had a vote in 1847, and voted for Stansfield. Witness had an account against Mr. Booth, who was a supporter of Stansfield. Received about 8*l.* in 1847, and the balance left was in the shape of ten per cent., which was then taken off. Was canvassed by Willan's party at the last election. Mr. J. Beaumont saw witness about his vote for Stansfield. Perhaps he might have asked Beaumont about his old account and the payment of the discount, but Beaumont did not say he would pay it if witness voted for Stansfield. Beaumont said he would have nothing to do with it. Knew a number of beer-shop-keepers, but never said he would not vote for Stansfield until the old account was paid. Had an account at the last election for breakfasts. It had been paid by Mr. J. Beaumont, and witness put the old "discount" on the new bill, which had been paid altogether. Had not seen Leech.

Cross-examined—Put the "discount" down by charging a little higher for the items. Had promised Stansfield a long time, and could not vote for a man who wanted to divide "Church and State." (Laughter.)

Re-examined—Received the orders for breakfast on the nomination day from John Sykes, for twelve or fifteen people. They came back. The amount of the bill sent in was 10*l.*

Evidence was taken to prove what was termed the "bottling up" of witnesses, and treating them at the George during the evening before, and also on the day of the election, free of expense, by the agents of the sitting member. Two old men, of between seventy and eighty years of age, and who complained that it was "a shame" to bring them all the way from Huddersfield, deposed that they were thus bottled up at the George, and supplied free and freely with beds and brandy-and-water. Other witnesses spoke to having distributed "free gratis" thirty-six gallons of beer on the nomination day, and sixty gallons on the polling day, at the instigation of agents of the sitting member. One of these witnesses said he had not been paid for this, and calculated he was a loser by it, and that it was not done to influence his vote.

HULL.—Here they have a plan of bribery, probably not peculiar to the place, but as yet undescribed before the committee. The main agent in the business describes the thing very well:—

J. Walker, of Manchester, basket-maker, deposed that he knew Wild, who arranged with him to attend to the general duties of the committee-room in Saville-street, to put down the names of voters who came to vote for Clay and Goderich. The persons who came there and had their names so put down, expected to be paid for their time. By that he meant the usual custom, that a man should be paid for his time when he went to vote. That was the way it was understood in Hull. (Laughter.) Was not aware of persons being registered for any other purpose. The list he alluded to was a special list of persons sent from the district committees of workmen who expected to be paid for their time. If a voter came into the room, and his name was put down in the list, witness and the committee would expect him to vote for their party. It was a common expression among the people of Hull, getting their names "set down" in this way. Witness looked after those voters, and employed himself actively in getting them to go to Saville-street. Many voters came with papers from the district committees, on which were the names of persons to be employed six days. About 300 or 400 names were put down in this way altogether, but no money was paid them at the time. Witness took 20 or 30 of these kinds of voters who had their names set down to the poll, and they voted for Clay and Goderich. Could not say he saw Wild pay them any money, but after the election he had seen many people in King-street, who told him they were waiting for their money. Knew they were paid, and saw the money in their hands. It was generally a sovereign and a half. Was present when Wild put his signature to these papers. Witness received 30*l.* from Wild on the day of the election, and witness paid some of the voters money on taking them to the poll. One voter, on being asked how it was he received 30*s.* for only two days instead of six, said, "Oh, it's a common practice in Hull: all parties do it!" In addition to getting their names set down, the voters got glasses of grog; but these were things witness could not speak to more particularly, as they were things he did not remember after they were gone; but it was a usual thing in Hull, when they wanted to make a voter "all right," to give him grog. On the polling day, a dozen voters met at the Queen's Arms, and had their names set down and grog, for which they did not pay; but the bill and the voters were paid afterwards. Did not know by whom, and had rather not answer the question. They were paid. Witness saw them each with a sovereign and a half. Remembered negotiating with the 30 men, who wished their number multiplied by 10, and told them he could not go beyond the "market price." The witness caused some amusement by several times hesitating to answer certain questions, for fear, as he phrased it, of "criminating himself."

Was never called upon by Wild to render any account, but received from Wild altogether between 30*l.* and 40*l.* Witness had received 50*l.* for his evidence before the committee. Did not consider this bribery. (Laughter.) Rollett came to him to get the information he had given in his evidence, and they talked together "about the baseness of the electoral system generally," and this had been a standing opinion of witness for many years. (Laughter.) Prior to the passing of the Reform Bill, a freeman always got 2*l.* for a split vote, and 4*l.* for a plumper; but since that system was abolished, the new voters were the most difficult to manage. They did not know their price. Witness was speaking of the 10*l.* householders in the former case. Now the "market price" had dwindled down to 30*s.* a-head. There was also the custom, on both sides,

of giving refreshment. It was usual to set down a freeman for six days pay. Some did not get paid, and, had it been otherwise, there would not have been the bother of this petition. (Laughter.) Out of between 4000 and 5000 voters polled at the last election, witness would say that 1000 were accessible by this means. The practice had existed less extensively at this election than at former times. Voters were "set down" as messengers, not for employment, but for their votes. There were none of the "open houses" of the old time, but voters were introduced by a member of the committee to the landlord of a tavern, and they were then allowed to order and have what they liked. Witness would say that between 400 and 500 voters were "set down" in this way at Saville-street, the term "setting down" in Hull meaning that they were to have 30s. each for the colourable employment of messenger, but in reality for giving their votes. The members of the district committees sent voters to Saville-street with notes for this purpose, addressed to "X Y Z" alias to Wild, who told the bearer it was "all right;" the voter's name was set down, and he knew he would be paid for his time.

The decision, by consent of the unseated members, is as follows:—

"That James Clay, Esq., and George Frederick Samuel Robinson, commonly called Viscount Goderich, are not duly elected burgesses to serve in this present Parliament for the borough of Kingston-upon-Hull.

The Chairman: I am directed by the committee further to inform the House that the committee have unanimously agreed to the following resolutions:—

"That James Clay and Viscount Goderich were by their agents guilty of bribery and treating at the last election for the said borough.

"That it was not proved to the committee that the acts of bribery and treating were committed with the knowledge and consent of the sitting members.

"That John Walker was actively engaged as an agent in carrying into effect a most extensive system of bribery and treating at the last election.

"That there is reason to believe that corrupt practices have extensively prevailed at the last election for the borough of Hull."

Writ suspended until the 11th of April.

NORWICH.—The special committee which Mr. Duncombe obtained to look into the charge against Brown, the Parliamentary agent, for withdrawing the petitions of Colonel Dickson and others against Peto and Warner, without their consent, assembled on Thursday. An attempt was made to examine Mr. Brown in the first instance, but he lustily protested against it as unparalleled—"unparalleled in the history of England"—to examine a witness before an accusation was made against him. Incidentally, however, he roundly asserted that Mr. Kitton, the local agent, had given him authority to withdraw the petition. The committee then took up with Mr. Kitton. His story was one of interest.

When the Marquis of Douro and Colonel Dickson were thrown out at the last election, meetings were held, a case got up, and the Tories determined to petition against Peto and Warner. Kitton came to town, and went to the Carlton, and there saw "Colonel Forester," as he confessed with much reluctance, about the petition. Colonel Forester recommended Brown; Brown spoke well of the case; sureties were forthcoming; the Tories held another local meeting, and again resolved to go on. Then Kitton came to London. He "saw Brown again, and Captain Ives and Colonel Dickson became sureties, and the objections by Coppock to the recognizances were over-ruled before the examiner. He saw Brown again on the 18th of January, and Brown asked him if he would set off the Norwich petition as against the West Norfolk. Witness said, 'It is quite impossible.' On the Saturday before the petition was withdrawn, Brown again asked witness if he would withdraw the Norwich for the West Norfolk, and witness again declined. This was at Brown's office, in Parliament-street, at about three o'clock, and Brown went over to Coppock's, saying, 'Your petition will not come on before Easter; the matter does not press.' These were Brown's last words on the subject. Witness, seeing the paper on the table, said, 'I will look at it while you are gone to Coppock's,' but did not wait till Brown returned, and left, saying he should be in town on Tuesday. Subsequently, witness was surprised at seeing the withdrawal of the petition announced, and witness wrote thereon to Colonel Dickson, and also to Brown, stating he had no authority from his (witness's) clients for the withdrawal of the petitions, and requesting him immediately to restore them to the lists, and asking for a reply. Witness, however, had received no reply to the letter, but received one from Brown, dated the 14th of February, stating, 'I have withdrawn the Norwich petitions, with those for Middlesex, Kidderminster, and Gloucester. Coppock has withdrawn Youghal, County Down, and West Norfolk.

"Mr. Duncombe.—In that case, then, Coppock had not the advantage.

"Kitton.—No. There were two petitions presented in the case of Norwich; one against Peto and another against Warner. The object of having two petitions instead of a joint petition was, to have the power of withdrawing one if it was desired; so that Lord Douro or Colonel Dickson and Peto might remain, or Lord Douro and Warner. He did not know that it was to facilitate compromise, or to obtain Colonel Dickson a seat in lieu of Warner. Compromise had been talked of, but there was no negotiation. According to the rules of professional etiquette, the petition should not be withdrawn before witness conferred with his clients. If Brown had said to witness, 'Now, Kitton, Warner will retire if you withdraw the petition,' witness would have called his party together. Brown had

no right to do anything without witness's instructions, witness being sole agent. Witness complained to Colonel Forester as to the conduct of Brown, and he coincided in his views, and he seemed to think Brown had acted indiscreetly. Colonel Forester did not tell witness he had given Brown any authority to withdraw the petition. He did not inform the Colonel that Coppock had 'paired' off so many petitions on the other side. The professional charges of the petition were to be paid by a subscription in Norwich, and not by the Carlton. He did not understand the Carlton was to contribute to the expense of the matter in London. He understood that Messrs. Thompson, Debenham, and Brown were, professionally speaking, electioneering agents of the Carlton. Colonel Forester offered 6l. or 8l. for the preliminary investigation at Norwich, which witness declined, saying if the Liberals did not come forward, the petition must drop. He did not know to whom Brown was to look for his expenses. He never considered Colonel Forester had anything to do with the petition, or that he interfered.

"Examined by Colonel Dickson.—Colonel Dickson, seven or eight weeks ago, asked the witness to remove the petition from Brown's hands, because Lord Ranelagh had expressed to Colonel Dickson a very sorry or bad opinion of Brown, saying, 'He'll sell you.' (Laughter.) Colonel Dickson had on many occasions told witness nothing would make him drop the prosecution of the petition, and that he would subscribe towards its expense.

"Mr. Duncombe.—What was the connexion between your remaining in Brown's office and Brown's going to Coppock?

"Kitton.—When Brown came back, he said, 'Coppock's list is nearly exhausted.' He talked about Coppock's 'fighting petitions,' which witness supposed were against Conservative members.

"Mr. Duncombe.—They appeared to be balancing an account current of fighting petitions? (Laughter.)

"Kitton.—Yes.

"Mr. Duncombe.—Did you understand that Coppock's powers of compromise were nearly exhausted?

"Kitton.—That was what he understood. (Laughter.) When he said there were certain lists in Brown and Coppock's hands, he only spoke from *on dit*. He was not acquainted with the arcana of the Reform Club. (Laughter.) It was generally understood that both acted in concert as to these petitions, and that, somehow or other, when Brown withdrew a petition, Coppock withdrew one also. (Laughter.) They were called 'fighting' petitions, he supposed, because when they came into Committees of the House, the parties assumed the attitude of fight. The other petitions had no particular name, but in some cases the sitting member carried too many guns for the petitioner. Some were fictitious, others were 'fighting' petitions, and some were *bona fide*. The Norwich petitions were no speculations."

Colonel Dickson himself was examined yesterday, and proved a dangerous witness for his party. He exposed all his negotiations with Colonel Forester, Forbes Mackenzie, and "W. B.," for a seat; how he was referred to Dover by Colonel Forester, and how thereupon Mr. Forbes Mackenzie said,—"That Colonel Forester had no business to settle the matter without his leave; and that any one would suppose that the borough was his own. (Much laughter.)"

Then he was referred to Abingdon; but that failed; so he went to Norwich.

"With reference to the withdrawal of the petitions, he produced a number of letters, showing Mr. Kitton's and his own anxiety to proceed with them; and he stated that if Mr. Brown had not been so sharp in withdrawing them, it was his intention to have put them in the hands of another Parliamentary agent. He first saw Mr. Brown, after the withdrawal, in the street, with Major Beresford, and he expressed to him the indignation which he felt. Mr. Brown asked him up into his office, as he did not wish to be blackguarded in public. They went into the office accordingly, and he told Mr. Brown that he must take the consequences, upon which Mr. Brown replied, 'Damn the consequences.' Mr. Brown had since boasted in the Carlton Club to Mr. Bagge of having 'withdrawn the Norwich petitions, and upset Dickson.'"

The matter is not yet concluded.

RYE.—The following resolutions were adopted:—

"That W. A. Mackinnon, Esq., is not duly elected a burgess to serve in this present Parliament for the borough of Rye.

"That the last election for the said borough is a void election.

"That W. A. Mackinnon, Esq., was, by his agents, guilty of treating at the last election for the said borough.

"That this committee consider it to be their duty to recommend that further inquiry and investigation shall be made regarding the bribery at the said election, in the manner prescribed by the 5th and 6th Vict., c. 103, sec. 2.

"That the reasons alleged by counsel as to the abandonment of the trial of the said charges of bribery appear to this committee to be sufficient to justify such abandonment; and they therefore have not thought it necessary to examine the sitting member, or the candidate, or their agents, under the power given them by the first section of the said act.

"That it is the opinion of this committee that if it should be the pleasure of the house to act upon the above recommendation of the committee as to a further inquiry, no new writ should issue for the said borough until the result of such inquiry shall have been reported to the house."

BRIDGENORTH.—This borough is not likely to be without candidates for the voices of the electors. Already two have appeared, and others are talked of. The first candidate in the field was Mr. G. W. Hope, but on the appearance of an address from Mr. Prit-

chard, banker of Broseley, who is supposed to have considerable local influence, Mr. Hope withdrew; but others are announced as likely to come forward. Sir R. Pigot, the late member, has issued an address to the electors, in which he says:—

"It is to me a source of the greatest satisfaction, and in some degree will compensate me for the serious expenses incurred in the defence of your interests, that the character of the borough is still unsullied, and that after all the imputations which have been heaped upon you, the falsehoods disseminated, and the libels put forth through the scurrilous columns of the London press, Bridgenorth stands forth in striking contrast with the cases made out against other constituencies; and, though it was true that a new writ has not immediately issued, and that the public mind may require to have in detail that which as yet has only been given partially and imperfectly, there is no doubt whatever that the time is almost at hand when the duty will again devolve on you of electing a burgess to the vacant seat."

Sir Robert Pigot is a man of a sanguine turn of mind, and in his view the press is scurrilous, and Bridgenorth immaculate. But they must wait—the writ is not issued yet!

ASSURANCE SOCIETIES.—Mr. J. WILSON moved the appointment of a select committee to inquire into the subject of assurance associations. After some remarks on the principle of Government interference, and the duty of Government protecting the public against abuse, he adverted to the enormous magnitude of these institutions and the amount of their capital. In Scotland alone the liabilities of fifteen assurance offices had at this time risen to 33,000,000l., and their annual income exceeded 1,500,000l. In Great Britain the accumulated capital of those companies with which it was now proposed to deal amounted to no less than 150,000,000l., and the annual income to 5,000,000l. It was an object of the greatest importance to place them on a more satisfactory footing than they had yet attained. No feature in our social economy was more important than the establishment of those offices, and it was the undoubted duty of Government to place them on such a footing as should give such natural and fair security to the public as would induce the use of them to the greatest possible extent. He regarded those companies rather in the light of a sacred trust for the future than as proofs of wealth in the present, and they might fairly be taken out of the category of commercial institutions. If they interfered with respect to joint-stock companies, they were doubly warranted to do so in the present case; and having already partially interfered, Parliament was bound to see that its interference was effective for the protection of the public. There was reason to apprehend that the two securities already provided by act of Parliament, registration and the annual production of the balance-sheet, had been grossly abused. Mr. Wilson then referred to several gross cases of fraud detailed in the report of the assistant-registrar of joint-stock companies, in which the character of the balance-sheets was essentially deceptive. So many mushroom institutions, without capital, had been established of late years, that it appeared too plainly that there was much swindling carried on under this pretext. Since 1844, 355 assurance associations had been projected, of which only 59 now existed.

The proposition of the Government met with general approval, with the exception of Mr. Hume, who thinks that every man should take care of himself. The motion was adopted.

COUNTY COURTS FOR SCOTLAND.—Mr. CRAUFURD moved for leave to bring in a bill for the more speedy and effectual administration of justice in the Sheriff Courts of Scotland. He thought it necessary to take this step, from finding that the Government measure for the same purpose fell far short of what was required. He proposed to extend the jurisdiction of the sheriff-substitutes to all cases where the value in dispute was under 50l., and even to cases exceeding that amount with consent of the litigants, abolishing appeals except on points of law, and also to make provision for an increase in the salaries of those functionaries.

Mr. JOHN MACGREGOR seconded the motion. The LORD ADVOCATE would not throw any obstacle in the way of introducing the bill, though he did not think the course pursued by Mr. Craufurd the most convenient he might have adopted, or that the measure, as explained by him, had any claims to be considered one of legal reform.

After a few words from Mr. Hume, Mr. Ewart, Mr. F. Mackenzie, Mr. Ferguson, for, and several other members against the motion, leave was given to bring in the bill.

NATIONAL GALLERY.—On the motion of Colonel Mure, Government approving, a Select Committee has been appointed to inquire into the management of the National Gallery; also to consider in what mode the collective monuments of antiquity and fine art possessed by the nation may be most securely preserved, judiciously augmented, and advantageously exhibited to the public.

[This resolution has been avowedly framed to include inquiry into the "picture clearing" at the Gallery.]

INDIA.—There was some discussion in both Houses last night respecting India; but as far as any practical result is concerned, the debates do not enlighten us. Government intend to bring in a bill of a more or less permanent character; but rather strong warnings are given them not to legislate on imperfect information.

LETTERS FROM PARIS.

[FROM OUR OWN CORRESPONDENT.]

LETTER LXIII.

Paris, March 8, 1853.

THE Empress is in an expectant, not to say an "interesting," situation. Scandalous tongues are busy, and

in club and saloon bets are laid as to the when?—retrospectively.*

A suicide has recently afflicted the Bonaparte family. Count Camerata, grandson of the Princess Eliza Bonaparte, sister of the great Napoleon, has blown out his brains with a pistol. He had, I believe, lost 200,000 francs (8000*l.*) on the Bourse, and the consciousness of being utterly unable to meet his engagements drove him to despair. He was only twenty-five, and bore a certain resemblance to the great Emperor. On the evening of the 3rd inst., he ordered his *valet de chambre* to pass the night at his bedside; but at eight o'clock the next morning, when the servant had left his room, he took a pistol, it seems, placed the muzzle to his right temple, and blew out his brains.

The Council of State has concluded the discussion of the Budget. It has suppressed by a vote an institution emanating from the personal initiative of Bonaparte—the Inspectors-General of Police. There is a mystery in the matter which is not yet explained. Persigny, to check the Inspectors of Police, had created Inspectors of the Prefectures. The two institutions had the same object—the surveillance of the Prefects. Only, the former corresponded directly with the Emperor himself, while the latter corresponded with the Minister. The one was an obstacle to, and a drag upon Persigny—the other was entirely dependent upon him, and obedient to his exclusive orders. Now, by an inexplicable resolution, the *Moniteur* declares the former suppressed, and the latter maintained. Is Persigny then, in fact, stronger than Bonaparte? Is he our master, after all?

The *Moniteur* has regaled us, moreover, with a new batch of Senators. Public attention has been keenly excited by the apparition at the head of the list the name of the famous Marquis de Boissy, the ex-peer of France, whose incessant interruptions and unremitting persecutions blanched the hair of poor M. Pasquier, the President of the Chamber of Peers. It is expected that his presence in the Senate will give us a pleasant diversion. His opposition will awake up the palsied echoes of the Luxembourg. Great is Boredom, and it will prevail!

Nothing new in the Corps Legislatif, except the expulsion of M. Bouhier de l'Ecluse. The fortnight's delay accorded to each deputy to take the oaths having expired, M. Billault pronounced the election of M. Bouhier de l'Ecluse to be cancelled, and gave orders that he should be forbidden to enter the Chamber when he next presented himself. An usher and a gendarme were set in ambush behind the door. M. Bouhier de l'Ecluse did try to enter, but the usher and the gendarme popped out from their ambush and barred the passage of the champion of legitimate monarchy.

Apropos of legitimate monarchy, the Legitimists who had accepted public offices since the second of December, and who had thereupon taken the oaths to Bonaparte, now all refuse to take the same oaths to the Emperor. Every day comes a fresh list of resignations.

The *Presse*, the *Assemblée Nationale*, and the *Mode*, received a first "warning" on the same day. (The *Siècle* has since been warned.) M. Emile de Girardin, on the following day, addressed to the *Assemblée Nationale* a sarcastic article, which all Paris enjoyed. The article was written in the mocking style of Voltaire. Every word was a fusée which burst at the feet of the Government. With regard to the foreign correspondents, it seems I was in error in announcing that all had been released. Two Legitimists, M. de Coetlojon and Virmaitre, are still in confinement at Mazas. The *Patrie* says they will have to pay for their accomplices. What say you to this word *accomplices*, applied to people who don't even know each other personally? On the day of the *Mi-carême* (Mid-Lent day), a grand ball was given at the Tuileries, notwithstanding the positive announcement that during the holy season of Lent the Court would renounce the diabolical exercises of the dance. When, upon Ash-Wednesday, Bonaparte announced that determination in the *Moniteur*, he meant to please the clergy; but as the measure was received with bitter displeasure by the tradespeople of Paris,

* Our correspondent here adds the various stories in circulation, making up a perfect *chronique scandaleuse*, with dates and conversations in due order and succession. We forbear to publish these reports, which, indeed, we have no doubt our correspondent "very properly" furnished us à titre de document only, and not for publication. We have elsewhere given our opinion of the real value, in the present state of France, of rumours—an opinion fortified by a letter of Voltaire's, written at a time of political compression and public silence, paralleled too faithfully by the existing regime. But we find no pleasure in spreading scandals against the honour of a woman because she has the misfortune to be the wife of an Emperor—which scandals, after all, soon or late, time will convict of calumny, if not of truth—more unseemly for being true.—Ed. Leader.

Bonaparte, to please them, changed his mind. Now this is a specimen of what the tribe of asses (*les imbéciles*) call clever policy (*de l'habileté politique*). Bonaparte oscillates between the Church and the counter: between the altar and the till. To please the one he must offend the other, and so on, see-saw *ad libitum*.

The ball at the Tuileries was remarkable only for the immense influx of your countrymen. Every Englishman in Paris made a point of being presented by his ambassador to the Emperor and the Empress, in order to have admission to the ball. *Et ainsi en a-t-il été.*

The Secret Societies, if we are to believe the official prints, are forming again. The journals of the Gard state that "the Préfet, the General in command of the Department, and the officers of Justice, escorted by a strong detachment of the 16th Light Dragoons, have deemed it expedient to visit the Cantons of Anduze and of St. Jean du Gard, where certain agitators had been endeavouring, for the last ten days, to put together again the broken links of the Secret Societies, and to propagate false news of an attack upon the life of his Majesty the Emperor. Twelve arrests were effected.

On the other hand, emissaries, pretending to be sent by the chiefs of the Republican party, have this week gone the round of the *ateliers* of Paris, inviting the working-men not to enter into any organization. The pretext assigned was, that "it was useless to descend into the streets, that the Government of Bonaparte was falling daily, that it was better to let it die a natural death, (*mourir de sa belle mort*),—that an *émeute* would only preserve it." These reasons are sound; but to pretend to deduce from them, by way of conclusion, that all organization is unadvisable, that it is better to remain isolated from any common action, at the very moment when the Government trembles to see the threads of the secret societies re-knit; this is evidently to play the game of our enemies; it is precisely the course our enemies are most anxious we should pursue. It is one thing to rush to arms in the streets, and another to wait for the storm to gather, and, meanwhile, to organize vigorously. Such are the safe tactics and the true principles of action; to give any other advice is an act of treachery, or, worse still, an act of imbecility. *Avis aux amateurs.*

This beloved government of ours has yet another subject of anxiety to brood over. I mean, a sermon. Father Lacordaire, of the order of Dominicans (I need not remind you that France abounds in Dominicans, Capucins, and Jesuits, again, now), preached a sermon on the first Sunday in Lent, which was, from beginning to end, a violent philippic against Bonaparte. In the name of outraged liberty he inveighed against despotism and despots. He has since received orders to leave Paris. But Bonaparte has not yet escaped the preacher. Father Lacordaire has had his sermon printed, and it is now passing from hand to hand. The Emperor, it is understood, was much affected by this blow. He had hoped, *le malheureux!* through the clergy, to bring back by slow degrees the population to faith—in himself. But this sermon of Father Lacordaire's has given a rough shake to the fortunes of Bonaparte (*à porté un rude coup de hache dans les œuvres vives du navire qui porte Bonaparte et ses fortunes*).

1. By enlightening the clergy on their duty.
2. By proving to the population, ostensibly, that the clergy itself resists the prevailing despotism. S.

CONTINENTAL NOTES.

THE *Moniteur* of the 9th inst. publishes the nomination of three new senators: General Aupick, Ambassador at Madrid; M. Lebrun, member of the French Academy, ex-Peer of France, ex-director of the National Printing Office, author of the tragedy of "Marie Stuart;" and Baron Theuillien, Deputy to the Corps Legislatif.

Louis Napoleon seems to have a mania for "inspectors general." The same number of the *Moniteur* contains a decree re-organizing the service for the conservation of diocesan edifices, and appointing three "inspectors general" to that service, at a salary of 6000 francs per annum.

Another batch of political convicts was to sail for Cayenne on the 10th inst., unless counter orders reached Toulon. This batch consists of a certain number of persons who were condemned by Courts-martial after the coup-d'état of December, 1851, some to simple transportation, others to transportation to a fortified place. Their punishment had been commuted to 15 years of hard labour either at the bagne of Toulon or at the penitentiary colony of Cayenne, at their choice. They had chosen Cayenne, thinking that they would be there classed in the category of political convicts, but when they had made their choice, they were informed that they would be assimilated to ordinary convicts. These persons wrote immediately to Paris to obtain, if possible, the revocation of their commutation, preferring a condemnation for life to a lighter but more degrading condemnation.

M. de Lavalette, ex-Ambassador to Turkey, has arrived in France.

Lord Stratford de Redcliffe, en route to Vienna and Constantinople, has been received in private audience by the Emperor.

The French Government seems to be groping its way towards a somewhat less restrictive commercial policy.

By a decree in the *Moniteur* of the 8th inst., *crêpes de chine* imported from the possessions of Great Britain in Europe, will no longer be subject to the restrictions established by ordonnance of February 8, 1826.

In the place of the suppressed General and Special Inspectors of Police, a Central Commissary of Police for each department is appointed, with salaries from 2000*fr.* to 5000*fr.* each, and an allowance for travelling expenses, and *frais de bureaux*, of from 1500*fr.* to 2000*fr.* a year. The budget of expenditure will be rather increased than diminished by the suppression of the inspectors, as the total expenses of their substitutes will be little short of half a million of francs per annum, besides special periodical commissions, which the Minister of Police is empowered to issue: an additional expense of about 200,000*fr.* per annum.

A telegraphic despatch from Vienna of the 8th inst., announces that the *status quo* had been re-established in Montenegro, all hostilities suspended, and the political refugees removed to the interior. Kleck and Sutorina are guaranteed to Austria, and the Porte assures the Bosniacs Christians of its protection.

The series of "denegatinos" by the French Government, to which we briefly referred last week, is a curious specimen of *Moniteurism*. The French Government had not addressed a personal note to the Federal Government of Switzerland on the subject of the refugees, but had given cordial advice. The Emperor had not with his own hands transmitted telegraphic congratulations to the Emperor of Austria, on his escape from assassination; but had sent an autographic letter to be presented through his ambassador at Vienna. The Emperor had not joined in any note to the English Government on the subject of the refugees, but relied on the English Government discharging all the duties of "good neighbourhood."

The French Government had not offered its mediation to Turkey in the Austrian difficulty: the fact being that the mediation was solicited, not offered.

Such are the denials of the *Moniteur*, by which we may gauge the value of its assertions.

Marshal St. Arnaud is said to be ill, and going to Hyères for his health. It is more than probable that he will not resume his office. He has long been in the way.

The words used by Father Lacordaire in the sermon which has procured him the honours of exile were as follows. His theme was the nobleness of a truthful character which disdained to win a temporary success by criminal means. In fact, it was a protest against the old Jesuit doctrine of "Do evil that good may come." He exclaimed—

"However magnificent the design, however grand the execution, even if the object be to effect what is called the saving of a nation, he who to effect this object makes use of villainous means, is himself nothing but a villain."

The Marquis de Moustier is named Envoy-Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary of France in Prussia.

By an Imperial decree a General Exhibition of the manufacturing and agricultural products of France is announced to be opened in Paris on the 1st of May, 1855.

The Spanish Cortes were opened on the 1st by a simple decree. The Government finds itself in presence of a vigorous opposition, especially in the Senate. In constituting the Board of the Senate, the four secretaries elected were all candidates of the opposition. The Second Chamber is more conciliatory, not to say subservient. M. Martinez de la Rosa, a sort of liberal Conservative, was elected President, being supported by the Government and by the moderate opposition. The Senate have appointed a committee, in spite of the Government, to consider the condition of the Press, as represented in the petitions of the principal journals; and have also named a committee to examine the protest of Marshal Narvaez, who had addressed to the Senate a violent denunciation of the arbitrary and illegal measures of the Government. There have been debates of great violence upon the conduct of the Ministry, who do not seem to put a good face upon their own unconstitutional proceedings. Altogether the situation is becoming very strained, and it becomes a question how long parliamentary government will be borne with in the present temper of the authorities at Madrid. The press is not allowed to publish any reports of the proceedings in the Chambers beyond the summary contained in the *Gazette*. This is wholly unconstitutional, and borrowed directly from the institutions of Louis Napoleon.

The trial of Gervinus, says the *Athenaeum*—the arraignment of nature, providence, and history—has taken place at Mannheim. Before appearing in the courts, the learned Professor applied to the Law Faculty of Göttingen for their opinion on the validity of the prosecution, and the Faculty transmitted a collective answer to Heidelberg in which they say that the charge against him founded on his book is absurd. The public prosecutor, however, would not think so—and the question has been regularly argued. The sitting was remarkable chiefly for the few words spoken by Gervinus himself—who showed very clearly that the indictment was neither "pious nor wise" in its spirit, nor possible in its effect. Propositions, phrases, declamation, said the Professor, were uniformly avoided in his book, and to facts alone was weight allowed. If the conclusion of a scientific process thus conducted were favourable to self-government—that was to say, to the participation of many rather than of few in the work of government—that was not of his doing, but should be laid to the account of that Providence which watched over the course and development of the human race. He allowed that the Courts might for a time silence the historian—but they could not, he said, silence History, and nature was proclaiming aloud the great facts of the age. He showed that his doctrine was no new doctrine; it was the doctrine of Aristotle, of Machiavelli, of Hegel, and of other thinkers. It was puerile, he urged, to dream of changing by a verdict at law the human conception of history. "The voice of history," he said, "is as sure to speak as the course of history is to run." That they could shut him up in a dungeon for four months he allowed—but on the fifth, he

told them plainly, he would be at work again. At most they could but drive him into exile—they could not hinder the fruition of a life. With noble simplicity and lofty scorn, the Professor then concluded:—"I have ventured to take up Aristotle's idea, and have found it confirmed by the experience of 2000 years—and I find further that the series of events which will give the complete confirmation to this law is not yet accomplished. I am like an astronomer who from the known section of the paths of a new planet—presumes to calculate its entire course. I turn to the sage and skilful of my own profession, and ask them for criticism and correction. I cast a glance towards posterity, and trust that when the series of events shall be complete it will judge my judgment. And now comes a lawyer, brief in hand, and thinks he has discovered a pamphleteer trying to make a revolution in the Grand Duchy of Baden, or perhaps in the German Bund. I hope I may be excused from defending myself against this charge." Professor Grövinus has been acquitted on the charge of high treason, but convicted of seditious libel, and sentenced to four months imprisonment.

The Emperor of Austria is now convalescent; he has been able to receive municipal deputations.

The *Vienna Journal* of the 5th, publishes the following characteristic letter, written by Archduke Rainer, of Austria, to Archduke Albrecht, the Governor of Hungary, informing him of the attack upon the Emperor's life:—

"Feb. 20, 1853.

"My dear Albert,—I write you a few lines in a great hurry on events here. I was sitting at my table reading on the 18th, about half-past twelve in the day, when my *chasseur* rushed into the room, and exclaimed, 'His Majesty is coming upstairs bleeding; he must have had a fall.' I told him to get linen and cold water, and rushed out just as his Majesty entered the ante-room. He said to me, 'They have been trying their Milan tricks on me now.' I was almost petrified when he showed me his handkerchief soaked with blood, which he had been holding to the back of his head. O'Donnell and I washed the wound with cold water. I left O'Donnell, and ordered out the carriage to fetch the nearest surgeon. The wound is on the back of the head, about an inch in length; it was gaping and bleeding copiously. There was a stream of blood down the shirt as far as the waist, and spots of blood all over his dress. Both his and O'Donnell's handkerchiefs were soaked with blood. As soon as all was in order I hastened to the palace, met Seeburger on the way, and informed Grunne of what had occurred. The latter turned deadly pale, and could scarcely speak. On my return I met Charles (Archduke), in the Augustiner passage, on his way from the Emperor to Sophie. We then placed his Majesty in a carriage, and drove him to the Bellaria. His Majesty told me, while I was applying the cold water, that he had received a blow on the head like the shot of a pistol; that it made his eyes flash, and that when he looked round he saw O'Donnell struggling with a man on the ground. O'Donnell told me that they had not walked ten or twelve steps on the bastion before he saw a fellow spring upon his Majesty, flourishing a knife; that he immediately seized him and pulled him down. His Majesty said to me, 'O'Donnell has saved my life.' He had half strangled the man when people came up to render assistance. They would have put him to death, but his Majesty ordered him to be taken to the guard-house. Everything was in commotion, everybody in despair. The lines were immediately closed, the railway stations occupied, the troops consigned to their barracks, and two batteries telegraphed for. At the *Te Deum*, an immense crowd and rejoicing. Every one showed the warmest sympathy. I trust all will be as well at Ofen. At Milan two of Kossuth's emissaries have been arrested, each provided with 30,000f. They were trying to enter the town the day after the row. His Majesty is getting on well; the wound is closed. To-day his headache has subsided, or is only felt when he coughs; but there are symptoms of a slight concussion of the brain. His Majesty seems quite well with his right eye, but the left is still dull. To prevent inflammation ice is placed continually on his head. The physicians think this will provide against it and prevent all danger. They have been quite satisfied hitherto, but his Majesty will have to remain eight or ten days perfectly quiet in bed, without occupation or much talking. Albert of Saxony arrived here yesterday evening. Ernst was here yesterday for a few hours. Leopold comes on the 23rd.—Yours,

"ARCHDUKE RAINER."

The attempt on the life of the Emperor of Austria appears to have produced a perfect panic among the despotic governments throughout Italy and Germany. At Lindau, in Bavaria, the door of every officer's house was lately marked in the night with a red cross. The King had been sent for from Italy. At Nuremberg and Bamberg strong measures of precaution have been taken. In Hungary great agitation prevails. Five hundred arrests were made on the 1st instant. On the 4th, four executions took place. One had been the tutor to Kossuth's children; another, an officer formerly in the Imperial service; the third a landed proprietor and lawyer; the fourth, a private soldier on leave of absence from his regiment. It is certain that a conspiracy had been formed to seize the fortress of Comorn, and it was very nearly being successful, but for the treachery of one engaged in the plot, which included many of station and wealth.

The Federal Council of Switzerland has addressed a note to the Austrian Government, declaring the accusations of complicity with the Italian revolt to be perfectly groundless, and reserving to itself the right to adopt all measures which may appear necessary in the interest of Switzerland in general, and of Ticino in particular.

About ten thousand Ticinese have been expelled from Milan.

Arrests and executions follow each other in dismal succession throughout Italy. At Milan, on the 1st instant, Radetzky decreed, by order of the Emperor, a sequestration of all the landed and personal property belonging to

political refugees from the Lombardo Venetian kingdom. The execution of the decree had begun by a commission held in the Borromeo palace. We hear of a citizen being dragged from his bed in the dead of night, to appear before the commission and declare his property. As this iniquitous decree affects about 30,000 refugees in Piedmont, besides those in France, it is likely to lead to serious international complications. Piedmont is said to have applied to England for advice, and some of the refugees in France have laid their claims before the French Government. The sequestration of property is to the amount of three millions sterling. Thousands (says the correspondent of the *Morning Chronicle*) are reduced to beggary; noblemen who, the day before, were in flourishing circumstances, are now beggars; and thousands who in a great measure were sustained by the hospitality and generosity of their wealthy countrymen, are now without bread to put in their mouths.

The King of Naples had, it seems, initiated this wise method of government, and had confiscated the property of political refugees.

The *Corriere Mercantile* of the 3rd publishes the following letter, addressed to the *Italia e Popolo* by the noble-hearted brother triumvir of Mazzini:—

"Feb. 27th, 1853.

"I only read to-day in your journal the letter by which Joseph Mazzini recognises and courageously assumes the responsibility of the last proclamation of the National Committee, which I signed. The misfortunes which followed that act have not in the least changed my judgment or my conscientious opinion. It is for that reason I hasten to declare that I fully concur in it, regretting only that distance should have prevented me from accomplishing sooner that duty. I remained near my friend until the close of last month, and having acquired undeniable proofs of the magnanimous wishes of the people of Milan, I parted with Mazzini on the day appointed for action, in order to go and announce that determination to other Italian provinces, ready to co-operate in the rising. I witnessed the preparations for the enterprise, but am not aware of the immediate causes of its failure. Whatever those causes may have been, I am more convinced than ever, by the grandeur of the popular acts, which have not been tarnished by want of success, that the faith which dictated to Joseph Mazzini his appeal to the Italians was not a snare, and that, if the enterprise failed, it was not because the advice was imprudent, or the people deficient in courage or goodwill. The statement which my friend will, I trust, soon publish, for the sake of truth, to satisfy the conscience and furnish correct materials for the history of the nation, will show that while men of the higher ranks of society remained indifferent or hopeless, the people of Milan, abandoned without direction to their own instinct, confided in the destinies of the country, and unanimously resolved to avenge themselves for the despotism of Austrian proconsuls and the judicial assassinations of the military commissaries; that the part we took in the movement, which was secretly prepared in brotherly popular associations, did not precede, but followed the firm determination of the oppressed, and that it was imposed upon us by a sacred duty as Italians, in the conviction of the indomitable courage of a people who, whatever might be our opinion, had sworn to restore Italy by a supreme effort to a station to which she has a right to pretend. The central provinces of Italy shared those dispositions of the Lombards, whom they were ready to imitate. I traversed them under the protection of their inhabitants; I found them all animated with the same sentiments; and, if the event of the capital of Lombardy had succeeded, every one of them, notwithstanding the want of arms, would have responded to the appeal. In those countries, where grief and generosity, and an immense love for their afflicted country, incite all classes of citizens to submit to the greatest sacrifices, the unsuccessful heroism of the inhabitants of Milan has not been profaned by servile reproaches; it met there nothing but the gratitude and profound veneration of the free men, who despise servitude, and he who placed faith in that heroism, who called on all the Italians to imitate it, was not cursed. Cowardly insults offered to the vanquished, imprudent calumnies, judgments wilfully calumnious respecting the intentions and magnanimous acts of unsuccessful patriots, and the shameful contempt shown to those who employ their faculties, and are ready to shed their blood, in freeing their country, are turpitudes unknown to the people, who leave them as a worthy appanage to the slaves of kings. But, tell the salaried writers of the monarchical journals, that filth becomes their hands better, and that we will not degrade ourselves by stirring it, in order to seek favours, which are the recompense of services rendered to Austria. Our cause depends on the conscience and virtue of the people, who know that the liberty and independence of Italy can never be won by diplomatic falsehoods, or with the consent of national and foreign Sovereigns, but by perseverance in the contest, and readiness to submit to the greatest sacrifices.

"Ever yours, "AURELIO SAFFI."

On the 3rd, three executions were to have taken place at Mantua. The following are the names of the persons sentenced. They had been in prison for a considerable time, and were arrested on the accusation of being connected with a subversive conspiracy:—Count Speri, of Brescia, a very young man; Count Montanara, of Verona; the Archpriest Mitroto, of Rovere, seventy years of age. Some twenty others are condemned to imprisonment, with irons, for terms varying from ten to twenty years. Upwards of a hundred persons are still in prison and under trial at Mantua.

While England is preaching a one-sided non-intervention, that allows every other Power to intervene, Austria is throwing a commercial net over Italy, through the accession of Parma and Modena to Austrian leagues.

The Grand Duke of Parma, by decree, declares that every individual conspiring against the safety of any foreign State, shall be punished with five years at the galleys.

The latest intelligence from Ticino reports that the measures adopted by the Austrian Government against the

Ticinese, are becoming daily more severe. The frontier cordon has been reinforced with artillery, and patrolled with strong detachments of troops. An insurrection in Baden was apprehended.

The *Languedoc* steamer, which arrived at Genoa from Naples on the 7th, reported that an attempt had been made on the life of King Bomba. A gun had been fired at the King, who was so seriously wounded in the leg that the surgeons had thought it necessary to amputate the limb.

This rumour requires confirmation. A correspondent, however, writing from Marceilles on the 8th, states that Naples letters report several separate collisions between the people and soldiers of the Swiss regiments in the Neapolitan service. Many Swiss, it is said, have been killed. The police have made numerous arrests.

Where will Austrian insolence stop? A British officer has now been expelled from Tuscany. A letter, dated Florence, 2nd, in the *Parlamento*, states that Mr. George Craufurd, brother of a member of the British Parliament, and an officer in the service of Queen Victoria, arrived there a few days ago from the Ionian Islands, where his regiment is in garrison. No sooner had he arrived than the police ordered him forthwith to quit the country. He inquired what was the motive of that arbitrary injunction, said that he should not depart, and applied to the representative of England, who demanded the revocation of the order, and asked the cause of that odiously exceptional measure. The Minister of Foreign Affairs replied that the Tuscan Government had been informed by its consul at Corfu that Mr. Craufurd was repairing to Florence for the purpose of organizing in Tuscany a committee of revolutionary propaganda. Mr. Craufurd protested that this was an infamous calumny; but neither his declarations, nor the interference of the English representative, could obtain for him an hour's delay.

M. Lamartine is very seriously, if not dangerously ill, from his old complaint—acute rheumatism of the joints.

Prince Menschikoff has quickly followed up Count Leiningen at Constantinople. The latter, by the way, has returned to Vienna, and is being fêted and exalted for his bravery in bullying the poor Sultan, deserted by his allies. The Russian envoy is to settle the question of the custody of the Holy places. The Porte has referred to the mediation of Russia.

Russian intrigues are more busy than ever in the principality of Servia. Four secret agents were recently arrested. They were engaged in stirring up a feeling on behalf of Montenegro.

Among the demands of Austria with which the Porte has complied, is one *à la Pacifico*, in the shape of an indemnification of 4,000,000 piastres, which Turkey has engaged to pay to a Herr Schönfeld, who had purchased large woods in the Herzegovine belonging to Ali Pasha.

Turkey is already, financially speaking, in a state of rapid dissolution. The principal bankers resolutely refuse to have anything to do with the society formed for the liquidation of the claims on the Turkish bank. The deficit left by Nafiz Pasha in the public treasury is said to be 30,000,000 piastres, but the order for his arrest has not yet been executed.

Ibrahim Pasha, in bygone times Master of the Ordnance, who rendered such good service to Sultan Mahmoud against the Janissaries, is dead. The countenance of Ibrahim was so stern and frightful, that he bore the name of "Karadzschem" (Black Hell) in Constantinople.

A French Consulate is established at Broussa, the residence of Abd-el-Kader.

We can state most positively, from the best authority, that it is untrue that Mazzini embarked, or sought to embark, on board H.M.S. *Retribution*, at Genoa.

It is untrue that a letter of Mazzini's has been seized by the Austrians, dated Turin.

It is untrue that Mazzini has recently passed through Paris.

Mazzini has neither stayed at Turin, nor at Genoa, nor at Paris since he left England.

A great deal of ungenerous nonsense is talked in quiet England among fireside-friends of liberty, about the folly and the cowardice of those who, from a distance, excite their countrymen to insurrection, remaining safe themselves. How shall this be said of Mazzini, who, without even a disguise, confronts the scrutiny of legions of spies; or of Aurelio Saffi, his brother in the Triumvirate, who, at the peril of his life, has bravely traversed the whole of *Central Italy* to convey the orders of Mazzini, and to arrest the hopeless flow of patriot blood?

PROGRESS OF THE ITALIAN QUESTION.

THE MILAN INSURRECTION.

WE reproduce from the *Monthly Record* (for March) of the Society of the Friends of Italy, the following clear, forcible, and succinct summary of recent events in the north of Italy, and of their proximate, as well as their more remote, but not less certain consequences. It is by these calm and complete condensations of facts, that the Society best discharges its duty to the great cause it advocates: a duty becoming daily more onerous, more painful, and more responsible. Having better information, as from official sources, at its command, than any isolated correspondence can afford, and having the opportunity of effecting close inquiries into the truth or falsehood of a multitude of discordant rumours industriously propagated by a host of misinformed or malevolent pens, the Society is enabled to dismiss with a quiet truthfulness, the thousand calumnies not only of the Austrian, but of the Austrianized journals.

"It was on the forenoon of the 9th of last month, that the news reached London by telegraphic despatch, that an insurrection had broken out in Milan on the 6th, when a body of citizens, armed with poniards, had attacked the Austrian soldiers and police in some quarters of the town, and particularly in or near the citadel. Many deaths were said to have occurred; and it was stated that the fighting was still going on, that a proclamation of Mazzini was posted up on the walls of Milan, and that all communication with the town was stopped. On the following day the *Daily News* published the proclamation of Mazzini, with another document purporting to be a proclamation of Kossuth to the Hungarian soldiers in the Austrian service in Italy, calling on them to join the insurrection. Forthwith, of course, all our political quidnuncs had their comments to make. With many, of course, the feeling was one of most friendly anxiety, wavering between hope and fear. With others, of course, the feeling was one of sheer aversion and alarm. Others there were, however, liberal men enough, who carried their English notions over to the scene of action, and set about measuring what was going on there with their small pair of English compasses:—'Why make a revolution—just now at least? Why not wait and select a right time? Why not wait to see what France will do? Mere nonsense to expect to do anything for liberty in Europe till France stirs! And then, above all, to begin such a revolution with poniards—poniards against cannon; a few hot-headed zealots against such an army as that which Austria possesses in Lombardy. We do not like that style of action, and proclamation of 'war to the knife.' We fear the attempt is premature, and that the consequence of such imprudence will only be to postpone indefinitely the time of successful action. Why cannot Italians act like Englishmen, who wait, resist passively, and only act when they can act broadside; or why, at least, do they not follow the admirable example of one of their own sections, the Piedmontese, who are going on so well, with tolerable liberty, in a career of moderate and progressive reform?"

"To persons knowing anything of Italy, or even considering attentively the insurrection itself and the circumstances attending it, all this preaching was most weary, stale, flat, and unprofitable.

"In the first place, they knew what had been going on in Lombardy, and how necessarily it had led to this insurrection. Let our readers refer back to past *Records*, where accounts are given of the recent arrests in the Lombard cities and in Venice, to the number of several hundreds of men in all classes of society; of the sufferings of these men and their families; and of the subsequent execution of a selected number of them by public strangulation at Mantua, after the whippings and other tortures, mental and physical, of Austrian dungeons. Let them realize these accounts; let them look at the blood there told of till their eyes see all things coloured red; and then, with eyes thus qualified, let them gaze at a map of Northern Italy, seeing the fertile Lombard plains, and these plains studded with their noble cities—Milan, Mantua, Padua, Verona, and others. Let them, then, think whether insurrection in Lombardy was a thing that could be arranged calmly and deliberately, like the day and hour for a dinner party. The population of England is more than twice as large as that of Lombardy; but if, in the course of one or two months, three hundred victims were selected from among the families of England for alleged political crimes, these victims tortured in prison, and some of them publicly strangled, would it be so very wonderful or so very reprehensible, if in some English town an insurrection were to break out, on the impulse of men goaded beyond endurance, and incapable of postponing action till they had first calculated the 'situation' of Europe, and the views of Louis Napoleon and his wife. Nor is this an imaginary view of the case as regards the Italian insurrection. It is a known fact, that in Lombardy men's minds were goaded to that pitch that insurrection was called for, was threatened, was almost decided on. It was in these circumstances that Mazzini, invoked by those who regarded him as their chief—Mazzini, who in previous times had prevented immature insurrection, who had dissuaded the brothers Bandiera from the scheme which cost them their lives, who had advised and enjoined patience on reluctant men—left his safe refuge in England, and hastened, as in duty bound, to such a proximity to the scene of action as might enable him to see and judge for himself, to arrange insurrection if insurrection were determined on, and to place himself at the head of it. The result is known. Mazzini had left England early in January, and, on the 6th of February, his proclamation was posted on the walls of Milan.

"But, in the second place, this insurrection, so far as appears, was not a mere hasty ill-concocted explosion of irremediable despair; it was a deeply-planned inauguration of what was intended to be a national Italian movement. The leaders of it are not to be blamed as thoughtless and hot-headed men. True, the particulars of their scheme are hid under the result which befel the beginning of it; but enough is known to indicate that the scheme was matured with a determinate regard—erroneous, it may be, but still determinate—to considerations of political probability, and even of military likelihood and strategy. The notion clearly was, that there should be a simultaneous or nearly simultaneous rising against the Austrians in all parts of Italy. It is thus and thus alone that a great army, such as that which Austria holds in Italy, can be paralysed and overcome. But even this was not the sole ground of expectation. It seems clearly to have been a second feature of the scheme, that it was to afford an opportunity for the practical exemplification of what has hitherto been only a theory, but a theory pregnant with great effects upon the condition of Europe—the theory of the alliance between Italy and Hungary. It is now many months since intellects of no mean sagacity saw in this theory at once a substitute and a death-blow for the old idea, that everything in Europe depends on the French initiative. Only the other day, too, this notion was familiarised to the English mind by the spectacle of Mazzini and Kossuth

standing together, hand in hand, on the same platform—Italy, as it were, pledging Hungary, and Hungary Italy, in the presence of a British audience. 'The time will come,' Kossuth said on that occasion, 'when, as thus you see me take the hand of my friend and brother Mazzini, so you will see Hungary and Italy, not only standing up, but also marching on together against the common enemy.' There is no doubt, therefore, that it was part of the scheme of the contemplated insurrection, that the Hungarian soldiers in Italy should fraternize with the Italian patriots. This accomplished, the alliance between Italy and Hungary would have been no longer a theory, but a fact; and Italy owing her freedom to her own exertions, with the assistance of another people oppressed by the same enemy, would have practically given the lie to the ruinous crotchet that her salvation must come by a side-wind from French policy and Napoleonic intrigue. Hence the significance of the alleged proclamation from Kossuth in circulation in Italy. Kossuth has since disowned the document; but of the truth of the main fact which the document alleged to Europe—namely, that in any struggle which the Italian leaders might resolve upon, Italy might depend on the co-operation of the Hungarian troops, so far as they were at the bidding of the chief Hungarian leader—there is abundant evidence in Kossuth's own declaration, accompanying the disavowal of the document, that had the struggle continued, he would have set out to be in the midst of it. A scheme, founded on such an agreement to combine the strength of Hungary with that of Italy, was no mere project of impatient folly.

"The only thing that remains, therefore, to afford the slightest ground for a charge of imprudence over and above the imprudence which must attach to every act where men dare a great risk in the face of an incalculable future, is the manner of *beginning* the movement. But let the real state of the case be considered. It was necessary that there *should be* a beginning; that this beginning should be in one spot; and that what was intended to become a *conflagration* should at first be a mere *spark*. Milan, judiciously enough for all reasons, was the spot selected. The Milanese had driven out the Austrians before, and were ready to try to do so again; and twenty-four hours of insurrection in Milan would rouse all Lombardy, and even bring Piedmontese strength into Lombardy. And to begin this beginning, to set a-going insurrection within Milan itself, what other plan was possible than that a certain number of men should meet at a given point, armed with poniards? Could they have gone into the streets with muskets even if they had them? Poniards and nothing but poniards, could begin such an affray; let the poniards but have opened the way, and sticklers for revolution on a great scale, would have seen the sequel taken up by their favourite agencies of muskets, barricades, and cannon.

"In short, the only real allegation against the plan is that it failed. The very nature of the plan, the very fact that there *was* a plan, is hidden beneath the circumstance of failure. Now failure was possible in any case, and even failure at the beginning; but there is reason, from the accounts received, to believe that the failure arose from a departure from the strict order of the plan as it had been laid down. Treachery or indiscreet babbling had forewarned the Austrians; this was known, and the word was given by the patriotic leaders to refrain. It was too late, however; the boldest and least patient, feeling themselves compromised, would not wait; and the insurrection was begun. It was crushed. They fell, these martyrs to liberty—men to be remembered hereafter, though we Englishmen may never know their names. Milan saw them fall, but held back, saying, 'so many deaths the more to-day; the recompense will come to-morrow.' And yet, 'who that can mentally analyse such an occurrence, will venture to say how near such a failure may have been to a glorious success.

"The consequences of the Milan insurrection are various. (1.) For Milan itself the consequence has been tyranny and suffering increased tenfold. Such of the known victims as did not perish in the streets have been hanged or shot, or are reserved for that fate. For other victims the Austrians are in search—their police tracking them through houses and hiding-places, while every gate of the city is kept shut and guarded to prevent escape. Coffins leaving the city, we are told, have been opened, lest they should contain Mazzini. A vain search! Meanwhile vengeance falls heavily upon devoted Milan. The governor Strassoldo at first thanked the Milanese for giving no countenance to the revolt; Radetzky, knowing better, or more candid, punishes the whole city, as morally implicated, by a tremendous fine. (2.) What are the consequences for the general Italian cause in Italy it is difficult yet to say. As a general rule, crushed attempts discourage men and postpone final success; but it is not always so. It is quite possible that the spirit which burst forth in this Milan insurrection may swell and grow underneath the surface, all the more rapidly that it has once again tasted escape into the upper air. We are already beginning to hear that it is so. (3.) At all events, the effect upon the opinion of Europe has been immense. More than anything that has happened for a long time, the Milan insurrection has impressed upon men and statesmen of all nations the fact of the *instability* of the present state of things in continental Europe. 'The entire surface of Europe, from Spain to Italy, from Greece to Poland, is a volcanic crust.' So said Mazzini in his proclamation; and men now believe it. Austria is agitated—there are rumours of commotions in her eastern provinces; Prussia manifests unusual alarm—the spirit of German revolution seems once more to stir. On what a little thing does the boasted order of absolutism depend!

"Among the consequences of the Milan insurrection may be reckoned the demand addressed to our Government by the united powers of Austria, Prussia, and France, for the extradition or expulsion of the political refugees—particularly Kossuth and Mazzini. If, as Lord Palmerston has stated in the House of Commons, this demand has not been formally made, it has at least been announced to our

Government in such a way as to call for a flat refusal; which flat refusal it has received. This intelligence, when spread through the length and breadth of the land, will rouse the best heart of the nation. Even the *Times* has declared that sooner than yield to such a demand, England 'will shed the last drop of her blood;' and if this is from the *Times*, what from the people of England? One thing, however, must be borne in mind. Supposing that the foreign powers desist from their absurd and insolent demand, there is still a course, by our present law, open to them. They may demand a prosecution of the refugees in our law courts, as Napoleon demanded the prosecution of Peltier. In that case, it will be for them to adduce proofs of conduct of the refugees in England contrary to the laws of England; and it will be for a British jury to pronounce the most important verdict of the present century."

PETITIONS ON BEHALF OF ITALY.

Austrianized articles in leading journals to the contrary notwithstanding, the recent movement in Milan has disconcerted absolutist thrones, and moved as only a patriotic fact can move, the sympathies of England. Mazzini invests conspiracy with a nobility hitherto unknown in Europe. His dauntless chivalry, his manly acceptance of the responsibility of the late frustrated Milanese initiative, have renewed the public admiration which his triumvirate inspired, of the rare union of the man of thought with the man of action. Illustrious among leaders, the sympathy of England has been awakened by his Roman sorrow for his suffering nation, in which, as he truly and justly says, in his letter to the *Italia E Popolo*, no "remorse" does or can mingle. Nor have publicists been less instructed by the genial letter of Kossuth, in which the Magyar leader justifies his own explanation, and maintains his public and private friendship for his eminent Italian brother patriot. As tyranny grows more and more harsh, suicidal, and insane, patriotism shines out more glowing than it has hitherto been beheld.

No local proof of this is more eloquent than that furnished by the progress of the Society of the Friends of Italy. New members are being added daily, accessions of funds are made, demands for petitions from all parts of the country are received. England, thus moved to action, is the best indication, beyond all newspaper sympathy, that the appreciation of earnest and courageous patriotism has not altogether died out amongst us.

The Honorary Secretaries of the Society of the Friends of Italy state to all friends who have petitions against the hostile occupation of the Roman States in course of signature, in their hands, that Mr. T. S. Duncombe, M.P., intends to bring forward his motion *immediately* after the Easter recess—that is to say, probably in the second week in April; but that he purposes to present, if possible, *all* the petitions, at one and the same time, before the House rises—that is to say, as nearly as may be, by the middle of the present month. Therefore all petitions now out should be forwarded to the Society in the course of the next ten days. With a little extra exertion this will be easily accomplished in almost every case; if, in any instance, it should prove impossible, the later date, the second week in April, must be considered as the last available moment.

The Committee urge all members who have not as yet undertaken the management of a petition, to procure and endeavour to return at least one, however moderate may be the number of signatures attainable in so short a time, before the motion of Mr. Duncombe is brought before the House. One week's devotion of the spare hours of each day to this practical work, will be the best testimony of a real interest in the cause, just now in the power of the Friends of Italy to render; and will be no more than is absolutely due to those liberal members of the House of Commons, who, with Mr. Duncombe, are prepared to submit deliberately to the votes of our Representative Assembly, the case so harshly aggravated of late, of the Roman people against the despotic governments of Austria and France.

Petitions, ready for signature, will be forwarded, on application, by return of post, to any person desiring them, from the Society of the Friends of Italy, 10, Southampton-street, Strand.

Need we ask the attention of our readers to this request?

THE WELLINGTON MONUMENT IN SOMERSETSHIRE.

We briefly reported a large and influential meeting of the county gentlemen of Somerset, under the presidency of the High Sheriff, held at Taunton on the 18th of last January, relative to the restoration of the Wellington Monument, which stands on a very exposed but picturesque and appropriate site on one of the outposts of the Blackdown Hills, immediately overlooking the town of Wellington, from which the Duke took his title.

It appears that this pillar, erected on that part of the Blackdown Hills which forms a part of the estate purchased by Parliament for the Duke, has fallen into a condition of decay not very creditable to the public spirit of the county. It cannot be from lapse of years; it must be from the imperfection of the original design, or perhaps the niggardliness of the execution. We have been favoured with a copy of a letter, addressed to Lord Portman by Mr. Arthur Kinglake, whose name and family are identified with Taunton, whose father was foremost in the original proposal of a monument in 1817, and who now comes forward energetically to redeem the character of the county from the imputation of indifference, and from the mute but deep reproach which alone the dilapidated pillar now serves to record.

Mr. Arthur Kinglake, in a small pamphlet printed for private circulation, gives a succinct and interesting history of this monument. He thinks, with good reason, that the republication of the proceedings of 1817, when the monument was first planned, may serve to revive that patriotic ardour which thirty-seven years of peace (we may add, thirty-one years of protection, and a *lustrum* and a half of freetrade) have somewhat quenched. The original design was grand; it was a triangular plinth rising from a circular basement—the latter formed by a circular flight of steps, eighty feet in diameter, and eight feet in height, divided by three blocks projecting from the angle of the base of the Pillar. These blocks were to be appropriated to retreats for three military pensioners—one a native of England, one of Scotland, one of Ireland; the three faces of the plinth were to bear an inscription in three languages. The angles were to be ornamented with brass cannon selected from those taken at Waterloo, and presented by the then Prince Regent. The shaft of the pillar supported by the plinth was to have been ninety-five feet in height, and surmounted by a pedestal crowned with a colossal statue of the Duke in the attitude of military command. This grand and imposing design, like many other similar intentions, was considerably abridged in the accomplishment. The actual pillar is described by the architect recently appointed to survey and report upon its condition, with a view to the realization of the original scheme, as "bold and imposing," but apparently unfinished. The main body of the outer flint wall is still sound, but the sandstone facing falling rapidly into ruin. The interior and upper parts of the tower have suffered much from want of protection in such an exposed situation, and one angle, for want of a lightning conductor, has been completely rent off by the storms that sweep those hills. The monument has also suffered, like all English monuments, from the barbarism of Vandal snobs, who have removed from time to time, and bit by bit, the greater portion of the *basso relievo* inscription. The present architect, Mr. Giles, suggests that in completing the original scheme, it would be better to keep the base of the pillar unbroken, and, considering the exposed site, to build a detached house for the three guardian pensioners, at a short distance from the column. For this purpose an endowment and repair fund will of course be necessary.

Mr. Giles recommends, as we think, with rare discretion and good sense, that the proposed colossal statue should be altogether abandoned. His remarks on this point are worth citing:—

"I should not advise that any statue be placed as a termination to the Monument. It is quite certain that no monuments of this kind have ever, even in cities, fully satisfied. A good work of art is thrown away at such a height, and a bad one is never worth its cost. When there is a statue it should be the principal object, sufficiently near the eye to be thoroughly appreciated, and to it every thing else should be accessory. There is also great difficulty and expense incurred in fixing securely large statues on the summit of buildings. The Nelson Monument in Trafalgar-square is seriously marred by a large coil of rope at its back, which mass was considered necessary to give stability to the figure. I believe that the more nearly the design approaches a simple pillar or tower, the better for a monument intended to be seen at a distance chiefly, and the less of ornament in such an exposed situation the less dilapidation will ensue. Should it be advised to erect a statue, some appropriate site may be found in either of the towns of Taunton or Wellington."

The estimate of cost of restoration, including the pillars, the house for pensioners, and the endowment and repair fund, with the contingent expenses, is laid by Mr. Giles at 3000*l*.

Mr. Arthur Kinglake, in his little pamphlet, prints a letter from the Duke to Lord Somerville, written from Paris in February 1816, when the Duke was in command of the army of occupation, thanking Lord Somerville for the measures which had been taken to erect the monument. We cannot forbear to reproduce this note. It has more warmth and colour, while it has all the brevity and decision of later letters from the same hand:—

"To the Right Honble. the Lord Somerville.

Paris, Feb. 1, 1816.

"I received by the last post your letter of the 22nd, and I assure you that I am much flattered by the measures which have been adopted, with a view to erect a Monument for the Battle of Waterloo, on the estate of Wellington.

"I have received Mr. Kinglake's report; I have so little knowledge of my own affairs, and possessing no former report to which I can refer I can form no opinion of it.

"My opinion has long been, that I have either too much or too little property in the neighbourhood, and I will readily, as depends on me, follow your advice in increasing it, either by the way of inclosure or purchase. I shall be obliged to you if you will give such directions as you may think necessary respecting the same.

"Ever, my dear Lord, yours most sincerely,

"WELLINGTON."

The Duke subsequently, says Mr. Arthur Kinglake, "identified himself with the feelings and interests of this county, by a personal inspection of the Pillar, and a special visit to the town of Wellington."

The foundation-stone of the Monument was laid on the 27th of October, 1817, by Lord Somerville, in the presence of a concourse of ten thousand persons, just twenty-two months after the meeting held at the Thatched House Tavern in London, at which the project was first advanced, and the subscription list commenced, in which the Prince Regent, the other Princes of the Blood, and Marshal Blucher, among other great names, figured conspicuously. We now come to a rather discreditable circumstance in the history of this monument. The Prince Regent, on the application of Lord Somerville, had granted a certain number of heavy ordnance, captured in the Peninsula and at Waterloo, to be selected for the purpose of ornamenting the base of the column. These cannon were sent round by water to Exeter, and there remained unclaimed, in the Council Chamber of that city, as a security for unpaid freight, wharfage, &c. "Application," writes the present Mayor of Exeter to Mr. Arthur Kinglake, "was made subsequently to various quarters, but no owner could be found, and on the present Council taking office they became their property."

"Some years back notices were (as by act required of unclaimed goods remaining in the Council's cellars) given, and those remaining unclaimed after such notice, were again advertised for sale and public auction held, and at this sale a brass cannon out of the lot was sold, the remaining being only worth old metal, as cast iron, were planted round the Exeter Quay, as boundaries for a certain enclosure, and where they now remain."

Really this neglect is unpardonable after such a violent display of "British feeling," patriotism, and gratitude, as we find embalmed in the after-dinner oratory of the "gentlemen of the first distinction in the county," who sat down to a good dinner at the "White Hart Inn on October 17, 1817, and"—after the cloth was removed, and—"the yeomanry dismissed," toasted, "Our good old King" (how queer this sounds to our ears!), the Duke of York, and other "loyal" toasts, "with appropriate respect." We are afraid that the excitement of that evening must have been succeeded by more than the usual depression. At any rate, the enthusiasm of these county gentlemen has remained laid up in ordinary ever since. Apropos of the cannon, Mr. Arthur Kinglake says well—

"A letter from the Mayor of Exeter, in answer to my inquiries relating to the Waterloo cannon, and intended as an adjunct to the present monument, forms a painful feature in local history. The trophies gathered from the greatest victory in modern times have found, I grieve to say, an ignominious destiny. Truly the old familiar Latin quotation is correct, which tells us that 'we may reap wisdom from our enemies.' The Bridge of Austerlitz, and the Column in the Place Vendôme might have suggested to Englishmen a happier application for cannon, taken at Waterloo, than to 'form the boundaries' of certain inclosures."

The meeting of the "aristocracy of Somerset," who were opportunely called together at the instance of Mr. Arthur Kinglake on the occasion of the funeral of the Duke, to take measures for restoring the monument, and redeeming the reputation of their county, and of their fathers, who had not the courage to accomplish what enthusiasm had begun, was in many respects interesting. It was called together by the representative of an old county family, the son of the gentleman who originated the design in 1817: it was attended in more than one instance by the sons of those who laid the foundation-stone; and we are glad to remark that it took place *before dinner*. We trust the enthusiasm displayed on this occasion, sustained by the eloquence of Mr. Bickham Escott and the fine feeling of Colonel Tynté and others, will not evaporate so soon as that of the 100 gentlemen who drank to "Our good old King" at the White Hart, on the 27th of October, 1817. We have heard it whispered, however, to our great regret, that the patriotism of the present generation of the Somersetshire aristocracy is rather lukewarm on the subject now that the first flush of feeling has faded away. We hope that in

this case, at least, they will not yield to the *ennui* which the protracted and cumbrous ceremonies of the state funeral, and the tedious bewailing of "The Duke," *sur tous les tons*, by mere traders in death and fame, has undoubtedly created. There are already many local monuments, chiefly statues, more or less execrable in taste, and more or less disgraceful to the country, erected to Wellington in his life-time. But there should be one *national* monument worthy of his name, of his services, and of his country. We cordially and entirely agree with the gentlemen of Somerset in thinking, that if a site is to be chosen for such a monument, none can be found to compete in national advantages and in local associations with this grand outpost of the Blackdown Hills, overlooking one of the loveliest vales of England, and visible "from sea to sea." Let it not be forgotten that Wellington was by ancestry and descent a Somersetshire man. The family of Wellesley, originally "Wellesleigh," take their name from the manse of that name, in a hamlet one mile distant southward from the ancient and beautiful city of Wells. The Duke emphatically recognised "his county" when he visited Taunton in September, 1819. It is customary to laugh at "Zummerzet" bumpkins; indeed, we are not quite sure that we can acquit our own conscience of having indulged in some such feeble joke in the heat of last July, or rather of the contested elections in that month. On another occasion, perhaps, we may do justice to the squires of that county by noticing the honourable conciliation that has knit together hostile parties, since the affirmation of Free-trade by a Protectionist Ministry, in united exertions for agricultural improvement. But, not to digress too far from our present subject, be it remembered that Somersetshire, though wise men *did* come from the East, can boast, within a circuit of a few miles, a monument to Wellington, one to the great Lord Chatham, one to Lord Hood, and one where the good King Alfred first raised his standard. Not many miles off, in the same county, is the birthplace (without a monument,) of Locke. Somersetshire, therefore, is not Boeotia, save in the fatness of her teeming soil: in men, she has been Attica, and Sparta too.

It would surely, we submit with great deference to the gentlemen present at the meeting last January, be a real honour to the county, to erect a national monument worthy of the name, solely and wholly at the county's expense. Jealousy of extraneous contributions would be not simply a feeling to be pardoned, but to be admired. Mr. Gore Langton, one of the members for the western division of the county, urged that subscriptions should "not be confined to the county of Somerset." We can appreciate this feeling. No doubt Mr. Gore Langton meant to say, that a national monument should be the result of a national subscription. Mr. Langton is evidently not so much a local as a general patriot. The public will, we are sure, be glad to accept his suggestion; unless, as we would fain believe probable, (we do but whisper the hint,) the gentlemen of Somerset come forward at once, with such a response to Mr. Arthur Kinglake's generous appeal, as shall at once make a national monument local, and a local tribute national.

YANKEE CHALLENGE.

ACCORDING to an American paper, a meeting of the New York Yacht Club was held on the 4th of February, and an invitation was given to all the world to go and contend for a prize in October next. "The attention of the English and Russian press to this official publication, was especially invited. The prize offered may be considered a very small one; but in this regard our club was guided by the prize offered by the Royal Yacht Club in 1851, which was 100*l*. And so in relation to the decision not to allow any time for difference of tonnage. Such is the English rule, and our own custom is abandoned to make it conform to their rule. We cannot doubt but this invitation will be accepted in the spirit of generous rivalry in which it is offered; and we promise all who come—to whatever nation they may belong—a frank and hospitable reception, and some wonderfully fast craft with which to contend, and to carry off the prize from which will be sufficient honour to compensate for the comparatively small value of the prize itself.

New York Yacht Club, New York, Feb. 4, 1853.

At the first general meeting of the club for the present year, it was resolved, that this club offer a prize of the value of five hundred dollars, to be sailed for on the 13th of October next (1853), open to yachts of all nations, provided one foreign yacht be entered for the race. The course to be from Robins' Reef Light in the harbour of New York, around a vessel to be anchored east by south, half south, twelve miles from the beacon on Sandy Hook, passing to the southward and westward of the Southwest Spit, and to the eastward of the buoy on the west bank, going and returning. The entries to close on the 22d of September. The race to be under the direction of the regatta committee, subject to the rules and regulations of the club, except that no time shall be allowed for difference of tonnage.

The course indicated is one of those over which the yachts of this club annually contend for prizes, lengthened by placing the outer stake boat five miles further than usual

outside of Sandy Hook, and is substantially the main entrance for ships to the harbour of New York, affording abundance of sea room for vessels of all sizes, and is fifty miles in length. As by the rules of the club the prize cannot be awarded unless the winning boat accomplishes the distance in ten hours, it is apparent that it will require something more than 'drifting' to decide the race, which will be repeated from day to day (exclusive of Sundays) until the distance is performed within the stipulated time. The entries are to be sent to the subscriber, G. R. J. Bowdoin, Recording Secretary, 65, Merchants' Exchange.

THE SHIP ERICSSON.

WE extract from the *New York Herald* an account of the last trial of the caloric ship. It is said to have been successful. The letter is dated "Washington, Feb. 22."

"The caloric ship *Ericsson* arrived at Alexandria yesterday afternoon from the mouth of the Potomac, where she had lain at anchor for twenty-seven hours, during the late snow-storm and thick weather. Captain Lowber weighed anchor at half-past nine o'clock last Wednesday morning at Sandy Hook, and, in pursuance of instructions, stood to the eastward, in the face of a strong gale and a heavy sea. He kept his course for eighty miles, when the wind shifted to the north-west; he then stood inshore again, in the face of the gale. During these two gales the ship stood the test nobly; and, though she pitched her bowsprit under water, with her leeguard immersed, her engines performed with the utmost regularity, the wheels making $6\frac{1}{2}$ turns a-minute with entire uniformity. Not the slightest motion was perceptible in the framework and bracing of the engines. After the ship and the engines were thus fully tested, Captain Lowber shaped his course for the Chesapeake, and, in going up the bay against a gale from the N.N.E., encountered a heavy snow-storm. On approaching the mouth of the Potomac, the weather became so thick that the pilot declined to go further, and the ship came to anchor at ten o'clock on Saturday morning. The engine had then been in operation for seventy-three hours without being stopped for a moment, or requiring the slightest adjustment, only one fireman having been on duty at a time during the whole trip. The consumption of fuel was under five tons in the twenty-four hours. Captain Sands, of the United States' navy, who was on board to witness the performance, is delighted with the result, and says that he would willingly go to Australia in her. Thus the great principle of the new motor is now a demonstrated reality."

We must remind our readers that very good authorities question the demonstration, and still suggest the strongest doubts.

PROGRESS OF RAILWAY "ACCIDENTS."

IT moves. Certainly, we shall shortly have a distinct department in the Administration—the Ministry of Railway accidents. Within eight days three frightful proceedings called accidents on the rails, and one in an engine-shed!

We briefly mentioned two last week. The Merstham accident we need not recur to; but the Manchester catastrophe demands ample notice.

The train was an express going from Bolton to Manchester. Just on entering the Dixon Fold Cutting the high speed and the concurrent excessive oscillation were complained of by the passengers. A gentleman who rode in the last carriage, annoyed by the jolting, said to a fellow-passenger that he thought they were going at a tremendous rate, and that the carriage rocked very unpleasantly to which the person addressed replied, "Oh no, we're only going a little quick;" but he had scarcely finished the sentence before both felt the carriage off the line. Almost immediately after it came to a stand-still, and on getting out hastily they found that an accident had happened, and that every carriage was off the rails. It was then about six o'clock, and the train had got about five miles on its way towards Manchester. The scene which then presented itself was appalling. The engine was laid across the up-line, with its head towards Bolton, directly opposite to its former course, whilst the tender was fixed in the side of a cutting, through which the line runs, a few yards behind the engine. The composite carriage which had been next to it was reared upon it, still higher up the side of the cutting; below, between the engine and the tender, was a first-class carriage, and next to it the second-class carriage. The first-class carriage was slightly on fire, and in these three carriages were a number of persons shrieking for help. Information was instantly sent forward to the Clifton station, but from some difficulty in carrying the information speedily to Manchester, it was fully an hour and a half before any of the officials from the main station could be got to the spot. In the meantime every exertion had been used to relieve the sufferers, and it was found that a fearful sacrifice of human life had taken place, and that many who were not killed were shockingly injured. The driver, Thomas Crostin, was found between the two lines, not far from his engine, quite dead, and horribly crushed; John Simmons, a man who got on the engine at Halshaw Moor, was found dead not far off, shockingly disfigured.

The composite carriage, which mounted upon the tender, was found to be scarcely injured. In one end compartment (second-class), there were five or six persons, who were uninjured beyond the severe shaking. The centre compartment contained two ladies, Mrs. and Miss Sofiani, wife and daughter of Mr. A. Sofiani, a Greek merchant, in Booth-street, Manchester, and Mr. Constantine Carati, of Glasgow, also a Greek merchant, a friend of Mr. Sofiani's. The ladies were much bruised and cut about the head, but were not more seriously injured. Both Mr. Carati's legs were broken a little below the knee. The compartment itself was not much

injured. The next, a second-class, forming the other end, was much more damaged. The first-class carriage was a complete wreck; of the frame scarcely a foot remained intact, and when the men went to clear it away they could do no more than throw the pieces into a heap. In this carriage were Mr. G. F. Barbour, of the Grange, Edinburgh; Mrs. Barbour; their three children, one about eight years, another five, and an infant in arms; Betsey Macartney, nurse, and Ellen Hogg, lady's maid. The second son was killed, the injuries on the head appearing to have caused instantaneous death. Mr. Barbour was very much hurt, and was insensible for a couple of hours, from a slight concussion of the brain and other injuries. Mrs. Barbour was also rendered insensible from the shock, and when she recovered she found herself lying across the rails. Fearing some greater mishap if she continued there, she crawled with great difficulty to the side of the line, and found her unfortunate child dead. She remained lying there perfectly sensible, but unable to rise, from about six o'clock until nearly eight, when she was removed to Manchester, and it was found that she had fractured her collar-bone. The eldest boy was taken up insensible, but not dead, and it was subsequently found that he was severely scalded on the lower extremities. Ellen Hogg, the lady's maid, escaped with a slight contusion of the spine. Betsey Macartney sustained a compound dislocation of the ankle joint, and when she reached the Manchester Royal Infirmary it was necessary to amputate the end of the bone before it could be returned to its place. The preservation of the infant she had in charge was almost miraculous. It was found by a passenger, lying in a ditch by the side of the rails, and was given by him to a woman, who took it to her cottage, undressed, and warmed and fed it; the unhappy parents not knowing, for a length of time, what had become of it. Mrs. Horrocks, wife of Mr. Horrocks, of Middleton-hall, drysalter, also sustained a compound dislocation of the left ankle, and the bone had to be cut before it was reduced. Mr. Vincent Martin, of St. Austell, in Cornwall, a traveller, who had just finished his north journey and got in at Hailshaw Moor on his return home, had his right arm fractured, two ribs broken, and his right hand lacerated. Mr. Robert Fitton, cotton spinner, of Shaw, near Oldham, sustained a fracture of the leg, and internal injuries. Mr. Henry Kay, of Prestwich, a salesman, had his left thigh fractured; and Mr. Henry Pugh, shoemaker, of Bexley-street, Salford, had both bones of his left leg fractured.

An inquest has been held. Several passengers spoke of the excessive speed; but the railway officials all concurred in placing it at between twenty-five and thirty miles an hour. But the most important testimony yet given is the following, by William Hurst, locomotive superintendent to the Lancashire and Yorkshire Railway Company. I know the engine No. 13, of which the deceased, Crostin, was the driver. That engine was under repair about three weeks ago. It had a general overhaul, and was put in good order. The engine was put on the line in September, 1847. It was under repair a fortnight or three weeks, and was finished three weeks ago, and has been working ever since. It had been several times under repair before; probably once every six months, but not more frequently than is usual. The engines are examined every day before they go out. The engine No. 13 had four wheels. I consider an engine with four wheels quite as safe as one with six wheels, for running our express speed, about 30 miles an hour. I had made no particular inspection of this engine since it was repaired. I have seen it since the accident. The axle is broken. I cannot say how it happened. I believe it was broken before the engine got off the line. I infer that from the course the wheels took. The axle is broken within the left axle box. The rails were forced asunder, but not for some distance after the first impression of something being off the rails. The sleepers were not displaced where the first marks of the engine being off the line were observed. There was no appearance of anything having been wrong with the line. The crank axle has all the appearance of being perfectly sound before it broke. My reason for thinking that the axle broke before the train got off the line is, that there is an impression of a wheel having been off, on the inside of the off wheel, for a distance of 27 yards, before any wheel appeared to have got off the opposite rail. I cannot account for that, except by the breaking of the axle allowing the wheel to slip off. That mark was on the same side as the broken axle. That axle might be broken either by violent oscillation, or by a violent blow on the flange of the wheel. The axle was a very strong one, five inches and a half in diameter. The iron is quite sound. I think that the speed which has been mentioned might cause an oscillation sufficient to break the axle. Such a motion as would break the axle would be more likely to be caused on a straight piece of road than on a curve. The wheel would not get away immediately the axle broke, because there were three inches of the "journal" in the axle-box, and the splash board also would hold it to the engine. The engine weighs fourteen tons. We have engines from twelve to twenty-four tons. I will not undertake to say that an engine with three pair of wheels would have been less likely to have gone off if the axle broke. I have heard no complaint that this engine oscillated or jumped in an unusual manner. I have never heard that the driver made such complaints. I do not think that the company would be justified in using a heavier engine than that for such a train as that on Friday night. Speaking individually, I would as readily trust myself to a four-wheeled engine as to a six-wheeled one. Four wheels will bite better than six.

The inquiry was adjourned to Friday.

Another smash occurred on Wednesday within a short distance of this city, upon the Bristol and Birmingham branch of the Midland Railway. It was ascertained that a collision, which had been attended by the loss of two lives, and the serious injury of some other of the passengers, had taken place. The down

north mail, which is due at Bristol at 6 A.M., upon reaching a sharp curve near the Mangotsfield station, about five miles from Bristol, from some defect in the engine, broke down, and came to a stand still. The engine-driver and stoker instantly got off the engine to put matters to rights and ascertain the cause of the stoppage, and while doing so the shock of a fearful collision was felt throughout the train. It was found that an engine, which had gone up to Gloucester in the night with the goods train, was returning to Bristol, when not anticipating any obstruction on the line, and the morning being very foggy, it ran into the mail train, which was at a stand-still on the line, with considerable violence, completely smashing the two hinder carriages, in which there were several passengers. Assistance was immediately rendered by the guards and passengers in the other carriages, and, upon clearing away a portion of the debris of the carriages, it was found that two of the passengers had been killed and about four others were more or less injured. The wounded passengers were removed to the George Hotel, Bristol, where they received assistance.

Bennett, the guard of the mail, although severely injured, had the courage to collect his bags and convey them to Bristol.

While the workmen were at breakfast in a shed belonging to the station of the London and North Western Railway at Longsight, near Manchester, the boiler of an engine burst. It had the effect of a shell in a bombarded town; the pieces falling among the groups of men, killing four, and wounding upwards of a dozen. The noise was terrific; five pillars were thrown down; many square feet of slating torn off; on the four men killed crashed the one side of the boiler; on others masses of material. The engine was very old, and had just been repaired.

IMPERIAL POLICY IN DETAIL.

In the night of the 11th of August last, during a violent thunderstorm, cries of distress were heard under the walls of the ruined chateau of Gaillac (Lot), then inhabited by three rustic families. The cries were "Help, help; my wife is murdered; I am a lost man; it is Albarel that is killing us." Albarel was one of the inhabitants of the chateau, and was the terror of the district. The voice of distress was that of another of the inmates, named Fau, who, with his wife, had been prevented from coming home till late by the violence of the storm. The third family living in the chateau consisted of a man and his wife named Barthe, and their daughter Victorine, a girl scarcely turned thirteen years of age. At the sound of the dreaded name of Albarel, who that morning only had threatened to strike Victorine's mother, Barthe and his wife were struck dumb with terror, but little Victorine jumped out of bed, rushed to her parents' chamber, and exclaimed, "Oh, father! take a gun and go out." Seeing that he hesitated, she added, "If you will not, I will go myself; it shall never be said that a man was killed at our door for want of help." Stimulated by this appeal the father went out, but it was too late. Fau was mortally wounded, and his wife dead. Meanwhile Victorine hid herself in the corner of a doorway through which Albarel, supposing him to be the murderer, must pass to gain his own lodgings. She presently heard the assassin approach with stealthy step. The slightest movement, and her life would have been sacrificed to the fury of a desperate ruffian armed and reeking with blood. She remained firm, assured herself of the identity of Albarel, saw him creep into his chamber, and instantly went in search of the officers of justice. Upon her evidence Albarel was sentenced to hard labour for life. The Emperor, on hearing of Victorine's courageous action, sent a watch to the Minister of Justice, and wrote with his own hand upon the envelope enclosing it, "For Victorine Barthe, to be presented to her in a solemn sitting of the Court of Assizes." Pursuant to the Emperor's desire a solemn sitting of the Imperial Court of Cahors was held on Feb. 27 last; Victorine was conducted by the usher to the witness seat in the centre of the court, and there, in the presence of the prefect of the department, a full bench of judges, the assize jury, and a large assemblage of the gentry of the department, the watch was presented to her by M. Joly, the presiding judge. M. Joly, in the course of a long speech, said that heroism had in all time been the natural production of the department of the Lot, and enumerated a long list of worthies born in the province from the time of the Romans downwards. After the delivery of the speech the prefect presented Victorine with a medal of honour of the first class and a purse of 150*fr.* on the part of the Minister of Justice; and at the conclusion of the ceremony the jury requested that the speeches of the President Joly and the prefect might be printed, and that each of them might be allowed to have a copy.

[Is there a surer way than this of winning a kind of theatrical popularity? But we mistake the French greatly if such histrionic performances can make them forget more than countervailing deeds of perjury and murder.]

MISCELLANEOUS.

The Queen has been twice to the Princess's this week, and twice out in her carriage.

Among the Palace visitors have been the Duke of Hamilton, Massimo D'Azeglio, Mr. Frederick Peel, and Sir Henry and Lady Bulwer.

Queen Victoria and Prince Albert, and the royal family, according to the present arrangement, will return to Windsor Castle on Thursday next, the 17th inst., for the Easter holidays. After remaining at Windsor for a fortnight, the Court will return to Buckingham Palace. There is no probability of her Majesty

going to the Isle of Wight, until after the royal accouchement, which is expected to take place in April.

Accompanied by Sir William Molesworth, Prince Albert visited St. Paul's, on Monday, to inspect the site of the Duke of Wellington's tomb. It seems that his remains cannot be placed beside those of Nelson; and it is therefore proposed, subject to the Queen's approval, to place the tomb between those of Nelson and Cornwallis.

Prince Albert and the Royal Commissioners for arranging the commencement of the contemplated new National Gallery, are in future to hold their meetings at Gore House, a wing of which has been fitted up for their reception. Sir Charles Barry and Baron Marochetti have been already professionally consulted by the Royal Commissioners respecting the new building.

Lord Carlisle is to be made a freeman of the City of Aberdeen.

It is reported that Mr. Chisholm Anstey is about to enter the Calcutta bar.

Colonel Boyle, lately unseated on petition, on the ground that he held a post of profit under the Crown, has been again elected at Frome.

Mrs. Harriet Becher Stowe, with her husband, Dr. Stowe, and some other members of their family, proceed direct to Scotland by the steamship *Glasgow*, which sails from New York on the 26th.

Liverpool, not unmindful of the greatness of her literary hero, William Roscoe, celebrated the centenary of his birthday on Tuesday, by publicly eating breakfast in his honour, and making speeches thereafter. There were among the company the Earl of Sefton, the Bishop of Chester, Mr. W. Rathbone, and Mr. W. C. Roscoe, the son of the hero of the day.

Mr. Layard having refused the English Consulship in Egypt—for what particular reason we are not aware,—has, at the request of Lord Stratford de Redcliffe, and on the recommendation of Lord John Russell, consented to accompany the English Ambassador to Constantinople,—though not, it is said, with any paid or particular appointment in the Embassy. Mr. Layard started for the East on the day of the publication of his new volume about Nineveh, reviewed in our paper of this day. He has not resigned his seat for Aylesbury.—*Athenæum*, March 5.

This week the jubilee of the British and Foreign Bible Society has been celebrated by a large meeting at Exeter-hall, and a service at St. Paul's, with the Archbishop of Canterbury for preacher. The society have in fifty years distributed 43,000,000 Bibles among 600,000,000 persons; such is their calculation. The sum subscribed at Exeter-hall on Tuesday was 10,000*l*. Among those present were Lord Carlisle, Lord Shaftesbury, the Bishop of Winchester, the Duke of Argyll, and the ex-Rajah of Coorg.

A meeting, attended by several members of Parliament and other gentlemen interested in the affairs of India, was held on Wednesday night at the St. Alban's Hotel, Charles-street, when it was agreed that any precipitate legislation on the subject of the future government of India was to be deprecated, and that another meeting should be held on Saturday next, at which members of Parliament will be invited to attend, and an association will be formed for the purpose of obtaining and disseminating complete information respecting the administration of India, and the mutual interests of that country and of England.

We see by the foreign journals that that eminent champion of Romanism, the Grand Duke of Tuscany, has conferred the honour of knighthood of the Order of St. Joseph upon the Jew Rothschild, in consideration of the service of that wealthy unbeliever in negotiating a loan. Can liberality go beyond this? A Jew admitted to an order dedicated to the husband of the Blessed Virgin, and conferred by a prince who imprisons men and women for daring to read the "Testament" of the Divine Son of that blessed Virgin!!! [We cut this from the *Standard*; one of Mr. Disraeli's warmest admirers.]

When a ship may be cleared out from any port of the United Kingdom under the British flag, and manned by foreigners, it will become easy for refugees or political propagandists to make a descent on the shores of any friendly state. By destroying the nationality of our shipping, the door will be opened to marauding expeditions, and our flag will shield—like a passport—all who may be disposed to avail themselves of the protection of our naval forces to revolutionise the kingdoms of Europe. Piracy will be indirectly encouraged under the British flag, for it is an easy matter to register a ship as British under an alias or fictitious name, even though that ship be foreign built. The vessels chiefly manned by foreigners, as in the case of lascars, Malays, and others, will meet with more frequent destruction, and, to crown all, piracy and insurance will rise to a premium.—*Morning Herald*. [Is this an idea of my Lord Viscount Maidstone?]

As an evidence of the value they set on his services, the City Commissioners of Sewers have increased the salary of their medical officer of health from 500*l*. to 800*l*. a year.

At the last meeting of the City Court of Common Council, Mr. Anderton carried a resolution, affirming the desirability of establishing a free library in the city.

Lord Palmerston has announced that St. Clement's Danes-churchyard will be closed as soon as the proper forms have been gone through.

There is a rumour that Sir Richard Mayne, the Chief Commissioner of Police, has resigned his office; and that he will be succeeded by Mr. Henry from Bow-street.

The American Arctic exploring expedition, under Lieut. Kane, is announced to sail on the 16th of April.

Three thousand miles of telegraph, connecting the presidencies and the Punjab, are to be laid down in India under the direction of the Indian Government. Dr. O'Shaughnessy, finding that the tempestuous winds of India would break the ordinary posts and wires, proposes bamboo and gutta percha tubes. An experiment has been successful on a line of eighty miles.

Are the disasters of the *Australian* over? She sailed resolutely out of port on Thursday for Australia; but

before she started certain passengers signed two strong protests; one expressing regret and disappointment at delay and expense; and the other certifying that while the ship was in dry dock at Plymouth, they had, with their own hands, "pushed up and down many of the iron bolts and rivets in her bottom, the same being perfectly loose, and from which the water poured in continued streams."

A young fellow has been sentenced to nine months imprisonment for abduction. He induced a young girl of sixteen to quit her home, and proceed to London under pretence of going to Australia. Although they travelled they did not sleep together, or in any way live as man and wife. Why he acted as he did seemed quite unaccountable.

Another case was peculiar. A young woman, half blind with inflamed eyes, and an idiotic expression of countenance, was brought to a union workhouse last November, and there a child was born. One day the mother, in suckling her child, purposely squeezed it against her breast until it died! She thought her hands would be at liberty again. She was tried at Nottingham; found guilty, and sentence of death, with recommendation to mercy, passed on her.

George Dumper, Joseph Rann, and Tom Wearn were drinking together. Joseph Rann was very old, and becoming tipsy first he set out homewards. Dumper and Wearn followed. They came up with Rann leaning against a gate; he was quarrelsome; but they helped him along. At last, however, they came to blows; and Rann was knocked down by Wearn. Finally they propped him up against a gate and left him. But Dumper, urged by some insane idea that they would be found out, went back, after he had got home, to "finish him." Next day the body was found, and Dumper arrested. He confessed the whole thing in prison. His trial came on last week at Winchester, and he was found guilty of "aggravated manslaughter," and Mr. Justice Crompton passed a sentence of "transportation for life."

There were three cases of child murder tried last week at the Reading assizes. In one case the child of the victim had been born in the house of the seducer, and was found wrapped up in some carpet in a pond. In another, the mother, immediately after the agonies of birth, cut off the head of her child. And in these two cases the former failed because it was not clear that the child was born alive; and in the latter it was held that the mother was insane at the time. Verdicts of acquittal were returned. In the third case the mother was acquitted of the charge of murder; and found guilty of concealing the birth. Punishment: eight months imprisonment. The ages of the poor girls were 16, 18, and 21, respectively.

Perseverance takes strange shapes. Thomas Unwin was robbed of a watch in August last by a girl, named Mary Hill, in the street. Some days after he saw her outside a public house; gave her into custody; but a gang of thieves rushed out at a signal and rescued her. Afterwards he met her in Bethnal-green; she again eluded him. At last, months afterwards, he again saw her in company with thieves; and a constable had some difficulty in arresting her. The close of her trial at the Middlesex Sessions was marked by a novel proceeding on the part of the bench. Mr. Sergeant Adams sentenced her to seven years' transportation. Hill, who had gone down on her knees imploring mercy, on hearing this rose up, and in a towering rage screamed out to the policeman, with many oaths—"You pig! oh, you pig! you perjured thief!" The Assistant-Judge: The sentence upon you now is, that you be transported for ten years. Thus adding three years to the original sentence, as a punishment for calling a policeman a "pig!"

Townsend and Waite have been sentenced to ten and seven years transportation for a burglary at Bowood, the seat of the Marquis of Lansdowne.

Two persons have been arrested and imprisoned as they were about to escape from their creditors. Their names are Dunne and Venables. Dunne was a passenger in the emigrant ship *Salsette*, Venables master and part owner, and they proposed to make for Port Phillip. They had freighted the ship, obtained a cargo of emigrants, sent the ship round to Portsmouth and joined her there, when the creditors got scent of their intentions, and their arrest was ordered by Mr. Commissioner Goulburn. Venables was cleverly though not sufficiently disguised. Both persons had been previously arrested for debt, but had got their liberty. [Mr. Venables has written a letter to the editor of the *Shipping Gazette*, in which he contradicts the statement that he wanted to defraud his creditors by emigrating to Australia. He states that there are sufficient funds in London to pay all persons having any claims upon the *Salsette*, and that an application is to be made to supersede the bankruptcy docket. Mr. Venables further requests that the fullest contradiction should be given to the statement that the firm had obtained goods from Messrs. Deane, Dray, and Co., without paying for them.]

John Stiff went to that peculiarly well managed theatre, the Princess's, to seek an evening's entertainment. He could not find accommodation in the pit; so he went to the boxes, being told there was room there. He paid his money, and seeing a front seat in the dress circle unoccupied, he sat him down in it. The box-keeper wished him to move; he declined; the box-keeper was about to pull him out; he gave the box-keeper a punch on the head. Mr. Hardwick fined John Stiff 20*l*. for the assault; but he said if managers "took money for a good part of the house, they had no business to give an inferior place. It is a species of unfair dealing to do so." Very consolatory philosophy for Mr. John Stiff. What a pity it had not been Mr. Hardwick!

Edward Poitiers was on the most intimate terms with Elizabeth Hodges, who herself was on the most intimate terms with the West End pavement soon after the going down of the sun. But Edward grew tired of his friend, and quitted her for another. He was at the Argyll Rooms on Monday, "with a young lady." Hodges saw him, and "conducted herself in a violent way," whatever that choice penny-a-liner phrase may mean. Hodges waited outside

Scott's supper-rooms at a subsequent stage of the evening, having in the mean time bought some vitriol. Poitiers came out, got into a cab, and Hodges then threw the vitriol over him; Poitiers gallantly throwing himself between the infuriated Roxalana and the "young lady." The assault was clearly proved. Hodges vindicated her conduct. She said Poitiers had deserted her; her rival had "sneered at her," and in revenge she flung the vitriol. Committed for trial.

Kinch, the railway-guard in the great accident at Oxford, who was arraigned for the manslaughter of seven persons, has been acquitted by the grand jury, who ignored the bill.

George Wellborn, the driver of the goods train in the accident near Stockton some time ago, and in which Mr. Grainger of Edinburgh was killed, has been found guilty of manslaughter, and sentenced to six months imprisonment. Wellborn drove on in the face of a signal.

While Dr. Lindley was practising rifle shooting on Thursday in his garden, the gardener incautiously got in the line of fire, and was severely wounded. Miss Lindley had adjusted the board; her father raised his piece, and just as he was firing the gardener rushed out to readjust the board.

HEALTH OF LONDON DURING THE WEEK.

THOUGH the weather has lately assumed a milder character, the high mortality that prevailed throughout last month discovers no abatement; on the contrary it exhibits a great increase. The deaths in London were 1011 in the last week of January; since that time they have steadily increased till the number registered in the week ending last Saturday amounts to 1427. The present return shows an increase of 83 above that of the week immediately preceding. Persons of all ages have suffered; of the 1427 who died, 573 were children under 15 years, 460 had attained that age, but were under 60, and 379 were 60 years old and upwards.

In the ten corresponding weeks of the years 1843-52 the average number of deaths was 1045, which, if raised in proportion to increase of population, gives a mortality of 1150 for last week. The actual number, therefore, exceeds the estimated amount by 277. Taking the same three periods of life as above, it appears that the mortality of the young is 13 per cent., of the middle aged 22 per cent., and of the old 44 per cent., above the corrected average.

Last week the births of 861 boys and 810 girls, in all 1671 children, were registered in London. The average number in eight corresponding weeks (1845-52) was 1469.

At the Royal Observatory, Greenwich, the mean height of the barometer in the week was 29.663 in. The mean temperature of the week was 35.3 deg., which is 4.6 deg. below the average of the same week in 38 years. The mean daily temperature, which was 31.6 deg. on Tuesday, when it was lowest, and was 8.4 deg. below the average, rose to 43.9 deg. on Saturday, or 4.1 deg. above the average. It was below the average on every day except Saturday. The mean dew point temperature was 29.2 deg. The wind, which blew from the north or north-east at the beginning of the week, changed on Tuesday to south-west; on Thursday it again blew from north-east, and at the end of the week returned to south-west.

BIRTHS, MARRIAGES, AND DEATHS.

BIRTHS.

On the 4th of March, at Apsley House, Ardwick, Manchester, the wife of Henry Sigism Straus, Vice-Consul of the Netherlands: a son.

On the 6th, at 59, Eaton-square, the Lady Gilbert Kennedy: a daughter.

On the 6th, at 29, Lower Belgrave-place, the wife of Henry Weekes, Esq., A.R.A.: a son.

On the 8th, at 11, Gordon-street, Mrs. Mark Lemon: a daughter.

On the 9th, at the house of her father, St. John's-wood, the wife of Philip Antrobus, Esq., Royal Scots Grays: a daughter.

On the 9th, at Stafford-house, the Duchess of Argyll: a son.

MARRIAGES.

On the 1st of March, at St. James's, Piccadilly, Francis Horsley Robinson, Esq., second son of the late Sir George Abercrombie Robinson, Bart., to Anna, widow of Arthur Raikes, Esq., late of the Bengal Civil Service.

On the 4th, at Calais, the Baron von Hoffman, to Anne, youngest daughter of the late Lieutenant-Colonel James Wright, Hon. East India Company's Service, Madras Presidency.

On the 5th, at the British Embassy, Paris, Alex. Edward Kelso Hamilton, Esq., eldest son of Alex. H. Hamilton, Esq., of the Retreat, Devon, to Jane-Harriet, only surviving child of Lieutenant-Colonel Lane, C.B.

On the 8th, at Christ Church, Turnham-green, Charles James Weale, Esq., Lieutenant 53rd Regiment, B.N.I., second son of Robert Weale, Esq., Inspector of Poor Laws, to Hebe Elizabeth, eldest daughter of J. P. Bull, Esq., Arlington House.

At St. Mary's, Elland, J. C. V. Minnett, Esq., Captain in H. M. Royal Canadian Rifles, to Mary, daughter of John Baldwin, of Clayo House, in the county of York, Esq., J.P.

DEATHS.

On the 30th of December last, on board the steamer from Panama to San Francisco, the Hon. Brownlow Bertie, late of the Second Life Guards.

On the 23rd of February, at his residence, Barnstaple, Devon, Edmund Lockyer Pym, Esq., second and only surviving son of Admiral Sir Samuel Pym, K.C.B., &c.

On the 25th, at Tours, Lieutenant-Colonel Hawthorne.

On the 2nd of March, N. J. Spörle, the eminent ballad composer, aged forty-one.

On the 3rd, at Wykeham, of scarlet fever, Alon Charles, third son of the Viscount and Viscountess Downe.

On the 4th, at his house, Rutland-gate, Hyde-park, Admiral the Hon. Sir Bladen Capel, G.C.B., in his 77th year.

On the 4th, at his residence, 33, Park-street, Grosvenor-square, Frederick Robert Manson, M.D., L.R.C.P., M.R.C.S., physician Northern Dispensary, &c.

On the 5th, in Thistle-grove, Brompton, Mr. Frederick Shoberl, sen., in his seventy-eighth year.

On the 5th, at his seat, Titchborne-park, Hants, Sir Edward Doughty, Bart., aged seventy-one.

On the 6th, at Weymouth, of scarlet fever, Thomasin Oliver, wife of Sir William S. Thomas, Bart., Commander, Royal Navy.

On the 8th, after a short illness, at Villa Etruria, St. John's-wood, aged thirty-nine, James M'Adam, Esq., of Tindon-end, Essex, only son of the late Sir James Nicol M'Adam.

The Leader

SATURDAY, MARCH 12, 1853.

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.

SHALL ENGLAND EXPEL THE REFUGEE PATRIOTS?

THE North American Indians had a practice, resembling that which existed in olden times in Europe, called running the gauntlet. Coulton, the hunter, successfully went through the ordeal; which consists in this: when a person has earned the respect of his judges by his daring, but has incurred the penalty of death, they allow him a certain "law," and then permit him to run for his life; the braves of the tribe being his pursuers. Such appears to be the public law of Europe with respect to great conspirators and revolutionists; but like all barbarous laws, it is attended with the disadvantage, that it totally confounds the dividing boundary between right and wrong. For example, Lord Brougham reprobates all "conspiracy" like that which broke forth at Milan, and all "lesser attempts against the majesties or constitutions of foreign states"—even "libels." According to this view, no person in England, nor any conspirator, must use severe language against any constituted authority, or any person in office; nor must he try to break down the constitution of any country, or to subvert its government; nor must he express desires to that effect. Judged by this rule, how are we to estimate the conduct of Louis Napoleon, the hero of the 2nd of December? He broke his oath, subverted his Government, murdered his fellow-citizens, surprised a whole capital in the night; in short, he illustrated "conspiracy" in its basest, most wanton, and most sanguinary form. And yet it is the boast of the Leader of the House of Commons, that this country is in most friendly communication with that person, and is consulting him on the state of Europe!

Lord John Russell's colleague and nominal superior, Lord Aberdeen, describes the conspirators of Milan as "persons calling themselves patriots, but really assassins in disguise." Government, he says, is sincere and loyal in its determination to carry the law into effect which shall prevent such conspiracies; to do so, is "a duty of paramount obligation." "The existing law is sufficient for the purpose;" and he hopes, therefore, that with that assurance the alarm created by "certain atrocious and sanguinary acts of recent occurrence connected with the residence of those refugees in this country," may subside. Now, what were the facts. Seventeen persons in Milan surprised an armed garrison, furnished to sustain a three year's siege. They did so at the risk of their lives: they did so for the purpose of subverting a Government which supports its authority in Lombardy by acts that broke down the ordinary rules of moral conduct; such, for example, as beating women in public because they did not give information as spies against their husbands. Lord Aberdeen characterizes the effort of these seventeen men as "an atrocious and sanguinary act;" but his colleague, late Foreign Secretary, real chief of the Cabinet, Lord John Russell, boasts of being in most friendly communication with the person who had sworn to maintain a constitution, and subverted it; who, at the head of a great army, assailed peaceable citizens, and murdered them in the night, and who established a tyrannical Government in lieu of one which was, at least, strict in the observations of law. Now, this confusion of right and wrong perplexes plain people.

But Lord Aberdeen sympathizes, as we infer from the facts, with Louis Napoleon, who broke his oath, subverted a Government, and caused peaceable people in Paris to be slaughtered; and the Earl intends to employ the law in this country in preventing the "crime" of a man like Mazzini, who desired to free his country—not from the impost of ship-money, not from the arbitrary conduct of their own native born king, but from

the public beating of women, from the wholesale imposition of taxes without any species of voting, from slow hanging, and other intolerable cruelties, under the dictation of an alien tyrant. Now, we do not understand how the countrymen of Hampden and Elliot can have so drifted from their own historic position as to agree in the slightest respect with Lord Aberdeen. We do not understand how the people of England can permit Lord Aberdeen, not only to support a Charles the First against Hampden and Elliot, but to support the most monstrous exaggeration of a Charles the First against the most harmless imitation of Hampden and Elliot.

Perhaps Lord Aberdeen will say, that the whole difference between a conspirator and a "saviour of society," is success in the conspiracy. We should be glad to obtain an answer to that effect; because then we might understand that if Mazzini and his compatriots could obtain sufficient help from this country, or any other source, to realize practical success, they would, at least after they had gone through the danger, obtain the sympathy and friendship of Lord Aberdeen. And then probably Lord John Russell would boast that he was in perfect friendship with Joseph Mazzini, and consulting him on the state of Europe!

We forget, however, that there would be still some difference. Joseph Mazzini has not sworn to maintain a constitution, and then subverted it by a midnight surprise. He has never emulated the tyrants in bloodshed. Seventeen men made a rush to surprise their oppressors; but when Joseph Mazzini has been governor, as he was at Rome, he did not cause women to be beaten in public, he did not cause his political opponents to be hanged slowly by a new process on the gallows; and not doing these things he found no necessity to surround himself with a body guard, as the only shield against the assassin. He was guilty indeed of the crime of having no body-guard, which is acting like a very vulgar person. He took his dinner, we have understood, at an eating-house, which is altogether an unsacred mode of feeding, and marks him out as destitute of all right divine. Sympathy, in Lord Aberdeen's mind, is reserved for the great monarch, who causes women to be beaten, who causes his subjects to be hanged slowly at a gallows tree; whose only shield against the assassin is an immense body-guard, and whose very kitchen must be under surveillance, lest the hatred of his subjects should visit him in the shape of an unwholesome dinner. When such a man is attacked Lord Aberdeen can express revulsion at "the atrocious attempt on the life of an illustrious prince, the hope of his country."

His country! Which is that? If he has any country at all, it is that very small province which consists almost entirely of the capital and its precincts, which is corrupted by the expenditure of official money collected from a great empire. It cannot be the country of Bohemia, which desires above all things to free itself from a hated subjugation. It cannot be Hungary, which detests the man who broke the pledge of his race, subverted an independent constitution, seized an independent church, and erased a state from the list of nations. It cannot be Italy, where every class holds back from his government, and whose "hope" lay, not in him, but in his death.

But we understand that Lord Aberdeen is to employ the law of this country in aiding that crowned assassin against the Kosciusko of Italy, Mazzini; in aiding a worse than Charles the First against the Italian Hampden. Lord Aberdeen avows that intention: are we to understand that the English people will support him?

We do not believe the English people will do so. The Anglo-Saxon, as our friends in America truly say, is at present the only real republican in Europe. Englishmen cannot be so degenerate that they will maintain Charles the First against Hampden. They will not place themselves in contrast with the Americans. Lord Brougham shows how difficult it would be to put any existing law in force against refugees in this country; but he suggests a much greater difficulty. If the refugees were refused rest for the sole of their feet here, they must cross the Atlantic, and, he says, "Would that put an end to conspiracy—to sending succours to Europe—to setting on assassins?" The difference would but be between fifteen days' sail and four or five days; and the same risk would be encountered by these foreign Princes and Governments, if they now run any

risk. There would be no other difference in regard to these schemes of murder or of rebellion." Of course not. The difference would be that England, wholly degenerate from her own character two centuries ago, would confess herself willing to play the foil for the virtues of her own child in America.

But we believe that Lord Aberdeen's threat is a *brutum fulmen*; and that there is no intention whatever of active meddling. If that be the fact, we do not know what use there can be in pretending that England is going to be subservient to the despotic tyrants of Europe. She had better by far stand upon her own ground, and declare that, while she will not meddle, either for the one side or the other, she has at all events no sympathy for the tyrants, and no regard for the dangers which they call down upon themselves. England does not mean to tear out, in the face of Europe, one of the best pages of her history; and if Lord Aberdeen only invited us to do so in plain terms, the English people would tell him a bit of its mind.

PROPOSED PARTITION OF TURKEY.

It is now admitted as a settled fact that Turkey is to fall, sooner or later; and the question, how will the territory be disposed of, becomes a subject of anxiety for the statesmen of most countries. Our own statesmen do not appear at all provided for the contingency, though it is not unforeseen. Lord John Russell speaks of the event as calculated to occasion "a war in Europe," through the pretensions which a certain potentate will put forth, and which would be incompatible with the interests of the other states, or with "the balance of power" in Europe. It is understood that this apprehension points at Russia. The *Journal des Débats* speaks of the same event as certain, and draws attention to a very curious memoir recently published in the *Augsburg Gazette*, although written so long ago as February, 1850, three years back. Whatever may be the authorship of the paper, it evidently speaks Austrian sentiments, and, as our French contemporary remarks, it casts no untimely light on the recent movements of Francis Joseph in Turkey.

The Memoir represents that the circumstances have changed with Turkey since 1815, and even since 1840-1, when it was the joint resolution of Europe that Turkey should be maintained. The victory of Austrian and Russian arms in Hungary has altered the relations of races, and has established the predominance of the Slaves. The revolutionists in 1848 contemplated a federation, under German and Magyar influences, which should open the path of commerce to the Black Sea; but the same end can now be better attained by a readjustment which shall elevate the Slaves of Turkey to their true position. The population of Turkey comprises 11,500,000 Christians (with a very slight admixture of Jews), and 2,900,000 Mussulmans. The *status quo* is no longer maintainable. Of the Christian territory Austria and Russia are the "heirs," and while Serbia and Macedonia may go to Austria, with Salonica, the rest may fall to Russia, with Constantinople and the Dardanelles. Such are the views put forth in the Austrian Memoir; and a magnificent scheme of railways and colonization is sketched out, which shall render this region a mine of wealth for Austria and Russia, and for commerce in general. The coincidence of this Memoir with the actual proceedings in Turkey, its publication in the *Augsburg Gazette*, and the suggestion that Austria and Russia, ceasing their rivalry, should divide that which each can prevent the other from taking to itself entirely, impart to this Note a special interest at the present day.

The *Journal des Débats* remarks the air of "discouragement" which characterized Lord John Russell's speech last week in reply to Lord Dudley Stuart's question. In 1840 England took arms to reduce Mohammed Ali, in order to sustain the Porte, and was all fire to defend "the integrity of the Ottoman Empire;" even in 1850, when the Sultan was menaced by Austria and Russia, an English fleet advanced into the Dardanelles to defend him, violating a treaty for the purpose; but now, says our Parisian contemporary, that article of faith has become no more than a question of time, and Lord John Russell guarantees the duration of peace only for a little while.

Thus in Vienna, in Paris, and in London, the extinction of the Ottoman Empire is set down as an event to be anticipated at no distant date; but as the Parisian writer says, the "annexation" of

Constantinople is an European question, and all precedents since 1815—Greece, Belgium, the Danish succession, &c.—dictate the rule, that such new dispositions must be effected by the joint consent of all Europe.

In form this last averment is correct; in spirit and true force it presents but half the truth. It is true, as the Note represents, that 20,000 men stationed at the Bosphorus could better maintain the power of Russia in Southern Europe than 100,000 on the mouth of the Danube; it is not less true that the same effective guard could close the Dardanelles against European trade, cut off England and her 3,000,000% of commerce from Trebisonde, and destroy the commerce that a million of pushing Greeks are carrying on as our middlemen—taking our goods and supplying us with grain. Austria, who must play second to Russia, may find it compatible with her judgment to give the South-eastern gate of Europe to Russia, who already possesses the North-eastern; but how would Western Europe consent? Already Russia is intriguing to “annex” Sweden and Norway, and to reduce Denmark to the position of a vassal, thus gaining the North-western gate; her next step would be to aim at the Pillars of Hercules, and to strive for possession of the fourth gate. But even short of that, she would, not long hence, have it in her power to give or to withhold from Western Europe the trade of the Baltic and of the Euxine, making the ports of Northern Germany await her pleasure, and holding the keys of the great granaries of Europe, from Dantzic to Odessa.

All these ulterior consequences are involved, and not remotely, in the proposal of the Memoir to recognise Austria and Russia as the “heirs” of Turkey; and it is for Englishmen to say whether they will passively witness a progressive assault, not only upon the liberties, but upon the commerce of the West. We do not perceive in Lord John Russell’s language that air of “discouragement” which the French writer imagines—rather the reverse. We suppose that the Leader of the House of Commons spoke under a perhaps overweening sense of the unpopularity which has clung amid our trading classes to the bare idea of “a war in Europe;” but even the utterance of the words is an advance in the direction of boldness; and now that trade itself is manifestly at stake, the timidity of the trading spirit may be overcome; for the timidest of creatures will be bold in defence of that which it loves.

The one doubtful point to us in Lord John Russell’s suggestive fragment of an explanation, is the apparent reliance on “France,” meaning Napoleon the Third. Most assuredly, in the event of an European war, that personage would take the side that appeared most likely to win; and as England is so hesitating in the approach to war, at the commencement he might be most attracted by boastful offers of alliance from Austria and Russia.

If England possess a man equal to her fame and to the juncture, she will find a bold position the easiest and safest. There are other parties to be consulted besides the two great Emperors, who profess to be the “heirs” of the monarch they are going to destroy. If England perseveres as she has done, in sticking to red tape and treaties, while negotiating with powers that uphold red tape and treaties for their own ends, and use arms and force to break these treaties when they please, she will merely give up Turkey to the “heirs” who seek to consummate their inheritance à la Macbeth. But if she desires to keep open the south-eastern gate of Europe, there is still a way, though there is no time to be lost. Russia and Austria have been busy in cajoling the Servians and Montenegrins, the Bosnians and Wallacs; and England seems to have retreated from communication with those peoples; while France is attitudinizing at Constantinople, or turning her attention, for her own ends, towards the southern shores of the Euxine. But the Slaves of Turkey still have a will of their own; and if a powerful voice asked them, “Will you be free and independent?” we believe that they would rise up, in valley and mountain, and would be a federal nation, as bold to assert their independence as the Circassians. The Federation of the Danube has all but existed: if it did, the question of the Dardanelles would be solved, and the path of English commerce would be free to Northern Asia and to India.

MORE CHAPTERS FROM THE GENESIS OF PARLIAMENT.

THE British Parliament, like vermin, is generated in corruption—there is no doubt of that. The committees, always excepting present company, admit it, and the evidence, which the daily papers will print, proves it. Not more closely allied in business relations, are Coppock and religious liberty, Brown and our glorious constitution, than the conscience of the elector and the purse of the candidate. All this may be learned in the lobbies. We are by degrees getting at the anatomy of Parliament; we pray heaven that the result may reward our submission to the odorous horrors of the dissecting-rooms.

Meanwhile it is to us revolting, but to some amusing to see the indignation of the undetected part of the House, to notice the Spartan morality, with which Satan, with the hoof concealed, rebukes the idiotic crime of those whose only fault, we know, in his eyes is, that the crime has been successful and discovered. Beautiful is the spectacle of an indignant Parliament cheering the proposal to make the Attorney-General, himself petitioned against, the instrument of wrath upon offending electioneers; and winning is the talk in which the vivacious Viscount, to whom all subjects and all departments are alike, cordially concurs in the proposition, except its sting, which he wants removed. Everybody, not petitioned against, is fiercely pure, and virtuously patriotic: and the British public is satisfied. According to the Tories, we are still to “let well alone,” “*stare super vias antiquas*,” though national demoralization is what they call “well,” and though novel expedients of modern swindlers are what they term “*vias antiquas*.” According to certain organs of the present Government we are simply to wait, to be thankful for this addition to our experience, and to expect that the new Reform bill, thanks to such experience, will be but a list of temporary appliances to meet minor evils, instead of a measure for renovating the constitution, and destroying those decayed and rotten parts of the present system, whence all the mischief springs. Secret voting, and an extended suffrage may now, say the Whig journalists, be postponed, though the former would make the purchase of an elector a hazardous outlay, and the latter, the purchase of a constituency a moral impossibility. We must begin by beautifying our present system, and then—proceed to its abolition. Such is the moral of the election committees, as drawn by some of the supposed Government organs. We trust the counsel have no direct instructions from the client.

Our readers will be familiar with the details of the several cases recently under investigation. It would, therefore, be wasting space to give here the quotations of the vote-market. Everywhere brisk, it seems to have been generally high. A nation of shopkeepers understands the first principle of the shop; and our free and independent electors place a higher value upon their qualms of conscience than even upon their plate, for the simple reasons that they are perhaps even scarcer, and certainly have been less in use.

At Hull it has grown so much a practice for the candidates to show their sincerity by their sacrifices, that agents take it for granted they are to spend as much money as possible, to corrupt in favour of purity of election, and to bribe electors to vote for the Reformer. Lord Goderich, who is young, and in these matters fortunately inexperienced, is turned out, taking much hearty sympathy with him into his retirement. Clay should have known better. If he has restrained the ardour of his supporters hitherto, why was he not equally successful at the last election?

At Chatham there must be great dismay. The committee not only unseated the philanthropic Smith, who got Government appointments for everybody, but they also recommend that the right of returning members should be taken from that borough. It seems that the Government candidate always gets in, the dockyard interest is so overpowering. To be sure there is this apology, that all Governments coerce voters alike, so that, except for the poetry and principle of the thing, it does not much matter! Besides, what are the tradesmen to do, now that they can no longer get their sons into the Post-office? With the ballot threatened on the one hand, and no vote at all on the other, they really see no mode of escape into future temptation. They remonstrate that they are not free agents,

and cry aloud for the moral training involved in resistance to gainful immorality.

At Cambridge, notwithstanding the softening influences of an eminently pious university, the voters are great scoundrels. In Barnwell, indeed, some ray of virtue (political, of course) is visible: the electors of that locality having their honest preferences, and selling a vote to Liberals for five pounds which they would only part with to Conservatives for ten. But the general principles of the inhabitants seem to be loose, and when an election passes over without the voters all selling themselves, the unfortunates only “miss it by holding out.”

These are the kind of discoveries in which each separate investigation has resulted, and these investigations, it must be remembered, bear no proportion whatever to the actual cases in which bribery is known to have been committed. Petitioning, under the present system, is most expensive, most needlessly expensive of course, and even in the committee rooms, as before, the eternal property qualification becomes the real question as to the fitness of the candidate. Unless he is willing and able to buy the co-operation of knaves he must forego the honours of Parliament. Where is the poor man to find his thousand pounds for the conveyance of a hostile witness to Boulogne, and where is the conscientious man who would obtain his dignities by such a course? How many Captain Clarkes are there to undertake such delicate missions, and how many honest aspirants to political fame or usefulness have the pleasure of knowing so accommodating a Captain Clarke?

But this evil may correct itself. Some day it will be discovered that Parliamentary agency is not a mystery, and that it is a lucrative profession. We shall then have young men betaking themselves to that pursuit, whose only chance will be in conducting cases on such terms and in such a way that petitioners may see where they shall land before they venture to embark. Let this experiment be fairly tried; we doubt not it will be successful.

INTERDEPENDENCE OF TRADES.

NOTHING could prove the dependence of one trade upon another more than the actual state of certain staples of our native industry. The three principal are all suffering in some degree from a violation of the allegiance which one ought to own to the other.

In Manchester, after an unusually prosperous season, some of the factories are put upon short time; because, it is said, there has been “a glut.” Now there is no sign of any such state of things. It is well known that, six months ago, stocks were short; the factories have been described, upon reports generally trustworthy, to be working to order; and although there may have been some working for stock within the last month or two, it would exceed all probability to suppose that the markets have been “glutted” in the sense in which that word was used in 1842.

But there is another explanation. The spring season is rather late; the home demand has not yet become very pressing; and buyers on speculation are willing enough to wait, because the natural movement of prices has been disturbed by the extravagant, if not fraudulent, speculations in the raw material. The dealers in the raw material represented that it would fall short, and this had a great anticipative effect on the prices of the manufactured goods. Buyers looked forward to a year of brisk demand, checked by high prices. In fact, the supply of raw cotton proves to be infinitely greater than ever it was; and instead of the demand being checked by price, there is every prospect that the price of the raw material will scarcely form an appreciable element in the movements of the market. The supply and demand will be regulated much more effectively by the price of labour, and the range of prices in general. Now, their legitimate profit is to be got out of an exchange of one material against another, reciprocally more valuable to those who receive, than to those who give; and the foolish attempt to snatch an unfair profit out of the earlier sales of cotton wool, by a false pretence of scarcity and artificial prices, must not only be defeated, in the long run, to the speculators who set that manœuvre in motion, but must extend its disastrous effects to the manufacturers, and to the hands who are now thrown out of work by the suspension of three thousand looms in Manchester and Salford alone. Here we see

employers and workmen stopped in their industry, deprived of income by the selfish speculations of traders following the maxim, that each must look out for himself, and disregard the interests of others,

"The staple trades" of Birmingham, we are told, "continue paralyzed to a considerable extent by the high price of metals," for which there are various reasons—partly the fact that the demand has been more rapid than the ordinary course of supply; partly, also, that speculative attempts to buy up stocks of the raw material, in order to a future profit, have introduced disturbances into the regular operation of trade; and partly, also, that the supply of coals falls short, which impedes the working of iron. Now, the short supply of coal is ascribable exactly to the same causes, with the addition, that masters and men have not been able to agree upon the amount of wages fairly payable; so that the permanent dispute upon that point has contributed to check the supply. It was, of course, strictly for the interest both of masters and men, that the facts of that dispute should be ascertained as soon as possible, in order that an agreement might be arrived at, that industry might proceed, that the masters might sell, and that the men might earn their wages. And here, again, for the want of a general understanding, we find loss entailed upon all parties concerned.

In Leeds business is generally good, because there has been as yet no very serious subtraction from the supply of wool. There is, no doubt, a striking improvement in the character of the trade. "The demand for 'all wool' well-made broad cloths is rather in advance of the supply"—an agreeable change after the general run for cheap stuffs and shoddy counterfeits; the materials which help so many tailors in the metropolis to undersell each other, and to clothe their customers in cloths that wear out before they cease to be new. But we have no confidence in the continuation of the prosperity of the woollen districts. For this reason, that we have no confidence in the continuance of a steady supply of labour for the Australian colonies; and if the Australian colonies are not kept going, Leeds will feel the effect. If Yorkshire can succeed in securing the uninterrupted prosperity of Australia, Yorkshire will continue to cheer England with the spectacle of uninterrupted prosperity at home.

It is not often that this reciprocal dependence of the several branches of industry, the one upon the other, is exhibited on so great a scale, and so palpably; but the lesson may be useful to men in business, since it brings home to them an illustration of the practical value of the principle of Concert; the principle, obedience to which leads to most of the success that is realized in trade—the breach of which occasions most of the grand disasters in trade.

THE CHURCH AND THE EMPEROR.

It may not be forgotten that in that grand tour in the South which immediately heralded the Empire, Louis Napoleon took occasion to remind the ecclesiastical dignitaries of Lyons, with rare unction of manner, and solemnity of deportment, that he at least had never considered religion as a political instrument; in other words, that he loved the Church, much as "misunderstood" women aspire to be loved, "for her own sake." Hence all the honours, wealth, and dignities heaped on the dispensers of holy oil, the teachers of implicit obedience, the consecrators of successful massacres, and the chanters of *Te Deums* to Austrian Kaisers, who treat their subjects to 1200,000 cwts. of lead! Hence the restoration of the Pantheon of Great Men (so long desecrated by the ashes of Voltaire and Rousseau) to be once more the shrine of the relics of the virgin patroness of Paris, St. Génovève; hence the encouragement to religious houses, orders, and confraternities, the fitful persecution of Protestants, the suppression of the chairs of philosophy in the University of France, the repudiation of the "classics," as Paganism in education; hence, above all, the frequent embassies of mitred envoys to Rome, the coquetting with the College of Cardinals, the submissive invitations to Pius Nono to take up his summer residence at Compiègne, and to astonish the impressionable Parisians by the apparition of a real live Pope, ring, fish, too, and all, mounted on a real pontifical mule, and figuring in the forthcoming spectacle of the imperial coronation. All for pure

love of true religion, and filial devotedness to Holy Mother Church. Not a thought of policy, not a mental reserve of state-craft, not an *arrière pensée* of imposing on the faithful! In return for all these favours heaped upon the Church by her most faithful son, does she not consecrate crime, deify success, and commend to all the saints the imperial adventurer, who saved society from pillage,—by making himself the one universal robber? The obligation is mutual, and the gratitude reciprocal. But what if there be one man, one priest, found in these dark times, and in that crouching city, where confusion of all right and wrong sits throned, a triumphant blasphemy on Providence and justice:—one whom neither favours and cajoleries can corrupt, nor tyranny silence, nor success intimidate; who, from the pulpit of the most crowded church in Paris, will denounce oppression, assert the rights of man, and vindicate the Providence of God from a disastrous and damning complicity; who will with unfaltering voice, like a two-edged sword, cleave hypocrisies asunder, and with words like thongs scourge the money-changers out of the temple:—oh! then will that man, that priest, faithful servant of a Master who knew not Popes, and of a Gospel that announced not cozening Primates, find favour with the imperial benefactor of the altar, and the disinterested lover of religion "for its own sake?" Ask Lacordaire, the exile, and Sibour, the accomplice.

COLONIAL AND OCEANIC POSTAGE.

It really is a question worth reconsideration, whether the boon promised by Lord Canning to the colonies, in an uniform postage of 6d., had not better be superseded by one more thoroughgoing. The revenue derivable from the Post Office is not to be despised, but the colonial branch is not the most important in fruitfulness; while the social and political advantages of freely extended correspondence between colony and home are unmistakeable. Under the influence of the penny postage in England, the traffic has increased so vastly that the "new" Post Office in St. Martin's-le-Grand is too small, and it is about to be enlarged. But already it is anticipated that the "Ocean Penny Postage" may be carried, and then we should want another enlargement. Now there is no better test and example of an ocean uniform postage than an English colonial postage. Other countries have to a great extent fallen in with our example of an inland low uniform rate: Russia has a postage of 4d. throughout her empire; the United States of America have a postage of 1½d. for 1000 miles; France has greatly improved her post; and other instances might be given. Difficulties exist in procuring the assent of foreign powers to one universal rate of a low amount; but a practical example would be the most cogent of all arguments.

A notion clings to the mind that a great distance deserves a great payment; and the Postmaster-General, it appears, cannot bring his apprehension of a colonial postage lower than 6d.—a penny for Great Britain, a penny for the colony, and 4d. for the sea-passage. Now this calculation seems to us to involve more than one fallacy. Is the Postmaster-General obliged to trouble his head with the revenue of the colony? If there were a great increase in the sea-borne letters, each colony, without any great increase of cost, would derive a proportion of profit from its own internal postage. Besides, most letters involve answers; and the simplest way, perhaps, would be, to let the colony keep all the postage it might collect in prepayment, on condition of delivering gratuitously all prepaid letters sent out from this country, and of paying a portion of the contract money, if any, for conveyance of the mails. The English department would thus be burdened only with levying the revenue accruing at home. Again, Mr. Rowland Hill showed most satisfactorily that the cost of the department lies mainly, not in the carriage, but in the collection and distribution of letters; and assuredly the length of the voyage makes little difference. Freight is not at 4d. an ounce: the wildest freights to Australia have been considerably under a penny for twenty ounces; and ordinarily the freight would be an inappreciable part of the smallest coin in the currency.

At present a letter from Australia may cost you from a couple of shillings to five or more, and the cost is a very serious "object" to a poor man. It is also a serious item to commercial

men, who ought to send freely in duplicate, and not to crowd too many subjects into one letter. Insurance business is in great part transacted by letter, especially with distant places; and for some time to come that important branch of business will be transacted for the colonies, at home. For these reasons a perfect freedom in the use of the post is most desirable.

It is true that a uniform rate of 6d. will be a great improvement upon the present rates; but we do not anticipate from it the full advantage. It is very nearly the average rate for the inland postage before Mr. Rowland Hill's time, which was about 6½d.; and we can all remember how much evasion and abnegation were resorted to in those days rather than run up an outlay for postage. Since 1840 the gross revenue of the postage has increased from an average of 2,250,000*l.*, or less, to 2,422,000*l.* in 1852; and the number of letters has increased from 75,900,000 in 1838, to 400,000,000 in 1852; showing that to the correspondent five letters are allowed in place of one; and if, with augmented expense, the *net* revenue of the post-office is not quite replaced, the loss is enormously more than compensated by the general stimulus to trade and revenue. There is no reason to suppose that the same principles do not apply to colonial postage; and when the Postmaster-General proposes to bring the colonial postage up to the level of English rates before 1840, we only ask whether it would not be financially and politically more judicious to proceed at once with the principles of 1840. While we thank Lord Canning for the 6d., we may still ask for the 1d.; and beg him, while he makes his building arrangements, to have in his eye the grand probabilities which are already foreseen.

THE DÉTENUIS OF LOUIS NAPOLEON.

NAPOLEON THE THIRD has supplied the commercial Englishman with a test by which to judge his character; for the commercial Englishman readily applies to moral questions the familiar test of *£ s. d.* "Do you know Mr. So and so?" was the question respecting a literary man, put to a tradesman. "A great rascal, sir; owes me five pounds." By the same rule Louis Napoleon must be an extremely grand rascal.

There are certain railway companies, who entered into contract with the French Government, some years back, to form railways from Fampoux to Hazebrouck, from Lyons to Avignon, and from Bordeaux to Cette; and according to French usage they lodged with Government, in all, 22,500,000 francs (900,000*l.*) of caution money. It is upon this money that Louis Napoleon has seized: he takes half of it for himself.

It is true that the companies have not carried out their contracts; but upon that fact two remarks must be made. In such cases, other foreign Governments have returned the caution money, which is lodged, not for direct forfeiture in case the whole bargain fails to come off, but as a test of good faith, and of completing the project when once begun. Spain has acted on that view. Secondly, the contract in the case of these railways was not carried out, because difficulties were interposed by the Government of France itself.

The bearing of the present French Government shows the extreme doubt which it entertains of its own conduct. These contracts were declared to have been forfeited in 1847, by the Minister of Public Works under Louis Philippe; but Louis Philippe did not attempt to take the money: he did not return it, but he never repudiated the English ownership of the cash. Even Louis Napoleon does not attempt the direct forfeiture of the whole, but he seizes half, returning half on certain conditions, and those conditions show the hollowness of his case. The half is returned on the conditions that the companies desist from all further claim, and from all present proceedings on the subject of the caution money. One of the companies, we believe, has an action at law against the French Government on this very subject; and thus the Emperor illustrates the morale of French equity, by seizing the half of the matter in action, and offering to abandon the second half, on condition that the plaintiff withdraws the suit!

The plea that the companies had broken their contracts, when the Government would not supply them with the opportunity of fulfilling those contracts, does but add to the turpitude of the transaction: it is like Robin Hood's fining the

Bishop of Hereford, because he did not dance well in the presence of his terrifier. The French call these deposits caution money; probably from the want of caution which the English show, in trusting their money in Paris. To prevent the people from having their throats cut, as he alone foresaw, by vulgar Socialists, he did the work genteelly himself: so he illustrates the sacredness of property, by confiscating the private estates of the Orleans family, and the deposit-money of English capitalists, against usage, and in anticipation of his own law courts. He "saves society" on presumption, as a Virginian saved Virginia, and he protects property, by taking it under his own wing.

Incredible as it may seem, however, the worst remains to be told yet. An offer, we understand, has been made to one of the companies, which would prevent the forfeiture of any part of the caution money. It amounts to this. The French Government wants, for some purpose (say, to restore the Budget to equilibrium), more cash; and if the holders, say of 4*l.* shares in this deposit-money, will advance sixteen sovereigns to the French Government, they shall have, instead of the two sovereigns, which would now be returned to them, a bond for 20*l.*, including the 16*l.*, and the whole of the 4*l.* This is a most extraordinary proposal: to seize the half of your money, on condition that you will accept the other half in full quittance, and then to offer to acknowledge the whole debt, on condition that four times as much shall be advanced. It is a proposal which measures, not only French impudence, but the French estimate of English sagacity. The refusal of English capitalists will measure the English sense of imperial honesty. We believe that there is no one implicated in this transaction, who would not rather possess two sovereigns, than the imperial bond for 20*l.*

"A STRANGER" IN PARLIAMENT.

WHEN the present Government was formed, a pleasant evening paper, bidding for the resumption of quasi-Whig Ministerialism, set about discovering a justification for the excess of strength in the Cabinet; and it was ascertained that the only way in which the soup could escape destruction from so over-manned a cuisine was by a general understanding being come to that there should be no concert—that each Minister should go to work separately, and that, accordingly, the departments being well looked after, the Ministry should take care of itself. The advice was practical in its application to a coalition not very sure of its basis; and clearly it has been taken. It is true there is a Cabinet Council every Saturday: but these are all about Montenegro and Milan—domestic policy stays at home, in the departmental bureaux. Thus, we see intensive individual activity among the Ministers—collectively, profound idleness. The Ministry, as a whole, is doing nothing—is still representative of nothing,—is avoiding all grappling with difficulties, arrangement of which would give fame to the Aberdeen cabinet,—which, to Lord John's chagrin, will doubtless be the historical title. But take the Government to pieces, and you will be astonished and delighted at the bustle going on in every separate sphere. Deduct last night from the week, when the Tory Opposition had the pas, and you will find a Minister the hero of the orders of each night—coming out to fight singly, and in rotation. It is the only plan with "all the talents;"—the worst of managers shirk a constellation of *all* the stars, simply from fear of the consequences. And the public, finding the Parliamentary proceedings dull, conclude that they are useful. It is indeed a session of work: but may we never have such another; for Parliament is our principal public amusement.

Do any of those people who pat their morning paper applaudingly, and say, "Ah, the House is really at it now," consider how the members suffer? Take Mr. Vernon Smith's objection, this week, to the proposal of a committee on "oaths," that there was no use appointing any more committees, since there were no members disengaged; and, as illustrating the same fact, Mr. Ewart's notice of motion for a select committee to inquire whether "the constitution and action of the select committees of this House might not be improved by generally diminishing the number of members composing such committees, and by making provision for their giving more undivided attention to subjects submitted to their consideration than they are able to do under the present system." Certainly we find twenty Irish members dividing on Thursday night in favour of the addition of more members to the India committee; but you may set that down to flery zeal—or the consideration that those who thus divided knew that they would not be called upon to sit, notwithstanding

Mr. Maguire's suggestion that a Papist would have more sympathy than a Protestant with a Hindoo; and indeed the existence of round towers in Bengal, "or thereabouts," justifies the supposition of affinity between Carnatic petitioners and a member for Cork. It is not necessary, however, to trust to indirect evidences; go into the committee lobby between twelve and four; study the "groups," and you will appreciate what the honour of a seat means in 1853. It means six hours of private business, which is not your own; and eight more hours of public business, which is your constituents'. And after such a routine it is not pleasant to have the fact blurted out, as it was by rash Mr. Whalley, this week, to the indignant amazement of Mr. Brotherton, that the private business of the House of Commons is "disgracefully and inefficiently conducted." Mr. Brotherton repelled the charge; how could the youngest member (Mr. Whalley was elected since the general election) know anything about the matter? "I told him," said Mr. Hume—Mr. Hume, the "inveterate reformer," should know. Mr. Hume is as indiscreet with his own nest as ungenerous with the nests of others; and so there it stands on record for general study—a confession in the House that the House does not know how to conduct private business; conduct of public business being, of course, an open question of some date. Seeing what is going on—the crowds of committees, the time they take, the dissatisfaction they give, the frightful expense they cause—it is impossible not to suspect that Mr. Hume is accidentally right. After all, therefore, when—the House being up after a closing heavy division—one sees a jaded M.P. fainting at the cloak room, into his paletot, and with hardly strength enough left—he has been "at it" since 10 a.m.—to light his cigar; when one follows his shaky steps to the cab-stand, and observes that his direction is home, and not to a ball,—even the young M.P.'s now, Mr. Whalley included, avoid suppers at Evans' and coffee in the Haymarket,—the pity is shared by some slight contempt, such as is felt for workmen who bungle with their tools. A thousand miles in a thousand hours is clever, in the way of a wager; but we cannot respect the routine which insists on going over two sides of a triangle when one would bring to the end. Mr. Ewart's plan of providing for an increase of subjects by decreasing the numbers on the committees, would not do, for this reason: the surface spread might one day become so thin that we should have committees of units. Let a practical nation consider what would become of us if a Parliamentary quorum should be one—and that quorum, say Sibthorpe. How he would report!

Government meanwhile is winning good opinion by single combats. Mr. Cardwell, on Monday, made friends of the shipping interest by adroit concessions, suggested to him by his old constituents; and the saying, while he spoke, that he was frightfully dry, was the proof that he was making an oratorical hit. Mr. Cardwell has got on in the world by being dull; and would sink at once if he were momentarily guilty of a spark of cleverness—supposing he could get it up. He is of that class of men who cannot understand what people see to admire in Mr. Disraeli; who mumble "charlatan" when they hear anybody being brilliant, and who console themselves for never being admired, though so immensely respected, by the consciousness that they were never late for an appointment—hoping that posterity, knowing that, may be induced to invite them down. He was Peel's pet, and is to be studied as the exemplar of the class Sir Robert encouraged and educated for the government of England. A great master is known by his pupils, in a great degree, and it is Sir Robert Peel's condemnation that he left us no public men to lead. You may think of Gladstone, but it is well known that there never was any real sympathy between the two. Sir Robert Peel, as he grew in statesmanship, marked a transition era, from the Pitts, and Sheridans, and Cunnings, to the "business members", the product of the Reformed House; and he has left us with the red tape tone intensified into our public life. What could a "man of business"—his great boast—leave us, as his representatives, but clerks? From his son, Mr. Frederick Peel, to Mr. Cardwell, those whom he led up to the treasury, have been clerks, and only clerks. It is odd, but Sir Robert Peel never picked up a great man. He hated the brilliant man, even snubbed Mr. Disraeli, and found, in the end, reason to repent that oversight. But, perhaps, he knew his age—the sort of men who would suit—and, clearly, dull, and decorous, soulless, but accurate and laborious, Mr. Cardwell has fame and position as an administrator, statesmen having gone, for the moment, out of fashion. So, to repeat, his very dissertation on ships, on Monday, did himself and the Government good service. The shipowners said next morning, "Practical man, Cardwell, sir;" and the Trinity House said the Government was more ra-

tional than that remarkable corporation expected, or had reason to expect. In the same way Mr. James Wilson, who is usually lucratively quiet in office, gave immense satisfaction in the city by his careful arguments against new assurance companies. It was a good point to make, at the right time, speculation having turned in a different direction; and if he get out a good report he will ever after be regarded by the big offices about the Mansion House as a great statesman, which would be a mistake, for he is only a great clerk, being to the statesman what the actuary is to the political economist.

Let it not, however, be concluded that the Government is only financial and statistical. Colonel Mure (a wonderful scholar, who cannot talk as well as—say Joseph Hume—wherefore, though an old member, he is nearly a stranger) is evidently acting for Lord John Russell in the matter of the National Gallery; so that the Cabinet is looking after its *didicisse fideliter* properly, perhaps because Mr. Disraeli started so boldly in the same direction, when he had the official chance; while, on the other hand, Mr. Fitzroy, cleverly backed by Mr. Phinn—who is an immense success among the new members, principally because he talks in the House without a trace of the Hall—is positively chivalric, on behalf of his colleagues, in his attempt to check the characteristic brutality of British husbands upon their wives. The introduction of such a bill as his is the more commendable that it is gratuitous, there being no feminine pressure from without, asking Government to give themselves supererogatory work; and as he proves himself "quite a lady's man," it would not be astonishing if an organization of back parlours were got up to induce him to resist callous Lord Campbell's Divorce Commission recommendations, the injustice done to women in these recommendations being obvious, as any peeress "in her own right" would easily show.

But it is out of the question to enumerate all that the Government is doing—departmentally. Every man of them is busy, and busy independently, for it is obvious Lord Clarendon is the only Minister troubled with the advice of colleagues. Mr. Gladstone, every one sees, is acting quite independently—oblivious of the "leader" next him; and, as on Thursday night, sometimes forgetting himself. That was the second time he had done damage to the Government—a serious evil, beyond the temporary reasons, as encouraging the clerks to look down on the brilliant men. In fact, it was Clerk Cardwell, on Thursday week, who saved the Government from the results of a speech of the brilliant Gladstone; and because there was no clerk at hand this last time, the brilliant man led a host into a minority lobby. There can be very little question that but for the running away—a harsh phrase of dignified and responsible representatives, but a sad fact—on the 3rd, Mr. Disraeli would have beaten the Government, and that on a Free-trade motion; and assuredly it is a great impeachment of the Chancellor of the Exchequer's "discretion" that he risked such a confusion as was seen in next day's division list—Disraeli, with Radicals like Walmsley, voting in favour of Free-trade against a Free-trade Government—the Government list including Charles Villiers—Charles Villiers actually voting against Free-trade! In one respect the division list was useful to constituencies; it told who are the men—healthy Radicals some of them are supposed to be—who will stand by the present Ministry at all hazards, whatever their no measures or their Budget, merely because they are the present Ministry. But Mr. Gladstone had no such purpose in view, and therefore did a silly thing in his haughty opposition to friendly Mr. Hume, who would have been very glad at an excuse to drop his dangerous motion. But he did something more than a silly thing in opposing Lord Robert Grosvenor, on Thursday, when that utilitarian nobleman held in his hand a power of attorney to get a majority on the ticklish certificate question. Opposition to the motion was a matter of course, but his hasty hauteur played the deuce. This time there was no temptation to the friends of Government to run away—it was not disgraceful to be in the opposite lobby; no Disraeli was trying to trap them: and they took the advantage of the nonchalant defiance of the most potent of professions, to oblige their solicitors, and to return their returns. Consequence—Mr. Gladstone was put in a foolish, the Government in an ignominious, position. They got Mr. Hume into their lobby—Mr. Hume was, of course, poor blundering old gentleman, anxious to make up for his doings that night week—but they had driven people they could not spare into opposition, and provided a division list full of curiosities—for instance, Mr. James Sadleir, brother to Mr. John Sadleir, a Lord of the Treasury, but also a solicitor, voted against them!—which will seriously hamper them, if they still venture to leave the certificates untouched in the Budget. This couple

of disasters, their first, provoke injurious doubts about the financial preparations promised to be completed early after Easter; and it is desirable that on the question of the Budget, at least, the departments should meet together for some sort of corporate conclusions. Evidently, Mr. Gladstone is not cautious enough without a clerk or two to check him. His Pegasus is not quite trained to the jog-trot yet.

This week's division list will show that "Christianity" was again an "open question." Lord John, in his department—viz., to look after civil and religious liberty—acting, like the rest, with perfect independence, if not of those of the Ministers who are in the Commons, certainly of more than one of them in the Lords, and assuredly undertaking to strike off the last fetter, &c. &c., without being very sure of the aid of the file—not to mention the rank of "ordinary supporters." This division is the test of our "progress;" and yet, after all, it appears, in this new Parliament which is starting the latter half of the nineteenth century, the head of the department of civil and religious liberty could only get a majority of 51, which is discreditably small to the Commons, and not large enough to effect the desired intimidation of the Lords. The episodic signs of progress, however, are more gratifying than the main indications furnished by Mr. Hayter (who whipped his best last night, and he is the greatest whipper-in that ever lived). It was very grand to hear Lord John, with his head and coat-tails thrown back in that dignified attitude which is inseparably associated with representative institutions, asking Sir Frederick Thesiger and the Tories whether they were justified in feeling indignant with the persecutors of the Madiai, while they themselves were proscribing the Jews? This is a point which suggests great mental progress in Lord John; and it is fair to say the hint told tremendously on a well-dined House. If men and Ministers would take to that sort of argument oftener, we should have less cant stopping the way. For instance, how easily that weary debate in the Lords on Monday, upon Lord Clancarty's argument against the Irish national system of education, could have been stopped, if Lord Aberdeen had had the courage to put the point—"Why, my lords, for heaven's sake don't intercept our denunciations of the McHales, who denounce the Godless colleges." But your grave statesmen can't often venture on the *tu quoque* with its full effect; and there are the dull dogs who can venture, but who cannot appreciate—as Vincent Scully, who closed the debate last night in a loud *Clark* accent, and who, for the Irish Brigade, spoke in favour of the Bill, and who yet missed the perception, that when the Roman-catholic members are ranged in a body in favour of the admission of the Jews to Parliament against the par excellence Protestant party ranged against that special phase of religious liberty, it cannot be quite true, as enthusiastic abhorers of the Pope too systematically assume, that a Papist is necessarily less tolerant than a Protestant. As Lionel Rothschild would say—our Madiai are in "Sequin Court."

Perhaps the pleasantest fact about last night's debate is that it was so fearfully dull. The intolerants were so conscious of the sham they were getting through, that they mumbled their bigotry in the humblest of keys; and the debaters on the other side felt so sensibly their zeal was a formality, that no efforts enabled them to be interesting. The world had made up its mind about the whole matter—the division was foreknown to a name—and the simulation of eagerness, of intolerance on one side and virtuous indignation on the other, could not be got up. Sir F. Thesiger (for one reason, because about the most Jewish looking gentleman within the bar) was hardly the man to lead a supremely Christian question, for there is a popular prejudice fatal to the New Testament pretensions of Barristers in good practice; and some such thought may have been busy in Mr. Disraeli's head. It was curious to notice that the moment Sir Frederick rose to move his amendment, Mr. Disraeli took his hat from under his seat, pulled down his vest, and—walked home. The vindicator of Caiaphas need not have spoken—need, even, not have voted, for has he not written enough? But should he not have listened, at least to his own Attorney-General, proving that the presence of a Hebrew in the Commons would be an impertinence to Providence? Far bolder was Mr. Osborne, who is not only of Jewish blood but who is proud of his race (the creed he is as scrupulous about as other people), and who took this opportunity of emerging from the taciturnity which office has imposed on him, to make a speech, the least merit of which is, that it demonstrated Sir Frederick's history to be as bad as Mr. Pimock's. It was a very good speech considering that there was nothing to be said, and that the orator spoke merely in order that it should not be remarked of him next day, as of Mr.

Disraeli, that he had been silent. But even under these circumstances it would have been better if it had been spoken on some other bench than that directly behind the leader of the House. When a good debater gets into office, and that a subordinate one, he at once becomes accountable to his chiefs in the Cabinet; and ease under "responsibility" does not come all at once—though, really, Sir Wm. Molesworth must be excepted, who last week, on the Canada Clergy Reserves, made a better speech—it was dashing, personal, vivid—than he ever made out of the *grata arva* he has at last been caught in. People said of Mr. Osborne last night, however, that it was "Osborne with the chill on,"—an Indian in continuations for the first time, using his tomahawk *selon les convenances*—decidedly afraid to "strike," and carefully avoiding that friendly and familiar "a laugh" (a reporter's definition of universal merriment) which was waiting on him—which came to attend him from the library—even from the most westerly club—and which he yet did not dare to evoke. However, it is an age of business, and we must consent to have our wits bought up: and failing Osborne last night, the humour took refuge in Henry Drummond; and he rewarded them by giving his incidental opinion—observe that he was taking the solemn Christian ground against the bill—that Cain was the first Dissenter. The *mot*, like most of Mr. Drummond's, was about the lobbies and the clubs in an hour: and people said "How good:" and the same people went in to vote reverently against Lionel Rothschild making the acquaintance of Mr. Speaker. "Damme, Sir, what would become of the lower orders, Sir, without religion?"

Saturday Morning, March 12.

"A STRANGER."

REPORT OF THE OXFORD UNIVERSITY COMMISSION.

III.

THUS far, however, we stand on statutable ground; and the Hebdomadal Board can quote its founder—"Populus me sibilat, at mihi plaudo." But it is forbidden to it to fall with dignity before the approaching stroke. The main functions of an University are those of education; and these the Hebdomadal Board has not merely tampered with for its own advantage, and to ensure its supremacy—it has abrogated the Laudian Statutes respecting education without consent of Crown or Convocation, although its own office is purely ministerial and initiative; and the professoriate, to whose duties "are assigned three long divisions of the Laudian Code, ranging through twenty-seven chapters," has ceased virtually to exist. It shows Laud's weakness as a legislator, that he excluded from the governing body the Doctors and Professors, (as the salaried graduates were at length peculiarly termed) and committed to a Board of Heads of Houses the supervision of a system of education to be administered solely by their ejected rivals. These were bound by statute and penalty to deliver regular courses of lectures in their respective faculties.

A like obligation to attend the public classes was imposed on the students; and, but by statute only, the Hebdomadal Board was bound to see that both obligations were duly discharged. The present Heads admit in their letter to the Duke of Wellington a "temporary interruption" to professorial instruction: the interruption, however, it is observed in the Report (p. 93), "has been the rule, and not the exception, for at least a century and a half," and for that period the justice of Gibbon's remark is unquestionable, that "in the University of Oxford the greater part of the public professors have, for these many years, given up even the pretence of instruction." Some strange instances were quoted from *Terræ Filius* (published in 1721) in the *Edinburgh Review*, of June, 1831, which manifest the degradation to which the professoriate was at that time reduced by collegiate influence; and, the University chairs thus lowered in general estimation, and the qualifications of their occupants reduced below the level of the college tutors, the virtual extinction of all the professorships, and the actual suppression of some, was rendered easy of accomplishment. Public instruction was more especially obnoxious to the collegiate interest in the faculty of arts; and four chairs established by the University in that faculty, were abolished by the Hebdomadal Board, at its own responsibility and risk.* The result was exactly what must have been expected, and assuredly was desired. No body of able and efficient professors mortified the mediocrity of the College authorities: no concourse of students crowded the schools;

* The fortunes of the chair of Moral Philosophy, endowed in 1621 by Dr. White, are instructive. To the end that professors, "every way competent," should be appointed, the founder entrusted the election to four Heads of Houses and the Proctors. The chair was made a sinecure, and one or other of the proctors installed professor on every quinquennial vacancy. This continued till 1820, when this abuse was discontinued.

no independent halls rose for their accommodation. The Heads established their interests on the ruin of their obligations, "*nec viget quidquam simile aut secundum*;" the student-life of Oxford decayed, unfed by the active element supplied by an energetic body of instructors, each occupied with the subject best adapted to his powers; the mere show of instruction and study now in vogue usurped its place, and dullness and *donnism* reigned supreme.

If we notice further the violation of the statutes, involved in the abrogation of the studies and examinations for the higher degrees in the faculty of arts, it is from no care to vindicate the Laudian system or method of instruction. The chancellor, that "first-rate college tutor," retained the "narrow learning of a former age," and, say the Commissioners, "the students of Oxford were made to study of Natural Philosophy in an age subsequent to that of Copernicus and Bacon from 'the physics of Aristotle, or his books concerning the Heavens and the World, or concerning Meteoric Phenomena, or his *Parva Naturalia*, or the books concerning the Soul, and also concerning Generation and Corruption.'" But the machinery was important, and whatever the changes in the studies and examinations should have been held inviolable. The technical terms, descriptive of the course of study pursued at the time, would be out of place here; it is enough to say, that the examinations for the bachelors and higher degrees were to be conducted by all the *Regent Masters*, whose function having been destroyed by the Hebdomadal Board, the very name is now obsolete, and not understood by numbers of Oxford men. Their control over the examinations was, perhaps, more important than their conduct of them; though we are surprised and amused to find the system over which they presided, commended by the present rulers of the University, as "a system of study admirably arranged, at a time when not only the nature and faculties of the human mind were exactly what they are still, and must of course remain, but the principles also of sound and enlarged culture were far from imperfectly understood." These Regent Masters, once no mean and unessential part of the University, are, as such, a nonentity now. "Their joints are marrowless." They are mere members of colleges, and of a college-convocation, and their degree means nothing. And yet in that House of Congregation which, as the Commissioners sarcastically remark, "meets only for the purpose of hearing measures proposed which it cannot discuss, of conferring degrees to which candidates are already entitled, and of granting dispensations which are never refused," the graduates in arts, divinity, law, medicine, and music, nominally receive from the Vice-Chancellor the power of entering the now barred schools, and publicly lecturing each in his faculty, in the following solemn form. "To the honour of our Lord Jesus Christ, and to the benefit of our holy mother the Church, by my authority and the authority of the whole University, I grant to thee the power of incepting in the faculty of (arts, &c.), lecturing, disputing, and doing all besides which pertains to the state of doctor and master in the said faculty, when thou shalt have completed all that relates to such solemnity. In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." Were the founder of Queen's to wake and hear this, and see what comes of it, he would have qualms as to the observance of his oath by his own foundation, "according to the grammatical sense and exposition, without any gloss." We say it seriously, we never felt more strongly the wickedness, to say nothing of the folly, of exacting oaths, than when we read the above, and reflected upon the subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles, which so often follows it. Truly, the proctors had reason in staying the proceedings in Convocation, in the matter of Tract 90. All are tarred with the same stick.

It is weakness, or worse, not charity, to doubt if the motives and objects of the Hebdomadal Board in those violations of the statutes, were a conscious and deliberate usurpation. The professorial system was overthrown to raise the tutorial from its relative subordination. The tutor could not extend his discipline over the bachelor, as every bachelor was entitled to commence tutor himself. By the extinction or absorption of the public teachers into their own body, the colleges secured the primary instruction of the University. It remained only to crowd the college books (the more under the new policy the better) with the names of Masters, Regent, and resident no longer, but the majority absentees, and in the main incompetent to instruct. The Regent Masters, competent to the tutorial office, would have continued in Oxford a dangerous because an independent body, and the usurpation of their functions by the Fellows would have been impossible. The wished-for result was attained by a stroke of policy more ingenious than honest. The Heads of Houses permitted empty standing to take the place of statutory study in the higher degrees, and saved alike their

credit and conscience by extending their power of proposing a dispensation "from some necessary and very urgent cause, and in cases which are not repugnant to academical discipline," to the nondelivery of their lectures by the public readers, and the nonattendance on their lectures by the students. The thing had an air of plausibility, but we need not affront our readers by discussing the argument of dispensable and indispensable matter. The very title of the dispensing clause "pro minus diligentibus publicorum lectorum auditione," shows how narrow is the power committed to congregation of limiting the functions of the University. It will hardly be contended that a power of dispensation, granted for some irregularity of attendance upon the courses of the public lecturers, was intended to supersede attendances on the lectures, and to dispense with the lectures and lecturers themselves. In this latter sense, 'dispensation' is evidently a word of Oxford second intention, called in, re-stamped, and re-issued by the Hebdomadal Board.

The governing body of the University has violated the Statutes to which it is sworn, and this not by the neglect of desuetude, but for collegiate advantage. A body, conscientiously attached to obsolete and impossible systems, deserves forbearance and respect, if it seek to carry them out according to the enactments to which it is sworn. From the Hebdomadal Board of Oxford argument and indignation fall alike misplaced.

AN ENGLISHWOMAN'S VOICE FOR ITALY.

THE ladies at Stafford House assembled to draw up a satiny address to their sisters in the United States, on behalf of the poor negro, to whose sufferings, perhaps, distance, as well as Mrs. Beecher Stowe, had lent enchantment in their eyes, have never, within our knowledge, raised their voice or "taken up a pen" on behalf of the white victims of Austrian despotism in Italy, or of Russian despotism in Poland, or of Bonapartist terrorism in France. These daughters of luxury, of delicate porcelain, albeit wrought from common human clay, have no eyes to see, nor ears to hear, nor hearts to feel, the miseries of their sisters in Europe. They can whine with sentimental anguish over the tortures of the quadroon torn from his wife and child; they can shudder with dainty horror at the whip they seem to hear descending as it digs the bloody furrows on the negro's back, in some Carolina plantation; but they do not hear the groans of widowed wives, of bereaved mothers, of orphaned daughters, in Milan and Mantua, in Buda and Pesth; they do not weep for maidens and matrons scourged with sticks in the recesses of prisons, sometimes in the staring street; they do not appeal to their aristocratic sisters at Vienna against the bastinado in Italy, or to their titled sisters at St. Petersburg against the knout in Siberia. How should they? These dainty sympathisers of Stafford House are the wives and the sisters of the statesmen and senators who begrudge the right of asylum to the refugees, after lavishing smiles on the oppressors; of the men who, to support the "balance of power," connive at the restoration of the Pope, while they deluge savage islands with Protestant Bibles; of the men who shamelessly calumniate the chiefs of European freedom, while they have a superfluity of compliments and caresses for the irresponsible and wholesale assassins whose "sacred" heads some fanatic knife has grazed; of the men who incite to revolt only to betray into ruin.

When, we ask again, did these gentle ladies, in Stafford House assembled, ever plead for the desolation of Italy and the wrongs of Hungary? On the contrary, it is notorious, it is not forgotten by the great English people, that these ladies are the ornaments, while their husbands and brothers are the props, of a system and a policy congenial to the crimes and cruelties of despotism, treacherous and hostile to the struggles of liberty.

Our American friends may well laugh to scorn the narrow and meagre humanity of those who can impertinently plead for poor blacks in Carolina, while they shut their eyes and harden their hearts to the despair of Italy "fainting 'neath the thong," and of Hungary trampled in the dust by murderous hoofs.

If, however, the voice from Stafford House be an insolent mockery, there is in the great heart of English womanhood in many homes, untainted by the dissolving poison of aristocratic complicity, a deep and strong sympathy, tender as the heart, and true as the soul of woman, for their suffering sisters in the fairest climes of Europe. They do not, it is true, form committees and indite "Christian Addresses" to the wives and sisters of the Austrian slave-drivers. They do not waste their ink nor scatter perfumed tears in idle demonstrations, nor do they affect impertinent comparisons between our institutions and the "systems" of Franz Joseph and Radetzky. But they honour the patriots—they pray for the deliverance of the prisoners—they invoke the vengeance of a righteous

heaven upon the seversign confiscators and the anointed murderers.

As we write, we have before us an eloquent "Appeal to the English People" on behalf of the patriotic cause, by an "Englishwoman." It is from the pen, we believe, of an amiable, and high-minded lady, long resident at Leicester. Taking the noble protest of Elizabeth Barrett Browning against a false peace, as a text and an inspiration, this generous lady, "confident in the religion and justice of the cause," appeals to those "who valuing freedom of thought, and action for themselves, desire to extend its blessings to others," to subscribe to the fund now being raised for the patriot leaders of Italy and Hungary. May our countrywomen listen to this noble voice. It is for them to mould the spirit of their children to the love of liberty and the hatred of oppression: it is for them to elevate and broaden the sympathies of their husbands and brothers, too often deadened in the paralyzing grasp of trade, and withering in the cold shade of the counter and the Exchange. This appeal relates in simple and touching language the facts of the Italian and Hungarian cause, too familiar to our readers, and it concludes with these heart-stirring words:

"Women of England! assist with your sympathy, and what influence you have, the cause of the weak and the oppressed. Let each one do something. Give each one, even if but a trifle, to the Kossuth and Mazzini fund. Spare not your money, at least, in aid of those who are giving their lives in defence of freedom of conscience, and liberty to move and speak as free men. Aid those who are giving their hearts' blood, with their tears, as they urge their beloved ones to go forth and die for the Right—to those who even on the scaffold, amid the tortures of a lingering death, can exhort the horror-stricken crowd to 'Remember God and their Country!' Is the life of the Pure and the Brave to be left for an undefined period to the mercy of the Foul and the wicked? Oh! Make the battle as short as possible, and turn it into a victory for the Right. Forget not the Faithful Dead who, in our own land, have won for us all that gives our lives their worth—and may the blessings of those ready to perish be on you."

This appeal, be it remembered, is no morbid "Uncle Tomery." It is not the languid intoxication of a literary dram.

THE VALUE OF "ON DIT."

WE are sometimes reproached with the number of "unconsidered" rumours that our Paris correspondent whips up in his weekly communications. It is neither our fault, nor that of our correspondent, if the silence, or, at best, the fragmentary information, of the independent press in France, is eked out by the rumours of the salons and the streets, which suggest, if they do not always correctly disclose, the truth that lurks under the official assertions and denials of the *Moniteur*, a journal which, under its present editorship, deserves the title of "*Menteur Universel*." There is a passage in a letter of Voltaire's which exactly sets the value, in the present state of France, on an *on dit*. Voltaire, writing to D'Alembert, in July, 1766, expresses his horror and disgust at the judicial murder of a youth, named La Barre, who, at the age of seventeen, was burnt alive at Abbeville, after having had his tongue torn out and his right hand cut off, for not having bowed to a procession of Capuins. By the way, at the rate the church is going on in France, under the auspices of Louis Napoleon, it is not quite impossible that this pleasant recreation of burning boys alive for not taking their hats off to a procession of monks, may be renewed for the edification of the regenerated society of France. We are sure that our religious contemporary, *L'Univers*, after putting down theatres, would desire no better substitute for the drama than an occasional *auto da fe* in the public squares. It was only last week that our correspondent related the fact of a young man sentenced to prison for receiving the Communion without having previously "confessed." Would not the punishment of La Barre be only the logical development of this system of judicial condemnations for constructive "sacrilege"?

Well, Voltaire, writing, as we have said, to D'Alembert, in horror and disgust, says, "What! in Abbeville, these *Busiris en robe* are to murder children of sixteen, with the most horrible tortures, and the nation suffers it! It is scarcely talked of for a moment: away goes the world to the Opéra Comique; and this barbarism, grown more insolent from our silence, will go on judicially slaughtering whomsoever it will. Let me know, I beseech you, what people say, since they do nothing. (*Mandez moi, je vous en prie, ce qu'on dit, puisqu'on ne fait rien.*) It is a miserable consolation to be told that these monsters are abhorred, but it is the only one that remains to our weakness, and I entreat you to give it to me."

CHURCH HARMONY IN FRANCE.

AN amusing and instructive controversy has been raging of late in ecclesiastical circles in France, touching the *Univers*, that ferocious ultramontane organ which superlative English Churchmen, and neophytes of Romanism on this side of the Channel so warmly admire. The Archbishop of Paris, who is only perhaps so much of a Gallican as to worship the Powers that be at Paris,

scarcely less than those at Rome, has found it expedient to visit with severe censure the doctrines of the *Univers* (which for us at least have the singular merit of not halting at their own logical conclusions) and not only to discountenance the circulation of that journal, but absolutely to forbid his clergy either to read it or to write in it. The French Archbishop who is (we say it with all respect to the mild and amiable virtues of our domestic Primate) what "John Bird" would probably have been under similar conditions and "environments," is not supported in this crushing censure by the whole Episcopate, into which, indeed, a strong and glowing element of ultramontanism has lately been infused. M. de Dreux Brézé, Bishop of Moulins, in a long and very ably written circular to the clergy of his Diocese, takes the side, with more or less of precautionary reticences and circumlocutions, of the offending *Univers*.

But the passage in this Episcopal circular, which many of our readers will agree with us in thinking the most instructive, if not the most true, is within a few lines of the conclusion, where the Bishop says that, if he does not think himself called upon in any way to influence his clergy in their choice of a newspaper, (he would not object to their taking in the *Leader*, as a tonic) he still thinks it far better that they should not engage in writing for any journal. "Not that even on this point," to quote the gentle words of this French bishop of the nineteenth century, "I would enjoin, I only advise: I do not exact, I ask: I impose nothing upon your obedience; it is only to affection that I appeal. ('John Bird,' of Canterbury, himself could not exceed 'Pierre' de Moulins in tender compliance.) Your merit will not therefore be the less, nor your recompence, and my consolation will be increased. The fact is, *Messieurs*, whatever people may say, that even in the discussion of matters which we possess most accurately, certain aptitudes are required for this daily polemical discussion, which God has not granted to us: and to enable us to overcome its perils and vexations, a callousness is necessary, which happily is not yet ours. *Accustomed to expound their thoughts without contradiction when they teach or when they preach, priests need have more indifference than human nature ordinarily can boast of, to bear with that contradiction, when they write.* Hence an unseasonable pre-occupation about their dignity in the defence which it had been better for them to remember during the attack; hence those controversies protracted without end by infinite disputes, or terminated by appeals to discipline, (*à la rigueur*) or by complaints which become the sport of the public."

It strikes us that what this respectable Bishop says of the clergy when they write, is very often applicable enough to the clergy (of all denominations and of all countries) when they speak, in the arena of open polemical discussion. We say of all denominations and of all churches, as the Rev. Professor Baden Powell remarked in a recent lecture at Oxford: "Bigotry and persecution exist in other churches besides the Romish, and in our day too"—to which we beg to add that they exist in other sects besides the Church of England. It is all a question of "dory." With very many Nonconformists "religious liberty" means liberty to sit at their feet—nothing more. If an example be wanted, compare the combatants in the recent discussion on Secularism.

The letter of the Bishop of Moulins has been denounced by the Archbishop of Paris to the Pope. This paper war is quite as edifying in its way as the recent passage-at-arms between two English bishops in the House of Lords, where we find one of the successors of the Apostles giving the other the lie direct, and the latter rising to "assure their lordships that there would be no hostile meeting in consequence." To be sure these apostolical amenities are consecrated by tradition. Peter and Paul once came to spiritual blows. Is not Henry of Exeter the Peter of Anglicanism, while his brother of Oxford is the Paul of "Puseyism"?

UNSTAMPED NEWSPAPERS.

WE are informed that Mr. Truelove, of the Reformers' Library, Strand, is summoned to appear before Mr. Jardine, at Bow-street, on Thursday next, at two o'clock, to show cause why he should not be fined 20*l.*, for selling the *Stoke-upon-Trent Newspaper*, the same being unstamped.

OUR PORTS!—There are drinking-songs by teetallers who trespass in ginger-beer; love-songs by men to whom love is a jest; home-songs by bachelors who live at their clubs; work-songs by the veriest idlers; hunting-songs by those whose noblest game have been rats and mice, and such small deer; war-songs by gentle ladies; sea-songs by landmen who get sick in crossing a river; matin-songs by sluggards who never saw the sun rise; vespers by good fellows to whom evening is the beginning of the day; mad songs by men who are never in a passion; and sacred songs by men who are never in a church.—From DALLAS'S *Poetics*.



Open Council.

[IN THIS DEPARTMENT, AS ALL OPINIONS, HOWEVER EXTREME ARE ALLOWED AN EXPRESSION, THE EDITOR NECESSARILY HOLDS HIMSELF RESPONSIBLE FOR NONE.]

There is no learned man but will confess he hath much profited by reading controversies, his senses awakened, and his judgment sharpened. If, then, it be profitable for him to read, why should it not, at least, be tolerable for his adversary to write.—MILTON.

THE RECENT COWPER STREET DISCUSSION (To the Editor of the Leader.)

SIR,—A notice of the Cowper-street discussion in your columns was forwarded to me, with some comments, by a correspondent; this criticism on your part is not open to reply in your columns, as Editors must have some latitude of discretion; but a subsequent notice is, I think, fairly open to remonstrance,—the one in which a short article appears editorially, at the head of Mr. Holyoake's peroration, and might have been a part of it. I have not to answer Mr. Holyoake in your columns, having said as much as he is disposed to notice already, but I put it to you as a matter of justice, whether you were fair in saying that his "peroration" was a fair specimen of the morality and temper of both sides?

Are you prepared to be judged by the peroration of an opponent?

I am satisfied to be judged by the entire discussion; and then the use Mr. Holyoake makes of epithets (to which one-third of his speeches were devoted) will be manifest; for his plan is, not to disprove the truth of an assertion, but to condemn it for severity; and, whilst parading it as uncharitable, he enlarges upon his own charity in not questioning the motives of his opponent, which he does in the very same breath.

As I know some of my friends are readers of the *Leader*, I am desirous not to be presented to them at Mr. Holyoake's appraising, whom I should not choose as the best judge either of himself or other people.

One periodical had an excuse for recommending to me the avoiding of personality, since the Editor owed me a private grudge, and settled his own account at the same time; but it ill accords with the name of the *Leader* to take sides in this fashion, and allow a debater, who never yet spoke well of a frank opponent (after meeting him), to insert a peroration as a fair specimen of the character of his antagonist.

As I said no words which I do not think true, and which I did not justify by proofs, the truth of my assertions, according to the connexion (from which they are distorted), should be taken into account. I know they are true, and that this makes them more unpleasant, for the greater the truth the greater the libel; and on this rule I do confess that I am a great libeller, for I told some truths that are not refuted by being called uncharitable.

Dignity, on the other side, would have consisted either in disproving the assertions or in being silent about them; whereas they are employed to injure the reputation of a Christian advocate, by one who decries imputation and praises charity only to make me appear uncharitable.

Yours, very truly,

BREWIN GRANT.

Birmingham, March 8, 1853.

[Had there been any doubt of the correctness of the representations in the peroration alluded to, they would be set at rest by the letter of our correspondent. Certainly, had we discovered the same personal acrimony in the speech as we find in the letter, we should have never selected the former for publication. It is not necessary that the Rev. Mr. Grant be "judged by the peroration of an opponent," he may be judged by his own letter. If "one-third of Mr. Holyoake's speeches were devoted to epithets," all we can say is, that the reports of the debate, in the four principal newspapers on the side of our reverend correspondent, do not bring out that fact, and the complaint of Mr. Grant lies first against those papers and not against us, who have published nothing inconsonant with the tenor of what has appeared there. Even the *British Banner* said, in an editorial article, that the wit and sarcasm of Mr. Grant

required "to be kept under proper restraint." The *Advocate*, a religious newspaper, in which Mr. Grant himself is a writer, publishes this passage from a provincial correspondent:—"Why, your young friend Brewin puns everything. You blame Holyoake for speaking lightly of a God he doesn't believe in; and what d'ye say to a fellow, Doctor, that puns the Deity he worships. . . . There's one man turnin' his back on an awful mystery, an' another, a v'ry clever young man (the Rev. Mr. Grant), stan's a winkin' at it." Then there is the *Christian Spectator*, which controverts Mr. Holyoake's particular views with great ability, and, we think, in some points with success, gives this passage in its February number on the first night's discussion:—

"Still more uncalled for, in our judgment, was the reading, by Mr. Grant, of a certain letter, published in the *British Banner*, and now avowed by Mr. Grant—unless to point a sarcasm at a party silent in the dispute, namely, the *Christian Spectator*. In his opening speech, Mr. Holyoake had quoted, with an acknowledgment of its candour, our admission that his is not a merely negative creed—that he has given to infidelity a positive side. Mr. Grant rejoined by reading the above-mentioned letter, which contains this phrase—'I flatter no man; I leave that to the *Christian Spectator*.' We beg to say that we have not flattered Mr. Holyoake either by intention or in fact. We simply recorded the fact, that he 'enjoys even among Christians a reputation for sincere convictions, a pure life, and invulnerable courtesy in debate;' bore testimony, from personal knowledge, to his honourable position among political and social reformers; and claimed for him the respectful attention of religious men. This was not even generosity to an opponent; it was but the rendering of bare justice to a fellow man. On one point, at least, the assembly in Cowper-street will have an opportunity of testing the value of our testimony—namely, as to Mr. Holyoake's bearing in public controversy. We sincerely regret that as far as the discussion has yet proceeded, his opponent has in this respect suffered by the contrast. We transcribe the impression of several independent observers, all whose prepossessions were with the Christian advocate, when we say, that Mr. Grant exhibited, on the first night of debate, an acerbity of temper, a disposition to substitute sarcasm for argument, and a preference of *ad captandum* to *ad rationes* appeals, which vexed his best friends, excited expressions of displeasure from many of his auditors, and caused visible exultation among his opponent's adherents. We respectfully remind Mr. Grant, that the Christian spirit, no less than Christian truth, is committed to him for vindication, and that by dishonouring the one he will assuredly endamage the other."

We suppose that all the parties whose united testimony is here quoted have not "a private grudge" against our reverend remonstrant. If so, he is very unfortunate in his public intercourse. For the sake of knowing both sides of questions upon which, as journalists, we find it necessary sometimes to report, we have occasionally looked into Mr. Holyoake's writings, and we have found loyal tributes of appreciation and respect to Dr. Kalley, the Rev. G. A. Syme, the Rev. Dr. Godwin, the Rev. J. H. Rutherford, the Rev. Dr. Ackworth, President of Horton College, near Bradford, not to mention others. Of these gentlemen he certainly has "spoken well after meeting them." Is it true, therefore, that these ministers are not "frank?" Let the reader take notice it is our reverend correspondent who suggests this doubt of his colleagues. We do not intend to have the Cowper-street debate resumed in our columns, and therefore we have said thus much in justification of our selection; and the public can now judge whether, as Mr. Grant opportunely suggests, the libel of what we published does not, indeed, lie in its truth.—ED.]

UNSECTARIAN SUPPORT OF THE MADIAT.

(To the Editor of the Leader.)

SIR,—The case of the unfortunate Madiat in Tuscany, has excited a considerable interest throughout Great Britain, and has induced our Foreign Secretary to remonstrate through one of our ablest diplomats, Sir Henry Bulwer, with the Grand Duke of Tuscany. It has also called forth the eloquence of the House of Commons, and proclaimed aloud to the world that there still exists in the breast of the Briton an inextinguishable sympathy with suffering humanity, and an utter abhorrence of all religious persecution from whatever source it may emanate. True it is that many look coolly on, and doubtless many of our Roman Catholic fellow-countrymen manifest an indifference to acting in the matter, most probably in consequence of the Protestants having acted too much under the influence of Protestant prejudices; and thereby preventing that much to be desired united demonstration of all classes of her Majesty's subjects. Prejudice, that fostering nurse of incredulity, appears to have created no inconsiderable amount of distrust as to the genuineness of the facts of the case; but to those who wish to examine the case in all its bearings, I would refer them to the *Times* of Friday the 18th, which contains a full report of a lengthy discussion on the subject, which took place in the House of Commons on

Thursday week. The several speeches are well worthy an attentive perusal, for they contain the opinions of Lord J. Russell, Lord Palmerston, Lord Stanley, Lord D. Stuart, Mr. Lucas, Mr. Drummond, and other distinguished members of the House, not only in reference to the particular case of the Madiat, but the great principle of absolute religious liberty, liberty not only to the Protestant, and the Catholic, but to man as man, a free citizen of the world, claiming his right to tread the mazy path of life according to the dictates of his untrammelled conscience, and unprejudiced reason, without any particular leaning towards any luminaries from without, which at least to him may appear to give but an uncertain light. He nevertheless feels as a man, and would fearlessly perform his part in the great drama of life; abhorring all religious persecution, and lamenting the existence of sectarian prejudices, he sees a form and real beauty in the lines of the poet:—

"For modes of faith let graceless zealots fight,
His can't be wrong whose life is in the right;
In faith and hope the world will disagree,
But all mankind's concern is charity;
All must be false that thwarts this one great end,
And all of God that bless mankind or mend."

I will merely in conclusion venture to suggest the practicability and desirableness of an unsectarian national demonstration of feeling in behalf of the Madiat, one in which Catholics, Protestants, Jews, and all classes of our countrymen might unite on the common ground of humanity, charity, and love.—I am, Sir, yours truly, M. E. D.

THE SUNDAY REFORM MOVEMENT.

(To the Editor of the Leader.)

SIR,—It was with much pleasure I read in your last impression, the able and practical letter of Mr. William Newton, and also your excellent comments thereon; but there was one thing which I particularly noticed, that, while you call on the industrious classes in large towns, to exert themselves in obtaining the Crystal Palace as a place of resort on the Sunday, you do not, apparently, make your appeal to the populations of our villages. My object, therefore, in addressing you, is to impress upon the working-classes and others, in every parish, village, or hamlet, throughout the country, the necessity of prompt and earnest measures, for securing a desirable place of recreation on their rest day; where the hidden wonders of creation shall be exposed to their view, the artistic skill of the artisan displayed, the perfection of art admired, the varied, yet harmonious beauties of nature exhibited, and where religion, science, and intelligence shall blend together. Let them boldly and resolutely come forth, and do battle with their Sabbatarian adversaries, not with violence, but with that honest and upright determination which never fails. Let us, one and all, who desire that the toiling millions should have some place better than the gin palace for Sunday enjoyment, strenuously exert ourselves to overthrow this narrow-minded opposition, and, if the working-classes are true to themselves, no power can withstand their rational and just demands.

I quite agree with Mr. Newton that it is not merely a metropolitan question, but affects the whole country; and thus it is that I would extend the movement to the smallest hamlet in England; and, as I believe it would be better for all petitions to be alike, that there may be no doubt of our unanimity, perhaps Mr. Newton will, through your columns, publish a form of petition, for the adoption of those desirous of assisting.

I am, Sir, yours respectfully,

Goodhurst, March 8th, 1853. WILLIAM APPS, Jun.

NOTICES TO CORRESPONDENTS.

G. E.—The paragraph we lately inserted, purporting to relate to the "Preston Co-operative Store," should have said the *Burnley Co-operative Store*.

AN INQUIRER.—The letter we publish this week precludes the necessity of pursuing the subject further. We are nevertheless obliged by his communication.

TASTE.—Taste is more liable than any other sense to run into grossness, and we take great pains to avoid this. Every boy knows the bad policy of slipping his sugar plums one by one from his pocket into his mouth as fast as he can munch them; and very seldom will he do so, unless from sheer satiety. He understands right well that his pleasure will be heightened in kind as well as strengthened in degree, if he treat his eyes along with his palate, and stop sometimes to think of the dainty before him. All children have this scientific way of eating, when they eat for enjoyment. And so at the festive board, we attempt by the embellishment of the table, by the witchery of music, and, above all, by the fountains of conversation, to raise the entertainment from that of a mere feed up to a banquet whereof a poet might partake, and which might not be unworthy of his song.—From DALLAS'S *Postico*.

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*.

THE *parti pris* in France has had a fine subject for sounding declamation this week. The stage has been in question. LEON FAUCHER, with the absurd pedantry of an Economist who fancies that a "prize" will stimulate morality as it stimulates industry, instituted a series of prizes to be awarded to those dramatic authors of France who succeeded in best representing *la morale en action*. LEON FAUCHER'S idea of Literature is one which would make HANNAH MORE and BERQUIN dethrone SHAKESPEARE and GOETHE; he wanted that which the theatre is at all times unwilling to give him, especially in France, *didactic* amusement; and as the public is notoriously fond of amusement, and fugitive from didactic "morality," it became necessary to "stimulate" virtue by awarding prizes. The *Report of the Commission* furnished *L'Univers* with an occasion for fulminating against the theatre as a hotbed of corruption. This is a favourite theme with the bigots. They have always been jealous of the theatre. Rival comedians!

The paper war has not been unamusing. JULES JANIN of course defended the theatres, which brought upon him the ignoble sarcasms of *L'Univers*, who, with customary delicacy, reproached him with being *grisonnant, couperosé, et fort ventru*; which, anatomically speaking, is true enough, but which could only weigh as an argument with minds like the partisans of *L'Univers*, accustomed to accept insult as argument. JANIN, however, is not the man to be silenced by *L'Univers*, and his rejoinder has been very amusing.

The whole battle lies in a misconception of the nature of the theatre. The stage is *not* a pulpit. It is not a chapel-of-ease to Little Bethel. It professes to amuse; and although you have a right to demand of it that like other amusements it shall be free from noxious influences, you have no right to demand that it shall be what it does not profess to be,—“a school of morality.”

And liberal applications lie
In Art, like Nature, dearest friend;
So 'twere to cramp its use, if I
Should hook it to some useful end.

The trial of GERVINUS for his Historical Introduction to the 19th Century will in after years be cited as a specimen of the imbecility of the Dynastic policy of our day. Nothing can more plainly indicate the insecurity of Governments than the childish terror they exhibit at a proclamation or a pamphlet. But the work of GERVINUS is not a pamphlet—it is a somewhat dry narrative of historical facts; if these facts carry with them conclusions unfavourable to the powers that be, whose fault is that? The narrator's? Will the march of History cease or slacken, because no sentinel counts the hours? Either the facts grouped in successive relation by GERVINUS are true or they are false; if true, ignoring them will not destroy them; if false, their publication will not make them true.

We cannot but regard it as of incalculable importance that men of the highest scientific eminence are now daily becoming more alive to the necessity of popularising Science, and of familiarising the public mind with principles—*les clartés de tout*, as MOLIERE admirably expresses it; for Science must inevitably form the basis of a future Faith. In the *Dublin Commercial Journal* there appear *Letters on Science, addressed to a Lady*, which we hope to see republished, so luminous and so intelligible is their exposition of certain fundamental conceptions, borrowed from AUGUSTE COMTE, but illustrated anew. They are models of popular exposition, avoiding the impertinent mistake of “writing down” to the supposed level of the reader, avoiding also the use of those technical forms only intelligible to adepts. Indeed, Science is rapidly following in the course of Literature: men are ceasing to write Latin. It was a great innovation to write in the vulgar tongue, so as to be read by the vulgar! If a man could not read Latin, so much the worse, to let him remain ignorant was the only alternative; the idea of descending to his ignorance, and writing what he could read was anarchial! It was placing the Bible in the hands of Christians—for their perdition! We have lived through this; our writers have long relinquished Latin, only those living archives of tradition named Scholars think of writing it now; and in the same way Science is emerging from its Laboratory into the Lecture Room, eminent men are writing what ignorant men may read and profit by. Science, like everything else, is becoming democratic; in ceasing to be the privilege of the few, it becomes the glory and delight of all.

SCRAP LITERATURE.

A Poet's Day Dreams. By Hans Christian Andersen. Bentley.
Knick-Knacks from an Editor's Table. By L. Gayford Clark. New York. Appleton.
“A BOOK'S a book, although there's nothing in't,” seems to be growing more and more of a conviction. It is not enough that slight and superficial works should be published, we are threatened with a Literature of Scraps. The microscope tells us visibly how—

“The very fleas have other fleas,
And smaller fleas to bite 'em;
And those fleas have lesser fleas,
And so *ad infinitum*.”

and our Literature is becoming microscopic. Time was when only the lofty folio and bulgy quarto claimed the honour of a book; if a work was

printed, it was a serious work, but now we have materials for a work often challenging attention; nay, descending lower still, we have seen that marvellous platitude compiler, Martin Farquhar Tupper, publishing a *Book of Title-pages*—the titles and schemes of various works he had not time to execute! It is one of the evils of our “Age of Print.”

Two books lie before us which would exasperate any critic who should look at them seriously. Hans Christian Andersen, whose fairy tales and children's tales are beautiful enough to make us very tolerant of his mistakes, has thrown upon the world such a collection of maudlin ineptitudes under the pretentious title of a *Poet's Day Dreams*, that not even our old regard can restrain our indignation. The book is an impertinence. It consists of twenty scraps, most of which would find no place in any good magazine, and united together by no more recondite art than is employed by the bookbinder. A poet's day dreams! There is not a trace of the poet, nor a glimpse of a dream: it is Northern sentimentality in a hectic style. There is one scrap, among the twenty, in which we recognise the felicitous author of the *Children's Tales*, and we quote it for your amusement, and as a makeweight against our condemnation.

“IT IS VERY TRUE.

“‘It is a frightful history!’ said a hen, in a remote corner of the town, where no historian had ever been seen. ‘It is a frightful poultry-yard story! I really would not dare to sleep alone at night. It is fortunate that there are many of us together when we go to roost!’ And she spoke in such a mysterious way as to make the feathers of all the other hens stand out, and the comb of the cock fall down. It is very true.

“But we will begin at the beginning, and that was at another corner of the town, in a poultry-yard. The sun had set, and the fowls flew up to their perches; one of them—she had white feathers and short legs, laid her eggs with all due regularity, and was, as a hen, in every way respectable—as she was about to go to roost, pecked herself with her bill, and down fell one of her little feathers.

“‘There it goes!’ said she, ‘and the more I pluck out the handsomer I shall become!’ But this was only said in jest—for she was the gayest among all the fowls, although, as before said, extremely respectable. So she fell asleep. There was darkness all around; hen was perched by hen; but the one who was placed nearest to her was not asleep. She heard and she did not hear, as people are so often obliged to do in this world in order to live in peace; but she could not resist saying to her next neighbour, ‘Have you heard what has just been said? I blame no one,—but there is a hen who has determined to pluck her own feathers out, by way of making herself beautiful! Were I the cock, I would despise and discard her!’

“A little way above the hen-roost lived an owl, with its mate and owlets; they had quick ears in that family; they overheard every word that the talkative fowl had said, and they stared with their large eyes, and the matron owl fanned herself with her wings. ‘Oh do—only listen! But you surely heard what was said? I heard it with my own ears. Actually one of these hens has so far forgotten all propriety, that she is sitting there and plucking off all her feathers, and allowing the cock to look at her thus denuded!’

“‘Prenez garde aux enfants!’ exclaimed the father of the young owls; ‘Children should not hear of such doings!’

“‘I shall go and tell the owl who is our opposite neighbour about it though: she is a good sort of friendly creature,’ and away flew the mother-owl.

“‘Hu, hu! whuh!’ hooted they both together, while they made the best of their way to a pigeon-house near; ‘have you heard the news? have you heard the news? uh! uh! A hen has plucked out all her feathers for the cock's sake; and she is freezing to death—if not already dead, uh! uh!’

“‘Where? where?’ cooed the pigeons.

“‘In the neighbouring poultry-yard. I have almost as good as seen it myself; it seems an incredible story to tell—but it is very true.’

“‘We believe every word of it,’ said the pigeons, and down they flew to their poultry-yard. ‘There is a hen—nay, some say there are two hens, who have plucked off all their own feathers, to look different from the rest, and attract the attention of the cock. It was a dangerous proceeding—enough to give them cold and make them die of fever—and they are both dead.’

“‘Wake up! wake up!’ crowed the cock, as he flew up on the wooden paling; his eyes were still heavy with sleep, but he crowed away notwithstanding. ‘Three hens have died of unhappy love for a cock! They have plucked out all their feathers. It is a shocking story, but it cannot be concealed.’

“‘It cannot be concealed!’ repeated the bats; and the hens clucked and the cocks crowed—and so the report travelled from poultry-yard to poultry-yard, till at length it came back to the place where it had originated. It was there told that five hens had plucked out their feathers, in order to see which of them had become the thinnest from their unfortunate love for the cock,—that they had attacked each other in a desperate manner, and fought till each, bathed in its blood, had fallen down dead, to the everlasting disgrace of their families, and to the great loss of their owner.

“The hen, who had dropped the light little feather, naturally did not recognise herself to be the heroine of the tale, and, as she was a very respectable fowl, she said, ‘For my part I can feel nothing but contempt for these hens; but there are too many of the same calibre! Such scandalous occurrences cannot be concealed, and I do not doubt the story will find its way into the newspapers. It is only what these wretched hens have deserved, and their families to boot.’

“The story *did* get into the newspapers; it was actually printed; and it is very true that one little feather can be magnified into five fowls!”

Mr. Gayford Clark's *Knick-Knacks* is another impertinence. Mr. Clark is the editor of the *Nickerbrocker Magazine*, and is accustomed to write a page or two of “gossip” in every number, which gossip seems to have been greatly admired by the American subscribers. If it suits the magazine, he is right in continuing it; but we having, with some weariness, read the volume of collected scraps, learn from the preface, with astonishment, that Washington Irving speaks thus of it:—

“‘I am glad to hear—’ writes an American author whose favourable estimate would reflect honour upon a far worthier literary project than the present—‘that you are preparing one or two volumes for publication from your ‘Table.’ You will perhaps remember that I once spoke to you upon the subject, and advised you to this course. I have often thought it a great pity that the sallies of humour, the entertaining incidents, and the touches of tender pathos, which are so frequently to be met with in your ‘Gossip,’ should be comparatively lost among the multitudinous leaves of a magazine.’”

Even our experience of the extraordinary *complaisance* of authors, so prodigal of praise to mediocrity, will not explain this sentence. The "gossip" is vulgar, affected, pointless—such as no periodical of moderate reputation in our country would purchase; but since our verdict will not suffice against that of so accomplished a writer as Washington Irving, we will open at random—literally at random—in order to be fair, and quote what we find.

Our first opening is at page 32:—

"L—'s *Reminiscence of Boyhood* was a positive treat. Well do we remember *The Execution of the Ground-Mice*, as performed by 'Ollapod' and the writer hereof, when we were 'wee things.' The prisoners were caught in the act of theft, under a 'shock' of cut-corn, after an ineffectual attempt at escape, and were confined in a square stone prison, 'dugged i' the earth' of the meadow. We slept but little the first night of their confinement; we thought of them during the night-watches, and talked of them, as Giant Despair talked with his wife of Christian and Hopeful, shut up in Doubting-Castle. In the morning we visited the prison betimes, and fed the 'plaintiffs' and 'examinationed' them as well as Dogberry himself could have done. We continued to visit them for several days afterwards; and their bearing evincing no penitence, they were condemned to be hung, and a day was appointed for their execution. We had seen a model of a gallows on the cover of the *Story of Ambrose Guinnett*, and 'Ollapod' constructed a very secure 'institution' of that kind; and when the fatal morning arrived, with all due privacy the culprits were brought forth, the thread of death which was to clip the thread of their lives being round their necks. They were addressed in moving terms by Ollapod, and assured that all hope of a reprieve was ridiculous; it could not be thought of by the 'authorities' for a moment. 'They must prepare to mount the scaffold!' They walked, 'supported' partly by the 'rope' around their necks, with firm hind-legs, up the latter, and the 'fatal cord' was adjusted to the transverse beam. It was a moment to be remembered. At a signal given by the jotter-down hereof, the trap-door fell, and they were launched into—liberty! For the thread broke, and the 'wretched culprits' were soon safe in the long grass of the meadow. It was a narrow escape for 'em!"

Our second is at page 105:—

"'I've always remarked,' says that profound observer, Mr. 'Chawls Yellowplush,' 'that when you see a wife a-takin' on airs onto herself, a-scoldink, and internally a-talkin' about 'her dignity' and 'her branch,' that the husband is invariably a spoon.' A friend of ours says that he was reminded of this sage remark the other night, in coming down the Hudson. A large, fat, pompous woman, who was ever and anon overlooking her husband, (a thin, lank personage, with a baby in his arms, who exhibited every mark of prolonged annoyance,) in reply to a meek complaint on his part of fatigue, and the expression of a wish that the nurse might very soon get over her sea-sickness, said:

"'I never saw a man conduct so before—never, on the face o' the globed airth! If I'd ha' known that you was goin' to act in *this* way, I certainly would n't ha' fetched you!"

"The gentleman straitway sang the 'Lay of the Henpecked' to the crying baby, and from that time forth, was as mum as an oyster."

Do you relish the humour of these? They are fair samples. What think you of a volume of such scraps?

As we have inflicted these extracts on our readers, to justify our remarks, we will quote what seemed to us the most amusing page in the volume:—

PUZZLING QUESTIONS IN "LOGIC."

"Most likely many of our readers will remember this 'vexed question' in logic: 'It either rains or it does not rain: but it does not rain; therefore it rains.' This used to puzzle us hugely; as did also the mathematical problem, in simple equations, which ensues: 'A cat has one more tail than no cat; no cat has two tails; ergo, a cat has three tails!' The conclusion is irresistible. Here is something, however, which is of deeper import: 'Johnson studied law with Dobson, under the agreement that he should pay Dobson, when he (Johnson) gained his first cause. After a time Dobson got tired of waiting for the conditions of the contract, and sued Johnson for his pay. He reasoned thus: 'If I sue him I shall get paid at any rate, because if I gain the cause, I shall be paid by the decision of the court; if I lose it, I shall be paid by the conditions of the contract, for then Johnson will have gained his first cause; therefore I am safe.' Johnson, on the other hand, being prodigiously frightened, sought counsel, and was told to reason thus: 'Dobson reasons well, but there must be a flaw in his argument; because I and not he will gain the victory. If the suit goes in my favour, I shall gain it by the decision of the court; if it goes against me, I shall gain it by the terms of the contract, not having yet won my first cause. Of course I shall not have to pay him!' *Vive la Logique!*'"

If it be true that every bad book obstructs the usefulness of some good book, which might have earned its purchase-money and its time, critics should make a stand against Scrap Literature as not only an impertinence but an injury. An author may be excused from publishing a bad book; he does not think it bad; but a book which does not pretend to be good, which avows itself the "sweepings of a study," the scraps fallen from a poor man's table, that can have no excuse.

THE PLAINT OF FREEDOM.

The Plaint of Freedom.

A COSTLY and elegant volume of intensely democratic verse has been sent to us, we presume for review, although it appears to have been printed for private circulation. We are somewhat puzzled what to say respecting it. If it be the work of some very young man it is abounding in promise; if what we take for buds be the consummate flowers—if its crudity be not simply unripeness but want of vital power, our verdict would of course assume a totally different form. Speaking absolutely, without reference to youth or age, the volume seems to us the work of one who has read poetry with diligence and passion, but who is not himself a born poet; the verses are not bad, some of the lines excellent, but nowhere do we detect the traces of originality—of individuality. They are readable, but we have read them before.

The Plaint of Freedom is a series of poems having continuity of thought and purpose—viz., an elegiac sadness over fallen England, a land which once was the land of Freedom, but which now the poet thinks, has fallen into lethargic cowardice needing to be aroused by the trumpet voices of its elder heroes; accordingly Milton, Alfred, Arthur, Robin Hood,

Edmond Ironside, Wat Tyler, and other sounding names, are invoked in stanzas of the *In Memoriam* fashion, and in a style which may be judged by the specimens we will cite:—

"Can Wickliffe's heirs permit the Pope?
May Cromwell's lieges court the Tsar?
Or Alfred's lineage shrink from war,
With shameful peace for only hope?
"And yet, thy sword a liar's tongue,
Thy highest faith some trick of trade,—
What marvel England's name is made
A synonym for Coward Wrong?
"The land that boldly judged a king,
And slew the traitor for his crimes,
Now stoopeth to the poorest mimes
Of Tyranny,—an abject thing.
"No wonder that thou darest not pile
My beacon-fire: 'twould light the world
To see the hydra-slavery curl'd
In thine own heart, Unhappy Isle!"

It is rather exceeding "poetic license" to call England a "synonym for coward wrong." Phrases like that are foolish not powerful, and take the keen edge from the truth the writer so indignantly utters; but it is one of the many phrases which indicate the writer's youth. Young writers are seldom solicitous of the nicely adjusted relations and powerful precision of truth—they aim at "effect" and shoot over the mark. Harken to this "rapt ravidity of rhyme"—

"The circled honour and the place
Of Genius stolen by the Mean:
What poor weak parody of a Queen
Insults the Elizabethan race!
"A peerage,—traffic's motley throng!
A Church,—where prelates build their styes!
And courts of law,—where Jefferies
Remains a precedent for Wrong!
"And in the halls where Vane was heard,
Some rascal Shopman, drunken-brave,
Babbling of State, while Fool and Knave
Applaud a lie in every word!
"A People: thousands crowd the streets,
Exclaiming,—Freedom! let thy grace
Be given us in the market-place,
Where slave his fellow-coward meets!
"So realms are colonized with thieves,
Despite the moss-grown hearths at home;
And starved men through the bleak world roam,
That native fields may fatten bees.
"New chapels built, new schools endow'd,
Of jails or hospitals no lack:
Yet evermore the Poor Man's back
Endures the cross and vulture-goad.
"Yet, with the gift of parrot tongues,
Priests prate of heaven, and earth a hell;
Or preach to Outrage,—'It is well!
God's luck to Villainy belongs.'
"And Patriots by snug parlour fires
Dream of their pleasant oaken wreaths,
And well-earn'd apopleptic deaths,
'In memory of' heroic sires."

The Plaint of Freedom is a political poem, it is not the outpouring of fancy and imagination,

"Singing of summer in full throated ease,"

it is not written to delight but to teach. Yet the primary requisite of a teacher is that he have some wisdom to endow us with. We do not find wisdom in these pages, we find the reverse. We hear a loud shout which is meant to be a trumpet-call, but we are not moved. When the poet shouts:—

"What gain is Chaucer's valorous rhyme,
What prize the fame of Azincourt,
If England's heart and life fall short
Of deeds and poesy sublime?
"If Wrong contending aye with Wrong,
And Robber Robber mastering,
Be all the sad shamed years may bring
Their dark blood-slippery path along?
"Hate copes with Hate, Power strives 'gainst Power:
What happy strength may Discord know?
From bitter fount what stream can flow?
What fruit shall follow canker'd flower?
"The door the fool Injustice built
Lets in his fellow. Nought can stay
Crime's Shadow. Fierce-wing'd Ruins lay
Their dragon-eggs in nest of Guilt."

he leaves us perfectly untroubled. If wrong contending aye with wrong, and robber robber mastering, be all that the years have brought us, then indeed it is time to gird up one's loins,—but does our young poet seriously mean us to believe in such a statement? England to our eyes wears quite another aspect. Indeed the poet does not anticipate that the nation will answer to his trumpet-call, but in some of the best lines in the volume sighs forth this lament:—

"The leaf hath fallen, the pool is stir'd:
Spread, ye slow circles! far and wide,
And reach the shore on every side.
So falleth my unnoticed word."

"None answer: yet by that lone voice
The waves of air are moved, to be
Moved yet again, eternally.
Dying unheeded, I rejoice.
"Long grasses hide a nameless stone:
The poorest grass-root hath its seeds:
What care though triumph's growth proceeds
From vile remains of one unknown?
"Thou, God! art living. At thy side
Truth sits, serenely waiting till
The glass of Destiny shall fill,
And Victory mount to claim his bride."

With this sigh and this hope he concludes.

A BATCH OF NEW BOOKS.

OUR method of rapidly disposing of many new works in one article, instead of waiting till space could be found to give each work its more lengthened notice, has been agreeable to our readers, who regard criticism in its two-fold aspect—viz., as a sort of "book-tasting" for the public, a guide to book clubs and purchasers, and also as an occasion when literary and philosophic principles may be illustrated and discussed.

Major Strickland's *Twenty-Seven Years in West Canada* (Bentley), for example, is a work which might furnish matter for a dissertation, or for columns of readable extract, did time and space suggest such treatment. But the "taster" for the public may briefly indicate the existence of such a work—adding, that it is the plain, sensible record of an early settler's experience (the Major began in 1825—a mere boy, of course), and one which, had it been compressed into one volume, would have been a decidedly valuable record; the diffuseness and the superfluous extracts from previous writers which enlarge the one volume into two, weaken the effect of what is really good. There have been many works on Canada; but this the latest is not the least welcome. It is "edited" by Miss Agnes Strickland. Do we owe the surplusage to her literary care?

In the Baron von Müffling's *Passages from my Life* (Bentley), which Colonel Yorke has translated and edited, we have military memoirs interesting to all military and historical readers, who will value its materials, and be less wearied with its tediousness than we must confess to have been. The Baron was a Prussian general and diplomatist engaged in the campaigns against France, during 1813-14; in 1815, he had a mission to the head-quarters of the Allied army, "to keep up the connexion between the Duke of Wellington and Field Marshal Blücher;" and during the occupation of Paris, he was appointed military governor of the city. A considerable person, such as the Baron was, cannot write of the events amidst which he moved, and of the persons with whom he was in relation, without producing a work of interest; but, as we before hinted, the interest is that of a special class of readers; to the general public it will be found interesting only in passages—such as this, for example, which brings Blücher and the Duke before us:—

"During the march on Paris Field-Marshal Blücher had one time a prospect of getting Napoleon into his power; the delivering up of Napoleon was the invariable condition stipulated by him in every conference with the French Commissioners sent to treat for peace or an armistice. I received from him instructions to inform the Duke of Wellington, that as the Congress of Vienna had declared Napoleon outlawed, it was his intention to have him shot whenever he caught him. But he desired, at the same time, to know what were the Duke's views on this subject, for should he entertain the same as himself, he wished to act in concert with him. The Duke stared at me in astonishment, and in the first place disputed the correctness of this interpretation of the Viennese declaration of outlawry, which was never meant to incite to the assassination of Napoleon. He therefore did not think that they could acquire from this act any right to order Napoleon to be shot, should they succeed in making him a prisoner of war. But be this as it may, as far as his own position and that of the Field-Marshal with respect to Napoleon were concerned, it appeared to him that, since the battle they had won, they were become much too conspicuous personages to justify such a transaction in the eyes of Europe. I had already felt the force of the Duke's arguments before I most reluctantly undertook my mission, and was therefore little disposed to dispute them. 'I therefore,' continued the Duke, 'wish my friend and colleague to see this matter in the light I do; such an act would hand down our names to history stained by a crime, and posterity would say of us, that we did not deserve to be the conquerors of Napoleon; the more so as such a deed is now quite useless, and can have no object.' I made use of these expressions only as far as was necessary to dissuade the Field-Marshal from his idea. It is not unimportant to preserve to history the motives which actuated the Field-Marshal in giving me this commission."

The *Legend of Pembroke Castle* (Bentley) is one of those "historical" novels in which very young readers delight, and which their "parents and guardians" think innocent and instructive, because they are "historical." Before pronouncing an opinion on this work we should wish to know the class of readers it addresses. If the young, we can answer for its fascination; if those who have glutted somewhat of the sweets furnished by the circulating library, then we must warn them that it is a very mild, rosepink affair. It does not claim the seriousness of criticism.

Nor indeed does Mr. Henry Spicer's ill-considered work, *Sights and Sounds; the Mystery of the Day* (Bosworth), wherein an "entire history" of the American spirit manifestations, known as the "Rappings," is jumbled together pell-mell with all kinds of reflections and digressions. The "excitement" caused in many circles by these pretended manifestations may send people to Mr. Spicer's work. He is a firm believer; and narrates marvels enough to satisfy the most credulous. We have a friend who has for years been collecting "mad books"—i. e., specimens of folly and eccentricity—we commend *Sights and Sounds* to him.

It is a wide leap from such a work to one of the solid excellence and practical value of Erasmus Wilson's *Dissector's Manual of Practical and Surgical Anatomy* (Longman and Co.) This is a new edition of the well-known book, newly illustrated with numerous woodcuts from drawings by the author, and so clear and systematic in its exposition that all who

desire a work of the kind will be grateful to Erasmus Wilson for descending from those heights of speculation and scientific research in which he has distinguished himself, to the humble drudgery of this useful text-book. It is a companion volume to the same author's *Anatomist's Vade Mecum*.

The essays by Dr. M'Cormac on *Moral Sanatory Economy* (Longman and Co.)—which treat of Female Degradation, Employment, Education, Household Culture, Criminal Management, Physical Training, Clothing, Food, Drink, Air, Drainage, and Prevention of Disease—are the essays of a cultivated physician, speaking from actual inspection of the present state of things, and worthy, therefore, of every one's mature deliberation. That without moral health our material interests are as naught, and without physical health our moral culture is ineffective—this is the lesson Dr. M'Cormac inculcates, and inculcates it forcibly.

Side by side with this volume let us place the *Essays on Political Economy* (W. and F. G. Cash), translated from the French of the late admirable Frederick Bastiat. They are written with beautiful clearness, and from abundant knowledge. They comprise Capital and Interest—That which is seen and that which is not seen—Government and Law. In various ways he illustrates his master principle, which is that of *Liberty*. Do not devise schemes for the protection or regulation of industry, but let industry be every way untrammelled, and it will organize the best conditions for itself! It is a small volume, but worth a large sum.

Lovers of antiquities and illustrated books are directed to W. Burckhardt Parker's *Lares and Penates, or Cilicia and its Governors* (Ingram, Cooke, and Co.), which is edited by Mr. W. F. Ainsworth. It is not only an agreeably erudite narrative of the province of Cilicia from the earliest times, written by one who had abundant opportunities, but also an account of the Household Gods of the Cilicians previous to their conversion to Christianity: this portion of the work is very curious, and is profusely illustrated with woodcuts. There is, moreover, some interesting matter on the Natural History of this country; and altogether the volume is a very attractive one.

To those who have not been bored out of all interest in the negroes by *Uncle Tom*, we recommend Dr. John Beard's *Life of Toussaint L'Ouverture* (Ingram, Cooke, and Co.). It is a well written and dramatic biography of the negro patriot, written with warm sympathy for the negroes, and with biographical admiration for Toussaint.

Speaking of illustrated works we must call especial attention to the *Children's Summer* (Addey and Co.), a series of artistic illustrations, accompanied by charming prose and verse, setting forth the varied delights of a child's summer. The graceful pencil of E. V. B., to which we owe these illustrations, has already won for itself a public by the last year's Christmas book of *Child's Play*, and that public will once more admire the nice poetic and artistic feeling of E. V. B., although the more critical will remark a certain Germanism, and with it a somewhat non-infantile look in the children's faces—they are too old, too staid, too meditative looking for their age. Their attitudes are charming and child-like, and the design of each picture is ingenious. Altogether *Children's Summer* is a very interesting work to place on a drawing-room table.

In noticing the first part of a re-issue of the *Encyclopædia Britannica* (Adam and Charles Black), for the sake of informing such readers as may desire to avail themselves of this opportunity of purchasing it by degrees, we need only repeat the promises of the prospectus, which assures its complete publication in twenty-one volumes, in monthly parts at eight shillings, and quarterly volumes at twenty-four shillings. A considerable advance is said to have been already made with regard to the printing, in order to prevent delay in publication. We should not, however, forbear to warn the proprietors against attaching too much importance to this regularity. Better to run a slight risk than have the chemical and biological articles older than their date of publication. This First Part contains Dugald Stewart's well-known and delightful *Dissertation on the Progress of Metaphysical Philosophy*. It is worthy of mention that the publishers have given the *Dissertation entire* in this part, so that persons desirous of possessing Dugald Stewart's work, without purchasing the *Encyclopædia*, or any portion of it, may do so: it forms a reasonable volume by itself.

Bulwer's *Zanoni* is with many his most popular fiction. It is now reprinted in the cheap edition of his works (Chapman and Hall), with a preface and an appendix, wherein some extremely imaginary writer undertakes to give a key to the typical meanings of this philosophical romance. That key will set many juvenile intellects busy.

Mrs. Norton's beautiful novel, *Stuart of Dunleath*, which we reviewed at length on its first appearance, has been included in the *Parlour Library* (Simms and McIntyre), where lovers of fiction are bidden to seek it. They will not often find a novel more entertaining.

Portfolia.

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

THE RAPPITES EXPOSED.

THE wide-spreading delusion of what is called the Spirit Manifestations or Rapping—its increasing *succès de salon*—and the solemn testimony to its truth given by persons formerly sceptical, now convinced by experiment, and those, too, often persons of ability as well as position, rendered it imperative on journalists to investigate the matter thoroughly. The extraordinary letter addressed to me by a German friend, and printed last week in these columns, made me anxious to do so without delay. That letter I presume has not been overlooked by our readers; at any rate they are entreated to read it now, for it is indeed an admirable report. Immediately after our séance it was read aloud, and the company pronounced it an unusually accurate description—in spite of its conveying an impression directly opposite to that which had resulted from our investigation. That letter places before the reader the "Rapping" as a

marvel; the writer, although he will not own himself convinced, emphatically declares that it is not an imposture. Our conviction was that a more barefaced and ignoble imposture had never been attempted; and for that conviction we had irresistible *proof*. If this seems paradoxical—if I can say on the one hand that W. R.'s report was an admirable one, and yet on the other that it was profoundly and essentially false in the conclusion to which it pointed—the paradox will only be one to those unaccustomed to sift evidence, and unacquainted with the worthlessness of "reported cases."

I will add to the paradox by saying that while the imposture is flagrant, there is nothing wonderful in its success. I am not astonished at any person's credulity. A man goes to a séance perfectly incredulous. He is staggered by the revelation of facts which it is absolutely impossible the Medium could know, facts perhaps known only to himself. The revelation is made to him in answer to a question *thought*, not *spoken*; no one knows the question but himself, no one knows the answer; yet the answer is accurate! Is it not marvellous? Can it be a trick? From that moment the astonished questioner is a devout believer. And yet in the face of hundreds of such experiences I pronounce the Rapping a flagrant, a transparent trick: but to see through it you must be on your guard.

Before I had witnessed these "astounding phenomena," I had formed an hypothesis of the whole process, which turned out to be accurate. It did not seem in the least surprising to me that the questioner should be correctly answered, even when asking questions mentally, of which no living soul but his own knew the answer. I invariably said: "The cause of your delusion is that you direct your attention to the *thing said*, and not to the *way in which it is said*. Whatever the trick may be, it will be just as easy to answer a question of one kind as of another—the nature of the question has nothing to do with it. If you ask where your grandfather died, his death being a mystery to the whole world, the answer is as easy as if you ask where Napoleon died; because as it is *you* who really give the answer, not the Medium, what you have in your mind is what will turn out to be the answer. You assure me solemnly that you do not tell the Medium anything; I declare unequivocally that you *do*. It is the same in cases of Clairvoyance: you tell all, and fancy you are told. You do not tell it in so many words, but unconsciously you are made to communicate the very thing you believe is communicated to you."

This reasoning, it is needless to say, had very little acceptance; it is stated here as an introduction to, and an explanation of the experiments I made. I had formed an hypothesis, and according to that hypothesis I framed certain traps into which the Medium would infallibly fall if my supposition were correct; the hypothesis and the traps I explained to certain friends *before* the experiment was made, and the result not only fully confirmed expectation, but showed what was certainly not anticipated—viz., that the trick was a miserably poor one—I thought it would be a good trick, such as the "Magic chair," "Magic wand," "Mysterious lady," or any of the clever conjuring tricks, whereas it really is dependent for its success on nothing but the amazing and active credulity of the audience. This is the conclusion of the writer in the *Household Words*, whose account is accurate, except perhaps in the explanation given of the "raps," which is said to be made by the toes. The writer, however, laid no traps for Mrs. Hayden (the Medium), he did not select "crucial instances." I did; and you shall presently learn what they were.

Our party comprised Mr. and Mrs. Masters, Sir William, Mr. Purcell, and myself (for obvious reasons the names given are fictitious, except my own). It was after dinner, and we were smoking our cigars, when the footman announced that Mrs. Hayden was in the drawing-room. We soon joined her there, and found her talking to Mrs. Masters about the "spirits," in the most easy, familiar way—indeed, she always spoke of them without awe, but with implicit confidence—as if they had been pet monkeys. The conversation soon became general, as we formed a circle round the table. It of course turned upon the "Manifestations," and Mrs. Hayden was copious in anecdotes (adroitly mingled with aristocratic and well-known names) of the surprising success which had attended her. At last, the rappings having announced that the ghosts were impatient to do something for the money paid, we took our cards, on which the letters of the alphabet, and the numerals from one to ten were printed, and the séance began.

Sir William was the first. He thought of one dead. On asking whether the person he was then thinking of was present, an alacrity in rapping assured him of the fact. He took his card; the raps were distinct; but the letters were all wrong. He tried another spirit—again the letters indicated were wrong. He tried a third, but a third time nothing came right. I was beginning to get anxious lest repeated failures should alarm the Medium and make her give some evasive excuse; so I suggested that Mr. Masters should try. He tried—but with the same desperate ill success. It was now my turn. Let me pause here to remark that both Sir William and Mr. Masters were determined to give no clue whatever—they remained purely passive awaiting a result; they passed their pencils along the alphabet with such terrible uniformity that the Medium was reduced to vague guessing, and of course in each guess it was thirty-five to one against her. This was what I had anticipated; but it was only negative evidence, and I was to elicit something positive.

I thought of a relative of mine, and said aloud, "I should like to know if she is present." Rapping answered "Yes." Observe, the person I thought of was a real person—I was planning no trap this time, because

the experiment was to be every way conclusive. I passed my pencil equally along the alphabet without once lingering, until after I had passed the letter J, with which her name began. Finding that I was not to have the *real* name, I thought I would try if I could not make the raps answer where I pleased. I chose N. Raps came; N was written down. What name, thought I, shall it be? Naomi or Nancy? Before I had finally settled, my pencil had passed A, and as I saw E, I determined E should be the letter, and E was indicated. N E, of course, would do for Nelly, and Nelly was spelled! Then came the surname, which ought to have begun with H; but, as my pencil did not linger at H, on we passed until we came to S, which was indicated without any intention on my part. I had then to invent some name beginning with S, which was not done at once, from the very *embarras de richesses*, however I thought O would do, and O was indicated; then R; and after that I resolved the name should be Sorel. It is unnecessary to follow further thus in detail my first trial; enough if I add that Nelly Sorel informed me she died in 1855, leaving 6 children, 2 of whom were boys, the eldest 14—every answer being ludicrously wrong, but declared by me to be "astonishing," which declaration was accepted in perfect faith by the Medium, who thought she had got one good, credulous listener at all events. That was my object—to make her fall into my trap it was necessary she should believe I was her dupe.

As far as my hypothesis went it was confirmed by this conversation. I knew that it was the questioner who supplied the answer, and I made the answer turn out whatever I pleased—not, be it remembered, having that answer originally in my mind, so as to admit of any pretended "thought reading"—but framing the answer according to the caprice of the moment, and invariably receiving the answer I had resolved on. Now you have only to replace *acted* credulity by *real* credulity, and the trick is explained. What I did consciously, the credulous do unconsciously. I spelled the words, so do they. The Medium knows nothing; she guesses according to the indications you give, and only guesses right when you give right indications; therefore if you ask what you and you alone can answer, she will answer it only on the supposition that you indicate by your manner what the answer is. But if any doubt lingers in your mind, let this my second trial suffice. I had called up the spirit of one who *did* exist; it was now time to call up one who never did exist. I asked for one of the *Eumenides*; the ready answer assured me of her presence! So then I was at last in actual communication with one of the awful troupe—*θανμαστος λοχος*—who "snore" so fearfully in *Æschylus*—one in whose nostrils the scent of human blood *laughed*, as we are told—

οσμη βροτειων αιματων με προσγελα.

What "emendations" might I not get from her! A bishopric was evidently within my grasp!

The result of my interview was that she died six years ago, aged 25, leaving seven children; facts for the first time placed at the disposal of some future Bloomfield. I called her back, subsequently, to ask her what *sect* she belonged to when in life, (I asked this question audibly, not mentally—as, indeed, I had all the others;) and the answer was, *Jew*. A Greek ghost embracing Judaism!

To show how completely the answers are made at random, when no clue is given, but only a 'yes' or 'no' is required, here are four questions I wrote on a piece of paper, and the answers I received:—

Had the ghost of Hamlet's father seventeen noses? Yes.

Had Semiramis? Yes.

Was Pontius Pilate an American? No.

Was he a leading tragedian? Yes.

I thought Mr. Purcell would have had a stroke of apoplexy, when I showed him these questions; how he restrained the convulsion of laughter is a mystery!

Let me not forget, that when Mr. Purcell called up a spirit, the answers were tolerably correct, not quite, but still near enough to be curious to one unsuspecting; he confessed afterwards, however, that he had semi-consciously *assisted* the Medium; but, in his second conversation, he called up the spirit of an old family servant, who, at an advanced age, married an elderly woman, and who subsequently drowned himself. These were the questions and answers, as written down:—

Does James miss his children? Yes. (Never had any.)

How many had he? Yes.

How many boys? Yes.

What did he die of? *Wafer*.

To explain this "wafer," it may be observed, that Mr. Purcell meant the death to be called water on the chest, which was his fallacious hint by way of an explanation of drowning; and, when he said aloud that the word was incorrectly spelled *wafer*, whereas it ought to have been water on the chest, Mrs. Hayden pointed triumphantly to the accuracy, "only one letter wrong, you see; *wafer*, instead of *water*!" and she referred to this several times in the course of the evening.

I have not half exhausted my stock of questions and answers written down at the time; but the foregoing will surely suffice; and, should they be deemed inconclusive, perhaps *this* one will close the question: As I had been so very successful in getting correct answers, and was evidently regarded by the spirits with singular partiality, they never declining to answer any question I put, it occurred to me to write this question on my paper, which I showed to Mr. Purcell:—

Is Mrs. Hayden an impostor?

An unequivocal Yes, was the answer; and, to make assurance doubly sure, Mr. Purcell affected not to hear that answer; so we repeated the question, and again were assured that she was an impostor. This was the most satisfactory answer of the evening, and I felt very sorry that the Medium was a woman—not a man, to whom I could have said, "I asked the spirits if you were an impostor, and you hear them declare you to be one." For I must plainly say, that a more ignoble imposture than this spirit manifestation never came before me—and that was the opinion of the whole party. It is easy for the reader to convince himself of this by a similar process.

G. H. LEWES.

P.S.—I have said nothing of the table being moved, simply because, before the Medium came, we tried the experiment ourselves, and found that by a motion of the knees, which should not be visible to any one sitting round the table, we could move a huge oaken table, of a size and weight which defied our moving it with the hands, while sitting; and, when Mrs. Hayden endeavoured to move it, as she had volunteered, Sir William twined his legs around the leg of the table, and prevented her. He felt her straining to move it; and she must have thought the table too heavy, for at length she desisted.

The Arts.

GOSSIP ABOUT THE THEATRES.

"On me prête beaucoup de sottises—I am credited with a great many absurdities I never uttered," said a somniferous abbé in the presence of D'Alembert, who, with a Frenchman's wit, replied, "Tant pis! on ne prête qu'aux riches—So much the worse for you! nobody lends anything but to the opulent." I thought of that *mot* the other day, hearing an actor complain of not having "parts" written for him, "like the French actors." Of course not: who will lend to the poor? The French actors can act, and therefore parts are written for them. No one hears Keeley, or Mrs. Keeley, Buckstone, or Webster, or Charles Mathews, complain that they cannot get parts. On our stage, we have not the *ingénue*; we have the "white muslin" and the "walking lady," but the *ingénue* is a part no man thinks of writing, because there is no actress for it; by the time our actresses have acquired the art, they have lost the age.

Mdls. Luther is an *ingénue*. She is young, and plays young parts, "characters." And very charming she is in them. In *Une fille de la*

grande Armée, for example, nothing can be more fascinating than her graceful *brusquerie* and petulance; she is

Pulchra, procax, petulante manu,

as old Ausonius would say,—that is, feminine, even amidst her unfeminine ways; fit for the salon, though bred in barracks. She made me, in that part, forget her incompetence in *Livre III., Chapitre 1^{er}*; or, rather, she indicated, thereby, the limits of her style, showing that she can play the *ingénue*, but not *la grande coquette*.

Lafont made his first appearance this season in the part of the "General," and was welcomed as the English always welcome old favourites. He is an admirable actor, and versatile. With him, the company at the St. James's assumes quite a new importance, and the larger audiences of late, show that the public appreciate the better bill of fare. Ravel is still here—still inimitable.

I have not much to say of the other theatres. Benefits and Easter preparations are the "order of the day." Webster is taking farewell of the HAYMARKET in all earnest, playing for the last time a variety of favourite parts. His farewell benefit is on Monday. Buckstone, who enters upon management at Easter, has been making great efforts to get a strong company together. Helen Faucit and Miss Cushman have brief "starring" engagements; the former to appear in a new play by Browning. But the strongest "company" in London will be at the ADELPHI—Webster, Leigh Murray, Wigan, Keeley, Mrs. Keeley, Mrs. Stirling, Miss Woolgar, Madame Celeste, &c. At the PRINCESS'S there will be no Easter burlesque, but a bandit melodrama, founded on Scribe's opera, *Marco Spada*, in which Charles Kean will doubtless perform an amiable ruffian with effect. A version of the same *Marco Spada* will be produced at the OLYMPIC. The same "gossip report" which brings these scraps to my ears, assails me also with the news that the LYCEUM will have another *drame spectacle* of the *Chain of Events* character, only instead of being in eight acts, it is to be in nine! and that Beverly is to do in it what no one else can do—surpass William Beverly!

You may expect, perhaps, that I am about to tell you something of Mr. Sands, the American ceiling walker at DRURY LANE; but, although I hear of this great "antipodal feat" of a man walking with his feet pressed to the ceiling, and his head resting on the "impalpable air," I also read, in the Drury Lane playbills, that he does so "in defiance of the laws of equitation," and being a philosopher, I am occupied in solving that problem before witnessing the fact. Consider what a deferential calculus is needed for this problem: "Given, the laws of equitation, to discover antipodal walking!" A new drama has also been produced at this theatre, *The School for Kings*, but I did not see it. I was afraid it also might have been in defiance of the laws of equitation!

VIVIAN.

Commercial Affairs.

MONEY MARKET AND CITY INTELLIGENCE.

Friday Evening, March 11, 1853.

DURING the early part of the week the Share Market has been somewhat languid, but during yesterday and to-day prices have again rallied. Consols, after being tolerably steady at 99½ to 99¾, yesterday rose to 99¾, and are to-day 99¾ to par. The expected arrival of news from Sydney, and the weekly meeting of the bank directors having taken place without any alteration in the rate of discount, has had a favourable effect on all stocks. Foreign Stocks have shown great activity during the week, particularly South American and Mexican. The Turkish loan has advanced to 2½ premium. Foreign Railway Shares have been very buoyant—in all the principal French lines there have been strong purchasers. The Northern of France have improved 20s. to 30s. per share; the South-Eastern of France, an embryo line which has not yet obtained a concession from the French Government, has been asked after a good deal this week, and several purchases made—from which it is to be inferred that the state of the Bourse in Paris is more satisfactory, and in that case the concession will be no longer withheld. Shares in the various Gold-Mining Companies have advanced in price. In Californian Mines the Nouveau Monde seem the best—a dividend even is threatened. Australian Agriculturals have improved; the offshoot from this latter Company, called the Peel River Land and Mineral, has risen 2½ per share. Nova Scotias are 1½ to 2 per share. More Copper Mining Companies have been projected. Lake Superior, which is well known by mineralogists to be abundant in copper, is to be the scene of these new operations. Money is allowed to be very easy, and if the Bank does not put the "screw" on again, there will be no lack of speculation.

BRITISH FUNDS FOR THE PAST WEEK (CLOSING PRICES.)

	Satur.	Mon.	Tues.	Wedn.	Thurs.	Frid.
Bank Stock	100½	228	228½	228½	shut	shut
3 per Cent. Red.	100½	100½	100½	100½	shut	100½
3 per Cent. Con. Ans.	99½	99½	99½	99½	99½	100
Consols for Account	99½	99½	99½	99½	99½	100½
3½ per Cent. An.	103½	103½	103½	103½	103½	103½
New 5 per Cents.	shut	shut	shut	shut	shut	shut
Long Ans., 1860	6 7-16	6½	6 7-16	6 7-16	shut	shut
India Stock	shut	shut	shut	shut	shut	shut
Ditto Bonds, £1000	shut	50	48	48	50	45
Ditto, under £1000	shut	50	48	48	50	45
Ex. Bills, £1000	13 p	10 p	8 p	13 p	13 p	14 p
Ditto, £500	shut	shut	shut	shut	shut	shut
Ditto, Small	shut	shut	shut	shut	shut	shut

FOREIGN FUNDS.

(LAST OFFICIAL QUOTATION DURING THE WEEK ENDING FRIDAY EVENING.)

Brazilian Bonds	109½	Peruvian 3 per Cent. Def.	64½
Brazilian New 4½ per Cts.	98½	Russian 5 p. Cents, ex d.	118½
Buenos Ayres Bonds	62½	Russian 4½ per Cents.	103½
Dutch 2½ per Cents.	98½	Sardinian Bonds	98½
Dutch 4 per Cent. Certif.	99½	Spanish 3 p. Cents.	44½
Ecuador	5½	Spanish 3 p. Cts. New Def.	24½
Granada, ex Dec., 1849,	22½	Spanish Passive, Conv.	5½
coupon	22½	Spanish Com. Certif. of	7½
Greek, ex over-due Coup.	8½	Coupon not funded	7½
Mexican 3 per Cents.	25½	Swedish Loan	1½ dis.
Portuguese 5 p. Ct. Conv.	41	Turkish Loan, 6 per Cent.	2½ pm.
1841		1852	

"The saving of from 30 to 50 per cent. on each suit of clothes, is a feature which the practical genius of Englishmen will not fail to appreciate."

THE above quotation is taken from a Work lately published, on "The Various Systems, &c., of the Woollen-Cloth Trade." The immediate reference of this extract is to the New System recently introduced at the LONDON CLOTH ESTABLISHMENT by

EDMUND DUDDEN AND CO.

And in which the Writer shows that the Customers of Messrs. Dudden and Co. save from 30 to 50 per cent. on their purchases by adopting the New System. The fine STOCK of the LONDON CLOTH ESTABLISHMENT is known as one of the best in the Metropolis, from which any Lengths, even the shortest, are

SOLD AT THE WHOLESALE PRICE.

But, as an auxiliary to the Cloth Trade, Cutters of superior talent are engaged; and Purchasers of Cloth, &c., may, if they wish, have it made up on the Premises, at the charge of

THE WORKMEN'S WAGES,

Messrs. Dudden and Co. guaranteeing, not only the Quality of the Cloth, but also the Fit and Workmanship of every Garment.

LONDON CLOTH ESTABLISHMENT, 16, COVENTRY STREET.

Royal Italian Opera,

COVENT GARDEN.

The Directors of the Royal Italian Opera beg most respectfully to inform the Nobility, Gentry, Subscribers, and the Public, that the Season will commence on Tuesday, March 29th. Full particulars will be duly announced.

HEAL AND SON'S ILLUSTRATED

CATALOGUE of BEDSTEADS, sent free by post, contains designs and prices of upwards of ONE HUNDRED different Bedsteads, in Iron, Brass, japanned Wood, polished Birch, Mahogany, Rosewood, and Walnut-tree Woods; also their Priced List of Bedding. Their new Warehouses enable them to keep one of each design fixed for inspection. They have also, in addition to their usual Stock, a great variety of the best designs of PARISIAN BEDSTEADS, both in Wood and Iron, which they have just imported.

Heal and Son, Bedstead and Bedding Manufacturers, 196, (opposite the Chapel,) Tottenham Court Road.

SUPERIOR TO COFFEE, BUT LOWER IN PRICE.

FRENCH CHOCOLATE, 1s. per pound, or in packets, 6d., 3d., and 1d. each, a preparation from the choicest Cocons of the English markets, and manufactured by the most approved French method. Coffee is far inferior in nutritive qualities to Cocoa. And Chocolate, or properly prepared Cocoa, is now universally recommended by the Medical Profession, as more conducive to health than any other vegetable substance which enters into the human dietary. The superiority of the above One Shilling French Chocolate, over raw and unprepared Cocons, may be judged of by the perfection attained in its manufacture, owing to which it may be used either as food or beverage.

PARIS CHOCOLATE COMPANY, distinguished by the Patronage of her Majesty the Queen, and the unanimous award of both "Council" and "Prize" Medals at the Great Exhibition of 1851. Manufacturers of Breakfast Chocolate, Bonbons, and French Syrups.

Sold Wholesale and Retail by the principal Grocers, Confectioners, and Druggists in the kingdom. Chocolate Mills, Isleworth; Wholesale Depot, 35, Pudding-Lane, City; West-End Agent, Mr. JOHN HATFIELD, 221, Regent-Street.

TO EMIGRANTS.

THE following GUTTA PERCHA ARTICLES will be found of great value to Emigrants, especially such as are proceeding to the

GOLD DIGGINGS.

GUTTA PERCHA LINING FOR BOXES.

BUCKETS. | LIFE BUOYS. | WASHING BOWLS.
DRINKING MUGS. | FLASKS. | SYPHONS.

GUTTA PERCHA TUBING.

SUCTIONS FOR PUMPS. | CARBOYS FOR GUNPOWDER.
JUGS. | MINERS' CAPS.

SOLES FOR BOOTS AND SHOES.

TO KEEP THE FEET DRY is of the utmost importance to the Emigrant. This may be secured by the use of Gutta Percha Soles, which are perfectly Waterproof, Cheaper and more Durable than Leather. They can be put on with ease by any one. This cannot be too extensively known amongst Australian Emigrants, as it is now difficult to find a Shoemaker in that country.

GOLD WASHING VESSELS OF EVERY VARIETY OF SHAPE MAY BE HAD TO ORDER.

Directions to Emigrants for lining Boxes with Gutta Percha Sheet, (so as to preserve the contents from injury by sea water,) also for putting on Soles of Boots and Shoes, &c., may be had GRATIS on application to any of the Gutta Percha Company's Dealers.

N.B.—The Company's Illustrated Circulars, with Instructions for Joining Tubes, Lining Cisterns and Tanks, and for securely attaching Gutta Percha Soles, will be forwarded (post free) on receipt of four postage stamps.

THE GUTTA PERCHA COMPANY, PATENTERS,
18, WHARF ROAD, CITY ROAD, LONDON.

