

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.*

NEWS OF THE WEEK—	PAGE
History of Parliament	262
Election Matters.....	266
Australia and Transportation.....	266
Lord Campbell and the Roman-catholic High Sheriff.....	267
Letters from Paris	267
Continental Notes	268
Louis Blanc and Mazzini	268
The Government and the Rifle Clubs	269
The American Re-action against Kossuth.....	269
The Kaffir War	269

Contents:	
The Burmese War	269
Progress of Association	270
A Heartless Poetaster	270
Piracy on Board English Ships	270
A Monk condemned for burning the Bible	271
The Belper Murder.....	271
Miscellaneous	271
Health of London during the Week	273
Births, Marriages, and Deaths	273
PUBLIC AFFAIRS—	
The Derby Interregnum	274
Social Reform in the Army	274

The "Sisters of Mercy" and Low Church Chivalry	275
Protection in the Gazette.....	275
The False Peace.....	276
Europe in America.....	276
Louis Bonaparte described by Shakespeare.....	276
LITERATURE—	
Niebuhr's Life and Letters	277
Men and Women of France.....	278
Samuel Bailey's Discourses	279
Books on our Table	279

PORTFOLIO—	
The Haythorne Papers	280
THE ARTS—	
Paillassé.....	281
Albert Smith on Mont Blanc	281
White Magic	282
Royal Italian Opera	282
Turner's Shipwreck	282
COMMERCIAL AFFAIRS—	
Markets, Gazettes, Advertisements, &c.	282-284

VOL. III. No. 104.]

SATURDAY, MARCH 20, 1852.

[PRICE SIXPENCE.]

News of the Week.

MONDAY arrived, has passed, and the Derby-Disraeli Cabinet is still in office. Indeed, the Ministerial crisis proves to be of a much more protracted kind than ardent men were expecting. The Protectionists are provokingly slow to begin the reaction; and the Opposition does not seem to know very well what it is about; insomuch, that there may be said to be a Ministerial crisis also in the Opposition. In the House of Commons, the week and the public action of the new Cabinet began with questionings; Mr. James Wilson, asking Sir John Pakington, as the new Colonial Minister, whether he intended to reverse the Free-trade policy as respects the West Indies; and Mr. Charles Villiers asking ministers generally, whether they intended to reimpose a duty on corn. At the same time, in the other House, Lord Beaumont put the same question to Lord Derby. The replies were, in substance, that Ministers do not intend to do *anything* of the kind this session, but that they retain their original opinions, and will prepare for a gradual return to protective policy. In detail and manner, however, the replies varied. Sir John Pakington was direct: he should do nothing now—not even arrest the periodical decline which the present law enacts in the rate of duty on foreign sugar; but, ultimately, he reserved the right of hereafter doing whatever he might be "in a position" to do "for the promotion of the objects he had in view."

In the matter of corn, the position of Ministers is very different. Lord Derby avows that he did not *wholly* object to Sir Robert Peel's measures, though he thought they went too far; he will not at once proceed to disturb them; he thinks a *countervailing* duty on corn desirable, but he will not pledge himself even to that; he will refer the question to the country, and will reserve to himself the right of *considering* what to do upon the expression of public feeling. He will not act even if he get a *numerical* majority in his favour, unless the manifest feeling be in favour of doing so. Mr. Disraeli's speech was substantially the counterpart. It is to be collected from this statement, that Ministers have no thorough confidence in the cause they have hitherto upheld; that they consider *some* of Sir Robert Peel's measures as having been final; that they have no specific intentions; but that they intend to commence a course of general reaction in politics and oconomy, if they find

[TOWN EDITION.]

themselves strong enough; of which they are far from certain.

The position of the different parties in the debate was such as to furnish no very clear insight into the future. Ministers were bold and confident in personal manner, but conciliatory and deprecatory in terms. Lord Derby spoke with much animation and dignity, and recalled to his hearers some of his earlier feats of eloquence. Lord Grey's counter-speech was flat and feeble in the comparison. Mr. Disraeli was easy, confident, and quite at home on the Treasury bench; he astonished the discreet by continuing in office much of the free air and the *repartee* that distinguished him in Opposition; he convinced the House that it was not so wonderful for him to be in office, but that it was more evidently impossible than ever that the whole Cabinet could not stop there. Both the two Ministers held out prominently their desire for no hasty disturbance; asked not to be "interrupted" in proposing the usual measures of finance, the continuance bills, and Chancery reform; asked it, not for themselves, but for their country; and, generally, made professions of candour, frankness, and a willingness to accept a real decision on the part of the nation.

Their reactionary intention as well as tendencies, however, is unmistakably apparent. Protection they desire, and will restore as much as they may—such is our inference from what they say. Questioned on the subject of National Education in Ireland, Lord Derby admits that he contemplates some unsettlement of that highly successful system—an enquiry with a view to separating the Protestant and Roman Catholic children in lieu of having mixed schools. In the peroration of his Monday's speech, Lord Derby cites the word "Protestant" in a manner that implies some appeal to the known religious feelings of his party—a Church and State spirit. And Lord Harrowby (better known as Sandon) only repeats the avowed sentiments of royal Ministers, when he says that the real question at issue is not whether the country will be Protectionist or not, but whether it shall be Democratic or not; the functions of the present Ministry being "to keep out the Democrats," with Lord John Russell at their head!

Of Lord John's share in the Monday's debate, it is enough to say that he followed up the policy of the Chesham-place meeting with painstaking, but that members left the House during his speech, especially when he plunged into statistics. Mr. Gladstone and Lord Palmerston insisted upon

a fair time for Ministers to take their *routine* measures, but denied their right to originate great measures before they should have established their tenure in office by an appeal to the country. Sir James Graham, quoting from speeches by Lord Derby and Mr. Disraeli, showed that they were bound in honour not to enter office unless they directly endeavoured to restore Protection. He spoke with great power, great effect, and a withering scorn of the new Leader of the Commons, implied principally by what he did *not* say; as when he expressed his reliance on the honour of Lord Derby—omitting to avow the same reliance on his colleague. The Manchester Free-Traders were represented by Mr. Villiers; but they did not take a very prominent place in debate.

Meanwhile Ministers have obtained, without opposition, their first vote in supply, the one for the number of men in the navy, including the "reserve" of 5000 men devised by the late Ministers. For some other movements, a select committee is the modest "first point of the wedge." Mr. Napier obtained a select committee to inquire into the state of the disturbed part of Armagh, Monaghan, and Louth, with a view to altering the jury laws, trying ribbon cases by special juries, protecting juries from intimidation, and re-enacting the penal laws against the use of signs and passwords. The Manchester and Salford Education Bill—the *sectarian* version of public education—was referred, by motion of Mr. Milner Gibson, with the sanction of Ministers, to a select committee; Ministers expressing doubts and hesitations precisely as to those parts of the measure which are of more popular tendency; and Lord John naively hoping that the committee *thus* sanctioned would lead to a settlement of the vexed question!

Out of doors, Ministers have not been left altogether in peace. Sir John Pakington, an old advocate of transportation in his capacity of chairman at quarter sessions, has been visited by a numerous deputation of gentlemen from the four important colonies of Australia, calling upon him to discontinue transportation. He spoke fairly, and was evidently impressed, though he did cite the petition of the Western Australians for convicts, and even the exploded project of the Moreton Bay penal settlement. Sir John may beat the colonies yet, if they will stand it.

And the routine of the Ministerial elections has not been unbroken, for Lord Naas has been induced to retire from the contest for Kildare, and his opponent, Mr. Cogan, is elected. He had

not been *Irish* enough in his votes, having opposed the Maynooth grant, and supported Lord John, who now ranks with Cromwell and Castle-reagh in Irish abhorrence. He betakes himself northward in search of a seat.

The conversion of the French 5 per Cents, which took the *petits rentiers* by storm a few days since, was one of those measures which had been predicted and announced, but contradicted over and over again by the *Moniteur*, so long as its disclosure was inconvenient. The pros and the cons of a measure involving so many public points of policy, and so large a field of private interests, are not easily to be stated: it is not easy to assent to the sweeping opposition of the *Débats*, nor is it possible to concur with the more sweeping approbation of the *Constitutionnel*. A measure that makes so serious an inroad on the hard savings of small tradesmen, and even of the working classes (many of whom were, in '48, compelled to accept *rentes* for a reimbursement of their savings banks deposits,) and that strikes at the resources of so many charitable institutions, must needs arouse a tempest of complaints, and what is more formidable, a deep and sullen undercurrent of distrust and discontent. But does it relieve the finances of the State? if so, the operation, in itself, is certainly not, whatever the *Débats* may say, illegal or unjust: it is not even unusual, as we know in England; but in France the holders of the Five per Cents maintain that there was an implied engagement ever since '97, never to reduce these securities: still, if it relieves the State? But to what extent? to little more than half a million sterling—to little more than will pay the self-appointed Civil List of the dictator!

This measure, then, will unsettle and disturb still more the finances of the country, paralyze the confidence of fundholders, and not be atoned for (as appears by the estimates just decreed) by reduced expenditure. The military and naval estimates are increased; so are the "extraordinary works;" and the difference presented in these estimates in favour of the receipts is, we need scarcely say "cooked," as our correspondent informed us weeks ago it would be, by important "omissions." Reduced taxation is rendered daily more impossible.

The triumphant election of Canot by a second majority of more than 3000 is an unmistakable protest. Rumours are rife, as usual, of the coming Empire? What matters it? Louis Bonaparte will have his day: but like Balzac's *Peau de Chagrin*, it shrinks even with every fresh gratification—nay, with every new lust, of his disordered ambition. The clergy seem to be half afraid of taking their share of the prey. The game is in their hands, and they are afraid to play it out. They know that in France no power is so ephemeral as theirs. The Revolution of February respected the Church: the Church betrayed the Revolution. The lesson is not lost.

The young Emperor of Austria has been playing the sailor on the Adriatic. It is amusing to here of this modern Canute, that he astonished all the sailors by remaining quite "calm and firm" upon the deck in a gale of wind, and was not at all seasick. Verily, a "divinity doth hedge" your Kaiser, and supplies him with sea-legs and a sea-stomach!

The downfall of Rosas, the dictator of the Argentine Republic, was brought about by the fleet, army, and money of Brazil. The River Plate question, which for fifteen years has baffled the diplomacy, and even the arms, of England, has now been settled—at least, seriously modified—without our interference, it may be, against our interests. Certainly our influence cannot be very great there at present, for the past policy of Palmerston in that remote region was even more feverishly ambiguous than his European exploits. The whole affair was, from first to last, an almost insoluble mystification, but the Argentine Republic (the last to be consulted) will hardly regret Rosas, whatever may be its welcome to Urquiza.

A second Burmese war appears almost inevit-

able. The first one, which began in 1826, lasted for three years, cost many millions sterling, and the lives of many thousand brave men. If the continuance of peace depended entirely on the Indian Government, we should have no doubt of their decision. But an arrogant Oriental despot, surrounded by women and flatterers, has an equal voice in the matter; and any attempt on our part to avoid war would be construed by the Burmese Cabinet into pusillanimity.

The close of the Kaffir war is announced; but so positive an announcement is somewhat like "hallooing before you are out of the wood." Sir Harry Smith has had a signal success. He had attacked the Kaffirs, it may be said, in their home—in the part whither they had taken their women and cattle; he had made a great capture of cattle; and the Kaffirs seemed to be crushed. But a second expedition was necessary, and of that we do not yet know the result. Enough had been done, however, to shame Lord Grey's heartless scolding of the old soldier for inefficiency. We cordially hope that Sir Harry may return to England with the dagger-wounds of Downing Street covered by fresh laurels, green as the memory of Aliwal and the Peninsula.

HISTORY OF PARLIAMENT. MINISTERIAL EXPLANATIONS.

THERE was a numerous attendance in both Houses, on the 15th, and Ministers were engaged in their first contest with the Opposition. This makes Monday a night remarkable in the annals of Parliament, and affords a new starting-point in the strife of parties and principles. We take the House of Lords first, because the debate was more compact, and the opposition less various and comprehensive; but still it was sufficiently so to show Ministers that they will have to face, even in that mild region, determined and hostile antagonists.

LORD BEAUMONT was selected as the catechist of Lord Derby. In order that he might place himself within the rules of the House, and enable their lordships to join in a debate, he presented a petition from certain persons, owners and occupiers of land, in Yorkshire, who prayed that they might be relieved from the existing uncertainty as to the intentions of Ministers regarding the re-imposition of a tax on corn; and he asked whether Ministers intended, as soon as a new Parliament assembled, to recommend to Parliament an alteration of the present policy, with respect to the importation of foreign corn. His lordship occupied above an hour in putting this question in a dry, uninteresting speech, the main points of which were that great uncertainty and great alarm prevailed as to the intentions of ministers, and that it was impossible to discover, from their election speeches, what policy they really intended to pursue.

LORD DERBY'S reply amounted to a virtual abandonment of protection, and, as will be seen, to a shifting of the ground of antagonism between himself and the late government from protection to parliamentary reform. At the outset of his speech, he ridiculed the pomposity of Lord Beaumont's address, made merry with the insignificance of the petitioners, and said he looked in vain for the alarm and uncertainty which were said to prevail in the country.

How could the mere categorical declaration of the intentions of government respecting the imposition of a few shillings more or less on corn, affect the relation between landlord and tenant, the amount of rent, and the covenants concerning land? To say that it would, was to depreciate the value of the final settlement of the question. But supposing that a small duty were imposed, he would not contend about the amount, whether it were 4s. or 6s. or 7s. a quarter, he would assert that a very small augmentation of the price would ensue; and would any one tell him that the question, as to whether that small duty would be imposed some six or eight months hence, would have the effect of introducing the smallest amount of uncertainty as affecting the relations between landlord and tenant, with regard to the permanent cultivation of the land? Still, he agreed with Lord Beaumont, that this was a question which ought not to be allowed to remain any longer in abeyance than possible. (Cheers from both sides of the House.) But, as to the question of uncertainty—why, my lords, there is a large party in the country, well known, who have declared in the most emphatic terms, that not till next election shall that uncertainty be removed; that by the next election the question must be definitively settled; and to that election, therefore, they on their own part, confident in the strength of their own cause, will be ready to appeal, and to submit if the sense of the country should be pronounced against them. But then he contended that the fall of the late Ministry had shortened the period of suspense; and, after again asserting that the appeal ought to be made as soon

as the great interests of the country would permit, he made a further and an emphatic declaration:—

"So far as I am individually concerned, no taunt, no challenge, no difficulties to which I may be subjected, no mortifications to which I may be exposed, shall induce me to recommend to my Sovereign that that dissolution of Parliament, however anxious I may be for a decision, shall take place one hour sooner than those great and paramount interests render necessary. (Cheers.)"

He entreated their lordships to consider the circumstances under which he and his party had "assumed" office. Not by any adverse motion of theirs had the late government fallen. Noble lords opposite would not venture to say that they had been encountered by a "factious opposition," or by a "desire to eject them from office." No; they fell from their "internal weakness," their "notorious inability to conduct business," the "absence of their friends," the "quarrels of their colleagues." The division on the Militia Bill could not have been the real cause; perhaps the noble earl who was taking notes (Earl Grey) knew the real cause. But when that hostile division took place, Lord John Russell had consulted his colleagues as to whether they should resign or dissolve Parliament, and they had come to the conclusion that a dissolution would be "inexpedient."

"Inexpedient to whom? Inexpedient for the noble lord and his colleagues, or inexpedient for the interests of the country? I will not impute such an unworthy motive to the noble lord as to suppose that it was for the convenience or advantage of himself and his colleagues that he so concluded. I must consider that both he and his colleagues had come to the conclusion that a dissolution of Parliament at the present time, whatever results it might have upon the future constitution of parties, was not expedient, but that it would be dangerous to the interests of the country. I ask, then, my lords, with what face can any man, or any body of men, who have declared that a dissolution was inexpedient—who have declared that they were unable themselves to conduct a government—who had advised the Crown to send for me to undertake the duty and responsibility of Prime Minister to the country—I ask, with what face or with what pretext can any one of those men, or any body of those men, call for a premature dissolution of Parliament, which they themselves condemned, or seek to embarrass that Government which, if they supersede and destroy, they know they have not the means of succeeding, or of erecting another in its place!"

But Lord Beaumont said he ought either to state in plain terms that he would support the present commercial policy, or that he would not, and if not, what course he intended to pursue. That was not the line of conduct followed by Lord John Russell in 1846, who, when Mr. Duncombe [who, Lord Derby said, erroneously, was now supporting Lord John Russell,] asked his lordship to state the principles on which he intended to construct his government, denied both the right of Parliament to ask and the duty of Government to answer such questions. That was the doctrine laid down by Lord John Russell in 1846; in that doctrine the Opposition of that day acquiesced, and had allowed Lord John Russell, who had taken power in the middle of the session, to carry on the Government "without vexatious opposition."

"My lords," dramatically exclaimed Lord Derby, "I ask no more. (Loud cheers.) I ask for justice, not to me or to my colleagues, but to the great interests of our common country. (Cheers.) I ask not to be interrupted in making the usual financial arrangements. I ask not to be interrupted in placing this country in a fit state of organization and defence in the event of foreign invasion. (Cheers.) I ask you not to interrupt the course of all public and private business. I ask you not to interfere with those useful reforms which have been chalked out by recommendations, given, no doubt, under a former Government, but on which the heart and mind of the people are set. I ask not," he began—"but" further argument was unnecessary. The advocates of a dissolution had no reasons for requiring it; and if not, where was the anxiety, alarm, and apprehension? "I have told you"—with this phrase Lord Derby petulantly began four sentences successively—"I have told you" that "we do not intend to disturb the existing state of things;" that the issue shall be decided "at the next election;" that the uncertainty is not more than before the Government changed hands; that "the present Parliament cannot be of protracted duration." Then, in the highly melodramatic tone, he continued—"But if a business of the country is to be factiously interrupted—in this house I have no fear—in the other I hope better counsels will prevail—if that business be interrupted, whatever may be the merits of the case, whatever the judgment which on abstract questions Parliament may be prepared to pronounce—that factious interruption to necessary measures, that interference with the course of a Government endeavouring to carry on the business of the country in the absence of any other Government which by possibility could conduct public affairs, will be visited—and visited justly—by the country on the heads of those who have so interfered." (Loud cheers.)

And in vindication of his assertion that there was no alarm, no uncertainty, he pointed triumphantly to that "accurate barometer of public feeling—the public funds!" The question was not and could not be confined to the re-enactment of the Corn-Laws; not to the reversal of the policy of Sir Robert Peel. He did not desire to see that policy reversed, but he thought it "had been carried to an unnecessary and dangerous extent." When the Navigation laws were altered, had he not declared that the alteration "involved principles which, once adopted, were final and irreversible?"

"I made that statement at the time," he continued, "and I repeat it now. I don't desire to go back to the law of 1840 with respect to corn. I don't desire to go back to the law of 1842." But he would have them calmly to consider whether they would apply themselves, not to the reversal of the present system, but to such modification of it as would alleviate confessed injustice. I frankly own, for myself as an individual—and I believe my colleagues

would not individually differ from me in opinion)—I have expressed the opinion that in regard to those who have suffered from the changes made, in being left without a corresponding alteration in the expenditure thrown upon them, the moderate imposition of a duty producing a large revenue, and thereby enabling other taxation to be taken off with hardly an appreciable effect on the food of the people, would be a most just, a most economical, and for the country a most advantageous mode of affording relief. (Hear, hear.) But I think that a proposition which no minister ought to bring forward and submit to parliament unless he is clear, not only of a bare majority, but of a very general concurrence of opinion throughout the country. I say that it is only one portion of a great question. In taking into consideration the course they ought to pursue, they are bound not, as the noble lord suggested, to fling down some months before a definite fixed proposition, which for five or six months to come should be made the subject of controversy and agitation, but, commending those suffering interests, not to the care of agitators and demagogues, but to the calm, deliberate sense of the country, the question would be, having ascertained that calm and deliberate sense of the country, how to take those measures which, though not in their own judgment abstractedly the most desirable, they may yet carry into effect with the general approbation, and in accordance with the opinion of Parliament, and without rousing angry feelings among other classes of the community." (Hear, hear.)

It was not a "paltry question, it was not a question whether a duty shall be imposed on foreign produce; not on such a question—said the noble lord—when I appeal to the country, do I intend that appeal to be made?" Then turning abruptly from stating on what questions he intended to appeal, he attacked the "Chesham-place convention," which he said bid fair to rival the "Lichfield House compact." The course adopted by Lord John had filled him with surprise and regret. The 168 members present at that convention had been absent from the House in the moment of danger, and although they had shown themselves "unwilling to support the measures of the late government, they were quite willing to join in measures for rendering any one impossible." And Lord John Russell, who laid claim to the character of a statesman and a patriot, consented to organize such an opposition; thought it not unworthy his high character and station to associate with those who had strenuously opposed him; and said that his next administration should not be a Whig administration, but on a much wider basis! Rising higher and higher in his tone as he approached the termination of his speech, Lord Derby turned away, as if in disgust, from the intrigues of Chesham-place, and stated, still melodramatically, his own intentions. "I shall go then to the country when it is consistent with my duty to my Sovereign and to my country that I should go there, not on a question of the kind suggested. That question I shall leave to the deliberate judgment of the public. I shall leave it to the general concurrence of the country, without which I shall not bring forward that proposition. (Loud and renewed cheering.) I say I will not flinch from performing my duty without fear, if the sense of the people and of the Parliament shall be with me and shall support me in a measure which I believe would be useful for the country. But I will not overstrain the influence which belongs to a government, I will not abuse the high position in which my sovereign has placed me; and I will not by a bare majority force on the country a measure against which a great proportion of the country has expressed an opinion. (Cheers.)"

It might be possible to render available the assistance of those who generally agreed with him, but objected to protective policy. But there was another question:—

"We are threatened with far more serious difficulties than opposition to the imposition of a 5s. or 6s. or 7s. duty. It is a question whether the government of this country can be carried on, and on what principles, and through what medium; and when I appeal to the country I should do so on this ground—Will you, who desire well to all the interests of the country, place your confidence and give your support to a government which, in the hour of peril, did not hesitate to take the post of danger when the helmsman had left the helm? (Loud cheers.) Will you support a Government which is against hostile attacks, which would maintain the peace of the world, which would uphold the Protestant institutions of the country, which would give strength and increased power to religious and moral education throughout the land, and which would exert itself moreover, I will not hesitate to say, to oppose some barrier against the current, that is continually encroaching, of democratic influence, which would throw power nominally into the hands of the masses, practically into those of the demagogues who lead them? Will you resist a Government which desires to oppose that noxious and dangerous influence, and to maintain the prerogatives of the Crown, the rights of your lordships' house, and the privileges of the other freely elected and fairly represented house of Parliament? Those are the principles on which I shall make my appeal on behalf of myself and of my colleagues; and in words which are placed in the mouths of the meanest felons in the dock, and which are not unworthy the lips of a First Minister of the Crown, 'I elect that we shall be tried by God and our country.' (Great cheering.)"

Lord GREY followed Lord Derby, stoutly defending the late, and attacking the present, ministry, with force pertinacity. He insisted at great length, and in recurring and various expressions, of the same opinion, that it was new and anomalous for a minister to come down to that house and say, "Our convictions, my lords, as to what ought to be done are as strong as ever, but we will not tell you whether or not we intend to act upon those convictions." Ministers were bound to say "We are for protection," or "We are against protection." Lord Grey represented the policy as to the food of the people as too vital to be kept in the

background. And as to the uncertainty being lessened by the change of ministers, until the change there had been no uncertainty whatever. The uncertainty had been created by the advent of Lord Derby, and for the best of reasons—that it had always been stated that the great object of the party composing the present government, was to re-establish protection. As to the fall of the late cabinet, when Lord Derby said that it had fallen from want of support, he ought to have remembered the cause of that. Had not Protection been the rallying cry of a party for five years and a-half? Lord Grey did not say that there had been a factious opposition, but, by all the means in their power, the noble lord and his colleagues had collected and kept together a powerful party, whose binding principle was the restoration of protection, and conducted a decided and eager opposition to the late government. He did not complain of that, but it was too much, after the Earl of Derby had been finally successful, for him to turn round and say—office fell into our hands, we did not seek it, therefore we may dispense with the ordinary rules of proceeding. And that Lord Derby would attempt to restore the protective policy it was natural to expect, especially after the declaration made by him in February last year, when he said that, as an honest man, and as an honourable man, he could not take office without attempting to retrace the false step which had been taken, and remedy the wrong which had been done, by imposing a moderate duty on corn.

Lord Grey argued that a dissolution was imperative on the possessors of office, because they were in a minority, and held opinions hostile to Free-trade. That was the course insisted on by Sir Robert Peel in 1841; that was the honest course. But what an extraordinary state of things had come about. The Prime Minister declared that he would not attempt to re-impose corn duties without the concurrence of the country, not even if he had only a bare majority. "Now, there was no man of common understanding who, hearing these words, did not clearly see that they gave up protection." Nothing could be done with such "rose-water support as this." What, then, was the object of the noble earl? If he meant to give us protection, why did he not say so? The fact was, he meant to canvass the counties as a protectionist, and the towns as a Free-trader. Would it not be difficult for the noble earl to prove, under these circumstances, that want of foresight, not want of candour, had been at the bottom of his conduct? In this strain, Lord Grey wound up a not ineffective speech, the sting of which was in the final words: Never, he said, throughout the annals of this country, had there been an instance of the public interests being so grievously sacrificed to party feelings.

The regular partisans of Government and Opposition now succeeded each other. Lord ABINGER said he had "privately remonstrated with Sir Robert Peel" on the danger and injustice of repealing the Corn-Laws! Lord CLANRICARDE echoed Lord Grey, pushing home the charge of inconsistency between practice and opinion, and, what was more damaging to Ministers, pertinaciously following up Lord Grey's line in showing that Ministers were about to cheat both the farmers and their parliamentary friends. The Earl of HARROWBY (formerly Lord Sandon) addressed himself to the friendly task of converting Lord Derby to an honest avowal that he had given up Protection.

"He believed that there was not the slightest chance of success for a protective policy, and if they went to the country upon that he felt sure that the result would be that the Conservative interest would be put upon a false issue, and that instead of trying the question of 'Protection or not,' the real question that would be tried would be 'Democracy or not?'" (Hear, hear.)

Lord BEAUMONT gave a second edition of his former speech. Lord WODEHOUSE preached on the moral danger of establishing the precedent that it was consistent with the duty of public men to abandon, when they obtained office, the measures the advocacy of which had brought them into power. Lord POWIS defended Ministers, and so ended the debate.

In the House of Commons the debate partook of the character of the great contest in 1846. There was a strong muster of members early in the afternoon. The *dramatis personae* were newly arranged. The Opposition benches and the gallery above were crowded; indeed, so full that some Opposition members were seen perched over the Ministerial benches. On the Mountain of the Opposition, but not below the gangway, were seated Mr. Cobden, Mr. Bright, and the members of that section of the supporters of the Chesham-place policy; while below the gallery were Lord Palmerston, his orderly, Mr. Monckton Milnes; Sir James Graham, Mr. Gladstone, and the Peelites generally. Ministers occupied the front benches on the right of the Speaker, backed by the baronet chivalry of the Country Party—Sir John Tyrrol and

Sir John Walsh, and next to them, Mr. George Frederick Young.

Below the Ministerial gangway sat a select squadron of agricultural members, headed by Colonel Sibthorpe.

The battle began by small skirmishes with Sir John Pakington and Mr. Disraeli. Mr. JAMES WILSON asked the Colonial Secretary what he intended to do with his notice of motion respecting the sugar duties, now standing on the paper as a dropped order? Sir JOHN PAKINGTON replied, that he had felt it his duty as a member of the Opposition (a remark met by ironical cheers) to press upon Her Majesty's Ministers what he believed to be the disastrous effects of their own acts; but as the present Government was "in an acknowledged minority" in that House, it was no less his duty to do what he thought best for the promotion of the objects they had in view; and he did not think he would be doing his duty by pressing the question, and therefore he did not intend to bring forward the motion. (Cheers and counter cheers.) He, however, reserved the right of hereafter dealing with the question, "if they should be in a position so to do." (Ironical cries of "hear" from the Opposition, and cheers from the Ministerialists.) It was understood that the Government would not interfere in any way with the reduction of the duty on sugar, which would come into operation on the 5th of July next. Mr. HEADLAM asked whether it was intended to put a tax on coals. The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER thought that was not a fair question. But he would so far overstep the bounds of the usual official reserve as to say, that at present Government had no such intention. "But," continued Mr. Disraeli, "if the proposition is likely to obtain the favour of the honourable gentleman's constituents, it shall receive on our part the most respectful attention," a sally followed by "loud laughter" and "cheers."

After these small passages of arms, the main combat was commenced by Mr. MILNER GIBSON, who, amid the stirring cheers of the Opposition, presented, and stated with great gravity, the now famous Manchester petition; and Mr. WILLIAM BROWN followed up the advance of the member for Manchester, by throwing in a similar petition from Liverpool. The order of the day for going into Committee of Supply was read, and the CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER moved that the Speaker do now leave the chair. This was the signal for Mr. VILLIERS, the old champion of free trade, who rose to put to the Chancellor of the Exchequer a series of inquiries, agreed to at the Chesham-place meeting, as to the intentions of her Majesty's Government. This he did in a speech of great weight, solidity, and with a certain earnestness of tone and language, supported by the encouraging cheers of the Opposition, and ironical interruptions from the Ministerial benches.

He described the importance of the subject as it affected trade, commerce, and domestic life. Information, he said, was wanted; it would be incorrect to say that the public had received none (alluding to the hustings speeches of Ministers); but it would be quite true to say that they would have been less perplexed if they had not received any. (Laughter.) He hoped that his motives in asking for information would not be misunderstood; he had no factious motives (ironical laughter from the Ministerial benches, and cheers from the Opposition), no party object. (Cheers.) He proceeded to vindicate his right—indeed, his peculiar fitness—as an old and disinterested advocate of free-trade, to ask for explanations. He had only been silent because he had believed the question safe. But the advent of the present Ministers had unsettled everything, and caused great apprehensions. He did not regret to see them in power; he knew what forbearance was due to a Ministry suddenly installed in office, and as yet unprepared to state their opinions on matters which required long consideration. But that was not the case with the present Ministers in relation to the chief question, since their minds had long been made up, and they were unknown except as identified with protection. To restore that, they had been banded together—for that they had sought and assumed power; and he thought they could not object to being called on to state in what way and how soon they intended to establish, now they were in power, the policy which their chiefs had recommended while in Opposition. Passing by Mr. Disraeli and the lesser lights of the country party, he dwelt at some length on the reasons why, above all men, Lord Derby ought to frankly declare his policy; and he quoted the famous speech of May, 1851, when Lord Derby said to his followers, that in him they would find "no hesitation, no flinching, no change of opinion;" he only looked for the moment to cry, "Up Guards, and at them!" It was not therefore unreasonable in persons, representing the interests to be attacked, to ask the noble lord to have the kindness to tell when he was going to direct his soldiers to be "up and at them." (Cheers and laughter.) He described the prosperous state of the country; even agriculture had improved, even the colonies were better off; and the country rested in that prosperity. But now men pledged to reverse the policy in force were in power, apprehension and uncertainty prevailed: contracts were not completed, orders were not sent home by foreign agents, because they did not know how to act for their principals. For three weeks the country seemed to have been labouring under a paralysis. After vindicating the people from the charge of being indifferent to great liberties conferred on them, and saying they were often too

confiding, he asked for a distinct, candid, and manly avowal of the intentions of Ministers respecting the importation of foreign corn.

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER was cheered when he rose to reply. Beginning with the end of the speech just delivered, he ridiculed the "gloomy views" of the Opposition as to the feeling of the country. Like Lord Derby he pointed to "that barometer of public opinion," the funds, to prove the tranquillity of things; and he expressed a cynical surprise at the discovery made by the Opposition that Government intended to propose a fixed duty. After stating what he might do but what he would not do, he declared that he would express the "feelings" of the Government "frankly, fairly, and without reserve." He then ran over the often-repeated statement that his party had, after making various efforts to mitigate the effects of Corn-Law repeal, resolved to adjourn all further efforts until another parliament had been called. The question was in this state when suddenly a change of Government ensued. And he contended, that as the change of Ministry had been brought about by no immediate act of theirs, they were not bound to state their intentions. "Why," he tauntingly inquired, "are we, sitting on this side of the House, to take a different course of policy from that which we asserted on the other side of the House?" a question met by cries of Oh! oh! and cheers. They were certainly not bound to do so, but to adhere to the policy they had followed in Opposition. He denied that their position, as Ministers, occasioned any greater uncertainty than did their position in Parliament before; and he contended that any "candid man" would acknowledge there was a difference in the duty of a party who might come into power by the profession of a protective policy, and the duty of a party professing such a policy finding themselves in power. The change rather tended to decrease than to increase the uncertainty. "But the hon. and learned gentleman asks me to tell him whether, in another Parliament, we shall be prepared to propose a fixed duty, according to his own figures, of 5s. upon corn. ('No, no.')

That is the question, as I understand it. ('No, no.')

If it is not, I shall be glad to know what the real question is."

Mr. VILLIERS.—"The question I put was, whether the Government intended to propose any scheme of commercial or fiscal legislation before the dissolution of Parliament in such a way that the question of the principle of protection or a duty on corn should be submitted to the deliberate judgment of the electors." (Hear, hear.)

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER.—"That is a mere Parliamentary periphrasis of what I said somewhat more simply. (A laugh.) Well, then, I say it is not the intention of the Government to do anything of the kind." (Cheers and counter-cheers.) Their business was to propose measures calculated to redress the injustice done to the agricultural and other interests, by the changes of 1846, 1848, and 1849. "But we are not pledged to any measure." (Laughter from the Opposition, and cheers.) Certainly not to a fixed duty of 5s. "I know," he said, maliciously, "there is a great desire on the part of gentlemen opposite that there should be a proposition for a fixed duty. ('Hear, hear' and laughter.) I regret, for their sakes, that I cannot give a promise to make any proposition of the kind."

In fact he would state nothing, promise nothing, but this, that the question should be settled at the next election.

"I am aware that the government is placed in some difficulties, but they are difficulties which, as we did not seek them, so we will not shrink from them. (Cheers.) I am told, though I know not on what authority, that there has been, on the part of the new Government, an *ad misericordiam* appeal to the House of Commons. I am not aware of it. I have not sanctioned it. I have not made it, nor have any of my colleagues. Let the blow be where or how, we shall do our best to encounter it. What we ask is, not fair play for the government, but fair play for the country." (Cheers.)

Turning to the question of a dissolution, he disclaimed, on the part of the government, all desire to put off that event longer than necessary; and he enumerated the measures, besides those of Supply, and the Mutiny Bill, which he thought should be carried, namely, the Disfranchisement of St. Albans Bill, Chancery Reform, and a measure of National Defence.

Having concluded this statement, he made a fierce party attack upon the Opposition. Thrusting his thumbs into his waistcoat, he said, with a swaggering air,—

"I should now sit down, did I not feel that I have a duty to perform to her Majesty's Ministers. The Opposition has very frankly inquired what are the principles upon which the Administration is formed. There is a subject scarcely second to that in importance in this country, and that is the principle on which her Majesty's Opposition is formed. (Great cheering.) I hope, therefore, I may be permitted to take this opportunity of making that inquiry. (Cheers.)"

Of course the meeting in Chesham-place did not escape him. He was surprised to hear that "within a fortnight of resigning the government of the country from an avowed inability to carry it on," within a fortnight of the declaration, to the House and to the Queen, that a dissolution was inexpedient, the noble lord should be engaged in constructing an opposition, the avowed object of which was to force Lord Derby to do that which Lord John Russell would not venture to attempt. No doubt the noble lord had arrived at that conclusion with a due regard to all the important circumstances.

"But," he asked, "if I am to trust the authoritative statement, as I have a right to do, the more especially when I have myself been challenged on the part of the

government, surely I am entitled to inquire what are the principles on which this new opposition is formed (hear, hear)—an opposition which the noble lord has constructed under the inspiration and with the aid and assistance of the right hon. gentleman the member for Ripon (cheers) and the hon. gentleman the member for the West Riding. (Cheers.) Such unbounded confidence exists between three such eminent men—I wish to know on what principle this new opposition is founded—this new opposition headed by a noble lord acknowledged by all of us to be an able and fitting leader, with such experienced vice-lieutenants as the right hon. gentleman the member for Ripon and the hon. gentleman the member for the West Riding. (Hear.) What, I again ask, is the principle on which the new opposition is founded? Is it the principle of papal supremacy or Protestant ascendancy? (Cheers.) Is it the principle of national defences or of perpetual peace? (Cheers and laughter.) Is it the principle of household suffrage or of the electoral groups? (Laughter.) Is it the opinion of the new opposition, along with the hon. member for the West Riding, that Free-trade is a panacea for all the evils of states? Or is it the opinion of the new opposition, in deference to the noble lord the member for London, that Free-trade is a great exaggeration? (Cheers.) He thought those questions ought to be frankly answered. For himself, great as were their difficulties, he did not despair. He had confidence in the good sense and temper of parliament; and if these failed him, he was sure of the country, "convinced that it would support the government in their attempt to do their duty to their sovereign, and in their resolution to baffle the manoeuvres of faction." (Loud cheers.)

Lord JOHN RUSSELL, without preface, attacked the extraordinary plea put forward by Mr. Disraeli, and insinuated by Lord Derby—"That the present Government had only accepted office because the Queen was without a government."

"Why," he continued, "it is notorious that they have been for years trying to supplant the late government; that they have been almost unscrupulous as to the means, and that they omitted no opportunity by which they could place themselves in the situation they now hold. (Cries of 'Oh! oh!' from the Ministerial side of the House, answered by ironical cheers from the Opposition.) Not satisfied with making direct motions adverse to Free-trade, they took advantage of any occasion of a hostile motion to go down and swell the ranks of the opponents of Government. (Cheers and counter-cheers.) It was this way that, without agreeing with the hon. member for Montrose, they came down to this House to support him in order to inflict a blow on the Government of that day. (Hear, hear.) What was their course at the commencement of the present session? Did they refrain from any attack on the Government? Did they confine themselves to weapons of legitimate warfare? Did they not use poisoned arrows for the purpose of attacking the late Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland? (Loud cheers and counter-cheers.) Had they not a motion of which they had given notice for the very next week, which was a vote of want of confidence in the Government? And, after this, can they pretend they were surprised when they were asked to take office, or that they were asked to take office on any other ground but because they had made a successful opposition to the Government. (Hear, hear.) Upon the very occasion on which the noble lord the member for Tiverton refused to the Government of the day leave to bring in a bill with respect to the militia—as upon the motion of the hon. member for Montrose—they came down, without any regard to the subject, without any opinion with respect to it—(cries of 'No, no!' cheers, and counter-cheers)—I believe, myself, without any opinion with respect to that subject, (cheers, and counter-cheers,) and they took the unusual course of refusing to the Minister leave to bring in a bill with respect to the militia. (Hear.) I own I am surprised that, after that course, they should make an allegation that they only accepted office because the Queen was left without a Government. (Hear, hear.)" He proceeded to show that he had quitted office in consequence of these incessant attacks and occasional defeats which must follow from the course adopted, to take the House by surprise. He felt that if he were not driven out of office, he would be "worried" out of it by gentlemen in opposition; and under these circumstances he thought it was a false pretence to say that honourable gentlemen opposite had only accepted office because the Queen was without a Government. He explained how Lord Derby's speech on the 27th had altered his position. Lord Derby proposed to govern with a minority. Now, if he (Lord John Russell) had thrown up office because he thought it unconstitutional to govern with an uncertain majority, how much more unconstitutional was it in the noble lord to attempt to govern with a confessed minority. And then they were not to discuss controversial questions, but wait until next February to learn whether Ministers intended to tax the food of the people. He exposed the absurdities and injustice of a fixed duty, and charged Mr. Disraeli with not dealing frankly with the house in reply to the questions of Mr. Villiers. It was proposed to refer the question to the intelligent portion of the people of England; but upon this question the whole community is intelligent. (Cheers, and counter-cheers.)

Lord John Russell entered into a statistical statement to prove the beneficial effects of free-trade; and members left the house in great numbers. After reviewing the free-trade policy, he returned to the question of the propriety of a dissolution, concluding that Ministers were bound to dissolve as speedily as possible; and flinging in their teeth the defiance that, instead of deservng reversal, the policy of free-trade demanded extension.

Mr. HERRIES made a general reply to Lord John Russell, retorting the charge that the late cabinet fell

through the incessant attacks of gentlemen in opposition, by saying that the main opposition came from the liberal camp. He also went into considerable detail respecting the navigation laws, with the view of showing how injurious to our interests those laws had been.

Sir JAMES GRAHAM followed Mr. Herries, and made a great speech, the main object of which was to show that the object of the present Ministry was to reverse the policy of free-trade, and he succeeded in showing it.

Clearing away the ground by making several smart hits at Mr. Disraeli, and Ministers in general, he entered boldly on his course, declaring that he had no doubt whatever as to what were the intentions of Ministers. "I stated last year, having then listened to him when his proposed measures on the subject of agricultural relief seemed somewhat mystified (a laugh)—I stated that I was forced to go to another house for the information which I wished, and I said that there were peers who acted in combination with the party of the right hon. gentleman who had been quite explicit as to their general policy. That policy was, as I understood it, first to change the Administration, next to dissolve Parliament, then to impose duties on imports, and among them upon corn. That was then my solution. A clue having thus been given elsewhere as to the objects of what was then the party in opposition, I adhere to that view of their objects now, and I call on them to deny it if they can. They have succeeded in their first move—(hear)—they have displaced the last Ministry, and are in power themselves; and it is now my belief that they wish to dissolve Parliament for the purpose of imposing, if they can (hear, hear), in the new House, duties on imports, and among those, duties on corn. ('Hear, hear,' from the Ministerial benches.) Do I represent the matter rightly? Well, it is entirely a question of evidence, and we have a difficulty here in ascertaining it. (Cheers.)" Now, he had the most perfect reliance on the honour of Lord Derby, and what he had stated, by that Sir James was convinced he would abide. Then, citing various speeches made by Lord Derby since the 28th of February, 1851, he read extracts from them, with parenthetical comments, and interrupted by exciting cheers from both sides. These extracts clearly showed that Lord Derby intended to restore a duty on imports and on corn. There was no hesitation about it, but a frank declaration of his undoubted intention to pursue a certain line of policy. Sir James piled proof on proof that such was the case. But he brought forward also more interesting testimony. "At that time, when the noble lord (Lord John Russell) resigned, and the present First Lord of the Treasury attempted to form a Ministry, the whole arrangement was kept open pending the return of the right hon. gentleman (Mr. Gladstone) who was then upon the Continent. Earl Derby made to him a proposal to join his Government. But what was the preliminary point? My right hon. friend asked the noble earl what we have asked in vain here—(cheers)—'What are your intentions on the subject of protection?' The Earl of Derby said, 'My opinion is pronounced; I am quite decided in favour of duties on imports, and I am not prepared to say that corn should be excepted.' My right hon. friend, therefore, true to those principles which he had constantly advocated in reference to this question, said, 'That preliminary step, then, is fatal to our union. I cannot consent to 'join your Administration.' (Cheers.) So earnest was Lord Derby in adhering to the faith of his pledges, and so sincere in his opinion in favour of a reversal of a Free-trade policy, that, though he had made the whole of his arrangements as to the formation of an Administration to depend upon the adhesion of my right hon. friend, when he got that answer he abandoned the project, (hear,) conceiving that success was not possible. I regret that the noble lord the member for Tiverton (Lord Palmerston) is not in his place to add his testimony; but unless I am greatly deceived—I should have stated it in his presence, and he could have contradicted me if I am misinformed—I am told, and I confidently believe, that the Earl of Derby had an interview, by the permission of her Majesty, with the noble lord the member for Tiverton when the present Administration was formed; that he did propose to that noble viscount that he should take part in the new Administration, and that the same question as was put last year by my right hon. friend the member for Oxford was put this year, and within the last fortnight, to the noble lord—that the same question, I say, was put, and the same answer given—that it was as possible for the Tax to flow backward from the ocean as for the corn laws to be repealed (loud cheers); and that it was impossible for him to join the Administration. Well, but now I think by this time I have gone very far to prove my case. (Cheers.) My reliance is implicit on the honour of Lord Derby." But he was not content. He accumulated other proofs. There was Mr. Christopher and Sir John Trollope. What did he say? And the extract may be taken as a specimen of the mode in which Sir James dealt with his question. Sir John Trollope said—

"I will state to you, in his own words, what Lord Derby said his future policy would be. From them you may gather, what every man must know, that this question does not rest with him or with the administration. We can do nothing unless backed by the constituencies of the empire." This is most certainly the case; we have no quarrel on that point. If (addressing the Ministerial side of the house) you frankly avow your policy, if you seek to bring it about by a dissolution, I do not deprecate a dissolution; on the contrary, I shall take occasion to state the reasons why I shall urge you to take that step without delay, so that we may join issue fairly, and the country be suffered to know what it has to decide. (Cheers.) What does the right hon. gentleman at the head of the Poor-law board continue to state? After quoting from the Earl of Derby's speech to the house on the 27th of February on the address passages, the effect of which I have already given to the house, the right hon. gentleman then goes on to add—

"Lord Derby thus refers the matter to the electors of

the empire. It must be determined by them, and speedily."

Yes, and speedily say I (cheers); let us have no hesitation, no delay. The right hon. gentleman continues—

"It is evident that the present parliament cannot last long, and I think you will agree with me that the sooner it is dispensed with the better."

But is this the feeling of the government? (Hear.) No, they have propositions for Chancery Reform (hear); they have a Militia Bill; they have in view, not only the disfranchisement of St. Albans, but the enfranchisement of other places; and this does not look quite like dissolving parliament "speedily." (Opposition cheers.)

"I believe (the right hon. gentleman added) this question will then be solved, and trust it will be set at rest for ever. We cannot afford to be always in collision with our fellow subjects." (Hear, hear.)

He then gives most salutary advice to the owners of the soil. He says—

"We must either have protection, or learn to live without it." (Loud cheers from the opposition.)

Now, I say to the gentlemen opposite, in the words of my right hon. friend, "You cannot have protection, and you must not." (Hear, hear.) Then the right hon. gentleman proceeds to show the agriculturists how they may live without protection—

"I know, if we try, that we shall have to turn our attention to the improvement of our estates, for where is the landowner who can say that more cannot be done?"

I say there is in these right hon. gentlemen perfect frankness and no guile—I had almost said that these were Disraelites indeed. (Loud laughter.)

Leaving the question of Ministerial intentions, Sir James fastened on the arrogant denial made by the Chancellor of the Exchequer that there had been an appeal *ad misericordiam* by the Government to the House; and quoted Lord Derby's famous sentence—"I know that I am in an undoubted minority in the House of Commons, and I appeal therefore to the forbearance of the House;" and he denied absolutely that there had ever been in English parliamentary history such an appeal made before. The Government were bound to dissolve the moment the most necessary measures were passed. Mr. Pitt had done so in 1784, Lord Grey in 1831, and Lord John Russell in 1841. On the last occasion, when there was a discussion as to whether a Minister in a minority ought not to dissolve or resign, a speech was made which Sir James read to the House. The speaker characterized the admission of Lord John Russell that his party did not sufficiently possess the confidence of the House, and yet held office, as unheard of; and inveighed in strong terms against Ministers holding office who could not carry their measures. "The speaker on that occasion," said Sir James, "was the present Earl of Derby." (Great cheering and laughter from the Opposition benches.)

The remainder of his speech was devoted to proving that the Free-Trade policy had been successful, even as it affected the landowners; and he brought forward the startling facts, that since 1846 5,200,000^l. have been advanced to landowners for drainage; the quantity of guano imported had increased from 83,438 tons in 1849, to 243,514 in 1851; and 365,902 acres had been enclosed since 1845. Taxes had been remitted, yet had the revenue increased. He cited the opinion of the Duke of Buccleuch, who opposed Corn-Law repeal in 1846, that it would be most dangerous to landowners to reimpose duties on corn. And finally, after more statistics, he wound up as follows:—

"I remember the last conversation which I ever had with Sir R. Peel. It was upon the eve of that great discussion upon our foreign policy in which he and I found it our painful duty to vote against a Government which upon other accounts, and more especially upon the account of their support of a Free-Trade policy, we had usually assisted. It was impossible not to look to the consequences of that vote, and I pointed out to Sir R. Peel the possibility that the Government would be overthrown, and asked him what would then ensue? He said, 'I know that in this country, without party connexions, no man can govern. I know that my party ties are dissolved, and I am not prepared to renew them, and do not desire to renew them. But, come what may, there is no effort that I will not make to maintain that Free-Trade policy, which I believe to be indispensable for the maintenance of peace and happiness in this country.' (Loud cheers.) Sir, I do not possess the abilities of my right hon. friend, but I possess his determination, and, like him, there is no effort I will not be prepared to make, and no sacrifice I will not be prepared to undergo, to uphold that policy; which, in my heart and conscience, I believe to be necessary for the peace, the happiness, and the well-being of my fellow-countrymen." (The right hon. baronet resumed his seat upon the front Opposition bench amid loud and prolonged cheering.)

This was a night of great speakers; but when Mr. WALPOLE rose to reply to Sir James Graham, there was literally nothing left for him to say, except what had been said before. He reiterated, however, Lord Derby's declaration in the House of Lords, that it was not a "reversal," but a modification of the policy of Sir Robert Peel, which was sought; and he declared that an appeal had been made, not to the "forbearance," but to the "justice" of the House. He could see no applicability in the precedents cited by Sir James Graham, and he concluded that circumstances justified the Government in their present proceedings. As a sting to his speech, a warning to Lord John Russell against joining in the "new and extraordinary amalgamation of parties," said to have taken place; alluding to the Whig coalition of 1784, he said:

"The right hon. member for Ripon has entirely forgotten to notice the extraordinary similarity between the position of Mr. Pitt and his Whig opponents and that of the present Government and their opponents. If I recollect aright, an extraordinary coalition took place at that time, when the Whig party went out of power. Nothing damaged the Whig party so much as that unnatural alliance (loud cheers); and I warn the noble lord, who is a constitutional Minister, to beware, as he loves the constitution (as I know he does) before he joins with those who not only vote with him in carrying any salutary reform, but who have objects behind—democratic tendencies to which the noble lord would not give way. (Cheers.) But the noble lord may be betrayed in an unlucky moment into a false position, much, I should think, to his own disadvantage, and I am sure to the great disadvantage of the country." (Cheers.)

Mr. GLADSTONE called the position of the Government "necessarily anomalous" and "provisional." The question of Protection had shattered a mighty party in 1846, deranged ever since the "whole mechanical system of our parliamentary government," and called for every effort that men could make for the purpose of bringing, for once and for ever, the question to a final decision.

His speech then turned upon two points, the duty of the Opposition in regard to the Government, and in regard to the question of protection. With respect to the former, he went over the precedents cited by Sir James Graham and disclaimed by Mr. Walpole, and he argued that they were not advanced simply as precedents, but as illustrations of a living practical principle, that if you want a strong government you must have one commanding a majority in the House of Commons. No one had blamed the present ministry for accepting office; as a choice of evils, (alluding to obstructed legislation) he was glad they had taken office. But it was the duty of the House—a duty from which they must not shrink—to compel the Government to appeal to the country on the vital question at stake (protection) at the earliest possible moment. He ran over Mr. Disraeli's category of "necessary measures" and decidedly excepted to that as a necessary measure, which spoke of disposing of the four seats which will be vacant when the St. Albans Bill is carried. Also he did not think Chancery Reform a subject which should prolong parliament. And finally, he concluded that an explicit assurance ought to be obtained that Parliament should be dissolved speedily. As to their duty to protection, that was clear—he was opposed either to the reversal or modification of the policy of free-trade. What they had to do now was not to discuss whether free-trade or protection was the better policy, but to bring that great question to a speedy and final issue.

Mr. BAILLIE COCHRANE here rushed into the debate, but he was disregarded, a great hum of conversation filling the House. Not so when Lord PALMERSTON rose. His appearance stilled the murmurs. He made a frank and explicit statement of his views. They amounted to this: that Ministers were in a perfectly anomalous, unconstitutional, and accidental position. They had taken office in a minority, and therefore must either resign or dissolve parliament. The former course would be inconsistent with the circumstances under which they accepted office, and before the latter could take place, the necessary business must be performed. But this must be the necessary business; and when transacted, a dissolution ought at once to follow. That, accompanied by a running condemnation of the Protection policy, was the gist of a short but telling speech.

After this the debate was taken up by Mr. MILNER GIBSON, Sir JOHN TYRRELL, Mr. OSWALD, Mr. NEWDEGATE, Sir A. COOKBURN, and Mr. BOOKER; and these gentlemen having spoken, the House went into Committee of Supply, and voted 89,000 men for the navy.

The absorbing interest of Monday's debate throws all the parliamentary proceedings of the remainder of the week quite into the shade. In the House of Lords, on Tuesday night, a debate on the system of National Schools in Ireland was introduced by the Marquis of Clanricarde's inquiry, pursuant to notice, whether Ministers intended to propose any alteration in the present application of the public funds for educational purposes in Ireland. The EARL OF DERBY, in his reply, referred to the fact of his having, as Irish Secretary, twenty years ago, framed the regulations and introduced the system of National Schools. He thought that, under existing circumstances, the subject was a proper one for a committee of inquiry. After expressing his regret that a great number of the Presbyterian clergy had kept aloof from the National system with almost as much perseverance as the clergy of the Established Church, he suggested that it might be well to consider whether in some cases Government assistance might not be granted to schools exclusively Protestant, and also to schools exclusively Roman Catholic. These were subjects which a committee might investigate. He was most anxious that Roman Catholics as well as Protestants should have, under Government superintendence, the advantage of a sound moral, literary, and religious education. The MARQUIS OF LANSDOWNER deprecated any hasty interference with a system which had worked so well, and expressed his conviction that if once the plan were introduced of giving separate

grants to the various religious bodies, mixed education would become the exception, and exclusive education the rule. The EARL OF DESART denied that the present system was one of general education; he wished to see classes still more united. The EARL OF ROSEN made a speech on the "Protestant Ascendancy" side of the question, and declared that the National Schools prevented the conversion of the Roman Catholics. Lord Montague defended the system; Lord Donoughmore attacked it. The Marquis of Clanricarde replied briefly; and after some conversation between the noble Marquis, Lord de Ros, and the Earl of Donoughmore, the subject dropped.

In the House of Commons, on the same day, Lord ROBERT GROSVENOR, in putting a question to Lord John Manners, the Chief Commissioner of Works, on the subject of the ventilation of the House, drew a doleful picture of the sufferings members were compelled to undergo while attending their legislative duties. If something were not speedily done, he anticipated fatal consequences.

Lord JOHN MANNERS hoped that an efficient remedy would soon be applied; he expected great improvements from the efforts of Dr. Reid and Mr. Goldsworthy Gurney. In answer to a question from Mr. Duncombe, he announced that the government had decided not to interfere with the arrangements by which the Crystal Palace would be removed by the 1st of May. The recommendation of the commissioners, who had received an immense quantity of evidence, was to that effect, and their reasons appeared to the government to be satisfactory. Mr. NAPIER, the Irish attorney-general, moved for a select committee to inquire into the state of the disturbed districts of Armagh, Monaghan, and Louth, the object being to ascertain the cause of the crimes of violence that had disgraced those localities, and the sufficiency or insufficiency of the laws to meet the evil. These outrages usually arose out of the occupation of land, and were the overt acts of a great secret confederation, which, if not put down by the law, would put the law down. No doubt, if it could be properly administered, the law would be sufficient, but from the intimidation of jurors and witnesses some open-day murders had been committed with perfect impunity. He recommended an alteration in the jury laws, in order that juries to try cases that affected life and property should be composed of persons who would not be likely to be intimidated. He thought also that it might be wise, under certain restrictions, to re-enact the law making it penal to be in possession of signs and passwords. Mr. Hatchell took on himself the entire responsibility in regard to the late special commission, and explained the difficulties that sometimes lay in the way of securing the conviction of offenders. He admitted some alteration was necessary in the jury laws, but deprecated any interference with the liberty of the subject. Mr. MCCULLAGH ascribed much of the outrage in Ireland to the want of confidence existing between the owners and occupiers of land, the neglect of the duties of property, and the wholesale evictions that were from time to time carried on. He denied that there was any necessity for changing the law because in a particular district there had been a difficulty in obtaining convictions. After a few words from Mr. GROGAN the motion was agreed to. The annual Indemnity Bill was brought in, and the house adjourned.

In the House of Commons on Wednesday a long discussion took place on the Manchester and Salford Education Bill, the second reading of which, moved by Mr. Brotherton, was met by Mr. Milner Gibson with an amendment to refer it to a select committee to inquire into the state of education in the boroughs in question. He based this proposal on the ground that the bill, though technically a private was in reality a public measure, seeing that it went to establish the novel principle of supporting free schools, not only for secular education but for religious teaching in the forms of catholicism and of all sects of protestantism, by means of the public rates. Mr. ROBUCK seconded the amendment, not that he objected to the precise principle embodied in the measure, but that the bill ought to be treated as a public bill. Mr. WALPOLE, after giving great credit to the promoters for their good intentions, objected to establish by a private bill great principles which must affect the public generally, such as the principle of compulsory rating, free education, and the restriction of religious education to the reading of the Bible. He was prepared to agree to the motion for a committee, with some alterations in the wording. Lord JOHN RUSSELL also thought the measure ought to be dealt with as a public one, and was favourable to the inquiry. He felt strongly that the education to be given should be of a religious, and not wholly of a secular character, but acknowledged the difficulty of deciding upon a religious system of instruction in which all should agree. Sir ROBERT

HARRY INGLIS took occasion to reiterate his opinion that the education of the people ought to be entirely left to the Established Church. Mr. W. J. Fox admitted that if the object were to afford religious education by the state, it should be in the religion of the state; but he objected to any compulsory rate for the purpose of teaching religion. After some further discussion, Mr. BROTHERTON consented to adopt the amendment, and postponed the bill for a month. Mr. TUFFNELL obtained leave to bring in a bill to abolish property qualification for members of parliament, and the house adjourned.

Thursday's proceedings in both Houses were of a miscellaneous kind. In both, questions were put to Ministers respecting the ill-treatment of a British officer of the *Firebrand*, off Leghorn. It was stated by Lord MALMESBURY that a petty officer had leave to go on shore, and while there, in uniform, having quarrelled with a policeman, he had been seized, rudely treated, and thrown into prison. Mr. Scarlett had interfered, and the head of the Tuscan police had been imprisoned for eight days as an atonement for the outrage. In reply to an extempore question from Lord Palmerston, as to what had been done in Mr. Mather's case, the CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said all he could say was that reparation had been insisted on by the Government; and being pressed by Lord John Russell to state with what result, Mr. DISRAELI turned sharply upon him, and said it would have been more satisfactory had the noble lord given notice of his question.

After an announcement by Lord Derby, in reply to Lord Ellenborough, that he did not intend to encourage in any way the formation of volunteer rifle clubs, Lord Shaftesbury moved that an address be presented to the Queen, praying for the establishment of a state asylum for "criminal lunatics." He made a long speech in support of his motion, dwelling much on the improved method of treating lunacy, and arguing for a separation of "criminal lunatics" from those who were not criminal. Lord Derby objected to the phrase criminal lunatic. If a man was a lunatic no act could make him a criminal; and he objected to the motion chiefly on the ground of the expense it would be to the country. Ultimately the motion was withdrawn.

In the Commons a "count out" put an end to the sitting at an early hour. The chief matter discussed was a motion made by Mr. John Reynolds for a committee to inquire into the losses sustained by the depositors of the Cuffe-street Savings Bank, and praying for compensation. The Chancellor of the Exchequer met the question by a direct refusal, but signified that the whole subject of savings banks was being reviewed by the Government, with the view of placing them on a satisfactory footing. Several Irish members advised Mr. Reynolds to withdraw his motion, but he persevered, and on dividing the House he was beaten by 169 to 40.

Mr. Slaney obtained leave to bring in a bill to legalize the formation of industrial and provident partnerships. The measure did not touch the existing law of liability, but simply extended the provisions of the Friendly Society's Act of the 13th and 14th Victoria, to parties among the working classes who joined together in partnership, so far as to enable them to vest their property in the hands of directors of their own choosing, and to appoint a tribunal for deciding disputes among themselves. There was now a very thin House, and attempt was made to count out, which failed; however, a little later, the manoeuvre was successfully practised in the middle of a debate between Mr. Hume and Mr. Henry Drummond, on the worn-out topic of Sir James Brooke and his government of Borneo; and the House adjourned.

ELECTION MATTERS.

Mr. R. A. Christopher, the new Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, was re-elected for North Lincolnshire on Saturday last, after a nominal opposition, which, however, served as a demonstration in favour of free trade. The proceedings took place in one of the assize courts in the Castle at Lincoln. Mr. T. G. Corbett proposed, and Sir Charles Anderson seconded his nomination. Mr. John Norton rose to address the meeting, when the sheriff had inquired whether there was any other candidate to be proposed, and was received with loud cheering; but objection was taken to his right to speak, as, although a freeholder of the county, he was not on the register. Mr. C. Seeley, who is a candidate for the borough of Lincoln at the next election, said that he would put the questions to Mr. Christopher which Mr. Norton would have done; and he would go further than that, and propose a candidate in opposition to Mr. Christopher—one whose name would go down the pages of history as possessing the most brilliant mind of any man of his age—the Right Hon. Thomas Babington Macaulay. (Loud cheers.) Mr. Cooley, a builder, seconded the nomina-

tion of Mr. Macaulay. Mr. Wilkinson, merchant, proposed Mr. John Norton as a candidate. Mr. Wilson seconded the nomination. On a show of hands being taken, more than two-thirds of the people in the court, which had become crammed, held up their hands for Mr. Norton, and the sheriff declared, amid vociferous cheering, that the choice had fallen upon that gentleman. Mr. Norton (who is at the head of a large drapery firm in the city of Lincoln) then addressed the electors in favour of free trade, and predicted that not only would the present government not be in power three months, but that Mr. Christopher himself, who was the "pilot balloon" for Sir R. Peel, would probably be the pilot balloon for the final abandonment of protection by the Earl of Derby's cabinet. Mr. Christopher was received with cheers, mingled with groans. He declared that if, after an appeal to the country by the Earl of Derby, the majority of the next House of Commons should be against a return to protection, he thought the agitation on the subject should be for ever abandoned. Mr. Norton then withdrew, and Mr. Christopher was declared to be elected. Three cheers for free trade, three cheers for Cobden, and three groans for protection, finished the proceedings.

The activity of preparation for the expected general election still continues. Sir George Grey's constituents in Newcastle, and throughout the northern division of Northumberland, have received a circular from the late Home Secretary, in which he intimates his intention of again asking for their suffrages and support. Mr. G. F. Young, who was pledged to come forward for Cambridgeshire, has been released from his promise, as he represented to his supporters that it was of greater importance that he should return to Scarborough, in order to keep out Lord Londesborough's free-trade candidate. The name of Mr. Adeane has been substituted for that of Mr. Young, as the "Protestant and Protectionist" candidate, in conjunction with Mr. E. T. Yorke and Lord George Manners.

An idea being common among some of the electors of the borough of St. Albans, that the measure of disfranchisement will not be carried before the dissolution of Parliament, a kind of private meeting of the principal movers in electioneering matters in the town took place on Wednesday week, with a view of securing the return of Mr. Jacob Bell, in the event of a general election. The Hon. Robert Grimston, brother to the Earl of Verulam, is named as likely to be the second candidate who will be brought forward.

Mr. Forbes Mackenzie has consented to stand for Liverpool, on the Conservative interest, in conjunction with a merchant connected with the port, Mr. Charles Turner. It is not expected that the opposition will be sufficiently strong to throw out the present members, Mr. Cardwell and Sir Thomas Birch, both of whom possess the confidence of a large portion of the electors.

The *Banner of Ulster* says, "If the defeat of Lord Naas for Kildare were the result of his conduct in the Birch and Clarendon case, we should regret it; but far higher considerations, we feel confident, decided this important issue. We have heard sinister rumours in regard to the noble lord's negotiations for a certain northern borough, [Coleraine] and we intend to watch the proceedings of parties, who will understand from this alliance that we know perfectly well what they are about."

Mr. Vincent Scully has gained the support of some very energetic if not very judicious patrons. The parliamentary committee of the "Catholic Defence Association" have issued the following manifesto in his favour for the guidance of the Roman Catholic electors of the county of Cork:—

"We rejoice that through the honourable and patriotic retirement of Mr. McCarthy, who has withdrawn his own claim rather than risk any division of the Catholic interest, your path lies open to repeat in Cork the victory gained by the men of Kildare.

"1. Mr. Scully is the son of that patriotic Irish Catholic, Dennis Scully, author of the *Statement of the Penal Laws*.

"2. He is a Catholic of Irish Brigade politics."

"3. He is opposed to the Godless colleges.

"4. He is for the total abolition of the tithe rent-charge.

"5. He is for the liberal adjustment of the law of landlord and tenant.

"6. He is a thorough supporter of the glorious principles of 'civil and religious liberty.'

"7. He is for the total and immediate repeal of the infamous 'Ecclesiastical Titles Act.'

"1. Mr. Frewen is the avowed supporter of Lord Derby's 'No popery' government, and of the infamous 'Ecclesiastical Titles Act.'

"2. He has been introduced into your great Catholic county by Lord Bernard, the living representative of the intolerant inscription on the bridge of Bandon:—

Turk, Jew, or Atheist,

May enter here,

But not a Papist."

"3. He has no connexion with your great county, except as the relation of C. H. Frewen, the 'No Popery' member for the county of Sussex.

"The Catholic electors of Cork cannot hesitate between two such candidates.

"EDWARD PRESTON, Chairman.

"HENRY W. M. WILBERFORCE, Sec."

Mr. Tennyson D'Eyncourt will stand again for Lambeth. Mr. George Thompson offers to the electors of the Tower Hamlets another lease of his services; and it has been resolved, at a meeting of the Liberals of that borough, to put Mr. Ayrton up with him. Sir William Molesworth will be opposed at Southwark by a former rival, Mr. Apsley Pellatt. Alderman Wire's name is mentioned in connexion both with Lambeth and Finsbury.

We have received the following letter from Mr. George Smith, secretary to the Ship Locality, White-chapel:—

March 17th, 1852.

"SIR,—You will greatly oblige the members of the Ship Locality by inserting the following resolution in your paper:—It was unanimously agreed to, that in the opinion of this locality, the extraordinary ability displayed by Mr. William Newton on every occasion in the cause of our oppressed fellow men, but more especially the dignified manner in which he has recently advocated the rights of man against the tyranny of those called masters, cannot be too highly appreciated by the industrious classes of this country, believing Mr. Newton is pre-eminently entitled to a nation's gratitude. We hereby recommend to our brother electors and non-electors that gentleman as a fit and proper person to represent the borough of the Tower Hamlets in the next parliament."

AUSTRALIA AND TRANSPORTATION.

SIR JOHN PAKINGTON'S troubles have fairly begun. In consequence of the rumoured departure of several ship-loads of convicts for Hobart Town, in violation of Lord Grey's promise that transportation to Van Diemen's Land should be abolished, a deputation of thirteen gentlemen, representing the four colonies of New South Wales, South Australia, Victoria and Van Diemen's Land, headed by four members of Parliament well known for the interest they take in colonial matters,—Sir William Molesworth, Mr. Adderley, Mr. Ewart, and Mr. Chisholm Anstey, waited on the new Colonial Minister, at his office in Downing-street, on Wednesday. Sir William Molesworth observed on the cause that had led them to seek this interview, referred to the particulars of Lord Grey's promise, and the discontent of all classes of the colonists at its non-fulfilment. He assured Sir John Pakington that the Australian colonies were on the eve of becoming potent states. If wisely and prudently governed, they would long retain their present feelings of attachment and loyalty to the British Empire; but the continuance of transportation would soon destroy those feelings. After some remarks from Mr. Ewart, Mr. Adderley followed with an explanation of the universal excitement of the colonists on this subject, and their powerful organization by means of the "Australasian League." He declared that further perseverance in the present course would prove abortive, would exasperate the Australian colonies, and lead to active resistance, similar to that which was successfully carried out at the Cape; and he expressed his firm belief that if the Government suffered another such defeat as had been sustained in that case, it would go far to destroy our colonial empire. No consideration could be of such importance as that this country should faithfully keep all her engagements. Mr. Anstey observed that the only reason for the slight falling off of agitation in Van Diemen's Land was from the belief that the discovery of gold in the adjacent colony of Port Philip had rendered the continuance of transportation to that quarter utterly impossible. Mr. Michie, a New South Wales colonist of nine years' experience, explained that the attendance that day of gentlemen connected with nearly all the Australasian colonies was caused by the fact that the convicts carried to Van Diemen's Land would soon be dispersed throughout the other colonies. Van Diemen's Land had become a conduit-pipe through which felons were poured into the neighbouring colonies. A large admixture of convicts with the vast numbers of people at work in the gold fields of New South Wales and Port Philip would lead to scenes of bloody outrage that would disgrace the English name throughout the world. Mr. J. A. Jackson said that the last mail from Van Diemen's Land conveyed the intelligence, which corresponded with the news from Sydney, that nearly all the elections were favourable to the "Anti-transportationists;" the members for Hobart Town, the capital, being no other than the President and Treasurer of the Australasian League in Van Diemen's Land. Some others of the deputation having made a few observations, Sir John Pakington replied. He sheltered himself under the plea that he had just acceded to office, that he was not responsible either for the policy or the alleged breach of faith of

his predecessor, and that he would give the subject his serious consideration. Sir W. Molesworth thanked Sir John Pakington for the courtesy of his reception, and for having at least arrested the sailing of two convict ships destined for Van Diemen's Land. Sir J. Pakington might not be responsible for the breach of faith committed towards the colonists, but a breach of faith committed by a Secretary of State was the breach of faith of the Government. The colonists knew no individuals. They knew that the British Government had pledged itself to a particular act, and the British Government, by whomsoever administered, was responsible for its performance. The deputation then retired.

LORD CAMPBELL AND THE ROMAN CATHOLIC HIGH SHERIFF.

THE Chief Justice of England has replied to Mr. Scott Murray's letter, explaining several passages of his charge to the Grand Jury at Aylesbury, which he thinks Mr. Scott Murray has misinterpreted, and maintaining the impropriety and indiscretion of the High Sheriff's conduct in bringing his Roman-catholic chaplain to accompany the judges from the railway station to their lodgings. He says that Mr. Scott Murray's protest against "the supposed *dictum*," that "the chaplain appointed by the sheriff becomes the chaplain of the judges," was quite unnecessary. All that Lord Campbell meant was, "that *pro hac vice* he officiates as chaplain to the judges; and there can be no doubt that he does so, as he invariably preaches before them, and says grace when they entertain the magistrates at dinner, although the sheriff is not present as a guest." He then proceeds to give an explanation of another part of his charge:—

"I should have hoped that my meaning was as little liable to be misunderstood, when I said, that 'the Protestant religion is the religion of the judges of this country,' viz.—that all the judges of England who go as judges of assize are Protestants,—a fact uncontested and notorious—and I cannot imagine that any sheriff, with the knowledge of this fact, would do anything to offend their Protestant feelings, from the consideration that, in point of law, persons of a different religious persuasion may be appointed judges."

He says that the custom of a Protestant clergyman, appointed by the sheriff, accompanying the judges, and sitting by them while they are trying criminals, was adopted out of "compliment to the judges," and not as "a privilege of the sheriff."

"The sheriff's chaplain, *qua* the sheriff's chaplain, can have no more right to sit in the carriage with the judges, or to have any intercourse with the judges, than any other member of the sheriff's establishment. The sheriff may abstain from appointing any one to officiate as chaplain for the judges, but he cannot be entitled to intrude upon them his own chaplain, of a different religion from theirs."

Lord Campbell does not doubt that Mr. Scott Murray has stated the precedents on which he relies exactly as they were stated to him, but two of them he has ascertained to have been founded on an incorrect report of what occurred.

"From a letter of the Rev. Mr. Coldwell, the very worthy rector of Stafford, I find that you have been misinformed as to what has occurred in this county; for Mr. Fitzherbert, the first Roman-catholic sheriff of Staffordshire, appointed a Protestant clergyman to officiate as chaplain at the assizes, 'the sheriff not being accompanied by any Roman-catholic priest whatever;' and, although Mr. Whitgrave, the second, had a Roman-catholic priest as his 'personal chaplain' (which he had an unquestionable right to do), he employed a Protestant clergyman 'to preach the assize sermon, to attend with him to meet the judges, and do all that pertained to the office of chaplain during the year.'"

And even if they were all as stated, he should refuse to be bound by them, "believing that they passed *per incuriam*, or upon an erroneous view of what is becoming." Mr. Justice Crompton fully concurred with the course adopted by the Chief Justice at Aylesbury. Lord Campbell concludes by declaring that he wishes the Roman-catholic Relief Bill of 1829 to be carried into effect "in the spirit in which it was framed," but he thinks that claims, such as those advanced by Mr. Scott Murray, are calculated "to stir up strife, and to prevent or retard measures which might be of great benefit to the Roman-catholics of the United Kingdom."

LETTERS FROM PARIS.

[FROM OUR OWN CORRESPONDENT.]

LETTER XII.

Paris, Tuesday Evening, March 16.

THE chief event of the week is the conversion of the five per cent. stocks into four-and-a-half per cents, by a simple decree of Bonaparte's inserted in the *Moniteur* of Sunday last. The unfortunate fund-holders were thunder-struck. I am not acquainted with the characteristics of the English *rentier*, but in France the whole race is of the most sheepish and credulous species

known. I told you in my sixth letter, that this conversion was contemplated, as well as the decree on the *Crédit Foncier*. The report in fact was current in well-informed quarters; and had even become so widely spread, that the Government felt called upon to give it a formal contradiction, both in the *Constitutionnel* and the *Moniteur*. Whereupon these worthy *rentiers* were wrapped in blissful sleep. How could they doubt the honesty and integrity of such a government? Today, awaking to find the tenth of their fortunes annihilated by the stroke of a pen! they can find no curses bitter enough for L. Bonaparte. They would cause an *émeute*, if an *émeute* could be got up by such people.

As to the measure itself, though it affects the interests of a few individuals, it is advantageous for the general welfare. The 5 per cent. stock amounted to 186,000,000 francs, the reduction of the interest, or conversion from 5, to 4½ per cent, is equivalent, therefore, to relieving the country of a burden of eighteen million and a half of francs. Then, again, the interest allowed by the Bank of France being only 3 per cent, to have maintained the government stock at 5 per cent, would infallibly have led to the absorption of the commercial capital of the country into the *rentes*. Does not this explain the material impossibility which has existed in France for the last thirty years—to find capital for industrial undertakings? The conversion will certainly not remedy this evil entirely, for there will still be the difference of 1½ per cent, between money invested at the bank or in the funds, in favour of the latter. Nevertheless, the new measure is a step in the right direction.

Louis Bonaparte had also motives of a *personal* nature for effecting, in this summary manner the conversion of the stock. He wished to demonstrate the superiority of the autocratic system, where unity of action accompanies unity of will, over the parliamentary system, in which the clashing of wayward caprices paralyses the power of each. The conversion of the stock has three times been voted by the Chamber of Deputies; once during the Villèle ministry, under the Restoration, and twice during the reign of Louis-Philippe. Three times it has been rejected by the Chamber of Peers. That which has been the wish of the country for twenty-seven years, and which France could not obtain, Louis Bonaparte has realized in a few minutes. If this man were aught but an ambitious mediocrity, if he were, in a word, a man of genius, he would not fail, with such acts as this, to become the idol of a nation so acute and sensitive as the French.

The conversion of this stock has further been a *job* on the part of L. Bonaparte. One of his familiars was at the Bourse on Saturday the 13th, and sold 3,000,000 of *rentes*, to be delivered on Monday the 15th; funds being at 103 fr. 60 c. On Sunday the 14th, the decree appeared. On Monday the funds had fallen to 100 francs. Here then was a plum worth 2,160,000 francs to L. Bonaparte realized by this Napoleonic decree. All things then being considered, the conversion is a *clever* financial operation.

Another decree which figured in the *Moniteur* of Sunday, settles autocratically the budget for 1852. It has been the custom in England, from time immemorial, and it has been a principle in France since 1789, that supplies could not be voted without the consent of the nation or its representatives. *Nous avons changé tout cela* since the 2nd of December. L. Bonaparte has himself voted the taxes for 1852, and has given himself a budget of 1500 millions of francs. I told you, a fortnight or three weeks ago, that this would happen, and the reason is easily understood. Enormous defalcations have been committed in the finances since the 2nd of December. The Generals have been gorged with presents: Courtesans have wallowed in ill-gotten plunder; and the murderers of defenceless women and children must needs receive their hire. All this has been done and must continue, lest a higher bidder should enter the field. The subsidies for every branch of the public service have been freely manipulated. The disorder is so complete, that any account is utterly impracticable. To investigate the budget, under such circumstances as these, would be to ruin the government of L. Bonaparte. Therefore has he settled it by a decree.

A third decree appears in the *Moniteur*, regulating education. This is not the final decree which is to suppress the University. The present decree cancels the privilege of irremovability hitherto enjoyed by the body of professors. It gives to the President of the Republic the absolute power of nomination and revocation of the professors of the first class, and to the Minister of Public Instruction the same power over the second-rate teachers. In the several Universities in France, which correspond with those of England, the professors were elected by their colleagues. It is therefore obvious that the new decree robs them of their independence.

A fourth decree abolishes the formula which at pre-

sent heads all legal documents: "In the name of the French people," and substitutes for it the following: "Louis Napoleon Bonaparte, President of the Republic, to all whom it may concern, greeting."

A fifth decree is directed *personally* against General Cavaignac, who had intended solemnly to refuse taking the oath to Louis Bonaparte required by the Constitution of the 14th January. This refusal would have marked the opening of the Legislative Body. To parry the blow which the new member for Paris meditated against L. Bonaparte, the latter decrees that the refusal of any magistrate or public functionary to take the oath shall be considered as a resignation. That deputies, being public functionaries, are consequently bound to take the oath; and finally, that any addition, modification, restriction, or reservation, made as regards the oath, should be considered as a resignation.

It is also asserted, that to avoid the exposure of a refusal on the part of the deputies to taking the oath, they will be summoned to the Tuileries, in order that they may fulfil that condition before the President in person, and that those who should refuse to obey the summons would be considered as having resigned their seats in the Assembly. Do not these precautions indicate the great fear which the Prince President feels for the General Cavaignac?

Last Sunday the election of the 4th arrondissement took place in Paris. M. Carnot, the Republican candidate, being opposed to M. Moreau, the Government nominee. On this occasion there was much excitement. The *Faubourgs* for the first time threw off their lethargy, and to show their Republicanism voted for M. Carnot. On the other hand, the *Bourgeoisie*, to prove their opposition, also voted for M. Carnot. M. Carnot was thus elected by a considerable majority: the votes being 16,753 to 13,343. The shock was rudely felt by the Government. Several influential *Ouvriers* who had escaped the massacres of the 2nd December were seized during the night, thrown into a cellular wagon, and conveyed to Havre, thence to be transported to Cayenne. Amongst others, the Citizen Philippe, blacksmith, and delegate to the democratic committee, for the Faubourg St. Antoine. A great number of other citizens have been torn from their families and carried away since the day before yesterday. 467 citizens have been removed from the Fort d'Ivry and forwarded to Havre and Brest, probably to be transported to Cayenne and Algeria. Citizen Miot, a Representative of the people, and Citizen Pornin, Causidière's Ancient of the Montagnards, are amongst those destined for Cayenne. The roads in the South are completely furrowed by the poor transports which the Government is sending to Algiers. Five columns, numbering altogether 400 men, have been taken from the single department of the Basses Alpes. There are small villages, numbering but 300 souls, from which as many as 27 have been transported. I am further informed that many arrests have recently taken place in the same department, including the Baron Duchaffant, a Republican, and M. —, a medical doctor. Besides which, the vice-president of the Tribunal of Digne, and the president of the Tribunal of Barcelonnette, have been expelled the French territory.

The republican party has just suffered a painful loss in the person of M. Marrast, late President of the Constituent Assembly, who died of apoplexy. The funeral, at which all the republicans of Paris attended, was a complete political manifestation. The police did not allow any oration. M. de Lamartine, who was present, has published an eulogium of the deceased. Armand Marrast did not leave as much as would cover the expense of his funeral. Is he not avenged of the calumnies which the enemies of the republic propagated in 1848, against his administration at the Hotel de Ville.

The wanton extravagance of Louis Bonaparte; his dictatorial measures; his violent decrees against property, are now avenging the republic, whose sole crime was its respect for the laws.

Reports are current that the Empire will be officially proclaimed next Sunday, the 21st of March. An organized *émeute*, prepared by the police, is also spoken of. The wholesale butcheries of the Boulevards will be renewed. The Orleansists will be pounced upon and carried off, as were the republicans, and Louis Bonaparte will be proclaimed Emperor of the French! It appears to me that this bloody, stage-like effect is needless. To attain this result, a simple decree would have sufficed. The bloodhounds of the *Elysée* are not of this opinion. They say that we are a living lie, so long as we preserve the name of *republic*, and that to efface that name would be to be convicted of the lie, *flagrante delicto*; and that consequently the enemies of Louis Bonaparte will rise *en masse* against the new Emperor, and that nothing but *grape-shot* will subdue them.

In the meantime, L. Bonaparte has appointed a grand review to take place on the 21st, under the pretext of distributing *Eagles* to the delegates of the

different regiments. On this occasion all the troops quartered in the neighbouring departments have received orders to march on Paris. The apothecary Fialin, the *soi disant* de Persigny, will be created *Prince-arch-Chancellor* on the day of the proclamation of the Empire. One circumstance alone can prevent the Empire, it is the *veto* of the Emperor of Russia. But, after having trampled on the constitution of a whole nation, would you shrink before the *veto* of one man?

An increasing ferment now reigns in France. The agitation has reached the provinces. The *bourgeoisie* are on the alert. There might be something startling in that quarter shortly. In another direction the fusion of the two branches progresses. There are several points already on which they agree. A treaty containing four articles has been decided upon:—1. The tricoloured flag *sémé* with fleur-de-lis. 2. The reign of Louis Philippe to be recognised. 3. The Duc de Nemours to go to the Comte de Chambord at Frohsdorf. 4. The Comte de Chambord to visit the Queen Amélie either at Claremont or at Naples. The Elysians are the ready hawkers of these rumours. In fact, the fusion occupies much of their thoughts. To punish the Legitimists, the decree which re-establishes the titles of the nobility, is only applicable to the imperial nobility. The Elysée declares that the decree shall not be applied to the *ancienne noblesse*. It is even still further in contemplation to consecrate, by an imposing ceremony at the Tuileries, the conferring of the titles upon such of the nobles as would rally to Louis Bonaparte. To punish the Orleanists, however, it is said at the Elysée that a decree will be issued forbidding the defendants to appeal to the legal tribunals against the presidential decrees, and thus cutting short the legal warfare which the Orleans family are carrying on against L. Bonaparte.

No note has yet appeared in the *Moniteur* on the Swiss question. The most contradictory reports prevail on that subject. It is nevertheless patent that Louis Bonaparte flinched before the firm attitude of the Swiss Government; so that now, feeling himself beaten, he is toadying to Austria. That country still speaks of intervention on her own account. Louis Bonaparte insists on his pretensions, and has declared to the court of Vienna, for the purpose of encouraging it, that if Austria made an armed intervention, he would do the same.

A fresh menacing note has been addressed to Belgium. This time it is on account of a masquerade at Ghent, in which Louis Bonaparte and his heroic nose were turned into ridicule. The Belgian Government offered to dismiss the Commissary of Police of Ghent; but Louis Bonaparte demands the sacrifice of the Governor of the Province, and the Belgian Government refuses. S.

CONTINENTAL NOTES.

THE *Moniteur* of Thursday published the estimates for 1852.

The State expenditure is calculated at 1,430,363,244 francs; the receipts at 1,449,413,604.

The import duties on fermented liquors are reduced by half, and those on liquors sold by retail raised by half.

The war estimates are augmented by 7,000,000 francs; those of the navy by 12,000,000 francs.

The extraordinary works are augmented by 14,000,000 francs.

On Wednesday appeared a decree for the reorganization of the Legion of Honour. Louis Bonaparte declares himself to be its chief and grand-master. Many new formalities are introduced, and the admissions into the order are to be on a more restrained scale than hitherto. The Legion of Honour, however, has been too irremediably disgraced by the wholesale nominations of stock-jobbers and place-hunters under Louis Philippe, and of adventurers and Decembrists under the new Bonapartist era. The riband is now a badge of servility, if not of dishonesty.

Granier de Cassagnac, once the paid writer of Guizot on the *Epoque*, defends the confiscation decrees in the *Constitutionnel*, by heaping coarse and cowardly insults on the house of Orleans. All the documents, *pro* and *con*—the protest of the executors, the legal opinion against the decrees, and the pamphlet in their defence—are permitted to appear in the journals.

The Bishop of Orleans has declined to accept a seat in the Supreme Council of Public Instruction. The Bishop is probably awake to the insecurity of the tenure.

The *Suisse*, of Berne, of the 14th instant, publishes the answer of the Federal Council to the French note of Jan. 24. It is dated Feb. 9; is addressed to Count Salignac-Fenelon; and, after quoting the arrogant terms in which the demands of the French note were couched, asserts that Switzerland is not the scene of such plots against France or other states as is stated; but, were it so, the Federal Council has never refused to do whatever international law can justly require of it. The answer then observes that

what is demanded in the note of the 24th of January is entirely new. According to it, the authority of the country is to have nothing further to say as to the ulterior sojourn or expulsion of strangers who have been received in the country, and who live under the protection of its laws and its institutions; in future it will depend rather upon a mere sign from a foreign legation to decide what measures the authorities shall take in the domain of the police regarding foreigners. If the Federal Council did not refuse to comply with the demand made to it, it would violate in the gravest manner the Federal constitution, as well as its most sacred duties towards the country, which has confided to it dictatorial and superior executive power; for it cannot but see in this demand a serious attempt against the independence, the dignity, and the liberty of the confederation. There cannot but be seen, moreover, in this demand a decided interference in the internal affairs of Switzerland. But if the Federal Council declines to accede to the demand which has been addressed to it, it does not follow that it will permit the refugees to take steps hostile to other states while they remain on the Swiss territory. The Swiss Federal Council hopes it has given all the assurances compatible with the honour and independence of the confederation, and which fully satisfy the demand of international law. Further, the threat by which the note is terminated cannot make it leave the path traced out for it as much by the profound sentiment of its duty as by international law, and it doubts not by the voice of the Swiss people.

The Belgian newspapers entering France being now, in common with other foreign journals, subjected to a duty of three cents. per copy, the Belgian government has laid a similar impost upon French papers entering Belgium.

M. Hulsemann, Austrian Chargé d'Affaires in the United States, is said by the *Augsburg Gazette* to have received orders to return to Washington. The *Lloyd* of the 13th announces that Prince Schwarzenberg was sufficiently recovered from his indisposition to have had an audience of the Emperor on the previous day. The Grand Dukes Michael and Nicholas of Russia arrived in Vienna on the 12th. M. Anthony Kutschera, formerly editor of a Styrian newspaper, and since confined in the prison at Gratz for publishing sentiments displeasing to the ministry, emigrates to America, the government bearing his expenses.

In Bavaria there is a contest between the State and the Church. The German journals publish a letter from the Pope to the Archbishop of Bamberg, commending "the priestly courage, solicitude, and circumspection" displayed by that prelate in asserting the prerogatives of the See of Rome against the monarch and the government, and assuring him of the continued hearty support of the Pontiff. Even in this Catholic kingdom, it is complained the rights of the Church are not properly respected, nor have her powers free play. The *Augsburg Gazette* reports that the whole Episcopate of Bavaria has resolved to unite in new and strong representations to the king on the principles of their late ultramontane manifesto.

The Jesuit missions in Franconia (Bavaria), all on a sudden, have been interdicted by special order of the King.

From Baden and Wurtemberg thousands of emigrants are wending their way to France and Northern Germany, in order to embark for America.

The troops of the Duchy of Baden were released on the 13th inst. from their oath to the constitution, and being re-sworn, undertook "to fight bravely against any enemy so often as and in what manner the Duke may think fit."

The Protectionist Cabinet in England is said to excite great apprehensions in Denmark on account of the commercial activity which has sprung up between the two countries since the establishment of Free Trade. We may judge, says the correspondent of the *Morning Chronicle*, of the value of the Danish agricultural export to England from the following list of the exportation from the western harbours of North and South Jutland alone, during the last year, by steamers only, which has just been laid before the Diet:—Exported by steam from Jutland, 1851—Horses, 91; large cattle, 17,456; calves, 8; sheep, 6346; swine, 1523; foxes, 16; turkeys, 21; butter, 382½ barrels; corn, 277½ barrels; pork, 215,914 lbs.; eggs, 83,940; wax, 1279 lbs.

The Emperor of Austria has been to sea in the Adriatic with the Austrian steam squadron, which executed under his orders a sort of sham naval fight in the Bay of Trieste.

LOUIS BLANC AND MAZZINI.

WHAT FRENCH SOCIALISM IS, AND IS NOT.

(To the Editor of the Leader.)

(LETTER V.)

THE FRENCH SOCIALISTS DO NOT, IN ANY SENSE OR DEGREE, AIM AT THE SUPPRESSION OF CAPITAL.

And this may be affirmed, for the very simple reason that the words SUPPRESSION OF CAPITAL are nonsense! What is Capital, in reality? The definitions given by

the economists are not identical: their common meaning, however, is perhaps, as nearly as possible, resumed in that given by the philosophical theorist, John Stuart Mill: *Capital is wealth appropriated to reproductive employment.*

Whilst he is working, man has need of nourishment, of clothing, of a home: he requires the materials to work upon; he must have machines, implements. They are CAPITAL. You accuse the Socialists of desiring to suppress CAPITAL? A ludicrous imputation, in truth! You might as well accuse us of desiring to suppress the crops that nourish us, the flocks that supply us with wool, the houses that afford us shelter; in short, the whole of our materials of labour! The Socialists know, believe me, marvellously well, that Capital is the most beneficent of divinities: that from its fruitful union with labour, springs WEALTH: that when we decompose the price of any given product, of a pair of cotton hose, for example, the necessity and the benefits of Capital are discovered in the analysis of the share that accrues to the squatter who cleared the land in Carolina, to the canvasser that drove the ship from New York to Havre, and to the machinery that turns ten thousand knitting needles. The Socialists are not at all unaware that it is to the intervention of Capital, in the form of wagons, of horses, of railways, of locomotives, that the workman is indebted for the power of doing in one day what, without such help, he would not have accomplished in two months. But it is precisely because Capital is fruitful, because it is necessary, because it assures to mankind the gratuitous coöperation of nature: yes, it is precisely because of all these its results, that the Socialists prefer a régime that would place it at the disposal of all, by the association of forces, to a régime that commits it to the mercy of a few.

What the Socialists combat is not CAPITAL: it is CAPITALISM: that is to say, the absorption and the invasion of Capital by a limited number, to the exclusion of the mass.

In his famous treatise on *Corn Trade Legislation*, Necker supposes certain men who find the means of taking exclusive possession of the air, as others have taken exclusive possession of the soil. Then he represents them devising tubes, inventing pneumatic pumps, which would enable them to rarefy the atmosphere in one place, to condense it in another, so as to dispose of the respiration of the human race. Now what are we to think of their reasoning if, in order to prove the legitimacy of their exclusive right over every portion of air fit to breathe, they insisted that air is in the highest degree beneficent and necessary; that without air we could not breathe, that for want of breath we should cease to live? What would be thought of their good sense, if, to those who might reproach them with monopolising the air, they took it into their heads to reply—*You desire to suppress it, then?*

The sophism perpetually employed by the adversaries of Socialism, consists in confounding the utility of CAPITAL with that of CAPITALISM. As if the utility of a thing depended on its being a monopoly, and not on itself.

Here is a road, for instance, which is the exclusive property of a company of speculators; whence this consequence—that we must pay for using it. Is it, then, useful because of this tariff? No; on the contrary, the tariff is a barrier erected against whoever cannot pay, and has the effect of limiting the use of the road; and so, the more limited the use, the less useful is the road.

Here is a machine just discovered, which becomes through a patent the exclusive property of the inventor: is it the patent that makes the machine useful? Far from it. Universalised in its application, and placed at the service of all the artisans associated in work, it would immediately produce marvellous results; whilst in the hands of one man only, and under the régime of anarchical competition, it runs the risk of becoming a hostile weapon, a bludgeon with which the exclusive possessor will crush his rivals, and break the arms of thousands of poor workmen. CAPITAL IS WEALTH FRUCTIFIED BY LABOUR: CAPITALISM is a greedy intermediary, who, by the onerous conditions he imposes on the union of the two, diminishes where he does not destroy its fecundity. Capital is the goose with the golden eggs: let us defend it against those who are for cutting it open.

What is credit? According to the régime of individualism, it is the confidence which induces a capitalist to lend to an industrious man, for a certain time determined, and in consideration of a premium, entitled *interest*, the use of that portion of capital of which the latter has need to turn his industry to advantage.

Now, in order that this kind of transaction may be carried out, two conditions are indispensably requisite: 1st, That the capitalist shall find his advantage in consenting thereto, and he does find it in the receipt of

interest; 2nd, That he shall be assured of not losing the value of the article of which he momentarily quits possession; and, as a general thesis, he cannot have any such assurance, other than the material security which the industry that borrows has to offer him.

Hence, we draw two consequences: the first, that thanks to the interest, there are fortunes which are in a condition to accumulate without giving any trouble to their possessors, wholly and solely because *their money begets money*; the second, that those who have the best material security, to furnish—that is, in other words, the richest—are those whom capital comes forward to serve with the greatest alacrity; so that the poor man, to whom credit would be most necessary, is just the man to whom one never lends; so that, moreover, the richer a man is, the easier is it for him to get rich; and the poorer a man is, the more difficult is it for him to emerge from his misery.

Now, I ask, is this reasonable? is this agreeable to the laws of eternal justice? Does this not wound feelings that God has implanted deep in the human conscience? Yes, truly, is the unhesitating reply of the Socialists.

And let not the objection be brought against them that these are inevitable consequences. They are inevitable under a régime of every man for himself, in a social order where the possession of the materials of work is monopolized; in a world, given over to tyrannical calculations, and to the hazards of an universal antagonism; in a system of social conventions so complicated and intertwined, that when a man has need of credit we are obliged, on pain of folly, or at least of imprudence, to take into consideration, not what he is worth in character, but what he is worth in purse. This necessity of lending nothing to men who possess nothing, the Socialists, indeed, recognise, but they recognise it only as the fatal result of an ensemble of vicious institutions; an ensemble which perhaps may be progressively changed. Suppose, for instance, a vast system of ASSOCIATIONS of mutual benefit and mutual responsibility (*solidaires*), which, by dint of labour and economy, have got together a collective capital, the profits of which every incoming workman would be admitted to share. Suppose that (instead of being close, as the old corporations, known in France by the name of *jurandes* and *maitrisés*, were) these fraternal associations should be open; the problem would be solved.

In such a case, indeed, for a man to obtain the materials of labour he would have no need to pay interest, nor to offer any material security. To belong to, and to be able to certify to a calling, to work for the profit of the ASSOCIATION in the midst of his fellows, and before the eyes of all, would suffice.

Personal credit, that is to say the confidence which is addressed to the merits of persons, would thus supersede real credit, that is to say the confidence which rests only on the possession of things, and the principle of distributive justice, would not be exposed to the constant violations which now must needs make the heart of every good man bleed. For who would venture to deny that usury, odious as it undoubtedly is, and eloquently as it has been condemned by St. Basile, St. Ambrose, St. Chrysostôme, by all the Fathers of the Church, is only a logical consequence of existing institutions.

If it be true, as M. Bastiat pretends, and as all the economists, our adversaries, pretend with him, that the interest of capital derives its legitimacy from the fact that the lender renders a service, are we not forced to admit that the service is all the greater in proportion as the situation of the man to whom it is rendered is more desperate? Can a man pay too dearly for his life? Can a man pay too dearly for his honour? If my life, or the life of a friend is at stake, let the usurer take, for interest, my liberty; I shall owe him then my gratitude! If my honour, or the honour of a friend, is at stake, let him exact a pound of my flesh; I shall owe him then my blessing when the moment has arrived for baring my breast to the knife!

SHYLOCK. "You have among you many a purchas'd slave,
Which, like your asses, and your dogs, and mules,
You use in abject and in slavish parts,
Because you bought them. Shall I say to you,
Let them be free, marry them to your heirs?
Why sweat them under burdens? Let their beds
Be made as soft as yours, and let their palates
Be season'd with such viands? You will answer,
The slaves are ours: so do I answer you;
The pound of flesh which I demand of him
Is dearly bought, is mine, and I will have it."

Divine Shakspeare! why not have made the literal execution of the bond signed by Antonio the dénouement of your immortal drama? Did not Shylock invoke the sacred principle of "freedom of commercial transactions?" Had he not rendered to Antonio, reduced to beg it of him, one of those services of which M. Bastiat speaks,—an immense service? It was his

due—that pound of bleeding flesh cut from the breast of a man!

There we see Capitalism judged in its extreme consequences, in its most rigorously logical results. Well then, whatever makes consequences like these, if not so extreme, inevitable: whatever makes a logic like this, though the circumstances of its operation be less tragic,—if only—possible: that the Socialists combat and resent.

What right have you to reproach them with aiming at the destruction of Capital, when they do nothing but denounce the abuse of its monopoly? By what strange subversion of all the laws of reason, do you come forward to accuse them of cutting down the tree, when their sole endeavour is to make it bear savoury, instead of poisoned, fruits: and when they invite to the enjoyment of its sheltering shade all the children of one common Father—God?

Is it to desire to suppress the harvests that nourish, the stuffs that clothe, the houses that shelter man—if we aspire to a state of society in which the reapers should never hunger for a loaf, in which the weavers of precious silks should not be clothed in rags, and in which the builders of palaces should not be left to perish for want of where to lay their heads?

LOUIS BLANC.

(To be continued.)

THE GOVERNMENT AND THE RIFLE CLUBS.

A NUMEROUS meeting of the members of the Metropolitan Rifle Club was held on Thursday, at the Thatched House Tavern, St. James's-street, for the purpose of receiving the answer of her Majesty's Ministers to the offer of the services of the club in the event of any threatened danger to the country; Captain L. Murray Prior in the chair. After a few preliminary observations from the chairman, the secretary read the following answer of the Secretary of State for the Home Department, transmitted through the hands of the Marquis of Salisbury, as lord-lieutenant of the county. It was as follows:—

"Her Majesty's Government are highly sensible of the value and importance of having the assistance of volunteer rifle corps, and, in case of necessity, would willingly avail themselves of that assistance; but until some progress is made in the measure which they will have to submit to the consideration of Parliament with reference to the militia, they have deemed it desirable that the formation of such corps should be suspended for the present, except in those cases where the late Government have actually sanctioned them, or where it may be expedient for special reasons to make an exception. In the case of the county of Middlesex, it does not appear that there is any immediate necessity for the formation of such corps. But I beg your lordship will be so good as to thank the gentlemen who have made applications submitted in your letters for the readiness they have shown in offering to come forward."

A resolution was then passed, expressive of regret that the Government had felt it necessary to decline their services, which, without expense to the country, would aid the regular forces in the event of a foreign power attempting to invade the country. Another resolution was passed, that the club should fit themselves by rifle practice for future organization should circumstances arise which might render their formation into rifle corps desirable to her Majesty's Government. A vote of thanks was passed to the Marquis of Salisbury and to the chairman, and the meeting was dissolved.

On the same day a meeting was held at the Bridge House Hotel, London-bridge, when it was resolved to form rifle companies for Bermondsey and Southwark, as portions of the Surrey Rifle Regiment. A letter was read from the Earl of Ellesmere, who regretted that he was too old to join himself, but he had two sons who would join immediately.

THE AMERICAN REACTION AGAINST KOSSUTH.

A STRONG demonstration against Kossuth was made at the Congressional dinner, held at Washington on the 21st of February, in honour of the birthday of George Washington. Kossuth was criticised, in connexion with his intervention doctrine, very severely by several speakers who were all emphatically against intervention. We note that a reaction is arising in the American mind, or rather a feeling, which is a set-off to the enthusiasm he excited. It has been diligently fomented by certain journals, and all unfavourable reports have been copied into the German papers, which again have been copied with comments by the American editors. This has been systematically done. Again, the Americans complain of his "theatrical manner." The long correspondence has turned up officially. Consul Hodge off Marseilles, had a dispute with Kossuth, whom he represents as behaving very hotly. To put an end to the unpleasant scene, the consul says, "I wished him a pleasant voyage, bowed, and retired—I, in a cold and respectful manner—he, like an oriental satrap." The

Boston Transcript says the letter from which the extract is given was written in haste, and "quite blind in some parts." But even they complain of Kossuth for patronising their great men and acting the *grand seigneur*. Mr. John Barners of Baltimore is of a like opinion. He had an interview with Kossuth; was hurt by his tone and language in speaking of the Washington foreign policy, and left him, determined never to see him again. His description of Kossuth is curious. "I left him," he says, "with the conviction that he was the most erudite scholar, accomplished, fascinating, and elegant orator of the age; at the same time a sturdy beggar, a dangerous incendiary, and a cold-hearted ingrate." All this must be taken for what it is worth.

THE KAFFIR WAR.

THE *Bosphorus*, royal mail screw steamer, arrived at Plymouth, on Saturday last, at half-past five, A.M. She left Cape Town on the 3rd of February, and it was then confidently expected that the Caffre war would soon be brought to a happy conclusion. Major-General Somerset, with the troops who had formed the expedition over the river Kei, returned to head quarters, at King William's Town, on the 11th of January, having been in the field six weeks, with only a single blanket to each man, and no tents. They had completely routed the enemy in every affair in which they had made resistance, and had captured thirty thousand head of cattle. On the 15th of January, the leading Kaffir chiefs, Macomo, Stock, Sandilli, and Kreli, sent a deputation to Sir Harry Smith, at King William's Town, to sue for terms of peace; but the governor informed them, through Mr. Brownlee, the Gaika commissioner, that their surrender must be unconditional, "trusting to her Majesty's clemency," and that if this were tendered "in a solemn manner, and in good faith, hostilities would cease, and their lives be respected." Eight days passed over, and on the 23rd of January the governor ordered a combined movement, in seven columns, on the Amatola mountains, and the country east of the Keiskamma, with the object of devastating the crops, and capturing the cattle, of the enemy. It is known that the Kaffirs are short of powder, and anxious to reap their crops;—but some private letters state that they have decidedly improved in military tactics, are perfectly unsubdued, and have merely made overtures of peace in order to gain time for the harvest, and to procure a new supply of ammunition. But should the operations of our troops on the Amatolas be attended with success, there is no doubt that the Kaffirs will be so humbled and weakened as to submit to any terms that Sir Harry Smith may choose to dictate.

THE BURMESE WAR.

DESPATCHES from Bombay of the 17th of February, in anticipation of the Indian mail, bring us further intelligence of the Burmese War. Commodore Lambert, after destroying the stockades at Rangoon, and blockading the mouths of the Ierawaddy, proceeded to Calcutta for further instructions from the Governor-General. The Marquis of Dalhousie arrived at Calcutta on the 29th of January, and is said to have approved of all that had been done by the commodore, with the exception of his having captured a Burmese ship of war. It appears, however, that it was not upon this account that the *Fox* frigate was fired upon by the batteries on shore. The Burmese viceroy told Commodore Lambert that if he attempted to remove British property from Rangoon, he should be assailed from the stockades; and the commodore replied that if so much as a pistol was discharged at him, he would level the stockades; and accordingly, when attacked, he kept his word. He had before offered to restore the Burmese ship as soon as an apology was rendered for the insult to the British flag which led to its seizure.

The last accounts from our naval force near Rangoon are, that since the destruction of the stockades no fresh collision had taken place. Meanwhile troops and munitions of war have been despatched from Calcutta; the Peninsular and Oriental Company's steamship *Pre-cursor*, with guns and ordnance stores "up to her hatchway," conveyed 1081 officers and men of the 67th Bengal Native Infantry to the coast of Arracan in two days. More troops are about to be sent from Madras, to strengthen the small force in the British provinces of Tenasserim and Arracan adjoining the Burmese territory. Plenty of troops are available at Madras, and, if necessary, could be assisted from Bombay. The Bombay Government could spare an European regiment, and a couple of steam-frigates without inconvenience, and immediately, and, by the close of the monsoon, a division of two or three brigades.

If the Burmese do attack us at all, they will wait for the setting in of the monsoon, during which season our troops will be unable to act with effect, and if we

are compelled to resort to a campaign, we must wait till the commencement of the dry season in October. In some quarters an accommodation was not yet considered impossible. Lord Dalhousie hoped that the Burmese might be forced to terms by a strict blockade of their river.

Such a result is not considered probable, as the Burmese have always shown themselves to be insensible to all commercial considerations. By the latest accounts, dated the 25th of January, the old town of Rangoon had been burnt and razed to the ground by order of the Governor, and its materials employed in erecting stockades, and strengthening the fortifications of the new town, which is situated a mile and a half inland from the old one, and is, consequently, out of the reach of the frigate's guns. The trade of Rangoon has always been in the hands of a motley foreign population, who have thus lost much property in unfinished ships, stores of timber, and merchandise.

Large quantities of timber, much of it half burnt, were seen floating down past the British vessels at the mouth of the river, and in some instances it was recognised by parties to whom it had belonged. Fresh claims to compensation have consequently arisen, and, as money is what the Burmese have least ability and inclination to part with, it follows that they have an additional motive to hazard a war. Large numbers of Burmese troops are said to have reached Rangoon from the upper provinces, but food for them was said to be growing scarce.

PROGRESS OF ASSOCIATION.

THE MASTERS' STRIKE.

A LETTER having appeared in the *Times* of Monday, from Mr. Sidney Smith, the Secretary of the Association of Employers of Operative Engineers, which contained a statement to the effect that 9034 men of all branches of the trade, including 1311 labourers, had signed the master's "declaration," and gone to work; the Executive Council of the Amalgamated Society of Engineers sent an answer to the same journal, which appeared on Wednesday. The letter is signed, as usual, by J. Musto, President, and W. Allan, Secretary, on behalf of the Executive Council, and they maintain that Mr. Sidney Smith has grossly exaggerated the number. They give a list of the London manufactories, with the number of persons working in each of them, at those branches of trade recognised by the Amalgamated Society, which amounts to 366.

In addition to this number, there are 51 moulders in the whole of the London manufactories. In Manchester there are a less number than in London; and in Oldham, out of about 600 skilled workmen turned out of employment, there are not more than 20 men who have signed the declaration and taken their places. "Good men," they add, "will never sign a declaration so subversive of true independence as the employers' declaration is; and therefore no settlement can take place while it remains a condition for resuming work."

Among the evidences of the confusion introduced into the Engineer trade by the obstinacy of the masters, is an advertisement in our number for this day, which announces that Mr. W. Barnes, a working Engineer, is doing work on his own account. Capitalists have immense opportunities in their favour; but if they persist in teaching the consumer to deal directly with the producer, and teach the workmen to rely on themselves, or to associate their labour, they may find that measures of coercion recoil on those who devise them. The agency of the capitalist has its advantages, but so has direct dealing.

BIRMINGHAM STRIKE.

MR. SCHOLEFIELD, M.P., in a letter, has urged the propriety of an immediate arbitration, and expresses his belief that there would be no difficulty in finding gentlemen whose high honour and general character would be a guarantee to all parties for an intelligent and honest decision. The quarrel unquestionably threatens to inflict great injury upon this branch of trade, so peculiarly identified with the name of Birmingham, and it is highly desirable that it should be terminated. The operative gunmakers of the town and neighbourhood have for many years suffered greatly from the caprice of the Board of Ordnance, and more especially under the last contract, they were wretchedly remunerated for their work. A numerous meeting of the gun-stockers and finishers of Birmingham assembled at the Old Fellows-hall to meet the contractors for the supply of the 18,000 rifle-muskets required by the Board of Ordnance, with the view, if possible, of settling their differences as to prices. A long discussion ensued, in the course of which the masters undertook, if the men would execute the work at the prices paid for the last new line musket, to become liable for all risk and loss consequent upon the sight and other improvements of the new rifle, except when damage was done by negligence. After three hours spent in argument the masters retired, and eventually the men resolved unanimously, "That any deviation from the prices which they had given in on January 10, 1852, the same being sanctioned by the Board of Ordnance in 1844, would be injurious to them as workmen, and unjust to those masters who accepted their

circular as a pledge that their demands would be neither greater nor smaller, and, upon the faith of which those masters had rendered for the present contracts. They could not, therefore, accede to the proposals now made by the contractors." It is clear, after this determination that the contractors cannot obtain the execution of the orders in Birmingham without coming to the terms required by the men. The contractors, it is said, have received the materials from the Tower, and the work must be immediately executed, or the materials returned. The masters, it is understood, decline an arbitration.

CENTRAL CO-OPERATIVE AGENCY.

Weekly Report, March 9th to March 15th, 1852.

THE Agency transacted business with the following Stores:—Leeds, Ullesthorpe, Bocking, Norwich, Halifax, Banbury, Bannockburn, Braintree, Middlesboro', Padiham, Selkirk, Burnley, Glasgow, Birmingham, Portsea, Woolwich, Derby, Hawick, &c. &c. We hear that several conferences are about to take place in the provinces; the attendance of every existing Store at such a meeting as this, through well-qualified delegates, is of great importance, as the great advancement which the Stores have to promote—viz., the realization of coöperation, as the new organic principle to be introduced in industry, will be completely frustrated if the operation of the Stores are not combined through common centres.

"SOCIALISM IN COURT."

VICE CHANCELLOR TURNER, on Saturday, March the 6th, heard a case argued which turned on the validity of a clause of the will of Joseph Russell, of Shirley-street, near Birmingham, by which he left his executors, William Jackson and Thomas Aston Jackson, his residuary legatees. The plaintiff, Russell by name, and next of kin to the deceased Joseph Russell, declared in the bill which was filed at the commencement of the suit, that this residuary gift was not really made for the benefit of the defendants, but was a secret trust for the purpose of founding a school to teach the doctrines and principles of socialism. Mr. Speed, for the next of kin, read some communications of the deceased Joseph Russell to his solicitor, in directing him to prepare his will in order to prove his desire to found a Socialist school. There was also evidence that he had attended Socialist meetings, and had sometimes acted as chairman. One of the witnesses declared himself well acquainted with the doctrines of the Socialists, as propounded by Robert Owen; and that they intended to abolish religion, marriage, law, police, and government. In corroboration of these statements, the witness produced some of Robert Owen's works. Mr. Walker and Mr. Kirkman pursued similar arguments on behalf of other persons interested in setting aside the disposition made by the will. Sir W. Page Wood and Mr. W. M. James, for the Attorney General, claimed the deceased Joseph Russell's personal property for charitable purposes, if the will were set aside. Mr. Rolt and Mr. White, for the defendants, denied that there was any evidence of a trust for socialism. The testator and the defendants were all members of the Church of England. The late Mr. Russell might have had some sympathies with Socialism, but what the real meaning of Socialism was certainly did not appear from the evidence.

On the 9th of March the case was brought to a conclusion, Mr. Speed being heard in reply. The Vice Chancellor was of opinion that the secret trust had been established by the evidence, and was therefore an attempt to evade the law of mortmain. He made the declaration prayed by the next of kin, as to the gift of his freehold and leasehold property. As to the personal property, there must be an inquiry as to the nature and tendency of Socialism, and a receiver must be appointed for the present.

A HEARTLESS POETASTER.

At the York Assizes, on Saturday last, before Mr. Baron Alderson, a case of breach of promise of marriage was tried, in which the "base man" conveyed his written promises in rhyme. Miss Lucas, the plaintiff, was described by her counsel as a young lady of great personal attractions, carrying on a "genteel" business as a milliner, at Lockwood, near Huddersfield, and residing with her mother, the widow of a house painter. William Blakey, the defendant, is a cloth finisher, at Huddersfield, and had been paying his addresses to Miss Lucas since 1849. He frequently declared that he was sincerely attached, and desired "not a slave, but a companion." He asked the mother's consent, who frankly told him that her daughter had no fortune; to which he replied that he was not in quest of a fortune, and in proof of it he declared that he had frequently declined the opportunity of marrying young ladies with large fortunes. He continued to pay attentions until November, 1851, when he married a Miss Lister, but did not disclose the fact till further concealment became impossible. During their intimacy a correspondence had been carried on between "the parties." The first letter which Mr. Blakey wrote bears date the 15th June, 1849, and began,— "Dearest Hannah,—You will think I have forgotten you altogether, but I do assure you I have not, for, with the poet, I can truly exclaim,

"Absence makes the heart grow fonder."

In another letter, he wrote, "Never is the sign of an inn more welcome to a weary traveller, than your

letter, which I received on Sunday last, was to me. As I traced its characters I could almost imagine that I heard your sweet voice repeating the words it contained, the sound of which still echoes in my ears like distant music."

This was a specimen of Mr. Blakey's prosaic style, but he afterwards found that he could not rise to the full height of his amorous feelings, except upon the wings of poetry. He, therefore, addressed the plaintiff in the acrostic style, the first letter of each line forming, when put together, his own Christian and surname:—

"When wilt thou return my love,
Innocent as a turtle dove,
Like the lambkin, full of play,
Lightly skipping on the way;
In the groves, where warblers sing
All harmonious to the spring,
May we join the joyful ring.

"Black as winter would all be,
Lost and irksome, without thee,
All confused by love's alarms,
Kindest, come into my arms,
Ever more I would be thine;
Yes, my love, and only thine."

After this, Mr. Blakey returned, for a few letters, to prose, but subsequently again made an attempt at the sublime, in verse, and, as in the former case, forming an acrostic of his own name:—

"Wilt thou, my dearest, be so kind,
In love to ease my tortured mind?
Lest by delays, my reason fly,
Love longs its object to enjoy,
In thee is centered all my care,
And all my joys, thou charming fair,
Must I be left to black despair?"

"Blest is she, whose beauty fair,
Links with such charms as virtue rare.
All I want is, may I be
Kindly loved, fair one, by thee,
Else life's a blank, I do declare,
Yes, I must love thee, charming fair."

Since her desertion, Miss Lucas had been in delicate health. Mrs. Lucas, the mother, was the only witness examined, and the letters having been put in and read, Sergeant Wilkins addressed the jury for Mr. Blakey. He admitted that there must be a verdict for the plaintiff, but what were the circumstances? Why, the defendant, at twenty-two years of age, was proved to have fallen over head and ears in love at the first moment, and he would say to the young ladies in court—never give heed to young men who express themselves in poetry. The defendant had done wrong, but what had the young lady lost? For that was the question. She had lost a silly young man, who, instead of telling her in plain terms that he loved her, broke out in a rhapsody—

"My lady fair,
I do declare,
Your grace and air
Are beyond compare."

Let the jury, then, judge of the extent of the loss she had sustained, and give such damages as twelve honest men ought to give. The jury gave a verdict for the plaintiff, damages 45*l*.

PIRACY ON BOARD ENGLISH SHIPS.

ON Wednesday advices were received at Lloyd's, giving the details of the massacre of the commanders and portions of the crews of the British ships *Victory* of London, and *Herald* of Leith. The *Victory* was the property of Messrs. Cook and Wilson, of Dockhead, Bermondsey, a barque of 579 tons burden, and commanded by Mr. William Lennox Mullens, and having sailed to some Chinese port was then chartered to convey coolies to Callao. On the 6th of December she sailed from Cumsingmoon with three hundred coolies and a general cargo. On the afternoon of the 10th, between three and four o'clock, the coolies made a rush into the cabin, seized the ship's arms, and the slaughter then commenced. Mr. Mullens was then walking on the poop, and a party of the coolies at once went to secure him. A sailor named Henry Watt endeavoured to protect him, but was immediately killed, and his body thrown overboard. Mr. Mullens got up into the mizen rigging, but being followed closely by a coolie armed with a cutlass, he slipped down one of the back-stays on deck, and was cut to pieces by the infuriated savages. The second mate, James Aranso, and the cook, Edward Bailey, were next murdered, and the ringleaders of the coolies then, believing that they had overcome all probable resistance, beckoned to Mr. William Fagg, the chief mate, who had taken refuge on the foretop-sail-yard, to come down. He did so, and he was then led to the wheel, and by signs directed to steer for the land, on pain of being put to death if he disobeyed. After cruising about the coast of Cochin China for some days, the coolies having chosen what they thought would be a convenient place to land, ordered the ship to be brought to an anchor, and went ashore, carrying off with them a considerable part of

the cargo, and having previously destroyed the ship's papers and log-book. Mr. Fagg subsequently obtained some aid, and brought the ship into Singapore in the latter part of January.

The *Herald*, under the command of Mr. Lawson, left Shanghai for Leith in the course of last October, having on board, besides the master and his wife, two European mates, a steward, a carpenter, a cook, a Portuguese seaman, twelve Manilla men and a Manilla boy. Four or five days after they left Shanghai the crew were put upon customary allowances, which annoyed the Manilla men very much, and before the ship got to Angeer they had gone four or five times to the master, and "asked for more," which was refused. They then planned a scheme for murdering all the Englishmen on board, and tried to persuade the Portuguese sailor to join in the project. In order to gain time, the Portuguese recommended poisoning as the safest plan, and accordingly some deleterious substance was mixed with the sugar for the captain's coffee, and Mr. Lawson and his wife partook of the coffee, suffered from its effects, but speedily recovered. In the meantime the Portuguese had contrived with some difficulty, for he was closely watched, to inform Mr. Lawson of the plot. The master then directed the officers to take away the Manilla men's knives, and ordered the Englishmen always to keep themselves armed, and prepared for any sudden attack. About the twenty-fifth day of the voyage, Angeer was sighted; but as neither water nor provisions were in the master's opinion required, the *Herald* was not brought to an anchor. This brought matters to a crisis, and on the next morning the Portuguese was alarmed by hearing his name called in a loud voice; he went on deck, and meeting some of the Manilla men, was told that they should now be able to have as much as they wanted to eat and drink, as the captain and the other officers were dead. In the cabin the Portuguese found the bodies of Mr. Lawson and the other officers: they were all quite dead, except the chief mate. Mrs. Lawson was sitting near her husband's corpse, weeping. The villains then attached heavy weights to the legs of the bodies, and threw them overboard. The mate had not breathed his last when brought on deck, and was heard to say, "Good God!" One of the Manilla men then took command of the ship, and in five or six days he ordered the steward, the cook, and the Portuguese to be tied up, and told that the hour of death had arrived. The steward was killed with an axe, but the cook, who was a native of the coast, and could speak the Manilla men's language, persuaded them to spare himself and the Portuguese, both of them promising secrecy. That same day it was determined to scuttle the ship, and abandon it. The boats were got ready, and in spite of Mrs. Lawson's entreaties to be taken on shore, they secured her with ropes inside the cabin; and having scuttled the vessel, the Manilla men quitted her in the largest boat, with the Portuguese and the cook, and shortly after the ship was seen to founder. Early on the following morning the boat reached Java, and the murderers landed at Sijilankang, but the suspicions of the authorities having been roused they were arrested, and the Portuguese, the cook, and the Manilla boy having all given the necessary evidence, the pirates were sent to Batavia to await the operation of the law.

A third vessel had lately arrived at Hong Kong, the captain and officers of which had narrowly escaped having a similar tragedy on board. The *Corcyra*, commanded by Mr. Paterson, was proceeding from Macassar to Shanghai with a Javanese crew, when the men revolted. The second mate was murdered, but the other officers succeeded in overpowering the rascals, who were to be tried at Hong Kong.

A MONK CONDEMNED FOR BURNING THE BIBLE.

BROTHER JOHN BRIDGMAN, a monk of the order of St. Francis, was tried and convicted at the Mayo Assizes, on the 6th instant, before Baron Lefroy, for scandalously burning a Bible, and thereby creating a riot. The local paper thus gives the charge:—"John Syngian Bridgman, otherwise John St. John, otherwise Brother John, stood indicted for that he, not having the fear of God before his eyes, but contriving and intending to scandalise and vilify the true Protestant religion, as by law established within these realms, and to blasphemous the holy gospel of God and our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, did, on the 23rd day of November, in the fifteenth of the Queen, at the parish of Ballyovey, unlawfully, wickedly, and blasphemously, in the presence of divers liege subjects of our Queen, set fire to and partly consume by fire a copy of the holy gospel of God, being the authorized version thereof appointed to be read in churches, called the New Testament, and then and there holding in his hands said New Testament, wickedly and blasphemously in the presence and hearing of divers liege subjects, then and there pronounced and spoke with a loud voice, and published of and concerning said New Testament, as aforesaid, these profane and most blasphemous words—that is to say, that 'It,' meaning the New Testa-

ment, 'is not the Word of God, but the word of the Devil—and the Devil's book—Luther's Bible—or your heretic Bible,' to the great dishonour of Almighty God, and in contempt of the Protestant religion, and to the great scandal of the profession thereof, and against the peace," &c.—The prisoner was defended by Mr. Keogh, M.P. Baron Lefroy, in his charge to the jury, said—I am anxious that this case should be confined within the limits required by the law, and shall state to you what that law is. It is for you to say whether those charges have been proved or not, and whether you are satisfied that he said he was not burning the Word of God but the word of the Devil, and whether the words were applied to the authorized version of the Holy Scriptures; and whether the burning of that book is consistent with the reverence due to that version of the Scriptures authorized by the law of the land. In this case he is indicted for burning the authorized version; but the offence is equally applicable to any other version of the Scriptures, whether it be the Douay Bible or the Rhenish Testament, and the words used would be blasphemous against either version, as showing a want of reverence for the Scriptures, because it is not the version of the Scriptures which will warrant the commission of such an offence. If a man can throw a book into a fire, whether it be a Douay Bible or the authorized version, and if you believe that he did not intend any contempt, then you should acquit him; but if you believe that he did burn the book and make use of the language, it will be your duty to find him guilty. The jury retired, and after about half an hour's deliberation, returned a verdict of guilty. On the verdict being read, Mr. Blake, Q.C., said to his lordship that the Crown did not wish to press for any punishment in this case, the object of the prosecutors being to put a stop to such acts. The learned baron was very glad to hear counsel for the crown say so, and trusted there would be no further acts of this kind perpetrated, and, after a brief address to the prisoner, concluded by pronouncing the following sentence;—"To give bail, himself in 20*l.*, and two sureties in 10*l.* each, to keep the peace and good behaviour to all her Majesty's subjects for seven years, and to come up for judgment when called upon, getting ten days' notice."

THE BELPER MURDER.

IN the last week of last December a murder was committed at Belper, in Derbyshire, which caused great excitement throughout the county. The murderer, Anthony Turner, by trade a tailor, was employed by Mrs. Barnes, a widow lady, sixty-four years of age, and possessed of considerable property, to collect certain weekly rents for her. Turner has a wife but no children. He also had charge of an illegitimate child, the alleged offspring of Mr. Walker, a brother of Mrs. Barnes, for whose support he made some deductions from the rents he received. Mrs. Barnes was dissatisfied with the amount of money which he brought her: they had frequent disagreements, and at last she discharged him from the office of receiver. The same night that he got notice of this, Turner was at the house of Mr. Haslam, a provision dealer, and, alluding to Mrs. Barnes's conduct, he declared that "he would do something to be talked about." When he rose to leave the house, he took up a large carving knife and went out through the shop, saying to Haslam, who was serving a customer, "Excuse me for taking this." Haslam ran after him and called him to come back. The night was dark, but Haslam heard Turner reply "I won't." Haslam, suspecting his intentions, ran to Mrs. Tomlinson, who kept the lodge at Mrs. Barnes's gate, and begged her to go up to the house and warn the inmates to prevent Turner from entering the house. But Turner had already passed the lodge gates and got access to the kitchen, where he met Harriet Storer, Mrs. Barnes's maid, and asked if he could see her mistress. Harriet Storer went to inquire, and during her absence Haslam came in, fearful of the consequences, and told Turner that he was wanted in the village; he said he could not come. Haslam, at Turner's trial, said he looked calm and sensible; but Harriet Storer described him as appearing wild and half drunk, and she gave that description of him to Mrs. Barnes, who accordingly declined to see him, and fastened her door with a bolt. As soon as Turner was told by Harriet Storer that Mrs. Barnes would not see him till Monday, he said "Damn you, I will see her," rushed up stairs, and burst open the door with his foot. The girl ran into an adjoining room to call Mrs. Barnes's nephew, Mr. Bannister, and not thinking that anything worse was the matter, told him that Turner had gone into her mistress's room, drunk. She then returned to Mrs. Barnes's room, and was horrorstruck to see Turner with one knee on Mrs. Barnes's knee, a hand on her shoulder, and holding a knife across her throat. She ran down the front stairs screaming, while Mr. Bannister, who is lame, was coming up the back stairs. On entering the room he found Mrs. Barnes standing in the middle of the room, speechless, but motioning with her hands. Supposing that she and Turner had had high words, he concluded that she was so enraged at Turner's insolence as to be unable to speak. The room was not well lighted, and that which turned out to be blood, was regarded by Mr. Bannister at the time as a red "comforter." Turner was then standing near the door, brandishing the knife in his hand, though Mr. Bannister could not then distinguish what it was. He called out "Begone, you rascal;" and then shouted "Run for the constables—ring, ring!" Turner having gone to the back stairs, Mr. Bannister laid his hands upon his shoulders, and, with a push and a kick, sent him tumbling down. All this was but the work of one or two minutes. Miss Harrison and Miss Harmer, two nieces of Mrs. Barnes, rushed into the room from the front stairs, just as Turner was being ignominiously expelled, and it was not until then that Mr. Bannister became conscious that Mrs. Barnes had received a fearful gash across the throat, from which the blood was flowing freely. Handkerchiefs and a towel were applied to the wound, and medical aid procured, but all of no avail. She was placed on the sofa, and though

she appeared conscious she was unable to speak, beyond articulating the names of "Patience" and "Louisa"—meaning Mrs. Bannister and Miss Harrison. After giving one or two gasps she expired. The deceased's hands were cut, and she had evidently flown to the bell, on Turner's attack, as the handle was broken off, and the wall stained with blood. Several small articles were broken, as if in a struggle. When Turner was precipitated down stairs, he recovered his legs two steps from the bottom. He then caught hold of Harriet Storer, who was about to go up, and made a cut at her face with all his force. She threw her head back, but her escape was a narrow one, as the knife actually cut away a portion of her cap. Turner then made his way out of the house and escaped. It was supposed he had drowned himself, and the river was dragged; but two days after he was arrested at his mother's house, whither he had returned after wandering about the country. These facts were all clearly proved on his trial, which took place at Derby, on Saturday, before Mr. Justice Maule. Turner's counsel attempted to prove that he had lost the control of his reason by drink, and by brooding over his real or fancied wrongs; but the jury, after a very short consultation, returned a verdict, which the foreman emphatically pronounced, of "Wilful Murder." The judge immediately passed sentence of death. Turner is well known in the town where he resided from having taken a prominent position in some minor political matters. He is blind of one eye, but his countenance is shrewd and penetrating, with nothing particularly indicative of ferocity or brutality.

MISCELLANEOUS.

We would remind our readers that the second *conversazione* of the Friends of Italy is to be held next Wednesday evening; the particulars of time and place will be seen from an advertisement in this day's paper. After the lecture from Mr. Dawson—which, we doubt not, will be worthy of him and of the subject—the audience will again have an opportunity of hearing M. Mazzini's expositions of the state and prospects of Italy. This time, however, these expositions will not be conveyed, as they were on the occasion of the first *conversazione*, in the form of a written lecture, but will arise out of the *impromptu* demands for more full explanation on certain points that may be made during the evening. Other speakers will also address the meeting.

The *Daily News* says—"The Volunteer Rifle Clubs have, it is stated, been snubbed by the new government; and the patriotic offer of gratuitous service for national defence has, it is alleged, been declined. Should this statement prove to be true, much feeling on the subject will doubtless be manifested throughout the country."

Pursuant to the determination of her Majesty's government to form Freemantle, Western Australia, into a convict settlement, orders have been issued that a transport ship should be fitted up to convey a batch of 500 male convicts to that colony. The convict guard will consist of 75 enrolled out-pensioners of Chelsea Hospital, who will remain at Freemantle as military colonists.—*Globe*.

On Saturday the small screw steamer, fitted out by Captain Beatson to proceed in search of the missing Arctic expedition by the way of Behring's Straits, was declared ready for sailing. The proposed field of search is east of the meridian of Behring's Straits, towards Keller's discoveries in 1849, Herald Island, and New Siberia. Captain Beatson takes out autograph letters from the Emperor of Russia, recommending the expedition to the commanders of the Russian outposts at Siberia and other Muscovite settlements.

A large number of the highest members of the mercantile and shipping interest, among whom are some of the East India directors, have determined to invite Sir James Brooke, the Rajah of Sarawak, to a public dinner, "in order to mark the sense they entertain of the eminent services rendered by Sir James Brooke to the interests of commerce and humanity, in his endeavour to put down the evils of piracy in the Eastern Archipelago; and in his labours to advance the interests of civilization in that part of the world." The dinner will take place after Lent.

A public meeting was held on Wednesday afternoon at Exeter Hall, to consider the recommendations of the Chancery Commissioners, and to adopt measures for obtaining the fusion of law and equity practice. Lord Erskine presided, supported by Mr. J. Hume, M.P., Mr. Trolowney, M.P., Captain Scobell, M.P., and other members of the Chancery Reform Association. Resolutions were passed, pledging the Association to continue its labours until those reforms had been effected in the present system of equity, which had been first recommended by this society, and afterwards by the Commissioners of the Crown.

On Thursday the first estimate of the present government which relates to the Commissariat service was printed. The estimate for the current year, 1852-3, is 481,201*l.*, being 33,241*l.* less than the estimate for 1851-52, when the amount was 514,442*l.* Of the decrease, 32,227*l.* is in respect of the effective service, and 1,014*l.* in respect of the non-effective service. The accounts are signed by Mr. G. A. Hamilton, the Secretary of the Treasury.

Tuesday was quite a gala-day at Dublin Castle, the Lord Lieutenant having signified his intention to receive two addresses of congratulation. The first deputation, according to ancient precedent, was from the Provost, Fellows, Scholars, and Students of Trinity College, and numbered nearly a thousand persons, headed by the Rev. Dr. Looby. As soon as they were assembled, Lord Eglinton entered the Presence Chamber, and received them "in the most cordial and friendly manner." The Rev. Dr. Looby then read the address which was in Latin, and Lord Eglinton read a suitable reply in English. The second address, from the Lord Mayor, Aldermen, and Corporation of the City of Dublin, was received in St. Patrick's Hall, as part of the flooring of the Presence

Chamber had given way from the great crowd formed by the University deputation. The members of the corporation were all arrayed in their official robes. The Lord Lieutenant, seated upon the throne, heard their address read, and gave a gracious answer, and all went off with due solemnity and dignity.

It is stated in the last advices received from the Cape of Good Hope that a London firm of eminence and wealth had undertaken to complete a railway to connect Cape Town with some of the most productive districts of the colony, furnishing locomotives, carriages, &c., for a certain sum, in the short space of two years. The project had only at the date of these accounts been made public, but it had received a most cordial reception, and its advantages were at once appreciated. In addition to the many reasons brought forward for its adoption, it is remarked that as the Cape appears destined to become the intermediate port for several lines of ocean steamers to India, China, and Australia, it is therefore necessary to provide a better means of communication with the interior than now exists, for the conveyance of produce to the port of shipment.—*Morning Chronicle*.

The royal mail steam ship *Teviot* which arrived at Southampton from Buenos Ayres, on Saturday, brought the news of the complete overthrow of the power of General Rosas, who has been the absolute Dictator of the Argentine Republic since the year 1834. On the morning of the 3d of February, a severe and decisive action was fought at Lugares, about two leagues from the city of Buenos Ayres, between the forces of Rosas and the allied Brazilian and Banda Oriental troops, under General Urquiza. The German cavalry, from the disbanded army of Schleswig Holstein, in the Brazilian service, literally rode over the cavalry of the Dictator of the Argentine republic, and the battle terminated in the total defeat of the Buenos Ayrean troops, of whom 4000 are said to have been killed and wounded. The action commenced at about six in the morning, and lasted with great fury until ten; in the afternoon the dictator's infantry and artillery, being almost completely surrounded, laid down their arms and surrendered to Urquiza's forces. Rosas himself was present during the action, and was wounded in the hand, though his troops were commanded by General Pacheco, who is reported to have been killed. The Dictator escaped with great difficulty, disguised as a marine, and took refuge on board her Majesty's steam ship *Centaur*, with his daughter, Manuelita, in the dress of a sailor boy, and several of his suite. General Mancilla, who commanded in the city of Buenos Ayres, had offered to capitulate to General Urquiza. The diplomatic agents of the various foreign powers were endeavouring to arrange matters amicably.

A large party of gentlemen went down on Thursday to view the Great Grimsby Docks, now so far completed as to be ready for opening on the 1st of May.

Some more experiments were made at Woolwich on Thursday with rifled cannon.

The Minié rifle practice, which took place recently at Woolwich, has been so satisfactory to the authorities at the Horse Guards, that orders have now been sent to commanding officers of various other regiments to send up parties this week to Woolwich for similar practice in this effective weapon.

Captain Delvigne, formerly of the Royal Guard, in the French army, has written a letter to the *Times*, detailing the circumstances of his invention of the cylindro-conical bullet, and of the mode of forcing it into the rifled grooves by the force of the discharge, and complaining that the weapon is now universally known by the name of Captain Minié, who only made a trifling improvement in the application of Captain Delvigne's invention.

The *Albion* 90, the *Encounter* screw-steamer, and *Indefatigable* frigate, left Malta on the 6th inst., for the westward. The *Phaeton* frigate received sudden orders while at Corfu, to proceed to Malta; she arrived there on the 10th, and on the 11th was towed out by the *Fury* steamer, also bound for the westward. The destination of this large portion of the Malta squadron was kept a profound secret, the captains having sealed orders.

The mortal remains of Marshal Marmont are, says the *Presse*, to be brought to France, and deposited in a vault which he caused to be prepared in the church of St. Vorles, at Chatillon-sur-Seine, the village in which he was born.

M. Thiers was among the "foreigners of distinction," present on Wednesday night at the first of the Countess of Derby's "receptions," at the official residence of the Premier in Downing-street.

The widow of Marshal Soult died during the night of the 12th at her chateau of Soult-Berg, in the department of the Tarn. She was in her 81st year. Her son and her daughter, the Marquise de Mornay, had not quitted her since the death of their father.

A long letter from San Francisco appeared in the *Times* of yesterday against the gold companies and the mining mania which raged so violently in London a short time ago, and intelligence of which had reached California.

Major Henry Eardley Wilmot, of the Royal Artillery, who was killed in action with the Kaffirs on New Year's Day last, was the fifth son of the late Sir John Eardley Wilmot, Bart., Lieutenant-Governor of Van Diemen's Land. He was born in 1816, and after the usual course of instruction in the Military Academy, Woolwich, now presided over by his older brother, Captain Eardley Wilmot, he obtained his commission in 1834. After eight years service in Canada and Newfoundland, he returned to England, and shortly after accompanied his father, then just appointed Governor of Van Diemen's Land, as his aide-de-camp. When war broke out in 1845 in New Zealand, Capt. Wilmot volunteered to go with the troops who were despatched from Van Diemen's Land by the governor. He was afterwards joined by a younger brother, Charles Eardley Wilmot, an ensign in the 98th; the two brothers ought side by side throughout the New Zealand cam-

paign, and the young artilleryman's energy and usefulness were so conspicuous that he received the brevet rank of major in 1846, when he was only thirty years of age. When peace had been established with the New Zealand chiefs, Major Wilmot returned to Hobart Town, and found his father on his death-bed. He left Van Diemen's Land after his father's death, and returned to England. In 1850 his company received orders to embark for the Cape, and from January 1851, when the present Kaffir war broke out, until the day of his mournful but glorious death, he was actively employed wherever hard and gallant service was required.

At the Palace of the Bishop of Exeter, on Sunday last, George Octavius Smyth Pigott was ordained deacon.

The Marquis of Londonderry having come to a right frame of mind, has agreed to present the Rev. Mr. Law, who recently eloped with his daughter, the Lady Adelaide Vane, to a living worth about 600*l.* per annum.

It is reported "on good authority," that the Bishop of Gloucester and Bristol (Dr. Monk) has, by a deed of gift, conveyed the whole of his interest in Horfield Manor—his disposal of which was so much discussed in the last session of Parliament—to trustees, for the benefit of small livings in his diocese. The donation takes effect from the present time, and its term is for the lives of the Princess Royal, and the Princesses Alice and Helena, and the longest liver of them. The annual income of the manor exceeds a thousand pounds.

The Liverpool police have been making a regular onslaught upon the begging fraternity. Between fifty and sixty of all ages, sizes, countries, and colours, were brought before the magistrates, and summarily dealt with. Some sturdy fellows, negroes and Malays, a few of whom had been within the grasp of the law before, looked as though begging was only the mildest pursuit which they adopted for a livelihood, robbery and violence being evidently to them more congenial. Amongst the crowd of prisoners was a hoary mendicant, upwards of 112 years of age. He was handed over to the care of the parish overseers.

Of late our metropolitan police courts have become a sort of supplementary poor-law board for conveying relief in cases of urgent destitution. Mr. Yardley, the magistrate at the Thames police court, on Tuesday, announced that the total amount forwarded by benevolent persons for Frederick Shaw and his wife, whose painful story we related last week, was 70*l.* 16*s.*; and for John Lauder, who had attempted to poison himself from despair at seeing himself and his eight children on the brink of starvation, 30*l.* 8*s.*; and for the purpose of providing an outfit for some destitute New Zealanders and Sandwich Islanders, 43*l.* 8*s.* 6*d.*; He also stated that means were being taken to advise these poor people how to lay out this money to the best advantage. On the same day Mr. Yardley received 2*l.* from the workmen employed by Messrs. Deane, gun-makers, for the relief of Lauder, and 10*s.* from H. S., for Shaw and his wife.

Mr. Disraeli appears to be no favourite with the great landed proprietors of the county of Bucks. He was very cavalierly treated during his recent visit. Early in last week, an application was made on behalf of the right hon. gentleman and his lady, for the use of the Judges' Chambers, a suite of apartments adjoining the Shire-hall, which have recently been built at the expense of the county. The ground of the application was that suitable accommodation could not be obtained at the Aylesbury Hotel, and the matter was formally brought before the magistrates at quarter session, who refused the application, alleging that the Judges' Chambers were public property, and that the George Hotel, built by one of the Dukes of Buckingham, and which had accommodated the Duchess of Buckingham, and other of the families of the leading landed proprietors, was quite good enough for Mrs. Disraeli. It was remarked, that on the arrival of Mr. Disraeli on Thursday evening, at Aylesbury, there was no one to receive him—not even a carriage in attendance, and he and his lady were obliged to avail themselves of a one-horse fly from the station to the George Hotel, where his only visitor was his solicitor, Mr. Smith.

Mr. J. F. Ansley, an under graduate of Trinity College, Cambridge, about twenty years of age, son of Mr. Gilbert Ansley, of Houghton Hill, Hants, was trying a horse on Monday afternoon on leaping fences in a field belonging to Mr. Sparrow, at Chesterton, about a mile from Cambridge. The horse suddenly refused one rather higher than usual, swerved aside, and started off at full speed round the field. Mr. Ansley retained hold of the saddle for some time, although he had lost his seat, but at last he slipped off, and his foot remaining in the stirrup he was dragged three or four times round the field, his head at every stride of the horse coming in contact with the ground. He was taken up insensible, and conveyed to Mr. Sparrow's house, but he survived but a short period, having sustained severe injuries of the skull.

An accident, attended with the loss of two lives, and injury to several other persons, though fortunately none of the passengers were seriously hurt, occurred on Saturday night to a train on the South Western Railway. The train left the Waterloo Station at half-past eight, and the journey was safely performed as far as Winchester, but when it had arrived within a mile and a half of Bishopstoke, a few minutes after eleven o'clock, the tire of the near leading wheel of the engine flew off, and the engine almost immediately left the line, and ran down an embankment of about twenty feet deep, dragging with it the tender, the guard's van, and the post-office tender. The crash was, of course, terrific. The stoker was killed on the spot, and the engine-driver was so much injured that he died shortly after his removal to the Southampton infirmary. The guard of the train was also much hurt, and the post-office guard had one of his arms fractured. The post-office clerk happily escaped. The policeman at the Bishopstoke Station, who was watching the approach

of the train, could distinguish what had occurred, the light in front of the engine marked its direction as it ran off the line. He gave the alarm, and an engine at once proceeded to the scene of the catastrophe, and removed the passengers, who were conveyed in another train to Southampton and Portsmouth. Mr. Stovin, the general manager, and Mr. Beattie, the locomotive superintendent, after inspecting the shattered remains of the engine and tender, gave it as their opinion that the accident was "one of those casualties which no human foresight could have averted." A coroner's inquest on the bodies of the two men killed, held at Southampton on Tuesday, brought in a verdict of "Accidental death."

A plantation near Exeter was on fire on Saturday for nearly a quarter of a mile.

A man who had taken chloroform while undergoing an operation in the St. Bartholomew's Hospital on Wednesday, expired in the hands of the operators. An inquest was held, and a verdict returned of "died from the effects of chloroform."

Some burglars effected an entry on the night of Friday week at the shop of Alderman Carter, watchmaker and jeweller, at the corner of Cornhill and Bishopsgate-street, and carried off rings, brooches, and other jewellery to the value of between 400*l.* and 500*l.* No watches were removed. A reward of 100*l.* is offered for the apprehension of the thieves.

Mr. Gleaves, a brewer, of Willingham, Cambridgeshire, and his wife, left home on the afternoon of Friday week for St. Ives, and the same night a fire broke out in a barn on his premises, which was not got under until five horses, three cows, and a large number of pigs and poultry, with a great quantity of dressed corn and some valuable implements were consumed. Two adjacent cottages were also destroyed with all their contents. There is no doubt that the fire was maliciously occasioned, as a fire broke out in exactly the same place a few weeks ago. The property belonging to Mr. Gleaves was insured.

A very extraordinary accident, which might have been attended with serious consequences, occurred a few days since at the Foreign-office. The new Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs—the Earl of Malmesbury—had made an appointment to meet the Austrian minister at three o'clock in the afternoon. His excellency arrived at the hour appointed, but the Earl of Malmesbury having been unexpectedly engaged, requested Count Buol to oblige him by calling again at four o'clock. In the interval, between three and four, the whole of the ceiling of the room in which the earl would have received the Austrian minister, fell with a tremendous crash—covering the tables and chairs, and floor of the apartment several inches deep with the debris of the plaster, which was between three and four inches thick. The room was unoccupied at the time, fortunately no person suffered any injury. Had the accident happened a few minutes later it might certainly have been considered an unfortunate omen. It is understood that the whole of the buildings on the south side of Downing-street are in a very insecure condition, and quite unfit for Government offices.

Kalabergo, who was condemned to death at Oxford last assizes for murdering his uncle at Banbury, made a most determined attempt on Friday week to escape from Oxford Castle. He was taking his usual airing in the yard accompanied by a guard, and while the attendant was looking another way he made a desperate leap, and succeeded in scaling the wall like a cat. There were stout iron railings at the top of the wall, but he managed to run along the wall, and sprang some distance to the top of another wall, but there was still another wall beyond it, and from the peculiar construction of the building he was unable to proceed any farther. The alarm bell was rung, and several of the turnkeys soon arrived below the place at which he had arrived; and Kalabergo, finding his escape impossible, waited patiently till a ladder was set for him to descend. He was then conveyed to a cell and securely manacled. This is the second attempt made by Kalabergo to escape. On a previous occasion he jumped from a window, and broke his leg. After receiving sentence of death, which appeared to make very little impression on the prisoner, he was visited in the gaol by the interpreter, Mr. Maggioni, and the Roman-catholic priest, Mr. Brigham, but he made no confession of his guilt until Monday, when he wrote one in the presence of Dr. Tandy, another priest, and the Rev. Dr. Harington, Principal of Brazenose College, to whom he gave permission to disclose all the circumstances under which the murder was committed.

A fight took place in the streets of Dublin on St. Patrick's day. The people were so very happy in following the military band with "hats off" that on their return from attending the troops to the barracks, they insisted on "hats off" pretty generally. Some persons resisted; a row ensued; the police interfered, and were met by showers of stones; finally, the mob was quelled by the police and a troop of artillerymen accidentally passing.

Henry Poulson and Thomas Paddock, two noted prize-fighters, with their seconds and bottleholders; John Callaghan, Alfred Trott, James Wharton, *alias* Jemmy Black, and ten others, pleaded "guilty," before Chief Justice Jervis, at the Derby Assizes, on Monday, to a charge of riot, and assaulting two constables in the execution of their duty. The transaction out of which this prosecution arose took place at Turnditch, near Belper, on the 16th of December last. A prize fight between Poulson and Paddock had been arranged to come off upon that occasion, and the expectation had collected an immense mob. Mr. J. Strutt, a magistrate, intending to prevent the fight if possible, went upon the field accompanied by two constables of the name of Wragg and Abell, and with great courage made his way into the crowd. By his direction Wragg cut the ropes which had been used to form the ring, but the mob expressed their determination to proceed, and began assaulting the constables. Wragg was a good deal beaten; and some attempt was made to unhorse Mr. Strutt. That gentleman, however, read the Riot Act, but at length found himself compelled to retire. The mob remained on the

field and a fight of forty rounds took place. Chief Justice Jervis commented with great severity on the lawless violence of which the prisoners had been guilty, and sentenced Poulson and Paddock, the principals, and their seconds, Callaghan, Trott, and Jemmy the Black to ten months imprisonment; and the rest to six months, with the exception of one man, Hirst, who having gone away when the Riot Act was read, was only sentenced to four months, all with hard labour.

Before the same judge, and on the same day, Robert Dixon, a travelling "lecturer on the mysteries of magic necromancy," was tried for the abduction of a little girl, named Mary Ann Farringdon, just eleven years old, and also for having taken advantage of the poor girl's youth, and his power over her mind and body, for the commission of a crime of still greater enormity. On her way to work at a factory in Derby, on the 1st of January, Mary Ann Farringdon was accosted by Dixon, who asked her where she lived, and whether she had a father and mother? Later in the day he met her again and told her that he had seen her parents, and that they said she was to go with him. Dixon took her to Nottingham by the railway. They slept at a lodging-house in a double-bedded room, and the next day he bought some clothes for her. They always slept in the same room. Medical evidence led to the conclusion that the worst part of the charge against Dixon was founded in fact. The parents of the poor girl heard nothing of her from the 1st of January to the 7th, when they received a letter with the Alfreton postmark, written by Dixon in her name, stating that she was very happy and comfortable; and that "the kind gentleman" had bought her "a frock, and a skirt, and a pair of nice new boots and stockings, and a shawl, and everything quite nice and respectable," and that she had "plenty of good food to eat." Mr. and Mrs. Fletcher, of the Dog and Partridge inn, at Pentridge, proved that Dixon passed three nights in their house with Mary Ann Farringdon, while he was lecturing on "necromancy" in the town. Dixon was defended by Mr. Adams, and after the judge's summing up, was allowed to address the jury, as he complained that his case had not been conducted as he desired. He was found guilty on all the counts, and sentenced to two years imprisonment with hard labour.

It is stated in the *Globe* of last Saturday that the Prussian government has appointed a Lieutenant of Police (Grief) to be stationed in London, for the purpose of watching over the movements of the German refugees here, and reporting to head-quarters thereon.

According to the last census in Switzerland, the population of that country amounts to 2,302,740 individuals, of whom 71,570 are foreigners. Of the whole body, 1,417,786 are Protestants, 881,809 Roman Catholics, and 3145 Jews. Amongst the foreigners are 1085 travellers and 1539 political refugees. The canton of Berne contains 458,301 inhabitants, of whom 6764 are foreigners.

HEALTH OF LONDON DURING THE WEEK.

THE deaths registered in London in the week ending last Saturday exhibit a great increase on previous weeks. In the last week of February they were 1069, in the first week of March, 1128, and last week they rose to 1232. That the unusual coldness of the weather has principally produced this result may be inferred from the excess of deaths at advanced ages, and from the increased number caused by diseases of the organs of respiration. The mean temperature in the first week of March fell to 36°, and in the following week was 40°, which is still below the average. The mean daily temperature was, with two exceptions, below the average from 18th February to the end of last week.

In the ten weeks, corresponding to last week, of the years 1842-51, the average number of deaths was 1034, which, if raised in proportion to increase of population, becomes 1137. The present return therefore shows an amount greater than the corrected average by 95.

BIRTHS, MARRIAGES, AND DEATHS.

BIRTHS.

On the 11th inst., at Roundhay, near Leeds, the lady of William Ewart Gott, Esq., of a son.

On the 13th inst., at Tavistock-house, Tavistock-square, the wife of Mr. Charles Dickens: a son.

On the 13th inst., at Walliscote-house, the residence of Admiral Fowler, the lady of J. Parkinson, Esq., of twins—daughters.

On the 16th inst., at Chesterford Vicarage, Essex, the Lady Harriet Hervey, of a son.

MARRIAGES.

At Fulham, on the 10th inst., John Sargent, Esq., of H. M. 95th, to Rosina Sarah Champion, daughter of the late James Henry, Esq., of Perth.

On Saturday, the 13th inst., at St. James's, Paddington, William Steele Wilkinson, late of the 1st Dragoon Guards, only son of the late Major Wilkinson, K.H., &c., of Kensington, to Emily, daughter of Sir John and Lady Hansler, of Westbourne-street, Hyde-park, and Eastwood, Essex.

On Tuesday, the 16th inst., at St. Pancras, by the Rev. H. W. Glead Armstrong, Captain Gamaliel Fitzmaurice, of the Madras Army, to Isabella, second daughter of the late Lieutenant-Colonel Lewis Bruce, 12th Regiment Native Infantry, Bengal Army.

On the 16th inst., at Mary Abbot's, Kensington, by the Rev. H. H. Westmore, Robert Ford, third son of Thomas Withy Inman, Esq., late of Bridgewater, to Ann, youngest daughter of the late John Bott, Esq., Secretary to the Privy Purse of his late Majesty William IV.

DEATHS.

On the 12th inst., Mr. Charles Newdigate Webb, late of Beddington Snuff Mills, aged 83.

On the 13th inst., at Warminster, Wilts, in the 80th year of her age, Mrs. Mary Ann Wyoche, daughter of the late Richard Samuel Wyoche, Esq., and the last of that branch of the family. She lived and died in the house in which she was born.

On the 15th inst., at Brighton, after a few days illness, at an advanced age, Mary, relict of the late G. H. Carew, Esq., of Crowcomb-court, Somerset, and Carew, Pembroke-shire, daughter of John Carew, Esq., of Anthony-house, Cornwall, deeply and sincerely lamented.

On the 16th inst., at Sherborne, Dorset, Herbert Tryon, son of J. F. Falwasser, Esq., aged 10 years.

TO READERS AND CORRESPONDENTS.

It is impossible to acknowledge the mass of letters we receive. Their insertion is often delayed, owing to a press of matter; and when omitted it is frequently from reasons quite independent of the merits of the communication. No notice can be taken of anonymous communications. Whatever is intended for insertion must be authenticated by the name and address of the writer; not necessarily for publication, but as a guarantee of his good faith.

We cannot undertake to return rejected communications. All letters for the Editor should be addressed to 10, Wellington-street, Strand, London.

Communications should always be legibly written, and on one side of the paper only. If long, it increases the difficulty of finding space for them.

The "Magnetic Evenings at Home" have appeared in Nos. 95, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, of the *Leader*.

Erratum in our last. In letter on "Vindication of Peace Policy," at the bottom of page 252, for "deficient of all laws," &c., read, "defiant of all laws," &c.

Postscript.

SATURDAY, March 20.

WE have now some distinct pledges from ministers in both Houses to a dissolution.

Soon after the House of Commons met last night, Lord John Russell distinctly enquired whether Ministers were prepared to advise the Crown to dissolve Parliament and summon a new one with the least possible delay? The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER said that was an "unprecedented" question, nevertheless he would answer it. Parliament would be dissolved, and a new one assembled in time to take a decision upon the question of confidence in the administration during "the present year." But a far more decided reply was given by Lord Derby to a similar question asked by the Duke of Newcastle, on presenting a free-trade petition from the Manchester Commercial Association. Lord DERBY was not so artistic as Mr. Disraeli, but he was far more frank and explicit.

"I am as anxious as possible," he said, "that at the earliest period, consistent with that which I deem to be for the welfare and good of the country—the country should have an opportunity of expressing its opinion upon the principles upon which and the men by whom the Government of this country shall henceforth be conducted. I will go a step further, and say, that I think the next autumn ought not to be allowed to pass over, not only without the country having had the opportunity of coming to a decision, but without Parliament having had the opportunity of pronouncing definitively and finally its opinion and its judgment on the course of policy that ought to be adopted on the part of the Government. I will give no pledge as to time, whether in April, in May, or in June, that an appeal shall be made to the country; but I admit that an appeal ought to be made to the country before the ordinary time of commencing the next session of Parliament; and that the great question in issue should be decided and adjudicated upon by Parliament at an earlier period, so that the ordinary and current business of the next session should not be interfered with by a protracted discussion on the commercial and financial policy of the country. Further than that I am not prepared to give any assurance."

Some distrust was created by a speech from Lord REDESDALE, as to how far the words of Lord Derby might be taken as a pledge. To remove this, the Earl of ABERDEEN, again professing emphatically his adherence to the free trade policy, said—

"I understood him (Lord Derby) to say, that consistently with such measures as were of urgent and primary importance being passed—a matter which must always be one of degree ('hear,' from the Earl of Derby)—he may attach greater importance to some than I may, but it is for him, of course, to decide (hear)—such measures as he thinks of primary importance (hear)—that he would then advise her Majesty to dissolve Parliament. (Hear.) But the important part of the declaration is this, that, be it sooner or be it later, a new Parliament will be called to decide that great question to which I have referred in the course of the autumn." ('Hear,' from the Earl of Derby.)

The House of Commons resolved itself into a Committee of Supply last night. Major Beresford moved the army estimates, substantially those prepared by the late government. They asked for 101,937 men, an increase of 33,223 over the number voted last year; and for a vote of 3,602,067*l.*, being an increase of 80,997*l.* A few words from Mr. William Williams followed the statement of the secretary, and nothing more was said about the estimates. There was far other work afoot. Mr. Osborne, leaving the estimates on one side, made a dashing attack on Ministers. He described them as seeking to conceal the cloven foot of protection under the smock frock of official reserve; he taunted them with thimble-rigging, and said the public, as usual, "were to be plundered, while the noble lord and his confederates in smock frocks were playing the game;" he said they were making a waiting-race of it, and he was distrustful when he saw "the Rupert of Debate" adopt the tactics of "Fabius Cunctator." In this style he proceeded. He savagely alluded to Lord Derby's "disloyal and treacherous ancestor," who betrayed Richard III. at Bosworth, and asked whether the farmers were to be thrown over "for such things were in the blood and would come out! He

said Ministers were a baker's dozen leagued together to put a tax on bread—an Amalgamated Society of chairmen of quarter sessions leagued together to raise the price of bread. He went through the rotten constituencies alphabetically, beginning A, Abingdon, and showed what small numbers and what corrupt electors they represented; and being in want of the letter E, he said, when he came to Mr. Herries, oh, he represents the Marquis of Exeter! He made an onslaught on the Irish appointments, showing how they were all anti-Roman Catholic, and he wound up by moving that the House should refuse the supplies.

To this sparkling and fluent charge, Mr. Whiteside offered but a faint and snarling resistance, criticising the taste which dictated Mr. Osborne's speech, and hinting at the soundness of his religion. The temper of the House, which was growing hot at this period, was cooled by a succession of speakers who made no great impression, and whose remarks were directed less to the personal than to the public question, which did not then happen to be at issue. But a remark of Sir Benjamin Hall called up the Earl of March, who said that the Duke of Richmond's rent-roll had decreased, not increased, as stated by the honourable baronet. The Earl of March then defined a "Protectionist" as "one who supported the government of Lord Derby." Mr. COBDEN had the bad taste to dispute the question of the rent-roll of the Duke of Richmond with the son of the Duke of Richmond, amid the marked coolness of the House; but he made a point when he asked Ministers what they intended to do with the Anti-Corn-Law League? Mr. WILLIAM MILES made a dull ministerial speech, expressive of confidence in Lord Derby. Mr. CAEDWELL entered into the debate with that coolness and dry circumspection which distinguish him; and he fixed the question at issue, by showing that it was unconstitutional for a ministry in a minority to hold office without appealing to the country, and insisting that the House would neglect its duty if it did not demand the fullest explanation of future policy. Mr. CAYLEY carried on the ministerial side of the argument. If the farmers of England are satisfied with Lord Derby (he said), what had anybody to do with it? Lord JOHN RUSSELL restated his speech of Monday, insisting on the necessity of a dissolution at great length, and defending himself on account of the meeting at Chesham-place. But the main point in his speech was a word of warning to the Tories. He described the seditious state of the country in 1817 and 1819. He pointed out how tranquillity had followed reform, and how democracy had been met and vanquished by these means.

"If," he continued ominously, "the noble lord now at the head of the Government means to resort to other means—if the laws that he has in contemplation are opposed to the general sentiments of the country—and if he contemplates that those laws will require to be enforced by other means than the present, let me tell him that, instead of discountenancing democracy, he will be the greatest favourer of that democracy." (Cheers.)

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER met the Opposition on the threshold. Their first motion, he said, is one to stop the supplies; that is the issue they have themselves selected, and on that we are prepared to divide. (Loud cheers.) He followed up Lord John Russell on every point. He charged him with faction, in organizing an opposition to force a dissolution, and winning support by promising to convert the late oligarchical cabinet into a broad-bottomed administration. He insinuated that both Mr. Cardwell and Lord John Russell were prepared to stop the supplies, whereupon each denied that he had such intention; upon which Mr. Disraeli turned round with mock gravity, exclaiming—Here, sir, you see the advantages of free discussion! Who would, he wondered, have the courage to vote with Mr. Osborne? He would go to the country on the clear, distinct issue—Has the country confidence in the present Ministry? Taking up Lord John's menace about resisting democracy, he asked with triumphant force by whose aid had the noble lord been able to repel democratic innovation—who had enabled him to resist Parliamentary Reform? To these home thrusts no reply could be made, and on this ground the Minister was unassailable.

Mr. Bright made a stout speech, leaving Lord John to defend himself, and fighting the question simply as between the country and Ministers, whom he menaced. If Ministers attempted to reimpose a duty on corn, "a great deal more than their corn laws would not be safe for six months;" the agitation of 1832 "would be but the whisper of a hurricane." "If you, as you allege, broke up an 'organized hypocrisy,' (cheers,) we will see if we cannot break up a confederated imposture." (Cheers.) A few words from the Marquis of Granby, who declared his confidence in Lord Derby, concluded the main discussion; and as Mr. Osborne withdrew his motion, the number of men was agreed to, and the vote on the money postponed until Monday.

The Leader

SATURDAY, MARCH 20, 1852.

Public Affairs.

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

THE DERBY INTERREGNUM.

WITHOUT a right to be in office, Stanley of Derby is obliged to ask leave of the Opposition to remain there on sufferance: he and his chief colleague, the leader of the House of Commons, have concerted the petition, and both beg on a set story. "I ask for justice," says Lord Derby, "not to me or to my colleagues, but to the great interests of our common country." "What we ask," says Mr. Disraeli, "is not fair play for the Government, but fair play for the country." On that plea Lord Derby petitions not to be "interrupted" in "the usual financial arrangements," in preparing for national defence, in "useful reforms;" he "entreats" the Lords "to look back to the circumstances under which her Majesty's present Government have assumed office;" for "the late Government fell by no adverse motion of ours."

This importunity is as false in common reason as it is in constitutional theory or conventional dignity. Lord Derby asks forbearance in the name of "the country." He has no right to speak in the name of the country. He deprecates questioning, as if the country had not a right to know on what principles its government occupies office. He palliates his conduct by the example of Lord John in 1846, as if one mean precedent could justify another. Let us look at this precedent which a Stanley borrows from a Russell, as the constitutional warrant for remaining in office without a parliamentary majority.

In 1846, Lord John Russell got up a coalition of Whigs, Radicals, and Irish members, against Sir Robert Peel, on the plea that coercion was not needed for Ireland. Once entered into office, Lord John and his colleagues continued, with no difference but diminished vigour and mastery, the main policy of Sir Robert Peel, and they resorted to the coercion which they had affected to resist. They had previously, in 1835, turned out Sir Robert by adopting Mr. Ward's "appropriation clause." They were now, in 1846, asked what they meant to do with the Irish church, and Lord John, remembering one false pretext, and then using a second, declined to answer. That is the precedent advanced by the chivalrous Stanley of Derby!

The debate of Monday night fully corroborates our view as to the absence of any right to justify Lord Derby's tenure of office: he sits, upon sufferance, by favour of an apology, a plea for the country, the precedent we have just cited, and a false pretext of his own: he wishes to push "the usual financial measures," which any Minister for the time being would be permitted to do; he would urge Chancery reform, which any future Ministry for the time being will feel compelled to do; he desires to disfranchise St. Albans, which is virtually done; and to give the four members for St. Albans and Harwich to other constituencies, which must be done, and ought to be done by a Ministry possessing the national confidence. Lord Derby sits by only half his warrant—the warrant of the Crown without the warrant of the country. He declares that he has nothing special to propose—quite the reverse. He cannot justly pretend that he has even the warrant of a minority in the country; for the Protective principles, which alienate the national majority, he holds so slackly that he must irretrievably have alienated his own minority. The bad precedent of Lord John, who had an ostensible majority, is no warrant for Lord Derby, who has no majority. The plea that he entered office by no act of his own only adds a fresh negative to his right: he had not even the right of seizure. His apology amounts to a claim, that he should be permitted to hold a Provisional

Government, and to keep it provisional for an indefinite time.

If the Government abuses its want of right, the Opposition does not display much power in the use of its rights. The right of the opposition is, to test the government, to see that no government of a minority continue in office, and to compel the new Government either to make for itself a majority or to resign. The present Opposition shows no disinclination to that compulsion, but it fails in resources and in the power of conceiving a true popular policy. To harass a feeble Ministry is not a popular kind of policy. To aim at the restoration of a Russell régime is not a fine specimen of invention. If Lord Derby, abandoning Protection, is a Peel without a new policy; if the new Chancellor of the Exchequer shows a disposition to consider the position of his party too much as a "situation," to be worked out dramatically; Lord John Russell's taunting behaviour is feeble in conception and utterance: and the more advanced Liberals do not seem to have made up their minds whether they shall follow Lord John or strike out new courses for themselves, or do both. Hence we see a wavering course, with many leaders, besides the superannuated leader of 1831-2. Lord John, Mr. Henry Berkeley, Mr. Locke King, all are leaders, and there are more to come. The Opposition lays itself open to the taunts of the Ministry and its friends, that among many minorities no one has a right to be in office any more than the Protectionist party. The rejoinder of the Liberals is an intimation that possibly the adhesion of Sir James Graham and Mr. Cobden may give to the Whig Ministry that "wider basis" at which Lord John hinted, and convert two minorities and a half into a majority. As to Mr. Cobden, Lord John seems to be thinking of it; perhaps he will if he must. And as to Sir James, he seems to be thinking of it; perhaps he won't if he sees his own interest.

Two minorities and a half, we say, because we observe that the majority of the Peel party sits below the gangway. We note that it is below the gangway that a truly statesmanlike view of the situation is to be found—declining to hurry or harass Ministers in measures needful for the routine of public business, but refusing to sanction the initiation of any great measures, until Ministers shall have obtained the sanction of the nation, without which the tenure of their seats is only provisional. Mr. Gladstone puts forth that view; Lord Palmerston, who sits near him, concurs. And Lord Palmerston, who so eloquently denounced the "distrust of the people" displayed in Lord John's Militia Bill, now deprecates a tax even of five shillings on the food of the people, because it would set the poor against the rich in a manner fatal to the harmony of the state. Lord Harrowby foresees that the question is no longer whether the country shall be Protectionist or not, but whether it shall be Democratic or not. He forgets another question, whether the country shall be national or not. The material interests of the people, justice to labour, the defence of the country, fair play to our colonies, alliances with free states abroad—these are elements of a national policy which would for a time supersede party pettinesses and interested intrigues, if there were but the leader strong enough to initiate such a policy.

In the meantime? Why, in the meantime the Derby-Disraeli Ministry is as good a stop-gap as any other; and if it chooses to stay in office without a technical right, so incurring divers pains and penalties, let us remember that the penalties fall upon the leaders of the party; and that in these days of indifferentism, Ministerial responsibility is as tenderly enforced as it is lightly assumed. Call it what you will, the present state of affairs is an interregnum under a Provisional Government, and the longer it lasts the better will the next Government be able to study its opportunities and its duties.

SOCIAL REFORM IN THE ARMY.

It is commonly supposed, that notwithstanding the changes made within the last few years, our military punishments are still very severe, when compared with those employed in the continental armies, particularly in that of France. This is a very mistaken notion. Although flogging may not figure in their published regulations, it is well known that the stick is freely and unsparingly administered in Austria by officers of every rank, from the colonel to the lance-corporal; that carelessness at drill, and other minor delinquencies,

are cruelly punished in Prussia with the flat of the sabre; and that "running the gauntlet" is not an unfrequent ceremony in a Russian battalion. The punishment of death for military offences, virtually unknown in the English army, is by no means unusual in the other countries of Europe. In France, more than thirty men are shot every year for heinous breaches of discipline; and for an act of insubordination, which would subject an English offender to six months' confinement, the French soldier is condemned to five years of the "boulet," hard labour in prison, with an eight-pound shot chained to his ankle.

The authorities at the Horse-guards, and the older officers of the army, have at all times shown themselves averse to any relaxation in the system of terror and coercion which was formerly considered indispensable,—in fact, the only possible plan for the maintenance and preservation of discipline: but they have been unable to check inquiry, or to withstand the force of public opinion, and they appear invariably to have carried out the progressive alterations in our military code with perfect good faith. That barbarous and degrading infliction, so long the opprobrium of our army and nation, which cruelly ruined many a generous promising young soldier, which hardened more than it restrained, and never reclaimed an old offender, has gradually been limited in extent, and its application restricted to some crimes of a disgraceful nature, and to a few of the offences most dangerous to the efficiency of an army. The discipline, good conduct, and contentment of a regiment depend, of course, greatly on the skill, judgment, and governing talents of the commanding officer. In many corps, flogging has become very rare; in some, both at home and abroad, such an exhibition has not taken place within the last two years; and in a few, not even for a longer period. The possibility of governing English soldiers without military flogging may therefore be said to have been demonstrated.

A Report on the Discipline and Management of Military Prisons, by Lieut.-Colonel Jebb, the Inspector-General, has lately been issued, which presents a mass of evidence quite conclusive as to the efficiency of a system of punishments, void of the exasperating and degrading effects of the lash, and yet eminently repulsive to rude, sensual, uncultivated natures, and well calculated to deter and reform, without injury to body or mind, the young and inexperienced culprits. The regimental commandants, whose separate reports are quoted by Colonel Jebb, are all but unanimous as to the good working of the system; but their general opinion is, that the prospect of prison-fare, and even of hard labour, does not exercise much restraining influence over the more depraved and hardened offenders. These men, forming the bulk of regimental "defaulters," and mostly habitual drunkards, are perhaps incorrigible by any system of mere punishment. The lash did not cure them, although it often enlarged the class. They are most unprofitable servants to the state, passing some months of every year in prison, and no inconsiderable time in hospital, and when present for duty, forming a centre of contamination, and damaging the character of the whole corps. The obvious suggestion is, that these bad soldiers should be discharged the service; and one of the regimental commandants, whose opinions are included in Colonel Jebb's Report, states that he would rely, for the future diminution of crime, rather on "improved barrack accommodation, and the dismissal of confirmed bad characters," than upon "any system of punishment." This goes to the very heart of the matter: these two remedial measures are inseparably connected; they contain at once the grand difficulty and its solution. We cannot dismiss the bad characters until, by improving the condition and brightening the prospects of the army, dismissal becomes a loss and a penalty. At present, the numerous desertions attest the repugnance of recruits, and a "free discharge" is held out in certain cases as a reward to the well-conducted soldier!

The Infantry of the Line form five-sixths of the army, and in their ranks there is much more bad conduct, more discontent, and more desertion, than in the Cavalry and Artillery. The Sappers and Miners in every respect are superior to every other corps in the service. In the army, as in all human society, physical comfort and bodily and mental exercise produce their results in orderly and moral conduct; and as the social position is raised, self-respect increases, and the

inclination to crime diminishes. Any one may satisfy himself by personal observation, either of the raw recruits or of the finished soldiers of the Cavalry and Artillery, that they are drawn from the same classes of society as furnish the men for the Infantry. The Dragoons acquire a more polished and confident manner from the closer and more familiar intercourse with their officers, arising from their daily meetings at "stables," and the nature of their duties in general. The Sappers and Artillerymen are held in general esteem from their acquired knowledge and accomplishments, scholastic and professional, for the attainment of which great facilities and encouragement are offered. A man must have had some previous education before he can enter the Sappers and Miners, but many a good mathematician and draughtsman has learned all that he knows, even reading and writing, in the Artillery schools. And the soldiers in these branches of the service, although receiving the same rations as the Infantry, are able, from their slightly higher pay, to contribute more for their messing, and their meals are therefore better both in quality and quantity. They are also clothed in a superior manner, with regard to materials and to appearance. In most stations they have an advantage as to barrack accommodation, but in this respect all have much to complain of. How must the young recruit's dream of the honour and respectability of his profession vanish when he finds some of his married comrades and their wives occupying the same room with twenty or thirty bachelors, and merely separated from them by a curtain! Loss of self-respect is loss of self-command.

And the poor soldiers of the Line—forming, as we said, five-sixths of the army, and who have done ninety-nine hundredths of the fighting in the last thirty-five years; half of whose service is passed in "foreign parts," and fully one-third in unhealthy climates,—are worse paid, worse clothed, worse fed, and less instructed than their more fortunate brethren, who, in consequence of being two or three inches taller, have been able to enlist in the Artillery or Dragoons. The Infantry soldier has not in general very hard work, (and so much the worse for him,) but his duties are monotonous, vexatious, and often frivolous, really without any object but to "keep him out of mischief." The qualifications for promotion merely extend to reading and writing, so that there is not much inducement for him to study. And in a crowded, cheerless barrack-room, with an apology for a fire—all bustle and noise by day, and the darkness just made visible at night by a few farthing dips,—there is little possibility of carrying on such pursuits. What life can be better calculated to induce apathy or recklessness?

The artilleryman and the dragoon are clothed in a becoming and serviceable uniform; the Guards wear coats of good, well-dyed cloth, and not disfigured with those bars of tape across the front which distinguish the men of the line. In order to keep these stripes of tape white and "clean" for parade and guard, the soldier is obliged to make a frequent use of pipe-clay in a liquid state, and the coat is often worn of necessity while many parts are still wet, particularly about the chest,—a practice not very conducive to health, especially for young growing lads. The whole dress seems studiously invented to make the man mean and ridiculous in appearance. With his brickdust-coloured coat, of a fabric much inferior in tint and texture to that worn by the boys of the Shoe-black Brigade, and with light slate-coloured trousers, his entire figure affords a dingy sort of example of the proverbial chromatic discord, sky-blue and scarlet.

We have no affection for a standing army; we think that even now we might begin to form a national defensive force; we wish to see our citizens more of soldiers. But as we must, at least for Indian and colonial service, have a regular army, we wish to see our soldiers more of citizens; we wish to see their characters and capabilities improved and enlarged, instead of being in many cases deteriorated and lessened, by their period of military service.

It is a great step to have given up flogging men into degradation and despair for offences involving little if any moral guilt; and we hope that it will not be long before that species of torture is entirely abandoned, and a specimen of the British cat-o'-nine-tails hung up in some obscure part of the Tower as a companion to the thumb-screws

and the scavenger's-daughter. But a greater work is to be done. There has been too much attention paid to the punishment and too little to the prevention of crime. We know that the subject is not now entirely neglected; military schoolmasters are being trained and set to work, and soldiers' libraries are encouraged and increasing. We fully appreciate the extension of the good-conduct warrant. But we must have comfort, and decency, and a possibility of quiet in barracks. Inducements to study and exertion should be created by raising the knowledge-test for promotion, and by opening still more the road to the higher ranks. And there is no reason that our soldiers should be totally unproductive; employment might be found for them, which would at once advantage them and the state, which would exercise their bodies and minds, increase their self-respect, brighten their prospects, and confer upon their social position something even of comfort and of dignity.

THE "SISTERS OF MERCY" AND LOW-CHURCH CHIVALRY.

ANOTHER "Morgan" has turned up, but this time he calls himself "Spurrell"—the Reverend James Spurrell, A.M. Like his sympathetic fellow-worker, at Leamington, this gentleman is engaged as a minister of the Gospel, in acts of mean discourtesy to ladies, but surpassing Morgan in uncharitableness, he adds misrepresentation to disrespect, and an awful profanity to both.

There is an institution, near Devonport, for ladies who call themselves "Sisters of Mercy," whose superior is the far-famed Miss Sellon, and who, externally, are known for nothing more than their singular costumes and beneficent acts. They lead lives devoted to the duties of their religion, and to succouring the poor. They have certain distinctions among themselves, certain rules, and a certain discipline. They derive their members from a class of young women who are rich and well educated, and who feel themselves, or fancy themselves, "called" to lives of devotion. They belong to the Church of England, and are under the immediate superintendence of the Bishop of the diocese. Also the charitable works of Miss Sellon and her "sisters," include certain schools for orphans.

These works of mercy offended the nostrils of the Reverend James Spurrell—who, from his unctuous manner, we are sure must be a 'low,' a very 'low,' churchman; and he, having got together, by hook or by crook, a quantity of private letters, and a very pretty collection of fabulous anecdotes, set about criticising—not the public acts—but the private doings of Miss Sellon! He then proceeds to publish the result of his labours, ostentatiously boasting that the duty "had not been sought by, but sent to, him, in the clear providence of God." And what are the results of this divine commission? a series of unmanly and untrue allegations against Miss Sellon.

Mr. Spurrell snuffed "Romanism" in everything. He had filched hold of private letters; he had been in communication with a recalcitrant "sister;" he had taken as gospel truth all she told him, or all he alleges she told him; and in a pamphlet breathing of fire and brimstone, and seasoned with that mixture of pious horror, and deprecating calumny, which ranters do affect, he voids his holy venom to the world. Miss Sellon has condescended to reply, giving a clear, calm, and dignified refutation of the gross misstatements edited by her inspired traducer, the Reverend James Spurrell. Her vindication is so triumphant and so uncompromising, that if he have but a spark of manliness in his composition he will, ere this, have apologised to the utmost of his power.

But he, and such as he, are incapable of an act of chivalry. He has been indignantly addressed by Captain Sellon, the father of the persecuted lady, and by Mr. David Chambers, a barrister of eminence, and Recorder of Salisbury, a brother of one of the "Sisters;" but not until the letters of the latter gentleman to himself, which he had disdained to notice, had been published in the *Morning Post*, would he respect himself sufficiently to send a reply, and then not to the injured persons, but to the *Morning Post*. And how did he, the self-appointed minister of Providence, meet the charge of cowardice and breach of faith? He referred the aggrieved father, and the outraged brother—to the law!

This is, we beg our readers to be well assured, but a fair specimen of low-church chivalry. It

is the tone—the temper of the Morgan and Spurrell party, dissenting in doctrine and discipline, but not in prizes and benefices, from the body they disfigure and bring into contempt; clinging to the Lion and the Unicorn of the Establishment, whilst they deny the sacraments, and deform the services, and slur the liturgy of the Church; tasteless as the conventicle; and tyrannical as the Holy office; backbiters and busybodies in the parish, vilifiers and petty despots in the pulpit, they speak and act, as if to be "evangelical" were to hold a patent for conduct unworthy of gentlemen, of Christians, of men.

We have read the pamphlet in question, and we unhesitatingly say, that it is a wretched compound of self-righteousness, unwarranted imputations, and violated faith. Honesty would compel Mr. Spurrell to join the ranks of dissent: decency would recommend him to learn manners.

Is not this only another instance of the pressing necessity for Convocation, and of some sort of internal discipline by which the church may at least be able to know her own, and to separate the false from the true? But we speak here in defence of the decencies and the charities of life which humanity remembers, when "pastors and masters" forget.

PROTECTION IN THE GAZETTE.

PROTECTION is at last officially abandoned: it is well that agriculturists should understand that fact—owners and occupiers both. Lord Derby and Mr. Disraeli, who have laboured so well in Opposition to keep alive some pulse and hope in Protection, have entered office only to signify that they will not undertake to carry on the contest. Let there be no mistake on this point: we desire neither to exaggerate nor to underrate what Lord Derby and Mr. Disraeli say. The Earl adheres to his old opinion against free-trade in the "abstract;" but he now consigns corn to a place of subordinate importance: "The question of the financial and commercial concerns of the country is not a mere question as to the imposition or non-imposition of a moderate duty on the import of foreign corn." But he explicitly says that he would not revive either the Navigation Laws or the Corn Laws.

"I recollect, at the time the great measure of the Navigation Laws was under discussion, I warned your Lordships against the adoption of it, on the ground that it involved principles which once adopted were final and irrevocable. I made that statement at the time, I repeat it now. I don't desire to go back to the law of 1846 with respect to corn. I don't desire to go back to the law of 1842."

Nothing could be more explicit. Lord Derby only retains his objection against the "extent" to which the Free-trade policy has been carried, and desires in future to "mitigate" the consequent pressure on certain classes. One plan would be, by the moderate duty on the import of foreign corn; but Lord Derby refers that to "the country." Mr. Disraeli implies that Ministers will not propose any specific measure, neither the 5s. duty, nor the 7s. duty; but will go to the country for a general judgment on their own character; and if, by the direct vote of the electoral body, they obtain the confidence of the country, then, as to Protective measures—they will consider of it! We quote his own words:—

"But I say frankly to the honourable and learned gentleman [Mr. Villiers], that in considering the fiscal arrangements of this country, I do not—I will not—to gain any popularity or to avoid any blustering, give it as my opinion that a duty such as he describes is one which any Minister under any circumstances ought to propose. * * * I know there is a great desire on the part of gentlemen opposite that there should be a proposition for a fixed duty. ('Hear,' and laughter.) I regret, for their sakes, that I cannot give a promise to make any proposition of the kind. What I intend to do, with the assistance and consent of my colleagues, is to redress the grievances of the agricultural interest; and we reserve to ourselves the right of considering what may be the best means by which that great object can be attained."

It was expected that Ministers would take their final stand upon a 5s. or a 7s. fixed duty; but it now turns out that they decline to do even that. If the country should call for a return, so far, to Protection, they will carry it out—such, if we can discover any kind of promise, is the extent of their present pledge. We need not point out the immense extent of ground thus abandoned: the Protectionists now will not even stand where the Whigs did before Peel's time.

Before he entered office, Mr. Henley declared that the Protectionists could not ask for a reversal of the decision, because there were no new facts; but there *are* new facts. Although still miserably poor, the agricultural labourers are better off than they have been for centuries. That is a great fact—a gigantic fact. And why? Because Protection sought to benefit industry by limiting production—by limiting production especially in the chief necessary of life; and through the abolition of that restraint, the eating population, especially the poor, is better off. As Lord Palmerston says, you cannot reverse the policy which gives the poor more to eat, without setting poor against rich. The farmers, too, in the more intelligent counties, Kent, for instance, are becoming so far reconciled to Free-trade, that they do not desire to have back Protection; though, in the duller counties, such as Shakespeare's Worcestershire, they still hanker after last year's moon. Condemned by the majority of the electoral body, hated by the towns, supported with diminished and dividing numbers even by its friends, officially declined by its leaders, who entered office as the representatives of the policy, Protection is destroyed for ever.

Still, its object was just, and will not be abandoned by the farmers or agriculturists of any class. The farmers say that now they have not justice; which is true. Tithes are an injustice, from which the towns escape. The charge of the poor, rated on the rental, is heavier on the farmer, who turns his capital *once* in the revolving year, if he does that, than upon the manufacturer, who can turn his capital several times. That the labourer is far from being *well* off, although better off than he has been, is proved by the steady desire to emigrate, repelled only by the steady obstructiveness of the Colonial department. Thus conditioned, the agriculturists will hear with astonishment and disgust, the confession—nay, not the confession, but the absolute assertion of the new Chancellor of the Exchequer, that "The people are in a state of contentment and prosperity."

No, no; the people have discovered that Protection which limited production was not the thing to exalt their condition; but they are not yet prosperous, and they are far from contented.

And we warn them that they will not radically or thoroughly improve their condition while free-trade remains the *final* law. They are already beginning to find that out. While industry is left, without concert or guidance, to carry on division of employments by the rule of haphazard, or the really misleading law of "supply and demand," the trade in articles of vital necessity, as compared with the trade in luxuries, will always be less efficient than it should be for the welfare of the country at large, less profitable for those who carry it on. We have now finally bade farewell to the delusion of Protection: henceforward we shall have to deal with mere Free-trade singly; and we shall the more rapidly learn to understand its total unfitness to be the one law of an industrial community like that of England. Farmers and labourers must begin to cast about for the new and true Protection which lies beyond Free-trade.

To that end we applaud the suggestion of an accomplished correspondent, that the Protectionists should henceforth become *out and out* Free-traders. Yes, let us have *real* freedom of industry—freedom of labour to associate its labour, to associate its capital—freedom of industry in all its relations. A thorough experiment in absolute freedom would soon teach even the most bigoted Free-trader to appreciate the peace and plenty that await Concert alone.

POLITICAL LETTERS.

IV.

THE FALSE PEACE.—REPLY TO A. L.

March 17, 1852.

MY DEAR A. L.,—I desire to answer you directly, and I will do so briefly.

"Peace," as you say, "*has* her victories, as well as War," but the victories of Peace are not those which satisfy the instinct that impels to war; and there is a kind of shifting of the ground in a shifting of the phrase, when we are called on to accept the victories of peace as a valid substitute. The instinct which craves the victory over physical danger, is not satisfied with a controversial victory; and while you stunt the faculties to which the instinct refers, you shun two dangers of a serious kind.

You divert natural instincts, or suppress them. But this never can be done, I believe, except to the injury of the entire man. I will confess that I have no belief in "the perfectibility of the human species," though I have in the progressive development of circumstances—material, moral, and artistic—which would enable our species to develop its natural type to the fullest proportions, including the development of *all* its faculties. It may be that a higher development is possible; but, within the scope of history, I see no evidence of it. On the contrary, I see many risings of humanity, many fallings, far below the type.

But let me leave general ideas, for very plain practical ideas. We all know that, in daily life, virtue is exposed to various temptations, detrimental to health of mind or body. I do not now speak of a *straitlaced* virtue, which I believe to be in itself abominable, and prone to vice. When you tell me that members of the Peace movement set themselves against vice, while I respect their zeal, I fear that they mean something different from that which I abhor. I know that, in time of active war, vices, ugly enough in themselves, put on a form of shameless violence, most hideous. On the other hand, we are told that "idleness is the root of all evil;" but the exciting occupations of civilized life prove that the evil may not lie in idleness. I stand by the evidences of physiologists, that the true corrective to excesses of mere instincts and appetites, the discipline which keeps the animal functions in the healthiest balance, is muscular exertion, pushed to the degree of bodily fatigue; and I know that the fatigue is healthiest when it is varied, and incited by a real interest. An exercise for duty is a poor affair, compared to the exercise of sports, of hunting, of bodily contest. The exercise should have a *real* object—such as interests the instinctive faculties, without which it will be listless, mechanical, and will not give the same tone to the muscles. A fine, vigorous man may be "free" in his life; but, save in some monstrously exceptional state of society, he cannot be unmanly in his errors. Now this physical training is denied to the bulk of society in our country, and in our day; and as a consequence to be expected, vice has become less flagrant, but not less gross, fantastical, tame, sickly. Life, not fully exercised, feeds upon itself, and peace proves as fatal as war.

So much for the use of warlike pursuits as exercises. But they have a further use, rather obvious in these days. You cite against me the example of the Continent: I have rather the right to cite it against you. The peoples have consented to waive their right of arms, and to permit the establishment of an armed class, separated from the body of the people; hence the people are easily enslaved. If the patriot, the virtuous man, the man who knows right from wrong, does not retain on his side the science of fighting, *ipso facto* he places all that he holds good and sacred, with himself, at the mercy of the barbarian. France has won her liberties, tardily, with many a backsliding, but still moving forward in the main; she has won these victories by the pen, but also by the sword. She loses them when her patriots cannot fight so well as her slaves.

The possession of the sword *does* determine the settlement of internal as well as external questions. An armed people is the arbiter of its own freedom, equally against the external foe and the internal traitor. It does not follow that the people is necessarily turbulent. I am not, however, overfond of statements in the subjunctive mood. You may show me, I admit, instances of a people corrupted and subdued, although armed—possibly because they had lost a sufficiency of chivalrous virtue: but to make out your case, you must show me a people that had retained its freedom, its material welfare, and its greatness, after it had ceased to bear arms. I know that England is now undergoing an experiment of that kind—a very hazardous experiment; but I thank God for the belief, that at the first aspect of real danger, yielding to the glorious old impulse, England will throw up the experiment.

You assume that right and force must be opposed to one another. I need not point out to you how that begs the question. I would ask you to find any other definition of "right," [in the sense of "jus," not of *justice*] than the union of conviction with power; I would ask you to

cite the instance of any people, great and actively beneficent to mankind, which was not, at the period of its greatness, also a warlike, if not a conquering people; and I would ask you, if conviction should not seek to wed itself, even for its own fulfilment, with power?

In handling the metaphysics of this subject, you speak, in defiance of all known truth, as if pain and death were worse evils than an enervated luxury, than the sufferings which peace tolerates, or the endurance of bondage. You speak as if the use of the sword must be cruel, unbrotherly, inhuman. Has the sword never vindicated humanity? The arbitrament of the sword, indeed, has one quality invaluable in all stages before we arrive at final truth: it leaves conviction untouched, and settles only the other half of right, which is might; and thus, when the adherents of two opinions are conflicting, it determines which shall rule, without bondage to the conquered opinion. If victory induce tyranny, it is because the faith of war is at a low standard, and chivalry has degenerated to mere soldiering—the trait of a rude or of an unwarlike people. If the adherents of the conquered opinion desire to recover the victory, they must train themselves, and recruit their forces, until they can add might to conviction. You may complain until the millennium, of that stern necessity; but it exists. I do not think that it is wise, or safe, or just to sacred interests, when we act *as if* we had already attained the millennium, or got within sight of it; and I derive consolation from finding that whenever any number of my countrymen collected together are reminded of the duty of being prepared to defend the liberties of themselves and of their country, the truth of the appeal is attested by the ringing response.*

Ever your sincere friend,

THORNTON HUNT.

EUROPE IN AMERICA.

EUROPEANS have borne the flag of victory on the plain of America. A French flag had already been upheld in the Rio de la Plata: the Schleswig Holsteiners have led the armies of the Banda Oriental against the conquered Rosas. Cortez and Wolfe fought before Washington and Jefferson had proclaimed the policy of keeping America American, and abstaining from Europe; but it is impossible to maintain that policy, and the Holsteiners are but pioneers. Cuba will perhaps witness the next display of European valour—will it also be, of European victory?

The Schleswig Holsteiners lent spirit to a liberating army: how completely might an American legion in Europe supply the converse of that example. It is a question of time—who shall begin first in good earnest, Europe in America, or America in Europe.

LOUIS BONAPARTE DESCRIBED BY SHAKESPEARE.

HENRY IV., Part I. Act iv., Scene 1.

"AND when he was not six-and-twenty strong;
Sick in the world's regard, wretched and low,
A poor unminded Outlaw, sneaking home:
. . . . We gave him welcome to the shore;
And when we heard him swear, and vow to God,
He came to be (of service to the State),
To sue his livery, and beg his peace,
With tears of innocence, and terms of zeal:
(We) in kind heart, and pity moved,
Swore him assistance, and perform'd it, too;
Met him in boroughs, cities, villages,
Laid gifts before him
. following him,
Even at the heels, in golden multitudes.
He presently, as greatness knows itself,
Steps me a little higher than his vow,
Made while his blood was poor;
And now, forsooth, takes on him to reform
Some certain Edicts, and some strait Decrees,
That lay too heavy on the Commonwealth;
Cries out upon abuses, seems to weep
Over the country's wrongs; and, by this face,
This seeming brow of justice, did he win
The hearts of all that he did angle for:
Broke oath on oath, committed wrong on wrong;
And, in conclusion, drove us to seek out
This head of safety; and withal to pry
Into his Title, too, the which we find
Too indirect for long continuance."

* I must qualify this: since I wrote it, I have heard an assembly of my countrymen shrink from an allusion to the subject!

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*.

LORD COCKBURN'S *Life of Jeffrey* has just been published. We have not read the volumes, but doubt not that, whatever may be their literary merits, they contain matter that will be abundantly interesting in literary circles. Lord Cockburn was one of the most intimate friends Jeffrey had—first his associate and friendly rival at the Scottish bar, and afterwards his brother on the Scottish Bench. Many stories, perhaps mythical, are current in Scotland, bringing out the contrast of the two friends—Jeffrey and Cockburn—in their character of barristers addressing Scottish juries: Jeffrey, the clear, Attic intellect, speaking in a distinct, musical voice, from which the Scottish accent had been almost eradicated; Cockburn, the Scotchman all over, and, what is more, the Scotch humorist. One of the stories, as far as our English ears can recollect the dialect in which it was told, was as follows:—In one case, in which Jeffrey and Cockburn, when barristers, were engaged, a question arose as to the sanity of one of the parties concerned. "Is the defendant, in your opinion, perfectly sane?" said Jeffrey, interrogating one of the witnesses, a plain, stupid-looking countryman. The witness gazed in bewilderment at the questioner, but gave no answer. It was clear he did not understand the question. Jeffrey repeated it, altering the words. "Do you think the defendant capable of managing his own affairs?" Still in vain; the witness only stared the harder. "I ask you again," said Jeffrey, still with his clear English enunciation, "do you consider the man perfectly rational?" No answer yet; the witness only staring vacantly at the eloquent little figure of his interrogator, and exclaiming, "Eh!" "Let me tackle him," said Cockburn. Then assuming his broadest Scotch tone, and turning to the obdurate witness, "Hae ye your mull wi ye?" "Ou ay," said the awakened Cimon, stretching out his snuff-horn. "Noo, hoo lang hae ye kent John Samson?" said Cockburn, taking a pinch. "Ever since he was that high," was the ready reply, the witness indicating with his hand the alleged altitude of John Samson at the period of his first acquaintance with him. "An', d'ye think noo, atween you and me," said the barrister, in his most insinuating Scotch manner, "that there's onything intill the cratur." "I wudna lippen him wi a bull-calf," (I wouldn't trust him with the guardianship of an infant bull,) was the instant and brilliant rejoinder. The end was attained, amid the convulsions of the court; what Jeffrey could not do with all his cleverness, Cockburn had done by dint of his inveterate Scotticism. Such is the story: true or not, we give it as we got it; and like most myths, if it is not true, it ought to be true, for it indicates exactly the two men, the one of whom now appears as the biographer of the other. We hope that Lord Cockburn, while doing justice to Jeffrey in his character as the Reviewer and the Man of Letters, known to all Britain, has also kept true in the biography to his own instincts, and told us a great deal about Jeffrey as the Scotch lawyer and Scotch judge, and one of the ornaments of that northern metropolis, all whose beauties, moral as well as physical, are dearer, we believe, to no heart than to Lord Cockburn's.

The ninth and tenth volumes of Mr. Grote's *History of Greece* are now out. They bring down the history from the period of the culmination of the Spartan supremacy, to the accession of Philip of Macedon. A very remarkable thing about these two volumes, is the amount of political teaching they contain, adapted to the present hour. The volumes are, we may say, pervaded with a lesson of contrast between the results of a government founded on despotism, and those of a government founded on free speech. Invariably in Greece, where free speech was permitted, and democratic spirit prevailed, the developments of society were better, greater, and more orderly, than where matters were managed by long continuations of military despotism, or occasional *coups d'état*. Politicians at the present day could not find anywhere better illumination on the great and growing question of "Government by popular assemblies," versus "Government by individuals, or oligarchies," than in these two volumes; and the illumination is all the more welcome, that it arises not out of intention to be dogmatic, but out of pure exercise of historic insight. Three or four volumes more will, we believe, conclude this great work of Mr. Grote's.

MR. GLADSTONE has published the third volume of his translation of Farini's *History of the Roman State*. This volume carries on the story from the flight of the Pope, to the landing of General Oudinot at Civita Vecchia. The narrative is interesting; but, like the two previous volumes, narrow and peevish in its spirit. One regrets more than ever, on reading these volumes, that Margaret Fuller's *History of the Italian Movement* has been lost to the world; it would have told the story of the Roman Republic in so different a spirit from that of the crabbed Farini, who, though he writes well enough, is precisely one of those men who would act like vinegar in any cause, souring all, and helping nothing. By the bye, Saffi, Mazzini's young and gifted colleague in the Triumvirate (one of the few men of whom even Farini speaks well, and who is precisely the man to win golden opinions from all sorts of people, and what is more, to deserve them), is writing a *History of the Roman Revolution of 1848-49*. We believe part of it is already written, if not published by the Italian press of

Switzerland; we would fain see it finished, and translated for the benefit of the English public, who, at present, grateful to Mr. Gladstone for his revelations of facts with regard to Italy, would be too much disposed to take a book like Farini's as sound on his recommendation.

NIEBUHR'S LIFE AND LETTERS.—

The Life and Letters of Niebuhr, with Essays on his Character and Influence. By the Chevalier Bunsen and Professors Brandis and Loebell. 2 vols. Chapman and Hall.

THESE are books to read, books to borrow, and books to buy. Niebuhr's *Life and Letters*, though less interesting perhaps than many a book we borrow, is more decidedly a book worth buying than ninety-nine in a hundred that are published. It is a book rich in teachings to the young ambitious student: teachings not simply of a didactic or critical nature, but such as form the rules and guidance of a steadfast, honourable life. Niebuhr himself was certainly far from being what we should call a great man; we separate widely from those enthusiastic admirers who in Germany and England almost worship his name; but we heartily admire that quality in him which raised him so high above mere pedants, and which gave as it were a moral momentum to his intellect, intensifying its force to such a degree that it seemed like a great intellect: and that quality is *truthfulness*. We do not mean thereby a simple abstinence from conscious falsehood—we mean a stern and noble singleness of mind, which translates itself in honesty and accuracy of thought and action. He was arrogant, he was prejudiced, but he was never untruthful. One may collect a heap of absurdities and of rash assertions from his published writings, but nothing said for mere "effect," nothing said to equivocate with truth, nothing that implies a want of the most thorough honesty of mind. For our own parts we have little admiration of his writings, although recognising their enormous erudition and destructive merit. He was, we must think, a dissertator, not an historian; a *Geschichtsforscher*, not a *Geschichtschreiber*. He destroyed traditions, but he constructed nothing. No Roman moves across his page. No life animates his story. He was a giant among Scholars; but among Thinkers and Artists he has no place. As a Scholar it does not become us to speak of him: his acknowledged superiority cannot be affected by any questions of detail. Let us, however, by way of warning to the student, remind him that the highest authorities are only to be accepted with respect, not with blind obedience; the verdict of a great authority should make us suspicious of any difference from it we may see reason to entertain, but should not, merely as a verdict, suffice to overthrow that opinion. Niebuhr, as we said, is a great authority; but his temperament was arrogant and rash, and we counsel the student to test every assertion coming from Niebuhr, just as if it came from a Jones. We remember, when the *Lectures* published by Dr. Schmitz came into our hands, we were startled by the assertion that Ennius "uses *ego* as a monosyllable." It is possible; but with all the softening of the Tuscan guttural (e. g., *hasa* for *casa*, *hanto* for *canto*.) it is difficult to conceive *ego* pronounced like the Italian *io*. Being naturally of a rebellious mind, and disinclined to accept the *dictum* even of a Niebuhr, we turned to the fragments of Ennius collected by Merula, and found that the word *ego* only occurs three times, and on each occasion the pronunciation is *equivocal*, because the final vowel is elided before the initial vowel which succeeds!

But although, as may be seen, we have not the high opinion of his intellectual greatness, held by many, we are unfeigned admirers of the purity and highmindedness of his moral character; and hence these volumes of *Life and Letters* have been of more interest and pleasure to us than all his achievements in history. Peculiarly valuable must these letters be to the young student, struggling against poverty, obscurity, and the insensate promptings of his own ambition, urging him to snatch at the success only toil and courage can achieve. Early in life he settled his career. He was to be an historian; and as far as nature had gifted him with the qualities to succeed, he succeeded in this dream of youth. Watch him in his study—how happy among his books! how honestly laborious! how he plans studies without thought of the toil, thinking only of the knowledge to be gained! While fellow students were wasting a God-given life in the Weinstube, enveloped in clouds of smoke, talking the infinite nonsense of youth, or roaring burschen songs—while others were airing their amiability at tea parties, Niebuhr was amassing the materials of his future work. "And believe me, dearest parents," he writes, in answer to their gentle reproaches, "it would be impossible to be as happy in much society as I am in the feeling that my solitude is well employed. When I have completed my studies, I will enter the world. Woe be to the fool who enters it before he has knowledge enough to compensate for its emptiness"—the true feeling of the scholar!

That he did not underrate the immensity of the task he had before him, may be read in this:—

"In order fully to understand, and to give lectures upon ancient literature, and ancient history, which forms a part of it, it is, in my opinion, absolutely necessary that I should have read through all the ancient writings still extant, at least once, with the closest attention—the more important works many times—and acquired a living and familiar acquaintance with each period. There may possibly be some exceptions to this rule in the case of special sciences, which must for ever remain a mystery to the uninitiated. This undertaking was carried out by Milton long ago. There would scarcely be found many to do it now, but it seems to me that it is what I undoubtedly ought to attempt.

"A profound and practical acquaintance with the grammar of the two classical languages must be obtained, partly by means of the various treatises on that subject, and partly from the literature of the languages themselves. A systematic philosophy, as the groundwork of all settled convictions, and all accurate thought; what is perhaps still more important, method in thinking, writing, and studying; added to these, various exercises in the art of composition, and a thorough command of our mother tongue, are indispensable requisites for any one who steps forth before the public, and seeks to obtain a high standing. It is no more than a man demands of himself.

"These, then, are the preliminary tasks that I should have to execute, before I

could accept a professorship in Kiel without a blush, and discharge its duties without disgracing or overworking myself."

Niebuhr was essentially a scholar—a bookworm; and he carried his feelings thoroughly with him in his studies. There was a certain stiffness of opinion about him, an intellectual narrowness which has repelled many, curiously illustrated in this passage:—

"My acquaintance with M. has been put a stop to by the difference of our principles; and what is strange, not in politics, but philosophy. He denies the freedom of the will, and the moral law; is a fatalist and indifferentist: I subscribe to Kant's principles with all my heart. I have broken with M., not from any dispute we have had, but on account of the detestable conclusions which necessarily follow from his opinions,—conclusions that absolutely annihilate all morality. I really loved him notwithstanding, but with such principles I could not be his friend."

Yet, lest this should leave an unpleasant impression, we will quote the following, wherein his moral nature finds expression:—

"Manly worth, elevation of intellect, and enthusiasm, are to me the noblest things on earth, superhuman, and the best pledge of our higher destination, heavenly origin, and divine illumination. I cannot worship the abstractions of virtue,—she only charms me when she addresses herself to my heart, speaks through the love from which she springs."

Or, this beautiful aphorism—

"To be strong in love is the only way to become noble, and all softening through education, which is not based on love, is merely pernicious."

We must reserve many other extracts, to be quoted elsewhere from time to time, and conclude this notice by an emphatic recommendation to all our studious readers to possess themselves of the work.

MEN AND WOMEN OF FRANCE.

Men and Women of France during the Last Century. In Three Volumes. Bentley. If Mr. Bentley accepted this work in the belief that it was original, we venture to say that he has been grossly deceived. It is French from the first page to the last. We have no time to hunt up the originals, but the internal evidence is conclusive as to these sketches being translations—and we will add, very indifferent translations; an opinion the following samples will prove. The common French idiom, *prendre la chef des champs* betrays a translator, and a bad one, for he has rendered it literally, "Ah, sire, is it not enough for to-day to have given me the key of the fields?" By way of literalness also read this: "She is rehearsing her part with that animal Lafontaine, who makes half my pieces." "*Homme d'esprit*" is translated "a man of spirit;" and for a sentence to puzzle the English reader take this: "As soon as Fontenelle presented himself at the Academy the old satirist took the field against him. Everywhere after the visit of Fontenelle followed that of Boileau." Who would imagine that this meant to describe how Fontenelle wanted to be elected as a Member of the Academy, and that every visit he paid to the members to solicit their votes was succeeded by a visit from Boileau? Indeed, the whole style of this work is not only transparently Gallic, but is, as we said, a very indifferent translation. Yet no name is on the title-page; no hint is given in the preface (which is dated February, 1852,) that the work is a translation; and we began it under the *bona-fide* impression that some English author had produced a companion work to Miss Kavanagh's *Women of France*.

Nevertheless the book is extremely amusing. It was worth translating for the gay picture it presents of literary and artistic France during that wonderful epoch. It is a portrait gallery wherein every head has a family resemblance with the rest, and all arrest the eye. The author has studied history from its anecdotal side, and he sketches Dufresny, Fontenelle, Marivaux, Piron, Prevost, Gentil Bernard, Florian, Boufflers, Rivarol, La Clos Grétry, Diderot, Boucher, Lantara, Louis XV., Camargo, Guimard, Sophie Arnould, Crebillon, Lamotte, Buffon, Bernis, Vadé, Dorat, Trublet, Watteau, Lancret, Vanloo, Grouze, Madame de Pompadour, Dancourt, and Mdlle. Clairon, in the liveliest colours. One must not look in it for profound appreciation of character, or for justness of criticism; but for anecdote, piquant biography, and pleasant pictures of the atelier, the court, the theatre, and the salon of the eighteenth century. It is no more like the true life of that epoch than novels are like reality; but it is as amusing as the most brilliant of novels, and cannot be set down unread. Such an *omelette soufflée* of literature it would be pedantry to criticise, so we will content ourselves with this brief indication of its nature, and select an extract or so.

Here is a passage about Piron, which contains almost as many jokes as sentences:—

"In the eighteenth century, the gentlemen of Beaune were not all men of wit. Piron found it a barren soil, if not for Bacchus, at least for Apollo. It was a fertile field for epigram; but a joke, to be intelligible to them, must needs be broad. Piron dressed up a jackass as an archer, and dragged him by main force to the training-ground. 'Here,' says he, 'is one of the company whom I met as I came along.' The animal began to bray, and the archers looked at one another with vexation, like people whose secret has been found out. In the evening, all the archers except the jackass went to the theatre. As the actors spoke somewhat low, the spectators began to cry, 'Louder, louder; we can't hear!' 'It is not for want of ears,' exclaimed Piron. The indignant audience threw themselves on the poet, who made his escape with the greatest difficulty in the world, exclaiming, 'Alone, I could whip them all.' In sober earnest, twenty rusty swords were drawn upon him. The next day, as he returned to Dijon, he mowed down vigorously all the thistles which he found along the road. Some of the people of Beaune, meeting him slashing away in this manner, asked, 'What are you about?' 'Parbleu! I am at war with the inhabitants of Beaune, and am cutting off their provisions!' The war lasted a long time; it was as celebrated as the battle of Fontenoy. To this day the gentlemen of Beaune do not relish pleasantries on the subject."

Here is another,—

"At that time, Piron went occasionally into society, dining here and there at a great mansion. He knew very well that it was his wit which was invited, as he

said, 'They hire me on wages.' He went everywhere without bending the knee. One day, at the house of some marquis, whose name I have forgotten, a nobleman made way for him to enter the dining-room before him. The marquis, observing this ceremony, addressed the nobleman: 'Oh, my dear Count, don't be so ceremonious; he is only a poet.' Piron repelled the insult like a man of spirit. He raised his head proudly, and went in first, saying, 'Since our titles are known, I take my rank.'"

How poets married in the eighteenth century is amusingly illustrated by Dufresny and Piron:—

DUFRESNY'S WASHERWOMAN.

"Dufresny returned to his lodging, thinking that a wife, the first he could get, would be a treasure to him in his misery. With a wife he would be sure of a home and of his daily bread; he had his days of ennui, and a wife would make them pass pleasantly. A letter from Biancoletti came to dissipate this odd reverie. Biancoletti invoked the aid of his humour to give the finishing touch to a piece he had in hand. Dufresny mended his pen, and sat down to answer the letter. He had not written three lines, when a woman, without any previous notice, walked into his room. 'Alas!' said he, 'people formerly took the trouble to wait in the ante-chamber; this is the inconvenience of being no longer a fine gentleman, and particularly of not having an ante-chamber.' The woman, who had heard Dufresny's remark, quietly said to him, 'I went through all your other rooms without meeting a single valet, otherwise I should have had myself announced.' Dufresny, recognising the voice, turned with a merry smile, 'Ah, is it you, Angélique? I am glad of it. I was waiting with impatience for my ruffles.' 'That is all very well, Monsieur Dufresny; but you have had no ruffles in the wash this long time.'

"This woman was Dufresny's washerwoman, a fine girl, pleasant and fair-complexioned, and dressed coquettishly. 'Do you know, Angélique,' continued the poet, resuming his letter, 'that you are a very pretty girl?' 'That is possible, Monsieur Dufresny; but I am not to be paid with that kind of money to-day. You have owed me eighty livres this long time. I beg you to remember me, for I am going to be married.' 'What is that? you are going to be married!' cried Dufresny, suddenly starting from his chair. 'And why not, if you please? Am I not old enough?'

"Dufresny had become thoughtful. 'With whom and with what?' 'With a valet-de-chambre of the Duc D'Harcourt, and with twelve hundred livres which come to me from my family.' 'Indeed! the miserable fellow is not to be pitied; a good match in faith! Has anything yet—?' 'What do you take me for, Monsieur Dufresny?' 'For a fine girl who desires only to become a fine wife.' 'That is all very well, Monsieur Dufresny, but you are making me lose my time with all your fine talk. Come, be kind enough to settle our little bill.' 'I have a horror of figures. See here: to finish this matter, I will marry you, and we shall be quits.' 'You are joking! A gentleman—If I take you at your word—' 'That is what I wish. But what will your other friend say?' 'Say no more about him.' 'Are you sure he has had nothing on account from your twelve hundred livres or from yourself?' 'I should have liked to have seen him try it! It is only to you that people give anything on account.' 'Well, embrace me, and let us be off to the next tavern. What a pretty wife I am going to have! By-the-by, have you a little money about you?' 'Do you know that you do me a great deal of honour? A man of your rank and of your talents to marry a poor girl incapable of playing the part of a duchess.' 'It is you who will be the dupe; look at the matter twice; see to what a state I have arrived, with all my talent and my forty-five years.' Angélique, weeping, embraced him. 'To-morrow,' said she, with charming simplicity, 'I will make you look as well as I have seen you formerly. But, first and foremost, you must ask me in marriage of my aunt Durand, for form's sake: it is not far—*Quai des Tournelles*. She is a good woman, and besides—she keeps my money for me.' 'Let us go instanter; we should never put off anything to the morrow. If you will take my advice, we will afterwards say a short prayer together at Notre-Dame, and it will be all over.' 'So, this is the style in which you wish to marry me! Thank Heaven, I do not agree with you!' 'Oh, I am willing to marry you in any style you wish. I will not even object to the marriage contract, though all such things are superfluous.'

"Three weeks afterwards, the marriage took place rather privately. Such was the manner in which Dufresny married his washerwoman. Nothing was ever more reasonable or more natural than this marriage, which caused so much scandal. But what mattered the vain satires of the world to Dufresny? He had a young and handsome wife who loved him, so he said those who pitied him were jealous.

PIRON'S WIFE.

"One evening after supper, Piron was ruminating on I know not what in Gallet's shop (Gallet, the gay song-writer, the merry tippler, was, besides and above all, a grocer), when a damsel entered, who asks for coffee and matches. Gallet having gone out, Piron undertook to serve the lady. 'Is that all you want?' Gallet, entering at that moment, laughingly said, 'Mademoiselle ought to have a husband in the bargain.' 'Excellent,' said Piron, 'if the damsel will take up with any kind of wood for her arrow.' The lady blushed, and departed without saying a word.

"The next morning, Piron had scarcely risen when she entered his chamber. 'Monsieur,' said she, all in a tremor, 'we are two children of Burgundy. I have long wanted to see a man of so much wit, and having learned yesterday that it was you with whom I had to do in M. Gallet's shop, I have come to-day unceremoniously to pay you a visit. Oh, monsieur, how weary you must grow here! I was very much afraid of finding some handsome lady from the theatre here; but, Heaven be praised! you live like a Trappist. Have you never thought of making an end of this, Monsieur Piron?' Piron, completely stunned by this talk, answered, 'Alas, mademoiselle, I leave the care of that to *la Camarde*; but, if you please, what do you mean by that?' 'I wish to say, have you ever thought of marriage?' 'Not much, mademoiselle; pray sit down while I light the fire.' 'You don't know, Monsieur Piron? it will make you laugh: so much the worse: I shall speak plainly. If your heart has the same sentiments as mine. . . . Piron, more and more astonished, looked at the lady in silence. 'In a word, Monsieur Piron, I come to offer you my heart and hand, not forgetting my life annuity of two thousand livres.'

"Piron, contrary to his custom, took all this seriously; he was touched to find at last a compassionate soul; the woman had tears in her eyes; he embraced her with warmth. 'I leave to you,' said he to her, 'all the preparations for the wedding. Gallet will write our epithalamium.' 'You make me, Monsieur Piron, the

happiest person in the world. I did not hope for so happy a conclusion, for—I do not wish to conceal anything from you—I am—I am fifty-three.' 'Well, then,' said Piron, with a slight shrug, 'we have over a hundred years between us. We would have done well to have met sooner.'"

Poor Piron! he closed his life of wit and debauchery by a not uncommon end:—

"He turned devotee! As a first sacrifice—I will not say to God, but to his confessor—he burnt a Bible, the margins of the pages of which he had enlivened with lamentations and epigrams in his peculiar style. He then set himself to translating the Psalms and writing odes on the Last Judgment. He said in relation to this, 'It is better to preach from the ladder of the gallows than not to preach at all.' This edifying old age opened the doors of the religious world to him; he was even received by the Archbishop of Paris; but the archbishop was not thereby secure against the epigrams of the poet. One day, in presence of a large company, the Archbishop said to him, with a nonchalance which betrayed some little vanity, 'Well, Piron, have you read my charge?' 'No, monsieur; have you?'"

SAMUEL BAILEYS DISCOURSES.

Discourses on Various Subjects; Read before Literary and Philosophical Societies.
By Samuel Bailey. Longman and Co.

"BAILEY of Sheffield" is a name grateful to the ears of all thinkers, and peculiarly grateful to the ears of the present writer, from its associations with the *Essays on the Formation and Publication of Opinions*, which charmed his youth: a volume of *Discourses*, therefore, bearing that signature, cannot be other than acceptable. We have read it with great pleasure. To induce you to do the same, let a brief indication of its contents suffice.

The opening discourse, on the "Mutual Relations of the Sciences," is somewhat traditional and commonplace. It is a grand subject; but when this discourse was written (1823) Mr. Bailey had not fairly grasped it. The second discourse, on the "Mammoth," is interesting. The third, on the "Changes which have taken place in the English Language," is both interesting and valuable, and should be carefully read by all whose inquiries are directed that way. The fourth is on the "Science of Political Economy;" the fifth, on the "Reformation of the Calendar in England;" the sixth, on the "General Principles of Physical Investigation"—a suggestive and luminous discourse on Method; the seventh, on the "Mechanical Causes of Thunder," an ingenious exposition; the eighth, on the "Paradoxes of Vision;" and the last, on "Wit."

It will be seen that the topics are various; various the merit of these essays. Our favourites are the essays on Language, Method, Vision, and Wit; and we select that on Vision for an extract, because it touches on a subject of universal interest. The two paradoxes of vision discussed by Mr. Bailey are—I. We have *inverted* images on the retina, nevertheless we see things *erect*. II. With two eyes we see but one image. The former of these paradoxes we will, with Mr. Bailey's aid, clear up.

That the image of every object is painted on the retina in an inverted position is an incontestable fact. Kepler long ago demonstrated how, from the laws of optics, it could not be otherwise. Yet that we do not see objects inverted is certain; and how this comes about has greatly puzzled philosophers. Before quoting the very satisfactory solution offered by Mr. Bailey, we may ask permission to transcribe here a note found among our metaphysical memoranda, written years ago, which, crudely enough, expresses an opinion substantially similar to that held by Mr. Bailey. "The question is an absurd one; belongs to the *metaphysical* will-o-wisps. To ask *why* we see erect objects by means of inverted images is to ask for a solution of all psychological problems. As well ask *why* sugar tastes sweet—it is not sweet; *why* fire burns and gives pain to my finger, but only burns, and does not give pain to my stick. The retina is not the final stage of vision—the retina does not see. If erect objects affect us through inverted images let the fact be noted. To ask the *why* is—

Ἄεροβατῶ καὶ περιφρονῶ τον ἡλιον,

and ought to be left to metaphysicians."

This crude note, with its scorn of "air galloping and questioning the sun," such as metaphysicians delight in, would not be accepted as an answer by any of those philosophers who had puzzled themselves with the paradox it so summarily dismisses; and we are glad, therefore, to be able to quote the following luminous and, as we think, convincing argument:—

"The fundamental position on which the true explanation rests is, that the picture of an external object formed on the retina is *not seen*. There can be no doubt, that, whenever we see the object, a picture of it must be painted on the retina; but that picture is itself invisible to the eye in which it is formed. We see the object, not the picture; and the presence of the latter in our own eyes can be nothing to each of us but a matter of inference. Myriads of the human race have lived and died without the faintest suspicion of their organs of vision being the constant theatre of such phenomena.

"The bearing of these facts on the question before us is obvious. If they do not, accurately speaking, *solve* the paradox, they *dispel* it. For what is there of a paradoxical character remaining?"

"If we do not see the picture on the retina—if we are never conscious of the presence in our eyes of inverted or indeed of any other images,—what paradox is left to perplex the simplest mind?"

"The supposed difficulty was, 'How is it that we see the object upright when the image is inverted?' and we may now turn round on the questioner and ask, 'Why should the position of an image which is *not seen*, which is *not present* to our consciousness, regulate the apparent position of the external object which is seen? what difficulty is there to be explained in the fact that our perception of the position of an external object is not affected by the position of an invisible image?"

"It has, however, been maintained by eminent philosophers, or, what is the same thing, it has been implicitly assumed in their arguments, that we do actually see the images on the retina. Not to mention less eminent writers, Dr. Thomas Brown may be named as one whose mind was evidently imbued with this notion, for it is continually implied in his reasonings and language.

"Now, for the sake of argument, let us for the present grant the position of the philosophers referred to, and mark what follows. It will be easy, I think, to show that precisely the same results in point of perception must ensue. If we actually saw the *pictures* on the retina, instead of seeing, as we do, the *external objects* which they represent, we could not see a single point or line in any other position than that in which it, actually appears. Nothing in any of those pictures could possibly be perceived as inverted.

"This must be apparent to every one who reflects that seeing an object inverted implies seeing it altered in its relative position to something else: but every object in the picture retains its relative place. If it is the figure of a man, for example, in a standing posture, which is there depicted, the feet will appear nearest the ground and the head nearest the sky. Thus, as every point in the picture must preserve its relative situation to every other point, the whole field of vision can contain no one thing in comparison with which any other thing can appear inverted; and nothing except what is in the field of vision can be concerned in the comparison. This may be illustrated by the position of the building in which we are assembled, at two different hours, as midday and midnight. At midday it is in one position in absolute space, or in reference to any fixed point; at midnight its position is completely inverted; but as there is nothing to be seen in reference to which it is inverted, it cannot appear so to us. On a first view, it seems incredible that this conclusion should have escaped any of the philosophers who have speculated on the subject. But, I think, we may perceive the source of their error and perplexity. They have tacitly assumed that the spectator is, in some way or other, cognizant of *both* the image and the object.

"Not, indeed, that they have consistently held to this duality of perception. They have sometimes spoken as if they considered the object alone to be visible, and sometimes the picture alone; but more frequently as if they conceived the eye to have the power of passing and repassing from one to the other, or of taking simultaneous cognizance of both, so as to bring them into comparison. From this unsteadiness and confusion of ideas, the paradox appears to have sprung. In order to see your way out of it you have only to avoid combining incompatible conditions. So long as you suppose that both the external object and the internal image are in the field of vision at the same time, or in close succession, or come and go by fits, and can be recognised by the eye as inverted in relation to each other, you may be perplexed to discover why the external object should appear upright, rather than the contrary; but keep constantly to one supposition, and you will be extricated from your perplexity."

BOOKS ON OUR TABLE.

A School Atlas of General and Descriptive Geography. Exhibiting the Actual and Comparative Extent of all the Countries in the World, with their present political divisions, founded on the most recent discoveries and rectifications. By Alexander Keith Johnston. W. Blackwood and Sons.

A School Atlas of Physical Geography. Illustrating, in a series of Original Designs, the Elementary Facts of Geology, Hydrology, Meteorology, and Natural History. By Alexander Keith Johnston. W. Blackwood and Sons.

A CAREFUL inspection of these Maps has given us a very high opinion of their utility, as the most cursory inspection will give of their elegance. The greatest pains have been taken with making them easy of reference—and that to young students is perhaps of less importance than to our grown readers, whom we may induce to place these Maps upon their shelves. For ordinary purposes they seem to us as perfect as need be; we leave to teachers the task of appreciating them as *school* Maps. The plates are exquisitely engraved, and the colouring throws each portion into a striking and agreeable relief: the simple plan of uniformly distinguishing water from land by its bright blue colour greatly facilitates the use of the Maps. The Index contains every name on every map. The *Physical Atlas* is an extremely interesting and valuable work, and has not the same rivalry to contend with as the *Geographical Atlas*. Students of Natural History will find it a great acquisition: especially the four last maps, which display the distribution of Vegetable Life, of Animal Life, of Races of Men, and of Religions. A mere glance at these distributions will impress his mind with a sense of the intimate correlation of organic life with physical conditions; while a survey of the whole must suggest to him a variety of new ideas on this great subject.

The Master Engineers and their Workmen. Three Lectures. By J. M. Ludlow, Barrister. J. J. Bezer, Fleet-street.

We would have noticed these admirable Lectures earlier, if possible, on account of their reference to the present contest between the Engineers and the Employed. Mr. Ludlow has compressed into these Addresses a very useful statement of the Political Economy, and, what is of scarcely less commercial consequence, the Morality, involved in this important struggle. It is not possible for many persons to have followed this discussion through the tedious and tortuous comments bestowed upon it by the daily press. To such as may not have pursued this controversy—to such as may not have succeeded in getting at the real and practical points in dispute, these pages will be invaluable. Mr. Ludlow states the case with great scrupulousness, and is in all respects a trustworthy and well-informed authority, and the publication of these Lectures is as useful as it is timely. Seldom has the difficult office of mediatorial advocacy between contending parties been assumed more judiciously, and conducted more dispassionately. The Workmen may consult these pages for instruction and guidance, and the Masters for information, which neither party will find elsewhere so succinctly rendered. It is right also to say, that Mr. Ludlow is not a partisan, any more than his colleague, Mr. Vansittart Neale, who preceded him in an able contribution to the polemics of this contest.

Hearts and Altars. By Robert Bell. Author of "The Ladder of Gold," &c. 3 vols. Colburn and Co.

ROBERT BELL has a cultivated talent. The liberal gifts of Nature have been liberally used, and trained into varied and successful activity. To considerable knowledge of books and observation of life, he brings the graces of a pleasant and picturesque style, so that his stories have the twofold advantage of satisfying the fastidious while delighting the novel reader. The three volumes now lying before us are composed of stories which have already appeared elsewhere; some of them were noticed by us on their first appearance; we cannot, therefore, (with so many books claiming notice at our hands,) do more than announce the publication, and recommend the lovers of psychological fiction to the strange story of *Phantoms and Realities*, and the lovers of Scott-like romance to the *Armourer of Munster*.

The Works of Plato. A new and literal version. Vol. V., containing *The Laws*.
By George Burges, M.A. (Bohn's Classical Library.) H. G. Bohn.

THIS, the fifth volume of the translation of Plato, which Mr. Bohn, with commendable daring, has ventured on publishing, contains the important treatise on *The Laws*, which the student should take up after carefully going through the *Republic*. It was obviously composed many years subsequent to the composition of the *Republic*, and is interesting as containing Plato's more matured opinions on politics. In form it is the least ornate and least interesting of all his works. If it be possible for a translator to drive away the student, Mr. George Burges is the man. He is more repulsive than Taylor; for while quite as obscure, he is a worse writer, and his notes are perpetual offences.

How to see the British Museum in Four Visits. By W. Blanchard Jerrold.
Bradbury and Evans.

MR. BLANCHARD JERROLD'S useful little book, *How to see the Great Exhibition in Four Visits*, obviously suggested a similar work on the more permanent subject of the British Museum. As a guide-book through that vast collection, it will be prized for the simplicity of its arrangement and the clearness of its style.

A Practical Treatise on the Diseases of the Lungs and Heart, including the Principles of Physical Diagnosis. By Walter Hayle Walshe, M.D.
Taylor, Walton, and Maberly.

WE have been tempted to give an extended notice of this excellent work, but the fear of its being too exclusively professional has restrained us. To students we address this note. Dr. Walshe here describes the facts and principles of physical diagnosis in their applications to lungs, heart, and the larger vessels; the principles of inspection, mensuration, auscultation, and percussion. Having illustrated these with great minuteness and lucidity, he proceeds to an elaborate investigation of the symptoms, physical signs, diagnosis, and treatment, of the chief diseases of lungs, heart, and aorta. The book is a very valuable addition to pathological literature.

Homœopathy in 1851. Edited by J. Rutherford Russell, M.D.
Groombridge and Sons.

THOSE interested in the squabbles of Old and Young Physic—of homœopathy and allopathy—will thank Dr. Russell for this amusing volume of papers illustrative of the position maintained by Young Physic. We have already, on more than one occasion, indicated our neutral position in the dispute, anxious as we are for free discussion of all matters.

Horses: their Varieties, Breeding, and Management, in Health and Disease. By D. H. Richardson. (Richardson's Rural Handbooks.) W. S. Orr and Co.

MR. MILBURN has revised Richardson's compact and very readable handbook on the breeding and management of horses. Harrison Weir has illustrated it; and Messrs. Orr offer it among their *Rural Handbooks* for one shilling!

The Upper Ten Thousand: Sketches of American Society. By a New Yorker.
John W. Parker and Son.

THESE sketches, which originally appeared in the pleasant pages of *Fraser's Magazine*, deserved gathering into a volume, for they present a picture of American aristocratism more vivid and acceptable than any other work we have seen. We noticed them on their first appearance, and need only mention the fact of their separate publication.

Life Assurance: its Schemes, its Difficulties, and its Abuses. W. S. D. Bateman.
Para Bellum. Brief Suggestions on the subject of War and Invasion. John Chapman.
Bohn's Illustrated Library.—Battles of the British Navy. By Joseph Allen, Vol. II. H. G. Bohn.

Bohn's Standard Library.—The Principal Works and Remains of the Rev. Andrew Fuller. By his Son, Rev. A. G. Fuller. H. G. Bohn.

Bohn's Scientific Library.—Cosmos: a Sketch of the Physical Description of the Universe. By A. von Humboldt. H. G. Bohn.

Bohn's Classical Library.—Orations of Marcus Tullius Cicero. By C. D. Yonge. H. G. Bohn.

Canada, as it was, is, and may be. By Sir R. H. Bonnycastle. 2 vols. Colburn and Co.

Use and Abuse; or, Right and Wrong in relation to Labour, Capital, Machinery, and Land. By William M'Combie. Ward and Co.

L'Éco, di Savonarola Foglio Mensile. Nos. I., II., and III. Partridge and Oakley.

Lena; or, the Silent Woman. By the Author of "King's Cope," &c. 3 vols. Smith, Elder, and Co.

Portfolio.

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

THE HAYTHORNE PAPERS,

NO. II.—THE DEVELOPMENT HYPOTHESIS.

IN a debate upon the development hypothesis, lately narrated to me by a friend, one of the disputants was described as arguing that, as in all our experience we know of no such phenomenon as the transmutation of species, it is unphilosophical to assume that transmutation of species ever takes place. Had I been present, I think that, passing over his assertion, which is open to criticism, I should have replied that, as in all our experience we have never known a species created, it was, by his own showing, unphilosophical to assume that any species ever had been created.

Those who cavalierly reject the theory of Lamarck and his followers, as not adequately supported by facts, seem quite to forget that their own theory is supported by no facts at all. Like the majority of men who are born to a given belief, they demand the most rigorous proof of any adverse doctrine, but assume that their own doctrine needs none. Here we find scattered over the globe vegetable and animal organisms numbering, of the one kind (according to Humboldt), some 320,000 species, and of the other, if we include insects, some two millions of species (see Carpenter); and if to these we add the numbers of animal and vegetable species that have become extinct (bearing in mind how geological records prove that, from the earliest appearance of life down to the present time, different species have been successively replacing each other, so that the world's Flora and Fauna have completely changed many times over), we may safely estimate the number of species that have existed, and are existing on the earth, at

not less than ten millions. Well, which is the most rational theory about these ten millions of species? Is it most likely that there have been ten millions of special creations? or is it most likely that by continual modifications, due to change of circumstances, ten millions of varieties may have been produced, as varieties are being produced still? One of the two theories must be adopted. Which is most countenanced by facts?

Doubtless many will reply that they can more easily conceive ten millions of special creations to have taken place, than they can conceive that ten millions of varieties have been produced by the process of perpetual modification. All such, however, will find, on candid inquiry, that they are under an illusion. This is one of the many cases in which men do not really believe, but rather believe they believe. It is not that they can truly conceive ten millions of special creations to have taken place, but that they think they can do so. A little careful introspection will show them that they have never yet realized to themselves the creation of even one species. If they have formed a definite conception of the process, they will be able to answer such questions as—How is a new species constructed? and How does it make its appearance? Is it thrown down from the clouds? or must we hold to the notion that it struggles up out of the ground? Do its limbs and viscera rush together from all the points of the compass? or must we receive some such old Hebrew notion as, that God goes into a forest-cavern, and there takes clay and moulds a new creature? If they say that a new creature is produced in none of these modes, which are too absurd to be believed, then they are required to describe the mode in which a new creature may be produced—a mode which does not seem absurd; and such a mode they will find that they neither have conceived nor can conceive.

Should the believers in special creations consider it unfair thus to call upon them to describe how special creations take place, I reply, that this is far less than they demand from the supporters of the development hypothesis. They are merely asked to point out a conceivable mode; on the other hand, they ask, not simply for a conceivable mode, but for the actual mode. They do not say—Show us how this may take place; but they say—Show us how this does take place. So far from its being unreasonable to ask so much of them, it would be reasonable to ask not only for a possible mode of special creation, but for an ascertained mode; seeing that this is no greater a demand than they make upon their opponents.

And here we may perceive how much more defensible the new doctrine is than the old one. Even could the supporters of the development hypothesis merely show that the production of species by the process of modification is conceivable, they would be in a better position than their opponents. But they can do much more than this. They can show that the process of modification has effected and is effecting great changes in all organisms subject to modifying influences. Though, from the impossibility of getting at a sufficiency of facts, they are unable to trace the many phases through which any existing species has passed in arriving at its present form, or to identify the influences which caused the successive modifications, yet they can show that any existing species—animal or vegetable—when placed under conditions different from its previous ones, immediately begins to undergo certain changes of structure fitting it for the new conditions. They can show that in successive generations these changes continue until ultimately the new conditions become the natural ones. They can show that in cultivated plants, in domesticated animals, and in the several races of men, these changes have uniformly taken place. They can show that the degrees of difference so produced are often, as in dogs, greater than those on which distinctions of species are in other cases founded. They can show that it is a matter of dispute whether some of these modified forms are varieties or separate species. They can show, too, that the changes daily taking place in ourselves—the facility that attends long practice, and the loss of aptitude that begins when practice ceases—the strengthening of passions habitually gratified, and the weakening of those habitually curbed—the development of every faculty, bodily, moral, or intellectual, according to the use made of it—are all explicable on this same principle. And thus they can show that throughout all organic nature there is at work a modifying influence of the kind they assign as the cause of these specific differences—an influence which, though slow in its action, does, in time, if the circumstances demand it, produce marked changes—an influence which, to all appearance, would produce in the millions of years, and under the great varieties of condition which geological records imply, any amount of change.

Which, then, is the most rational hypothesis; that of special creations which has neither a fact to support it nor is even definitely conceivable; or that of modification, which is not only definitely conceivable, but is countenanced by the habitudes of every existing organism?

That by any series of changes a zoophyte should ever become a mammal, seems to those who are not familiar with zoology, and who have not seen how clear becomes the relationship between the simplest and the most complex forms, when all intermediate forms are examined, a very grotesque notion. Habitually looking at things rather in their statical than in their dynamical aspect, they never realize the fact that, by small increments of modification, any amount of modification may in time be generated. That surprise which they feel on finding one whom they last saw as a boy, grown into a man, becomes incredulity when the degree of change is greater. Nevertheless, abundant instances are at hand of the mode in which we may pass to the most diverse forms by insensible gradations. Arguing the

matter some time since with a learned professor, I illustrated my position thus:—You admit that there is no apparent relationship between a circle and an hyperbola. The one is a finite curve; the other is an infinite one. All parts of the one are alike; of the other no two parts are alike. The one incloses a space; the other will not inclose a space, though produced for ever. Yet opposite as are these curves in all their properties, they may be connected together by a series of intermediate curves, no one of which differs from the adjacent ones in any appreciable degree. Thus, if a cone be cut by a plane at right angles to its axis we get a circle. If, instead of being perfectly at right angles, the plane subtends with the axis an angle of $89^{\circ} 59'$, we have an ellipse which no human eye, even when aided by an accurate pair of compasses can distinguish from a circle. Decreasing the angle minute by minute the ellipse becomes first perceptibly eccentric, then manifestly so, and by and by acquires so immensely elongated a form, as to bear no recognisable resemblance to a circle. By continuing this process the ellipse passes insensibly into a parabola; and ultimately, by still further diminishing the angle, into an hyperbola. Now here we have four different species of curve—circle, ellipse, parabola, and hyperbola—each having its peculiar properties, and its separate equation, and the first and last of which are quite opposite in nature, connected together as members of one series, all producible by a single process of insensible modification.

But the blindness of those who think it absurd to suppose that complex organic forms may have arisen by successive modifications out of simple ones, becomes astonishing when we remember that complex organic forms are daily being thus produced. A tree differs from a seed immeasurably in every respect—in bulk, in structure, in colour, in form, in specific gravity, in chemical composition; differs so greatly that no visible resemblance of any kind can be pointed out between them. Yet is the one changed in the course of a few years into the other—changed so gradually, that at no moment can it be said—Now the seed ceases to be, and the tree exists. What can be more widely contrasted than a newly-born child and the small, semi-transparent, gelatinous spherule constituting the human ovum? The infant is so complex in structure that a cyclopædia is needed to describe its constituent parts. The germinal vesicle is so simple that a line will contain all that can be said of it. Nevertheless a few months suffices to develop the one out of the other, and that, too, by a series of modifications so small that were the embryo examined at successive minutes not even a microscope would disclose any sensible changes. That the uneducated and the ill-educated should think the hypothesis that all races of beings, man inclusive, may in process of time have been evolved from the simplest monad, a ludicrous one, is not to be wondered at. But for the physiologist, who knows that every individual being is so evolved, —who knows further, that in their earliest condition the germs of all plants and animals whatever are so similar, “that there is no appreciable distinction amongst them which would enable it to be determined whether a particular molecule is the germ of a conferva or of an oak, of a zoophyte or of a man” —for him to make a difficulty of the matter is inexcusable. Surely, if a single structureless cell may, when subjected to certain influences, become a man in the space of twenty years, there is nothing absurd in the hypothesis that under certain other influences, a cell may in the course of millions of years give origin to the human race. The two processes are generically the same, and differ only in length and complexity.

We have, indeed, in the part taken by many scientific men in this controversy of “Law versus Miracle,” a good illustration of the tenacious vitality of superstitions. Ask one of our leading geologists or physiologists whether he believes in the Mosaic account of the creation, and he will take the question as next to an insult. Either he rejects the narrative entirely, or understands it in some vague non-natural sense. Yet one part of it he unconsciously adopts; and that, too, literally. For, whence has he got this notion of “special creations,” which he thinks so reasonable, and fights for so vigorously. Evidently he can trace it back to no other source than this myth which he repudiates. He has not a single fact in nature to quote in proof of it; nor is he prepared with any chain of abstract reasoning by which it may be established. Catechise him, and he will be forced to confess that the notion was put into his mind in childhood as part of a story which he now thinks absurd. And why, after rejecting all the rest of this story, he should strenuously defend this last remnant of it as though he had received it on valid authority, he would be puzzled to say.

The Arts.

PAILLASSE.

“ALCIBIADES, you bite like a woman,” said the dirty-faced Athenian youth to his impetuous playfellow. “No,” replied Alcibiades, “I bite like a lion!” In a similar spirit of perfect self-appreciation, I declare that on Friday night I cried like a man, at *Paillasse*.—I cried till my head ached. This is not the highest praise to be given to a drama. The purport of Art is not to set cambric in a flutter, and to redden the noses of us elegant young fellows in the stalls; but if not the highest praise, it is praise which can rarely be given, and is earned by the exquisite truth of Frédéric and Clarisse in their representation of human suffering. Shakspeare never makes us cry; Goethe never makes us cry: but writers of mediocre talent have repeatedly drawn floods of tears. The reason is

simple: the avenue to tears is through *domestic* sorrows, and it requires little art to travel on that path. To interest us in the representation of an heroic nature storm-tost in dark perplexities, moved to its heights and depths by the incidents of fate, or by the consequences of its own errors—to raise our sympathy for a *Hamlet*, a *Lear*, an *Othello*, is inconceivably difficult, because the dramatist must make us, who are on a lower level, raise ourselves to the height of his great argument; but it is an easy task to arrest our sympathy for a dying child, a bereaved mother, a wronged husband, or any of the thousand and one *domesticities* of the drama. That it is not oftener done is the fault of the actor, who spoils, by the unreality of his acting, the effect of the scene.

That fault certainly is not attributable to Clarisse, who played the anxious, mute-despairing mother, with a minute truthfulness, an overpowering pathos not within the reach of any actress on our stage. As a whole, her part wanted relief, perhaps; but the fault does not rightly lie with her so much as with the authors. Very noticeable was her by-play, so full of pathetic significance; and never once did she let drop the Mask to show us the Actress underneath—she was the *Persona* of the wife, never relapsing into *Mdlle. Clarisse*, conscious of boxes, pit, and stalls.

And what shall I say of Frédéric Lemaitre? If last week I had to make severe objections to certain portions of his *Don César*; to-day I have nothing but unqualified applause to add to my silent tribute of tears. From first to last his acting was free, bold, picturesque, elaborate, and pathetic. His soul had passed into the mountebank's body. The minute touches were such as only an actor of genius could conceive, while at the same time the broad outline of the portrait was never lost in the detail. The look and tone with which he asks his wife whether she blushes for him, now that she is discovered to be a fine lady—the attitude and look, as he leans against the rope, in that fearful second act, when despairing thoughts of suicide hurry across his brain—the natural pride with which he lays out the shawl he has bought for his wife—his agony of mind at her flight—and the intensely pathetic manner in which, in the last act, he looks at and fondles his child, who is now blooming and healthy, and whom he must renounce, that the bloom and health may continue;—these are touches which belong to the actor, not to the authors of the piece, and they are touches no one will forget. Much as I admire Frédéric, I never admired him with the same unmisgiving fervor as on Friday night.

I have said nothing of the piece, Webster having made it familiar through *Belphegor*. It is a work of little merit beyond the scope given to Lemaitre's varied powers. It has, indeed some domestic touches that almost amount to poetry; but they are worked into a tissue of melodramatic commonplace.

Next week I shall have to tell you of *Ruy Blas*, said to be Frédéric's greatest part: is not that a temptation—the greatest part of the greatest living actor!

ALBERT SMITH ON MONT BLANC.

WHEN Madame de Stael asked Talleyrand if Napoleon had more *esprit* than she had, the wit replied, “*Madame, l'Empereur a autant d'esprit que vous—mais vous êtes plus intrépide;*” so I will say of Albert Smith; there are cleverer men, but none more intrepid! His audacity is feverish. He runs a muck against whatever is less rattling and vivacious than himself. He laughs at High Art, and “can't abide” the manifold delights of Bigwigs. You would as soon find him at luncheon reading Aristotle's Topics as listening to a Beethoven quartett at night. Shakspeare is all very well in the closet (where one doesn't read him!) but Dumas and Maquet are the boys! Philosophy slow; High Art slow; History fearfully slow; Politics slow; Private Theatricals slow; Royal Institution lectures slow; Sermons slow!—he is the great Iconoclast of the fast school, smashing with relentless laughter all the solemn shams moving around him, frankly avowing his own want of appreciation of many things which others admire, and inclined to disbelieve that any one does sincerely admire them; and thus, as the most intrepid of Iconoclasts, he comes before a public, a large portion of which heartily admires him, another portion of which does not do him justice.

I claim for Albert Smith over and above your recognition of his popular qualities, the priceless quality of frankness. He accepts no sham. He pretends to admire nothing he does not in his soul admire. He pretends to be nothing that he is not. Beethoven bores him, and he says so; how many are as wearied as he, but dare not confess it? I may object to the Iconoclastic fervour of his avowal, and refuse to accept his taste as my standard, but I applaud his intrepid sincerity in not pretending to admire that which has no power to please him. O, if men would but recognise this virtue of intrepidity! If men would but cease lying in traditionary formulas—pretending to admire, pretending to believe, and all in sheer respectability!

But I am not going to suffer my vagabond pen to wander into a discussion on Albert's general character, nor on the hypocrisy of our age; I shall have enough to do to set down my impressions of his entertainment at Egyptian Hall, under the title of *Ascent of Mont Blanc*. You read in the papers last summer, how the intrepid Albert *did* make that perilous ascent; and you have probably read in *Blackwood* his narrative of the journey. But nothing you have read or heard will convey a true conception of the variety and amusement afforded by his Entertainment, which a crammed audience seemed to think filled the pleasantest two hours that could anywhere be spent. The scenery is painted by that accomplished and poetical artist, W. Beverley, and is not only remarkable for its exquisite artistic effects, but, as I am informed by a gentleman who has made the ascent, for its life-life accuracy; so that the spectator may be said to make the ascent of Mont Blanc, while cosily seated in Egyptian Hall. The only scene I should wish omitted is that of the French Restaurant, which is singularly unlike a Restaurant, and has a quantity of figures out of all drawing, and without character. (I should add, that these figures are not Beverley's). All the rest are masterpieces of scenic effect. The snowy solitudes of those mountainous recesses are presented with enchanting *vraisemblances*; and the aerial distances *font illusion*. Very remarkable is the unceasing variety of these effects occurring amidst scenes so monotonous: here was

* Carpenter's *Principles of Physiology*. 3rd ed. p. 867.

a danger I apprehended, and I was glad to see Beverley had so skilfully avoided it.

So much for the dioramic part. The "guide, philosopher, and friend" whom we usually find expounding the text of a diorama, is in ninety-nine cases a stupendous and overpowering bore, but in the hundredth case he is Albert Smith, and sums up in himself all the entertainment missing from the ninety-nine! His illustrations of the *Ascent of Mont Blanc* are of unflagging amusement. He sings, he plays on the piano, on the horn, on the hurdy-gurdy, on the flageolette—he sketches absurd characters, he mimics all voices, he paints in a word or an accent a national peculiarity,—he never stops, he rushes on like a locomotive of fun—

With a yup, yup, yup, tra la la la la—

and the sides of the audience ache with Homeric laughter!

So much sentiment and so much fun—so much poetry of nature and so much laughter you cannot elsewhere crowd into two hours: *Avis aux amateurs!*

WHITE MAGIC.

ON Wednesday Signor Biletta's long-talked of comic Opera, *White Magic*, was produced at the Haymarket. The libretto is as nonsensical as English comic operas claim the privilege to be, without, however, their customary dulness; the jokes are of an extremely feeble and comic-opera style (such as "then it appeared you disappeared," which I do not regard as a brilliant flash); and the ballads have the poetry of opera ballads—that is to say, the heroine is told she is—as "bright as the rose" and as "pure as the lily," her eye has "priceless gems within it," while

"Her heart is heaven—ah, who shall win it?"

O'er sea and land, o'er hills and valleys,

Her beauty holds its matchless reign.

O! why was Fate unkindly!

O! how could folly blindly

Divide us with its idle malice?"

The "poet" is anonymous; if he is wise he will studiously remain so. He will pant for obscurity, and deathless unrenown!

Happily, the music makes amends. It is light, facile, flowing, gay, and fresh. Although an Italian, Signor Biletta has skilfully avoided the old familiar phrases of the modern Italian school—he has avoided even their languid rhythms and Bellini sweetnesses; the school he belongs to is rather that of Auber, from whom he has caught something of the dancing rhythm and piquant orchestral effects, not to mention an occasional melodic reminiscence. Although not rich in melodic ideas, the writing is entitled to the rare praise of originality. By which I mean, that although the ideas themselves may not always be new, yet they are re-created in his new combinations, and bear the character of having flowed spontaneously from him: *elles coulent de source!* There are some passages where the writing is wide of the mark, and one unhappy attempt at a Balfé Ballad—

"You are bright as the rose that looks up to the sun;"

the failure of which will, I hope, warn Signor Biletta off that clap-trap and sickly ground; for he is capable of writing very charming music, such as will create a more lasting reputation than all the "Hearts bowed down with weight of woes" that ever "Dreamt in marble halls." But with these trifling exceptions, the opera went delightfully—the music having life and gaiety in its pleasant flow. Its success was genuine. I hope it will inaugurate a series of successes. We are sadly in want of new operas, and do not want grand operas.

On the whole, the execution was excellent. Louisa Pyne was more charming than ever, the little chubby *odou* syren that she is! Her singing was joyous and gracefully piquant, and would have saved any music. Signor Biletta had fitted her to perfection, and she returned him the compliment by singing his music faultlessly. Nothing could be more elegant than her singing of the elegant romance, "O was I then awake or dreaming?" if she had not marred one passage by the introduction of a common-place cadence—an introduction inexcusable in such a mistress of *fioriture!* Her sister played the part of a *soubrette* with some drollery. Weiss sang a good part with care and effect, though occasionally bawling, and singing his tenderness, like a stentor, at the pit, instead of singing it in Louisa's ear! As for Mr. Harrison—the true British tenor—he sang with his throat, his nose, and his calves, and was much applauded by a delicately discriminating part of the audience. The opera succeeded although he sang in it.

VIVIAN.

ENGLISH CONVERSATION.—The superficiality and insipidity of nearly all the conversations to which I have listened, or in which I have joined, is really depressing. As far as I hear, little is said about politics, which is a good thing,—much better than our German mania for going beyond our depth on such subjects; but, that narrative and common-places form the whole staple of conversation, from which all philosophy is excluded,—that enthusiasm and loftiness of expression are entirely wanting, depresses me more than any personal neglect of which, as a stranger, I might have to complain; for of this my share is not large, and I bear it easily.—*Niebuhr's Life and Letters.*

CONVICTIONS.—Deep in the foundations of his character, like the immovable blocks whereon great edifices repose, each man has to lay down for himself certain thoughts, sooner or later, of passing consequence, got out of secret and manifold communings regarding the great mystery of here and hereafter; and on these thoughts again, and the more happily and grandly as these thoughts are strong, there will still base and pile themselves, in some loose order or other, conclusions, sentiments, and diverse predilections, extracted painfully or otherwise out of the experience that is gone

through of life and its ways, and then employed back again in the scrutiny and contemplation of all that the world presents.—*North British Review*, No. XXXII.

Commercial Affairs.

MONEY MARKET AND CITY INTELLIGENCE.

SATURDAY MORNING, March 20.

THE Funds have this week been exceedingly buoyant; not, however, in consequence of the confidence reposed in the new Government, but from causes independent of them, such as the favourable intelligence (perhaps over-rated) respecting the Caffre war, the conversion of the French 5 per cents. a measure much approved of, and last, not least, the pressure upon the market of unemployed capital, to which there are daily large additions. The stock of bullion in the Bank coffers is now little short of twenty millions sterling.

Consols opened on Monday at 97½, 98, afterwards touched 89½, and closed yesterday at 98½.

Exchequer Bills have commanded 65 to 68 premium. The Foreign Market has been active, and in Buenos Ayres Bonds more especially the operations have been large and at imposing prices.

In Railway Shares there has been much business done, and quotations in many instances are higher.

ROYAL ITALIAN OPERA.

IN our Postscript, last week, we were able to announce the opening of the ROYAL ITALIAN OPERA, for its sixth season, on Tuesday, the 23rd instant. Passers-by inform me that the favoured, if not strictly fashionable, locality of Bow-street begins (to pass from the penny-a-liner to Bunn) to "throw off its winter garb of woe," and (to return to the penny-a-liner) to "wear an unusually animated appearance." In my own substantial language, I should say that Bow-street is already preparing to escape from the fell monopoly of imperious "Peelers" and dreary prison-vans. A furtive glimpse of the interior, through the grand entrance, brought back to me a world of delightful recollections. Ah! it must be confessed that at the end of July one conceives the possibility of living even without the Opera; but in March! perhaps we think the Opera one of the few things worth living for. And lo! here we are at the sixth season. Well, the directors (nothing like a majestic plural) have acted with a wise liberality in not reposing on the success of last year—a success, it may be remembered, more than commensurate with the satisfaction of the audiences; for many and frequent and grave were the *contretemps* that beset the direction, and disappointed the public, last year. Therefore, I say, that not to have relied on the great success of last year, but to have strengthened and enlarged the resources of attraction, is a policy as wise as it is liberal, and it will assuredly have its reward. This year's programme has an air of quiet certainty and confidence about it which is better than a budget of promises.

Costa's glorious band, modified only by accessions; the choral forces increased in efficiency (there was a little falling off in that quarter last year); Mario (we trust in renewed voice); Grisi, Tamberlik, and Ronconi, loaded with the spoils of Russia and with imperial honours; Viardot and Castellan not forgotten; Tagliafico, always a thorough artist; and others, if not named here, not less remembered; with our old friend Marini again, and a batch of new tenors, such as Herr Ander, the Vienna Prophète, and Guémard, the latest successor to Duprez, of Paris; and a soprano or two not unknown to continental fame; and a new contralto, who has the courage to take the place of Alboni and of Angri (what can we say more?); and the ballet recruited in its *personnel*, and restored to some prominence, (but only, we trust, as a *divertissement*), "is not this a dainty dish to set before a king?"

Weber's *Oberon*, duce Costa, Spohr's *Faust*, Rossini's *Comte Ory*, of delicious memory, and last, not least, *Pietro Il Grande*, by the immortal Jullien, which I believe, and predict, will startle into admiration the most sceptical, for it will, I feel sure, contain melody, skill, *esprit*, originality, colour, grace, sustained but not overlaid by science. These are tempting "features" for a programme. Meanwhile let us wish a hearty and genuine success to the *Royal Italian Opera* and to all whom it may concern!

LE CHAT-HUANT.

TURNER'S SHIPWRECK.

ABOUT to be engraved by Cousins, Turner's "Shipwreck" has been exhibited in the usual way, at the house of Messrs. Paul and Dominic Colnaghi. It is esteemed one of his finest works, before his manner had grown so eccentric and unruly, and it is a very striking scene.

The hulk of the great ship lies on her beam ends, the mass forming a kind of wall that shuts in the view to the left of the spectator; under the lee, boats are engaged in picking up the passengers, many of whom are still seen clustering on the wreck. A misty, murky light gleams away to windward, lending a glare of horror to the conflict of waters and wind.

Described in general terms, the picture would tell as one of unqualified greatness; and yet it is not so. There is a confusion in the painting as well as in the scene. Turner laboured, perhaps, under the false idea, that to paint a storm with effect, there should be a storm also in the palette. And some traits of the scene are positively wrong, such as the angular and even quadrate forms into which the waters are tossed—a trait which we doubt on the *windward* side of billows, however vehemently heaving and confusedly broken. Call it a great quasi-finished sketch, under correction, and it is a fine conception powerfully indicated, but it fails of perfect truth.

For the engraver it furnishes an "indication" proportionately powerful; and he will be able to soften its inaccuracies, while he will probably bestow a little judicious light on its obscurities. We have no doubt that it will be a fine engraving.

BRITISH FUNDS FOR THE PAST WEEK. (CLOSING PRICES.)

	Satur.	Mond.	Tues.	Wedn.	Thurs.	Frid.
Bank Stock	shut	220½
3 per Cent. Red.	shut	98½
3 per Cent. Con. Ans.	97½	98	98	98½	98½	98½
3 per Cent. An. 1726
3 per Cent. Con., Ac.	97½	98	98½	98½	98½
3½ per Cent. An.	100	99½
New 5 per Cents.
Long Ans., 1860	shut
Ind. St. 10½ per Cent.	260½
Ditto Bonds, £1000	73 p	73 p	73 p	70 p	77 p
Ex. Bills, £1000	67 p	68 p	68 p	65 p	68 p	69 p
Ditto, £500	67 p	68 p	68 p	65 p	68 p	69 p
Ditto, Small	67 p	68 p	68 p	65 p	68 p	69 p

FOREIGN FUNDS.

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

Brazilian Small	100	Peruvian, Account	105
Buenos Ayres, Acct.	78	Peruvian Deferred	35
Chilian 3 per Cents.	69	Portuguese 4 p. Ct. Acct.	104½
Danish 3 per Cents.	70½	Russian 4½ p. Cents.	63
Danish 5 per Cents.	103	Sardinian 5 p. Cent. Acct.	51
Dutch 2½ per Cents.	60½	Spanish Passives.	43½
Dutch 4 per Cent. Certif.	95½	Spanish 3 per Cents.	19½
Ecuador	51	Spanish 3 p. Ct. New Def.	3
Granada, ex Dec. 1849	24½	Spanish Com. Certif.	45
Granada Deferred	10½	Venezuela	10
Mexican, 1846	32½	Venezuela Deferred

CORN EXCHANGE.

The Corn Market has continued inactive, and wheat is about 1s. per quarter cheaper. In Colonial produce the transactions have been very limited, and Sugar more particularly is dull of sale except at reduced prices.

FROM THE LONDON GAZETTE. Tuesday, March 19.

BANKRUPTS.—J. FRANKLIN, of Great Marlow, innkeeper, to surrender March 27, April 30; solicitor, Mr. Spicer, 118, Chancery-lane; official assignee, Mr. Whitmore, 2, Basinghall-street. S. GASH, of Hatcham New Town, Camberwell, builder, March 27, April 27; solicitors, Messrs. Lawrance, Plews, and Boyer; official assignee, Mr. Johnson, 20, Basinghall-street. H. HOLLAND, of 1, Eldon-road, Kensington, builder, April 2 and 27; solicitor, Mr. Moxon, 27, Southampton-buildings, Chancery-lane; official assignee, Mr. Groom, 12, Abchurch-lane, Lombard-street. G. WARHURST, of Leigh, Lancashire, April 2 and 29; solicitor, Mr. Slater, Manchester; official assignee, Mr. Mackenzie, Manchester. T. LORD, of Ashton-under-Lyne, Lancashire, boot-maker, March 29, April 26; solicitor, Mr. Cobbett, Manchester; official assignee, Mr. Pott, Manchester. R. DILKES, of Warrington, Lancashire, innkeeper, March 26, April 19; solicitor, Mr. Nicholson, Warrington; official assignee, Mr. Fraser, Manchester. W. HOUGH, jun., of Rochdale, Lancashire, joiner, March 30, April 27; solicitor, Mr. Downen, Rochdale; official assignee, Mr. Fraser, Manchester. R. JAMES, of Lenton, Nottinghamshire, lacemaker, March 26, April 23; solicitors, Messrs. Battery and Son; official assignee, Mr. Bittleston, Nottingham.

Friday, March 19.

BANKRUPTS.—W. GREEN, Coggeshall, builder, to surrender March 30, April 29; solicitors, Messrs. Nichols and Clarke, Cooke's-court, Carey-street; official assignee, Mr. Bell, Coleman-street-buildings. C. KLUG, New Bond-street, valentia arabica importer, March 30, April 29; solicitors, Messrs. Sharpe, Field, and Co., Bedford-row; official assignee, Mr. Johnson, Basinghall-street. J. BRANCH, High-street, Camberwell, corn dealer, March 27, April 30; solicitor, Mr. Wilson, Gresham-street; official assignee, Mr. Cannan, Aldermanbury. R. WOOD, Wardour-street, Soho, upholsterer, March 30, April 30; solicitor, Mr. Kinsey, Bloomsbury-square; official assignee, Mr. Graham. J. DORMOZ, Charles-street, St. John's-wood, Portland-town, grocer, March 22, May 1; solicitor, Mr. Cooke, Lincoln's-inn-fields; official assignee, Mr. Pennell, Guildhall-chambers, Basinghall-street. B. SMITH, Droitwich, salt manufacturer, March 31, April 29; solicitors, Messrs. Mottram, Knight, and Emmet, Birmingham; official assignee, Mr. Christie, Birmingham. G. HENNEY, Elmley Lovett, Worcestershire, victualler, March 31, April 29; solicitor, Mr. Smith, Birmingham; official assignee, Mr. Whitmore, Birmingham. J. GREENE, jun., Wigan, ironmonger, April 1 and 22; solicitor, Mr. Barrow, Wigan; official assignee, Mr. Lee, Manchester.

STEAM TO INDIA, CHINA, &c.—

Particulars of the regular Monthly Mail Steam Conveyance and of the additional lines of communication, now established by the Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Company with the East, &c. The Company book passengers, and receive goods and parcels as heretofore for CEYLON, MADRAS, CALCUTTA, PENANG, SINGAPORE, and HONG KONG, by their steamers, starting from SOUTHAMPTON on the 20th of every month, and from SUEZ on or about the 8th of the month. The next extra Steamer will be despatched from Southampton for Alexandria on the 3rd of April next, in combination with an extra Steamer, to leave Calcutta on or about March 20. Passengers may be booked, and goods and parcels forwarded, by these extra steamers to or from SOUTHAMPTON, ALEXANDRIA, ADEN, CEYLON, MADRAS, and CALCUTTA.

BOMBAY.—The Company will book passengers throughout from Southampton to Bombay by their steamers leaving England on the 20th February, 20th March, and of alternate months thereafter, such passengers being conveyed from Aden to Bombay by their steamers appointed to leave Bombay on the 17th February, 1st of April, and 1st of alternate months thereafter, and affording, in connexion with the steamers leaving Calcutta on the 8th of February, 20th of March, and of alternate months thereafter, direct conveyance for passengers, parcels, and goods from Bombay and Western India.

Passengers for Bombay can also proceed by this Company's Steamers of the 29th of the month to Malta, thence to Alexandria by her Majesty's steamers, and from Suez by the Honourable East India Company's steamers.

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

SPAIN AND PORTUGAL.—Vigo, Oporto, Lisbon, Cadiz, and Gibraltar, on the 7th, 17th, and 27th of the month. N.B.—Steam-ships of the Company now ply direct between Calcutta, Penang, Singapore, and Hong Kong, and between Hong Kong and Shanghai.

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

CORK HATS.—The manufacture of these Hats was so defective last season on the part of most houses, as to lead the public, in many cases, to condemn one of the greatest improvements that has been effected since the introduction of Silk Hats, whilst the manual difficulty in learning the use of a new material still deters others of acknowledged reputation from attempting to produce them.

It is, however, now indisputable that Cork employed skillfully does form the best material for Hats, being durable from its toughness, and the only elastic and cool foundation for the Silk covering now universally in use.

The public are cautioned to purchase these Hats only of experienced makers. Exhibited at the Great Exhibition, Class 28, No. 125.

CORK HATS.—CLASSES { 6, No. 58. 28, " 125.

These Hats, shown in the above Classes at the Great Exhibition by Messrs. GAIMES, SANDERS, and NICOL, and which are now held in the highest estimation for their elasticity, lightness, and general comfort to the wearer, may be obtained, wholesale or retail, of the Manufacturers, at 22, Riekin Lane, Cornhill; at their Branch Establishment, No. 111, Strand; at all the principal towns in England and Scotland; several of the continental cities; and at any of the British Colonies. Weight from 4 ounces, prices varying as with other Hats, Sample Cases forwarded on receiving remittances.

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 of 1852 will commence on SATURDAY NEXT, MARCH 27th.

In announcing the present, the Sixth Season of the Royal Italian Opera, the Directors feel it almost unnecessary to repeat their assurances, or to reiterate their pledges of former Seasons, as to the future conduct of this great Lyrical Establishment; hoping that the manner in which they have hitherto conducted it will be accepted by their Patrons, as the best guarantee for its future management.

During the extraordinary Season of the past year, the Audiences of the Royal Italian Opera numbered among them some of the most eminent Musical Professors and Amateurs of Europe, many of whom were intimately acquainted with the great Lyrical Theatres of Italy, France, and Germany; and it must be a matter of pride and gratification to the English Public, as well as to the Directors themselves, to know that the Royal Italian Opera (both as regards the extraordinary talent of its individual Artists, as well its general completeness and perfection as a whole,) was pronounced by these distinguished persons to stand unrivalled among its European Competitors.

By the following outline of the arrangements for the Present Season it will be seen that not only have the most distinguished Artists of last Season been re-engaged, but that others, now occupying the highest positions in the Continental Theatres, have been added to the Establishment. The Orchestra and Chorus have received several important additions; and it will also be found that in the department of the Ballet (which will still be limited to short Divertissements, and to those Dances incidental to the Operas,) a very considerable augmentation in the personnel has taken place. In fact, extensive as the Company of the Royal Italian Opera hitherto has been, the assemblage of Artists this year will be found to surpass that of any former Season.

The Répertoire of THE ROYAL ITALIAN OPERA now consists of THIRTY-SIX OPERAS, each of which is complete in Scenery, Costumes, and Appointments.

Table listing operas and their composers: SEMIRAMIDE (Rossini), LA DONNA DEL LAGO (Rossini), L'ITALIANA IN ALGERI (Rossini), IL BARBIERE DI SEVIGLIA (Rossini), LA GAZZA LADRA (Rossini), IL TANCREDI (Rossini), LA CENERENTOLA (Rossini), GUGLIELMO TELL (Rossini), MOSE IN EGITTO (ZORA) (Rossini), OTELLO (Verdi), ERANI (Verdi), I DUE FOSCARI (Verdi), NABUCCO (ANATO) (Verdi), NORMA (Bellini), LA SONNAMBULA (Bellini), I PUEBTANI (Bellini), I CAPULETTI E MONTECCHI (Meyerbeer), LES HUGUENOTS (Meyerbeer), ROBERT LE DIABLE (Meyerbeer), LE PROPHETE (Donizetti), LUCIA DI LAMMERMOOR (Donizetti), L'ELISIR D'AMORE (Donizetti), LUCREZIA BOGGIA (Donizetti), ANNA BOLNA (Donizetti), MARIA DI ROHAN (Donizetti), LA FAVORITA (Donizetti), LINDA DI CHAMOUNI (Mozart), IL FLAUTO MAGICO (Mozart), DON GIOVANNI (Mozart), LE NOZZE DI FIGARO (Auber), MASANIELLO (Cimarosa), IL MATRIMONIO SEGRETO (Halévy), LA JUIVE (Weber), DER FREISCHUTZ (Gounod), FIDELIO (Beethoven).

During the Season, the following Operas will be produced:—SPHÈRE'S Opera of FAUST.

The Directors have the satisfaction to announce, that they have made an arrangement with the great Composer, Herr SPHÈRE, to produce this Grand Romantic Opera. The Recitatives (necessary in the Adaptation of the Opera to the Italian Stage) have been written by the Composer expressly for THE ROYAL ITALIAN OPERA, and the whole Work will be arranged and produced under his direction.

An entirely new Grand Opera, composed by Monsieur JULIEN, entitled PIETRO IL GRANDE.

ROSSINI'S Favourite Opera LE COMTE ORY.

As performed at the Académie Royale at Paris.

WEBER'S Fairy Opera, OBERON.

The Libretto, with the addition of Recitatives, having been expressly re-arranged by the Author, J. R. PLANCK, Esq.

DONIZETTI'S Grand Opera, LES MARTYRS.

As performed at the Académie Royale at Paris.

The ENGAGEMENTS for the present Season are:—

SOPRANI.

Madame GRISI,

Madame CASTELLAN,

Mademoiselle BERTRANDI,

AND

Madame VIARDOT,

ALSO,

Mademoiselle ANNA ZERRR,

(From the Imperial Theatre of Vienna.)

AND

Madame GAZZANIGA,

(Of the Teatro della Scala at Milan.)

An engagement has also been offered to Madame MEDORI,

(Of the Imperial Theatre of St. Petersburg.)

CONTRALTO.

Mademoiselle THERESA SEGUIN.

(Her first appearance in England.)

SECONDA DONNA. Mademoiselle COTTI.

TENORI.

Signor MARIO, Signor STIGELLI, Signor LUIGI MEI, Signor SOLDI,

AND Signor TAMBELLIK.

ALSO,

Signor GALVANI,

(From the Teatro della Scala at Milan, his First Appearance in England.)

Herr ANDER,

(Principal Tenor of the Imperial Theatre at Vienna, his First Appearance in England.)

AND

Monsieur GUIEMARD,

(Principal Tenor of the Académie Royale at Paris, his First Appearance in England.)

BASSI BARITONI.

Signor RONCONI,

Signor BOMMI,

AND

Signor BARTOLINI,

(From the Italian Opera of Palermo, his First Appearance in England.)

BASSI PROFONDI.

Herr FORMES,

Signor TAGLIAFICO,

Signor POLONINI,

Signor GREGORIO,

Signor RACHE,

AND

Signor MARINI,

(His First Appearance these Three Years.)

DIRECTOR OF THE MUSIC, COMPOSER, AND CONDUCTOR, Mr. COSTA.

The MILITARY BAND will be under the superintendance of Mr. GODFREY.

Maestro al Piano: Signor PANIZZA, (From the Teatro della Scala at Milan.) Prompter: Signor MONTERASI, Poet: Signor MAGGIORI.

In accordance with a wish, very generally expressed by the Subscribers, a short Divertissement will be performed on those evenings when the Opera given is not sufficiently long to form the evening's entertainment. This arrangement will avoid the necessity for giving portions only of other Operas; a plan, except on extraordinary occasions, subject to much objection. In order to meet this arrangement, the following engagements have been made:—

Mademoiselle ROBERT, (From the Académie Royale at Paris.) Mademoiselle LOUISE TAGLIONI, AND Mademoiselle BRUSSI, (From the Imperial Theatre at Vienna.)

Mademoiselle LEBLOND, Mademoiselle KOLEMBERG, Mademoiselle BELLOTTI, AND Mademoiselle L. BELLOTTI, (Their First Appearance in England.)

Monsieur MINARD, Monsieur FLUSSE, AND Monsieur RUAULT, (Their First Appearance in England.)

The CORPS DE BALLET will also be augmented, and embrace several Dances from Paris, being their First Appearance in England.

Maitre de Ballet, Monsieur ALEXANDRE. Leader of the Ballet, Mr. ALFRED MELLON. Director of the Mise-en-Scène, Monsieur LAURENT, (From the Théâtre National Paris.) Artistes Costumiers, Mrs. E. BAXBY and Madame MARZIO, Decorator, Mr. PRSCOTT. Machinist, Mr. ALLEN. SCENIC ARTISTS, MESSRS. GRIEVE and TELBIN.

Tickets, Stalls, and Boxes, for the Night or Season, to be obtained at the Box Office of the Theatre, (corner of Bow-street and Hart-street); and at the principal Libraries and Music Sellers. The Performances will commence at Eight o'clock on each evening. The Box Office is open from Eleven to Five o'clock. ROYAL ITALIAN OPERA, COVENT GARDEN, March, 1852.

French Plays.

Lessee, Mr. JOHN MITCHELL, 33, Old Bond-street. Seventh appearance of the eminent actor, Monsieur FREDERIC LEMAITRE, and Mdlle. CLARISSE.

Not an order will be given during M. F. Lemaitre's engagement. On Monday evening, March 22, the entertainments will commence at Eight o'clock precisely, with, (for the second time in this country,) Victor Hugo's celebrated Drama of RUY BLAS. Ruy Blas, M. F. LEMAITRE. And on Wednesday, March 24, the Popular and Favorite Play of L'AUBERGE DES ADRESSES. Mr. Mitchell respectfully announces that the engagement of Mons. Frédéric Lemaitre must unavoidably terminate at the end of the ensuing week.

SHAKESPEARE AND MENDELSSOHN. ST. JAMES'S THEATRE.

MRS. FANNY KEMBLE.—MIDSUMMER NIGHT'S DREAM, with the Music of Mendelssohn.—Mrs. Fanny Kemble will have the honour of Reading at the St. James's Theatre, on MONDAY MORNING, March 22, and again on THURSDAY MORNING, March 25, commencing on each occasion at Half-past Two o'clock, Shakespeare's Play of MIDSUMMER NIGHT'S DREAM, accompanied by the performance of Mendelssohn's music, under the direction of Mr. Lucas.—Boxes, 4s. Pit, 2s. Amphitheatre, 1s. 6d.—Boxes, stalls, and tickets may be secured at Mr. Mitchell's Royal Library, 33, Old Bond Street; also at the principal Libraries and music-sellers; and at the Box-office.

INSURANCE AGAINST RAILWAY ACCIDENTS, by THE RAILWAY PASSENGERS' ASSURANCE COMPANY.—Empowered by Special Act of Parliament (12 and 13 Vic. cap. 40.)—Offices, No. 3, Old Broad Street, London.

Chairman—J. D. PAUL, Esq., 217, Strand.
Deputy-Chairman—G. B. HARRISON, Esq., 24, Gt. Tower Street.

TABLE OF PREMIUMS.

Tickets, insuring against accident for a single journey, whatever its length, may be obtained at most railway stations, at the following rates:—

3d. to insure £1000, in a first-class carriage.
2d. to insure £500, in a second-class do.
1d. to insure £200, in a third-class do.

For the convenience of frequent travellers, periodical tickets are issued, which give the holder the option of travelling in any class carriage and on any railway, and may be obtained of the various Agents, or at the Offices of the Company.

To insure £1000, at an annual premium of 20s.
To insure £200, at an annual premium of 5s.

These sums to be paid to the legal representatives of the holder, in the event of fatal accident while travelling by railway, with proportionate compensation to himself in case of personal injury.

WM. JOHN VIAN, Secretary.

3, Old Broad Street, London.

TO THE INDUSTRIAL CLASSES.—

Suppose a man at the age of thirty, wishes to leave £20 to his widow, children, or any one whom he chooses, he will have to pay 10d. per month, or about the cost of one pint of beer per week, so long as he lives; but if he should die the next day after the first payment, his family will receive the £20.

Should a person be unable to continue the Assurance, the Sums paid will not be forfeited as in other Offices, as he will be granted another Policy of less amount, but equivalent to the sums already paid, and exonerated from any future payments.

The Directors of the

NATIONAL PROVINCIAL LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY

propose to extend the benefits of Life Assurance in all its details, to all classes of the community—in fact, to the millions generally, by adapting the modes of payments to meet their views and circumstances.

The Rates of premium for every other system of Assurance, detailed Prospectuses, containing a list of the Shareholders of the Society, and every other information, will be readily afforded on application to the Secretary, at the Chief Offices of the Society, 34, Moorgate Street, Bank, London; at the Branch Offices, Queen's Chambers, Market Street, Manchester; or to any of the Agents appointed in the principal towns throughout the United Kingdom.

TRAFALGAR LIFE ASSURANCE ASSOCIATION.

Chief Office, 40, Pall Mall, London.

Fully subscribed capital of £250,000, by upwards of 1000 Shareholders, whose names and addresses are published with the Prospectus, guaranteeing thereby most extensive influence and undoubted responsibility.

The system adopted by this Association presents unusual advantages to every class of life assurers and annuitants.

Loans are granted on personal or other securities, in connexion with Life Assurance.

Applications for Prospectuses, Forms of Proposal, Agencies, and all other information respecting the general business of the Association, are requested to be made to

THOMAS H. BAYLIS, Manager.

TO DEPOSITORS AND ACTUARIES IN SAVINGS' BANKS.

A perusal is invited of the new and important plan of INDUSTRIAL LIFE ASSURANCE, which has been prepared for the purpose of extending the benefits of Life Assurance among the industrious classes. Applications for Prospectuses may be addressed to ARTHUR SCRATCHLEY, M.A., Actuary to the WESTERN LIFE ASSURANCE SOCIETY, 3, PARLIAMENT STREET, LONDON, and Author of "OBSERVATIONS ON SAVINGS' BANKS," published by J. W. Parker, 445, West Strand, London: price 6s.

NOTICE.—A PUBLIC MEETING will be

held in the LITERARY INSTITUTION, JOHN STREET, TOTTENHAM COURT ROAD, on MONDAY EVENING, March 22nd, 1852, at Eight o'clock, to explain the Advantages connected with the UNITED PATRIOTS' NATIONAL BENEFIT SOCIETY, and the BRITISH EMPIRE FREEHOLD LAND and BUILDING SOCIETY. Mr. D. W. RUFFY, Secretary, and Mr. W. G. WORLEY, of Addlestone, Surrey, will attend and address the Meeting.—Admittance, Free.

POLITICAL SCIENCE.—The Physiology

of the Brain is becoming every day more recognised by philosophical minds as the only basis on which Political and Social Science can be firmly established, because it affords data whereby the nature of man as a moral and intellectual being can be abstractedly arrived at. (See M. Conte's great work, "Politique Positive," 1851.) A select CLASS is now in COURSE of FORMATION for pursuing this interesting study, under J. P. BROWNE, M.D. A MORNING LECTURE is also delivered every THURSDAY Afternoon, at Three o'clock, on the Principles of PHRENOLOGY.—For Prospectuses, &c., apply at the Phrenological Museum, 367, Strand, near Exeter Hall.

TO MILLIONAIRES.—A MILLION may

be safely and profitably embarked in the working of Major BENIOWSKI'S IMPROVEMENTS in PRINTING, Type Founding, Composing, Distributing, Inking Rollers, Printing Machinery, &c. &c., secured by fifteen patents in her Majesty's dominions, on the Continent, and in the United States.

Prospectuses, gratis, by sending, post-free, a stamped and directed envelope to 8, Bow Street, Covent Garden.

A LECTURE at the Mechanics' Institution, Southampton Buildings, MONDAY EVENING, March 22, at Eight precisely.

Admission Free. Reserved Seats, by tickets, to be had at the Institution, and at 8, Bow Street.

THE ENGINEERS' STRIKE.

LABOUR versus CAPITAL.

In consequence of the Protracted Dispute between Employers and Employed, W. BARNES and SON, Working Engineers, 29, GRAY'S INNS, SOUTHWARK, are now executing Orders and Repairs on their own account. Relying upon their experience in all branches of the Trade, they feel assured that Expedition and Punctuality will at all times maintain them in the position they have been compelled to take up.

A NEW AND CHEAPER EDITION,

In Two Volumes, Quarto, half-bound in morocco, price £3 12s.

BARONIAL HALLS & PICTURESQUE EDIFICES OF ENGLAND.

From Drawings made expressly for the Work,

BY HARDING, CATTERMOLLE, PROUT, MULLER, HOLLAND, ALLOM, LAKE, PRICE, &c.

Executed in Lithotint, under the superintendence of Mr. Harding,

WITH LETTERPRESS AND NUMEROUS WOODCUTS.

On the 24th inst. will be published in post 8vo, price 10s. 6d., with Portrait,

ROBERT BLAKE,

ADMIRAL AND GENERAL AT SEA.

BASED ON FAMILY AND STATE PAPERS.

BY HEPWORTH DIXON.

ALSO, BY THE SAME AUTHOR,

In Foolsap Octavo, price 7s., Second Edition,

WILLIAM PENN.

AN HISTORICAL BIOGRAPHY.

In post 8vo, Second Edition, price 10s. 6d.

THE LIFE OF JOHN STERLING.

BY THOMAS CARLYLE.

LONDON: CHAPMAN AND HALL, 193, PICCADILLY.

CAPITAL AND LABOUR.

Now ready, foolscap octavo, 2s. cloth,

USE AND ABUSE; or, Right and Wrong, in the Relations to Labour, of Capital, Machinery, and Land.

By WILLIAM M'COMBIE,

Author of "Moral Agency," &c.

Price One Shilling, foolscap octavo,

PAUL'S 'MAN OF SIN' identified with Papal Antichrist.

By JOHN MORISON, D.D., LL.D.

Ward & Co., 27, Paternoster Row.

Just published, 12mo, 3s. 6d. cloth,

A NEW LATIN DELECTUS, adapted to the arrangement of the Latin Grammar. By the Rev. H. C. ADAMS, Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford, and Author of the "New Greek Delectus."

London: D. Nutt, 270, Strand.

SOCIETY of the FRIENDS of ITALY.—

Just published, price 2d., with Notes, M. MAZZINI'S LECTURE, delivered at the First Conversation of this Society. Also, price 1d., the Society's "Monthly Record" for March.

The next CONVERSAZIONE of the Society will be held in the Great Room, Freemasons' Tavern, Great Queen-street, on WEDNESDAY EVENING, March 24, at half-past 7 for 8 o'clock precisely. The Lecture by GEORGE DAWSON, Esq., M.A.; after which M. MAZZINI and other speakers will address the meeting. Tickets of admission for members of the Society, 1s.; for ladies and gentlemen, non-members, 1s. 6d. each—may be obtained, prior to the meeting, at the Society's offices, 10, Southampton-street, Strand.

Already published by the Society:—"Address to the Public," 2d.; Tract on "Non-Intervention," 1d.; "Refutation of the Charge of Terrorism in Rome during the Republic," 2d.; "The Sicilian Revolution," 2d. To be had of Messrs. Kent and Co., Paternoster-row; Effingham Wilson, Royal Exchange; C. Gilpin, Bishopsgate-street Without, and all Booksellers; also at the Society's Offices.

EDUCATION BY THE SEA.

WESTON-SUPER-MARE, SOMERSET.

The comforts of a happy home, in this very healthy watering place, combined with a complete course of instruction in all the branches of a liberal education, imparted by the best masters, may be enjoyed by Young Gentlemen, on moderate terms, at the Rev. J. HOPKINS' Establishment, Weston Park School.

An articulated pupil is desired.

MR. ALBERT SMITH'S ASCENT OF

MONT BLANC, illustrated by Mr. W. BERRY, EVERY EVENING, at Eight o'clock.—Stalls, (numbered and reserved, which can be taken from the Plan at the Hall every day from 11 till 4,) 3s.; Area, 2s.; Gallery, 1s. Children:—Stalls, 2s.; Area, 1s.

A MORNING PERFORMANCE every TUESDAY and SATURDAY, at Three o'clock. EGYPTIAN HALL, PICCADILLY.

In 2 vols. 8vo, price 32s.

THE LIFE AND LETTERS OF

BARTHOLD GEORGE NIEBUHR.

With Essay on his Character and Influence,

BY THE CHEVALIER BUNSEN,

AND PROFESSORS BRANDIS AND LOEBELL.

In crown 8vo, price 8s. each volume,

THE POETICAL AND DRAMATIC WORKS

OF

SIR EDWARD BULWER LYTTON, BART.

NOW FIRST COLLECTED.

Vol. I., with Portrait and Vignette, handsomely printed in crown 8vo, contains,—

NARRATIVE POEMS, "THE NEW TIMON," &c.

Two Volumes, Post Octavo, 16s.

ÆSCHYLUS. Translated into English Verse. With Notes, a Life of Æschylus, and a Discourse on Greek Tragedy. By JOHN STUART BLACKIE, Professor of Greek in the University of Edinburgh.

London: John W. Parker and Son, West Strand.

This Day, in One Vol., post 8vo, 9s.

MISCELLANIES. By Rev. James Martineau: Being a Selection of Essays contributed to the Westminster and Prospective Reviews.

CONTENTS:—1. Dr. Priestley.—2. Dr. Arnold.—3. Church and State.—4. Theodore Parker.—5. Phases of Faith.—6. The Church of England.—7. The Battle of the Churches.

Also, just published,

INTELLECTUAL RELIGION. Being the Introductory Chapter to the "Progress of the Intellect." By R. W. MACKAY, M.A. 8vo, sewed, 1s. 6d.

WAR AND INVASION: being proposals for raising a National Force on the Voluntary Principle, after the example of the United States, as the only means of effectually securing the country against all hostile contingencies. 8vo, stitched, 1s. 6d.

London: John Chapman, 142, Strand.

NEW MEDICAL DICTIONARY FOR THE PEOPLE. In Monthly Parts, price 6d. each, to be completed in 12 Parts. 1, 2, and 3 are published.

THE DICTIONARY OF DOMESTIC MEDICINE AND HOUSEHOLD SURGERY. By SPENCER THOMSON, M.D., L.R.C.S., Edinburgh. Illustrated.

This Work is intended to be a concise and ready book of reference; in cases of emergency, either of severe illness or accident, in the absence of immediate medical assistance, and a safe guide in the domestic management of slight ailments, and of the sick-room generally. Also, a Compendium of those Sanitary Principles on which the attainment and preservation of Health depends. It is the book of the intelligent Mechanic, of the inexperienced Mother, of the Clergyman, and of the Emigrant.

"It is most clear and copious; and if continued as it has begun, will prove the most valuable periodical of the year."—Tait's Magazine.

"For families and for the clergy it will be a valuable guide."—Oxford Herald.

"Intended for all classes, and giving a promise of undoubted excellence."—Newcastle Guardian.

London: Groombridge and Sons, Paternoster Row. Sold by all Booksellers.

LONDON: Printed by GEORGE HOOPER, (of No. 3, Portland Place, Kensington, in the County of Middlesex,) at the "Office of Messrs. SAVILL and EDWARDS, No. 4, Cannon Street, in the Parish of St. Paul, Covent Garden, in the same County; and Published by T. BARNES and SONS, (of Broadway House, Hammer-smith,) at THE LEADER OFFICE, No. 10, WASHINGTON STREET, STRAND, in the Precinct of the Savoy, both in the same County.—SATURDAY, March 20, 1852.