

# The Leader.

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

## Contents :

<b>NEWS OF THE WEEK—</b>	<b>PAGE</b>
The Week in Parliament .....	430
Politics at the Feast of Art .....	432
The Bookselling Question .....	433
British Anti-State Church Association .....	434
Election Matters .....	434
Professor Newman's Lecture on England's Place and Duty in Europe—(concluded) .....	434
Letters from Paris .....	435
Continental Notes .....	436
"Hill-Top" or "Valley-Bottom" Water .....	436

Domestic Drama; or, The British Matron and her Rights .....	437
Murders .....	437
Miscellaneous .....	438
Health of London during the Week .....	439
Births, Marriages, and Deaths .....	439
<b>PUBLIC AFFAIRS—</b>	
"Cottoning" to Despotism .....	440
Break-up of the Book-Trade System .....	441
The Haunted Camp .....	441
The Black Statistics .....	442
Patagonian Missionaries .....	442

The Paris Co-operative Associations in 1852 .....	443
Taxation reduced to Unity and Simplicity .....	444
Problem for Lord Rosse .....	444
The Waters are Coming .....	444
D.V. ....	444
<b>LITERATURE—</b>	
Owen Jones on Decorative Art .....	445
Grant's History of Astronomy .....	446
The Melvilles .....	447
Books on our Table .....	447
<b>PORTFOLIO—</b>	
Comte's Positive Philosophy .....	447

The Two Sisters .....	448
<b>THE ARTS—</b>	
The Operas .....	449
Rose Cheri .....	449
The Warden of Galway .....	449
Marionette Theatre .....	449
The Ascent of Mont Blanc .....	449
The Musical Union .....	450
Exhibition of the Royal Academy .....	450
Exhibition of the Amateur Society .....	450
<b>COMMERCIAL AFFAIRS—</b>	
Markets, Gazettes, Advertisements, &c. ....	451-452

VOL. III. No. 111.]

SATURDAY, MAY 8, 1852.

[PRICE SIXPENCE.]

## News of the Week.

THE combination which was formed at Lord John Russell's house in Chesham Place has not survived many weeks, and the Militia debate this week has exposed the two leaders of it in antagonism the most disastrous; Mr. Cobden, with Mr. Bright, heading a paltry minority, and Lord John appearing as the subordinate coadjutor of the Ministers that superseded him. When the bill was to have gone into committee, Mr. Cobden moved an amendment demanding a return to show the effective force of the navy available for the defence of the coasts—the bill to stand over until that return should be made. The object, in fact, was obstruction. In the debate, Lord Palmerston made a good point, by producing a pamphlet emanating from the Peace party, and showing that it is "the Christian duty of this country to be conquered by France"! After that majestic exposition of Peace principles, the moderated expression of the same doctrines fell flat upon the House. Not so Mr. Drummond's converse of the Peace argument—that this country would benefit by being well thrashed, as it might then be roused to its duty of resistance. The Radical opponents of any militia scheme tried their strength on Monday, in a motion to adjourn the debate; which was lost by 68 to 291. The debate was adjourned, to allow opportunity for other speakers; but on the following night the amendment was negatived by 291 to 68. This division alone would suffice to show how little command of political tactics the Radical allies of Lord John Russell possess. As for Lord John himself, he adheres bravely to his policy of being always in the wrong place.

Sir John Pakington has brought forward a bill to confer upon New Zealand a constitution; a laudable exercise of diligence favourably contrasted with the delays of the last Government. To the details of the plan we cannot pledge ourselves; but at all events the political constitution of the New Zealanders will no longer be suspended on the decision of a Minister whose mind oscillates like a pendulum.

Mr. Sharman Crawford's Tenant Right Bill was rejected on Monday, by 167 to 57. The opposition, led by Mr. Conolly and Lord Naas, and supported by Sir William Somerville, was characterized by bitterness, and an imputation of bad motives; repaid with interest by Mr. G. H. Moore,

[TOWN EDITION.]

whose description of the relation between landlord and tenant, although not by any means new, is well deserving attention. The galling injustice of the existing laws was admitted by all, and Mr. Napier promised a moderate but efficient remedy. Can we put any trust in the quondam secretary of a Brunswick lodge, or believe that coercion and unlimited freedom of contract, well hit off by Mr. Moore as the creed of Shylock, will eradicate Ribbonism and regenerate the country? Lord Naas said Tenant Right would make a desert of Ireland. *Make a desert!* What is it now, then? A valley of Sharon, or a valley of the Shadow of Death?

Lord Lyndhurst has taken pity on Mr. Salomons, and has brought forward a Bill to repeal the old laws lurking in the Statute-book, which inflict all sorts of penalties and outlawry upon him as "a popish recusant," for refusing to take the oath abjuring the Pope "on the true faith of a Christian." Lord Lyndhurst seems to have taken the Government somewhat by surprise, and they allowed their unpreparedness to be seen. They do not seem to perceive that, by removing those obsolete laws, he has done something, small as it may be, towards mitigating the urgency of the Bill for the complete relief of the Jews. Meanwhile, however, the measure is only an act of justice towards a political opponent, and Lord Lyndhurst deserves well for undertaking the duty.

Active, energetic, and aggressive, the Anti-State Church association chronicles its own successful campaigns this week, and one of its advocates insists that the Bishop of Exeter is among its best champions. Such would seem to be the case. State-churchism is as much abhorred by the Convocation Party as by Dissent; and although the former could not peacefully tolerate the triumph of the latter, yet substantially the ends of both are the same—free development for all spiritual influences. We note here simply the rapid growth of each movement, especially of the former. Not only in England and the Colonies, but in Scotland, we observe that the movement advances: the bishops of Scotland have decided on recommending the admission of the laity to their Synod. Thus, every week brings this vital question nearer to a solution.

Abandoning the congenial atmosphere of Harwich, Sir Fitzroy Kelly has appealed, and successfully, to East Suffolk. He stoutly maintained that his principles were Protectionist, and he humbly confessed to his Free-trade sins while in

office under Peel. The remarkable fact connected with his election is, that his opponents were of the tenant-farmer class, and that he was not only soundly rated on the hustings for his manifold sins by a Free-trade tenant-farmer, but by miscellaneous and unsparing critics in the crowd. This would not be encouraging to Ministers if they were still Protectionists.

The Royal Academy dinner on Saturday was distinguished by an unexpected escapade. Lord Derby indicated the promise of a site for the National Gallery, which would leave the whole building in Trafalgar Square to the Royal Academy; and Mr. Disraeli, following up the idea, bespoke the aid of Lord John Russell! Everybody felt that it was a surprise, and Lord John looked discomfited; but he plucked up heart of grace, and did let out something like the reciprocation of a promise; still, however, answering Lord Derby, rather than Mr. Disraeli.

The agitation in the book-trade goes on, and the free-traders seem sure of ultimate success. The meeting at Mr. John Chapman's was a formidable array against the present system, and in the abolition of *that* it was nearly unanimous. But a letter from Mr. Carlyle cast doubt on the sufficiency of mere free-trade to regulate the literature of a country; Mr. F. O. Ward threw out hints as to the advantages of coöperation and association, to regulate the *number* of persons engaged in a particular field of industry; and he pointed to a statement already made by Mr. Owen, respecting the Ray Society, as a proof of the economical results derivable from *free* combination. In so many places does this coming truth show its light!

We have no news from France this week that our last week's summary had not anticipated. All eyes are fixed upon the coming fête, which seems, however, to wane in interest as the day approaches, whether from overwrought expectations, or because the play of *Hamlet* is to be performed with the part of 'Hamlet' left out. The Empire is adjourned. Pacific are the promises of the new Augustus, and the Bourse is *his* battlefield.

The Customs Congress at Berlin is shillyshallying in fruitless formalities, and very slow to get to work; but that the essence of the struggle between Prussia and Austria is as much political as commercial, no doubt remains.

Austria is trying to absorb the discordant nationalities of her scattered Empire.

All the imperial house of Russia have descended

upon Italy. Czar and Kaiser are shaking hands over the grave of liberty in that Peninsula, and the Pope blesses the bonds. At Verona the Illuminated Square of St. Mark's salutes their advent; a symbol of the popular rejoicing, and of the national welcome to the Pastors of Nations.

While Naples, under Austrian patronage, is coercing Poerio, and mourning the decease of the righteous Navarro; while Lord Malmesbury and Louis Napoleon are aiding to settle the succession and consolidation of the Danish kingdom, our authorities, having paid due honour to Rosas, are ostentatiously entertaining the brother of the King of Naples. The fact speaks volumes—it speaks blue books.

#### THE WEEK IN PARLIAMENT.

##### THE MILITIA BILL.

Mr. CORDEN, *vice* Mr. Milner Gibson superseded, assumed the command of the rump of the anti-militia party on Monday. On the order of the day being read to go into Committee on the Bill, he moved the following amendment:—

"That, to enable this House the better to consider the provisions of the Militia Bill, a return of the effective force of the royal navy on the 31st day of March last be laid on the table of the House; such return to contain the following particulars—viz., 1st. The names, armaments, number of crews and officers of all Her Majesty's ships then employed on active service, the stations on which they are employed, and the length of time each vessel has been employed on each station respectively, distinguishing steamvessels from sailing vessels, and also steamvessels propelled by screws from those propelled by paddlewheels; and stating the nominal horse power of the engines of each vessel. 2ndly. The same of all reserve or advance ships, with the ports at which they are now placed, and a statement of the periods which would be required to send them to sea in a fit state for active service; and that the consideration of the bill in committee be postponed until after the production of such return."

His speech on this text was very long, crammed with statistical statements, and arguments founded on them, to show that we had adequate forces at our command if we used them properly; that our ships were on foreign stations, where they were not wanted; that we had nineteen war vessels in the Mediterranean, nine more that Sir George Cockburn said was necessary; that no danger was to be apprehended from France; that war could not break out on a sudden and surprise us; and that we had a navy which could sweep the sea of the combined fleets of the world. The tone of his speech was aggressive. On the French question he gave another specimen of the high estimation in which Louis Napoleon is held at Manchester and in the West Riding:—

"It was no light matter to rush into hostilities with a people so brave, so wealthy, and so industrious as the people of this Empire; but they were told that the character of the President of the French republic was daring and resolute. He was afraid they were all too open to the blame of being willing to regard success as the test of merit; but Louis Napoleon had shown himself to be no fool—after all said, he was no blockhead. The people of France acquiesced in his rule—he had a larger civil list than the Queen of England—everything with him was *couleur de rose*; and yet it was said he would make a descent on our shores. Soon after the outcry of invasion was raised he (Mr. Cobden) had written to a friend in Paris, whose name had been quoted in the House, and was well known in Europe, and he had asked him for any facts to controvert the silly outcry. His answer was in two lines:—'Louis Napoleon, to make war, must do so through one of his generals; if the general succeeds he will eclipse Louis Napoleon, if he fails he will ruin him (hear, hear), and if I wrote a whole volume I could not say more.' He (Mr. Cobden) was not there to argue they should trust to the good sense or forbearance of any power whatever; but he said they had no reason to infer Louis Napoleon contemplated anything so suicidal as to make a descent upon the shores of England."

At the tail of his speech he shocked the country party by his presumptions in favour of the great towns.

"He was ashamed to press the subject further, because there was scarcely a man of common sense in the great centres of intelligence (ironical cheering from the Ministerial benches)—there might in some parts of the country, and in country constituencies, be found men who believed in the French invasion—but in the circles in which he (Mr. Cobden) moved—among people of Free-trade opinions, he could not find any one who really imagined the French were coming to invade us."

Mr. ANDERSON seconded the proposition. In reply, Mr. STAFFORD taunted Mr. Cobden with hurrying over the votes of supply, to facilitate the despatch of public business, and then bringing on this motion to facilitate delay; while Mr. CORRY retorted that Mr. Cobden seemed to have all the information he wanted, and yet he asked for more. The difference between us and the French was, that while we had a much more powerful navy, they had greater facilities for concentrating theirs in the channel. Mr. CARTER (of

Tavistock) supported, and Captain BOLDEO opposed, Mr. Cobden. Mr. BRIGHT made an extraordinary speech, replete with the stock arguments of the opponents of militia in general, and something more. He attacked the press as vehemently as Lord Derby himself.

"Look at the conduct of our press. He did not wish the English press to shut its mouth when anything was enacted in foreign nations which it believed to be contrary to freedom; but our press had for two months maintained an incessant daily fire of accusations against the ruler, and too often against the people of France. The French press during all that time, though under the control of the President, had never retaliated, or attempted to create in the minds of the French people a feeling antagonistic to the people of this country. He would admit, for the sake of argument, that the French President had shown greed of power, that he was cool, reserved, calculating, and unscrupulous; but it must be remembered that he was approved by the majority of the French population; and, if there were one reason more than another why he was so, it was because he had not plunged them into war. He admitted that they did not like the theory of his government, but if the French people, disagreeing in that, yet supported him because he had given them a permanent or temporary repose, the House might depend upon it that they would not rest a single instant if he should manifest the slightest intention of sending a piratical or marauding expedition against this country. There were no preparations made in France."

Turning upon Lord Palmerston, he made a rather effective charge.

"What was the noble lord afraid of? He could hardly be serious in anticipating an invasion of 50,000 men from a ruler whose extraordinary conduct in December last he had thought it right to applaud. He (Mr. Bright) was not sure that in his despatch the noble lord did not say that he thought the peace of Europe would be made safer by the course Louis Napoleon took upon this occasion. (Hear, hear.) But he would say at once that the noble lord was no authority with him on questions of this nature. (A laugh.) He did not pretend to set his opinion against the noble lord's. The House probably thought the noble lord a much better authority than he (Mr. Bright) was. (Cheers from the Ministerial benches.) The views of the noble lord with regard to a militia were perfectly consistent with his political schemes. The establishment of a militia would liberate so many soldiers for foreign service. The creed of the noble lord, so far as he (Mr. Bright) had observed, had always been in favour of universal diplomacy and incessant interference with other countries. He wished always to have the power, as he always seemed to have the disposition, of cajoling or bullying somebody or some foreign country. (Laughter.) The hon. and learned gentleman the member for Sheffield, who was his great champion two years ago, on one occasion called the noble lord 'a lucifer match.' He (Mr. Bright) presumed that this great military force was required as an extinguisher in case of any case of incendiarism breaking out. (Renewed laughter.) But he thought the country had already paid enough for some of the projects of the noble lord with regard to Africa, Brazil, and elsewhere. (Cries of 'Divide.') The efforts of the noble lord to do so much for freedom abroad, while he did so little for it at home, reminded him of one of the characters in the new work of Mr. Dickens, so much so that he felt disposed to call him the Mrs. Jellyby of statesmen. (Laughter.)"

The Press, attacked by the Radical Member for Manchester, found a vindicator in the Tory Whiteside.

After defending the bill, showing that the reason valid with Mr. Pitt—that France was a military power, and that its resources were centred in one man—was valid now, and citing the landing of Humbert in Killala Bay as a proof of the possibility of French ships evading our cruising fleet, Mr. WHITESIDE uttered the following manly and national sentiments.

"The hon. Member for Manchester had criticised the conduct of the press. He (Mr. Whiteside) admitted that the press of England had spoken out freely and boldly, and he believed it would continue to do so. That press was powerful and respected because it raised a fearless and independent voice, and he had no doubt it would continue to denounce the usurpations of despotic power, and to proclaim the wrongs of suffering virtue. But there might be danger from that fact; indeed, there was danger in the free institutions of this country; and he considered that the very fact of the existence of free institutions in England, and the destruction of free institutions in other countries, justified a Government in establishing a militia. And why a militia? Because it was defensive; because it was only intended for protection, and could not be regarded as an insult to any foreign power. It was a force solely and simply for self-defence."

Mr. MACGREGOR, who had previously moved the adjournment of the debate, now pressed his motion, and the House divided.

For the adjournment, 68; against it, 291;

Majority against, 223.

After some further skirmishing, Ministers consented to adjourn until Tuesday.

On this day the debate opened with a bluff but dull speech from Captain SCOBELL in opposition. He was answered by an equally dull speech by Sir HARRY VERNEY; who was replied to in his turn by Mr. GRANTLEY BERKELEY. Alluding to Mr. Bright's speech of the day before, he said—"The hon. member for Manchester had called the noble lord, the member for Tiverton, 'the Mrs. Jellyby of statesmen.' He (Mr. G. Berkeley) remembered two characters in an-

other story, whose names were singularly applicable to the hon. member for the West Riding and the hon. member for Manchester. The one was called 'Unhappy John,' and the other 'Miserable Dick.' (Laughter.)"

Sir De Lacy Evans, Major Beresford, Sir F. Baring, Captain Duncombe, Mr. Hume, added nothing to the arguments and statements a thousand times repeated on this question.

Mr. CHARTERIS made an apt quotation from a speech delivered by Mr. Wyndham fifty years ago:—

"Mr. Wyndham said:—

"We were told daily of the impracticability of invasion, by many eminent lawyers, by many sound divines, many worthy country gentlemen, many respectable merchants, many skilful agriculturists, many intelligent manufacturers, many very handsome women. The only persons from whom we did not hear these opinions were our soldiers and sailors. (Cheers and laughter.) Ask a sailor whether, with any superiority of naval force, he could insure the country against an invading army? He would tell you that he could not engage that an enemy should not effect a disembarkation on various points, even in considerable force. But put this question to a landsman—to a man who perhaps never saw the sea but from Margate or Brighton—who never embarked in anything but a bathing-machine—and he would tell you that to talk of invading a country in the face of a superior navy was the idlest of all follies, and that as long as we had our wooden walls—he would more properly say, our wooden heads—(laughter), we should never treat invasion otherwise than as a threat fit only to frighten children."

That speech was delivered in 1803, and in the following year all England was up in arms to repel a threatened invasion from France. (Hear, hear.)"

Mr. MITCHELL and Mr. COWPER followed in the beaten track. But at this stage of the debate, Lord Palmerston arose, and from a dull, uninteresting discussion, the House passed at once to a spirited contest.

Making some preliminary observations on the dogmatic character of the debate, Lord PALMERSTON stated the case between himself and Mr. Cobden and his friends, as follows:—

"If I am wrong, and the advice I give is followed, at all events the country is safe (cheers.) If they are wrong, and the advice they give is followed, the country may be ruined (loud cheers.) Now, sir, these hon. gentlemen dispute authorities. (Hear, hear.) They will not admit the opinions of officers of great experience, of sailors, and others, high in their profession, as to the danger which they call upon the country to guard against. These gentlemen, whose habits of life have made them conversant with the peaceful arts, with manufactures, and with industry—who know nothing of war, or of the chances of war (cheers)—who know nothing of the means of war, or how a war ought to be carried on—these gentlemen wish to lull the country into a feeling of security, and prevent Parliament from adopting any means to provide for its defence. (Hear, hear.) But, sir, these hon. gentlemen have disputed English authorities. We have just heard, however, from an hon. friend of mine the opinion of foreign authorities, which is exactly the same as the opinion of the English authorities. (Hear, hear.) But, sir, I have heard (and I believe the truth of what I have heard) that an opinion was expressed by a high foreign authority bearing on this question. I have heard, and believe it, that the late King of the French, when he visited this country after the dispute which arose on the question about Tahiti (and, by-the-by, it is not inopportune or irrelevant to this matter, to remind the House that on that occasion, when this country was on the point of being engaged, totally unprepared, in a war with a powerful neighbour on that very question, the very men who were loudest in declamations calculated to bring on a rupture, are the men who are now preaching peace (cheers)—I have heard, I say, that on that occasion the King of the French, rejoicing at the peaceful termination of the dispute, stated that, whatever he might have been told by his generals at the time, he felt certain that if a rupture had taken place, they would have undertaken in a week to have been in London. (Cheers.) That opinion, I think, may have some weight, although these hon. gentlemen look with distrust upon the opinions of English generals and English admirals. (Hear, hear.)"

He then alluded to some matters which had been stated in the course of the debate, and proceeded to review a wonderful pamphlet, published by the peace party.

"Now, sir, I have the greatest possible respect for those opinions which are sincere and founded in deep conviction, and therefore I am far from treating with anything like disrespect those opinions which I think are at the bottom of much of the opposition which we find to the measure now under discussion. (Hear, hear.) These opinions and these convictions have not hitherto been fully and broadly stated by those who have taken part in this debate; but these opinions and these convictions have been broadly stated in a pamphlet which I now hold in my hand, and which I do not think unworthy of the consideration of gentlemen who turn their minds to this subject. It is a pamphlet ably written, and in it, after serious reflection, the principle is laid down, that it is contrary to the Christian religion to do violence to any man, even though he may be an enemy. Sir, the object of this pamphlet is to show that it is the Christian duty of this country to be conquered by France. (Cheers and laughter.) The pamphlet, which bears the title of 'The Rifle Club; or, the Duty of Soldiers' (a very odd duty), is an amusing dialogue supposed to take place between two gentlemen. One of the speakers in this dialogue paints in vivid colours the result of an unopposed invasion. He says, 'I grant

you 250,000 men from France may come over to this country.' He says, 'They will come unopposed.' Then, it appears, they will take possession of London. (Laughter and cheers.) They will seize the Bank of England (not to find, I hope, the 18,000,000L. supposed to be lodged there) (Laughter and cheers.) They are to live by contributions (Laughter and renewed laughter)—the parliament is to be swept away (laughter)—the courts of justice are to be abolished (laughter)—the French general will issue edicts (laughter)—a new Parliament will assemble, to consist (laughter) of Frenchmen (laughter)—the *Code Napoleon* is to come in the place of the law of England—the Sovereign is to live like a private individual in Scotland (laughter)—and, finally, the government of this country is to be annihilated, and the administration of affairs to centre in the invading army. (Loud laughter and cheers.) 'But,' says the other gentleman in the dialogue, 'what will that signify?'—(hear, hear, and laughter)—'we shall go on working our mills.' (Loud ministerial cheers, and laughter.) 'We shall stand behind our counters and sell our wares in our shops.' (Cheers.) 'People must eat—they will want clothing—we shall supply their wants—and shall go on making money.' (Loud cheers and laughter.) One might say to these gentlemen, if that event should ever happen, what has been described by the poet—

"Sic vos non vobis mellificatis apes.  
Sic vos non vobis vollera fertis oves."

(Laughter and cheers.) It will be for them to take care that the wolves do not eat up the sheep. (Renewed laughter and cheers.) But, sir, the pamphlet goes on to make a statement which I think will astonish the house. The gentlemen in the dialogue first speak of an ambush, but then go on to say that, awe-stricken, this country, without applying for assistance to Austria, Prussia, or any other power, would deliver itself into the hands of the foe—but that in the course of time, and after some fifty or more millions sterling had been remitted to France, the French would be so terribly ashamed of their position—so utterly ashamed of the very ridiculous situation in which they had placed themselves, that they would leave this country to its own resources (Laughter). Nay, so deeply would the sense of their ridiculous position be impressed on their minds—and we know that the French people are most susceptible of ridicule—that they would offer to send us back those 50,000,000L. sterling which they had taken from our bankers, merchants, and tradesmen; and then they would be done again; we should show them a more glorious example—we should magnanimously refuse to take it. (Roars of laughter.) Yet I firmly believe this is written in sincere and sober earnest, and not at all in the spirit of ridicule."

He wound up by stating that it was for the country and Parliament to determine whether they would become the victims of submission with the peace party in and out of the House, or whether they were "still sufficiently wedded to their ancient notions of independence and self vindication" to provide a force to resist and repel every invader. (Loud cheers.)

Mr. WAKLEY, bursting with indignation, expressed his sorrow that Lord Palmerston, a man of such "gigantic intellect," should fall into the unfortunate position of quoting such despicable trash as he had addressed to the House. (Laughter.)

"The noble lord had not informed them who was the publisher of the stuff he had quoted, or by whom it was written, but he (Mr. Wakley) strongly suspected it was published at Highgate, in this county, where there was an admirable asylum for lunatics. (Great laughter.) He recommended the noble lord to visit it; he was sure the noble lord would admire it, and the kind of intellect he would find there. (Laughter.) To quote such trash as that! (Great laughter.)"

Entirely forgetting the Militia, Mr. Wakley fell foul of the Protectionists for ironically cheering the passage about mills in the pamphlet.

"Gentlemen opposite know perfectly well that there was something more potent about mills than they affected to admit (hear, hear); among other effects produced, mills had ground the party of Protectionists into a party of Free-traders. ("Oh, oh!") Oh, yes! they might make wry faces; the operation might have been remarkably disagreeable, but the operation had been performed; witness the budget of last Friday night. (Hear, hear.) 'Twas the mills which had done it all; 'twas the mills which had saved the country, so don't let gentlemen opposite reproach the mills, and don't let them reproach their master and teacher, Richard Cobden. ("Oh, oh!" and laughter.) Ay, their master and teacher, and a greater man than any of them. (Laughter.)"

After a few words from Colonel Thompson against the bill, Mr. DRUMMOND delivered one of his characteristic speeches.

Whatever *Punch*-like qualities the peace pamphlet might possess, he could inform the House that it was published by Mr. Charles Gilpin. He was not favourable to the bill, but he thought it the best they were likely to get.

"He could see no reason whatever why any troops should be stationed in the neighbourhood of the manufacturing districts. (Cheers and laughter.) He held, with the hon. member for Manchester and his friends, that it was a dreadful thing for the military to trample upon the people (a laugh); and therefore he would not put that temptation in the way of the troops, but would have them wholly withdrawn. (Laughter.) Nay, if the Peace Society would positively undertake to enter into a treaty with the President of France that he should sail into the Mersey instead of into the Thames, he (Mr. Drummond) was not sure that he would not be inclined to vote against this bill altogether. (Hear, hear, and laughter.) He

thought it was not improbable that a small invasion might do them a great deal of good. In his opinion this country was much in the same condition in which they sometimes saw a great overgrown spoilt boy, when one was inclined to say, 'I wish somebody would give that fellow a good licking.' (A laugh.) Now, he was inclined to think that a good licking would do us a great deal of good (laughter); and he believed that the first time an army got near to London those mills which had done such wonders would cease to work. (Hear, hear, and a laugh.) But it was said that the House was to be entirely guided on this question by the great constituencies, which they were told contained all the intelligence, and all the science, and all the knowledge of the country. He would appeal to the hon. member for Finsbury as a witness to the extent to which intelligence—and he hoped he might add morality (a laugh)—existed in those great constituencies. They had had a general Exhibition of the Industry of All Nations, but they had now done with it, and were pulling down the place. Suppose they built another, and had an exhibition of the morality of all nations? (Laughter.) In what position would the city of London stand (a laugh)—to say nothing of Finsbury? (Renewed laughter.) He might ask those who had bought coffee, or tea, or bread, or butter, or milk, in Finsbury. (Much laughter.) Why, the hon. member for Finsbury (Mr. Wakley) had shown that there was no place in Europe where there was such a mass of fraud as among the tradesmen of this enlightened city. (Cheers and laughter.)"

Lord JOHN MANNERS and Lord JOHN RUSSELL, in lame and wearisome speeches, wound up the debate; and on a division, the amendment was lost by 285 to 76.

Not dispirited by so complete a defeat, Mr. HUME, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. BRIGHT, and Mr. COBDEN assailed the Government with importunate solicitations for a postponement of the measure. Mr. COBDEN hoped that, although the majority was large, they would not forget that a minority had its rights and duties in that house. Would the contemplated Militiamen be liable to the lash? No categorical answer was given, and Mr. HUME dividing on the motion that the House should go into committee, was again beaten, by 219 to 85.

Consequently the House went into committee, and here another stand was made at the outset by the Opposition. Mr. BRIGHT asked for a "long day"—a proposition which the CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER characterised as "preposterous," and broadly he asserted that the opposition was maintained only for the purpose of "agitating" the country. He named Thursday for proceeding with the bill. On the question being put that the Chairman report progress, and ask leave to sit again, Mr. W. J. FOX renewed the combat, which was now carried to extremities. He repudiated the imputation of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and declared that he knew little of the feeling of the people if he thought agitation necessary to excite the strongest antagonism against the measure. (Cheers and counter cheers.) The people dreaded and abhorred the Bill, and those feelings would not be diminished when they knew that they would be brought into compulsory service, and put under the lash. (Oh! oh!) In vain Mr. WALPOLE and Mr. DISRAELI attempted to soothe the irritation, the latter insinuating that he meant nothing discourteous by accusing the Opposition of factious motives.

Mr. GIBSON, Mr. WAKLEY, and Mr. HUME charged the Government with precipitation—Mr. Wakley asking when the dissolution was to take place, and menacing the majority with every kind of constitutional opposition. The storm, partially allayed, was provoked again by Mr. NEWDEGATE, who reiterated the accusation of Mr. Disraeli about "agitation." This brought up Mr. COBDEN, who, upon Mr. Bernal saying that the only question before them was whether he should leave the chair, said there was something more than that involved:—

"When the hon. gentleman (Mr. Newdegate) spoke of agitating the country, he would ask him, and those who acted with him, who had been trying to agitate the country for the last five years? Was there a platform or a theatre in London on which the hon. member had not been an actor? (Cheers and counter-cheers.) If the hon. member imputed to them on his (Mr. Cobden's) side of the House that they were getting up an agitation to bring them back to the Treasury benches, and when there to repudiate the principles by which they had got into office (great cheering), then they might fall under his stigma. But he (Mr. Cobden) warned the Chancellor of the Exchequer not to repeat, in the tone he had used, (cheering and counter-cheering), the imputation of motives in which he had indulged respecting his (Mr. Cobden's) side of the House, and particularly not to repeat it to those who, having been placed in antagonism to the right hon. gentleman on many occasions, had, he humbly submitted, shown to him forbearance and consideration. (Cheers, and cries of 'Oh! oh!')

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER.—It is expedient when there has been a long discussion to remember its origin. When the hon. member (Mr. Bright) spoke of delay for the purpose of appealing to the country, what he meant was, that the country should be agitated. [Mr. Bright.—"I never said so."] As to the charge brought forward by the hon. member (Mr. Cobden) of obtaining power by the assertion of principles which, when in power,

we did not carry out, I beg to inform him that that is a charge which does not apply to me. (Cheers.) I am here, Sir, to put in practice, as far as I am able, the policy I advocated when on the other side of the house, and I say so without the slightest hesitation. (Great Ministerial cheering.) Notwithstanding the complaints of my demeanour, which are perfectly unjustified as I think, and if I used any expression or exhibited a manner calculated to give offence—which it is neither my habit nor disposition to do—I must say I feel it is the duty of Government, and I think we are only acting with regard to the opinions of the vast majority of the house and of the public out of doors, by calling on you to proceed with this bill. (Cheers.)

After another galling attack from Mr. WAKLEY on the abandonment of Protection by Ministers, the Committee divided on the motion of Mr. HUME, that the debate should be fixed for Monday.

Ayes, 31; Noes, 103; Majority, 72.

Even this did not terminate the conflict, so pertinacious and enterprising was the sturdy opposition. Another division was taken on the Chancellor of the Exchequer's proposition that the bill be again considered in committee on Thursday next, when the numbers were—

Ayes, 105; Noes, 29; Majority, 76.

The bill was accordingly ordered to be recommitted on Thursday, and the House adjourned at 20 minutes past two o'clock.

On Thursday, therefore, the debate was renewed in Committee. The stand of opposition was made upon clause three. Mr. HUME moved the repeal of all the existing militia acts, to prevent confusion. This was objected to by the ATTORNEY GENERAL.

Sir GEORGE GREY, who has faculties for getting up a personal contest, here objected that Ministers had pretended to obey the order of the House when they introduced this bill. Now the House used the word "consolidate" as its resolution. But here were Ministers coming down with a bill which did not consolidate the militia acts. This led to a smart discussion. Mr. DISRAELI declared that Government believed they could not have passed the measure had they repealed all preceding acts. They had, however, consolidated, for they had "consolidated by reference"—a statement which Lord JOHN RUSSELL professed he could not understand. Mr. WALPOLE admitted that consolidation by reference was not, strictly speaking, consolidation at all; but he promised well for the future. Mr. COBDEN broadly asserted that the object was to avoid bringing to light the infamous provisions of the unrepealed acts. The ATTORNEY-GENERAL, finding feeling running against them, began an attack on Lord John Russell, and declaring that no bill would satisfy him, he would even be able to oppose his own by specious and ingenious argument.

Sir W. P. WOOD repelled this insinuation, and diverted the course of the debate back to Lord Palmerston, whom he charged with beginning the personal attack on Lord John Russell. Somewhat sharply Lord PALMERSTON retorted that he had not spoken for the benefit of Sir W. P. Wood. He never preached to the converted. He took it for granted that Sir W. Wood having voted for Lord John Russell's bill would vote for this also. Sir W. P. WOOD replied that if the bills were the same, why had the noble lord opposed the introduction of the one, and lent his support to the other?

Nettled at this, Lord PALMERSTON insisted that he did not say that the bills were identical; but whether they were identical or not, his conduct should not be identical with that of the late Government; he would not attempt to overthrow a measure which he thought necessary, on account of a verbal difference. At this stage the House grew impatient, refusing to hear Mr. Ewart, and the gallery was even cleared for a division. The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER interposed, and requested the noisy to be silent, and those anxious to go to remain a little longer. After a few words from Mr. EWART, the Committee divided, but the amendment was lost by 165 to 82.

Mr. MILNER GIBSON moved an amendment to the effect that the qualification for deputy-lieutenants and officers of the rank of major, or of higher rank, be abolished; to which he added another amendment (to be proposed in the event of the first not being carried), qualifying any person possessed of a certain amount of personal property. Mr. WALPOLE expressed his willingness to accede to the second proposition, to the extent of qualifying officers possessed of personal property of similar amount to that which qualified holders of real estate. After considerable discussion, and on Mr. Walpole promising to introduce a provision on the subject, the amendment was withdrawn, and the clause agreed to.

On clause 7, Mr. CHARTERIS proposed that 40,000 men, instead of 80,000, should be raised to serve five years. Of these he proposed that 20,000 men should be called out in 1852, and 10,000 in 1853 and 1854 respectively; and he proposed to strike out all the

compulsory clauses. Mr. WALPOLE startled the House by replying that Ministers intended to introduce a proviso to the effect that the compulsory clauses should not be resorted to until after December, 1852. This was regarded, in the discussion which followed, as an admission that there existed no immediate necessity for the measure.

Reproving Mr. Cobden for implying—that that gentleman afterwards anxiously disclaimed—that the people of England are vagabonds, Mr. DISRAELI thus briefly and emphatically explained the grand object of the Militia Bill:—

*"This was the first attempt to habituate the people of this country to the use of arms, to which they were not at present generally accustomed. Circumstances, irresistible circumstances, had for a long time rendered such a policy necessary; and if this Bill should be adopted, though it was not a measure that would produce a disciplined army able to encounter the veteran legions of the world, it would be the first step in a right direction, and would lay the foundation of a constitutional system of national defence. (Cheers.)"*

Ultimately Mr. MILNER GIBSON moved that the word eighty thousand should not form part of the clause—an amendment negatived by 207 to 106.

Mr. BRIGHT now complained of the lateness of the hour, and it was agreed that the chairman should report progress and sit again on Friday.

#### CONSTITUTION FOR NEW ZEALAND.

SIR J. PAKINGTON moved, on Monday, for leave to bring in a bill to grant a representative constitution to the colony of New Zealand.

"He explained the scheme of the constitution proposed by the present Government, pointing out, as he proceeded, wherein it differed from that designed by Earl Grey. It was their opinion that New Zealand should be considered as one colony, and that it should be divided into seven provinces, each governed by a superintendent, appointed by the Governor-in-Chief, with a salary of 500*l.* a-year, each superintendent to have a legislative council of not fewer than nine members, to be entirely elective, the franchise of the electors (natives not being excluded) to be as follows:—a freehold worth 50*l.*, or a house, if in a town, worth 10*l.* a-year, if in the country, 5*l.* a-year, or leasehold property, with an unexpired term of three years, worth 10*l.* a-year. The question whether members of these provincial councils should be paid was left to the central legislature. Sir John read a list of the subjects, amounting to fourteen, upon which the provincial councils would be restrained from legislating. The duration of these councils it was proposed to limit to four years. The central legislature would consist of the Governor-in-Chief, as head, and of two chambers. In the scheme of Lord Grey the upper chamber was to be a representative body; but there was no precedent in any colony for an elective upper chamber, and the present Government recommended that the members of the upper chamber of the central legislature should be appointed by the Crown during pleasure. The lower chamber was to be elective, the franchise for the constituency the same as that for the provincial councils. The number of members for the upper chamber of the central legislature was to be not less than ten nor more than fifteen, at the discretion of the Governor-in-Chief; that of the lower chamber not less than 25 nor more than 40. Five years was intended to be the duration of the central parliament, the acts of which would override those of the provincial legislatures. It was proposed that there should be a civil list; that 12,000*l.* a-year should be retained, out of which the salaries of the superintendents should be paid, and that 7000*l.* a-year should be reserved for native purposes. All arrangements respecting the town lands to be in the hands of the general legislature. It could not be expected, he observed, that such a measure as this could be final, and changes would be introduced into the bill whereby the local legislature should have full power, from time to time, to enact changes in the constitution with the consent of the Crown. It was for the House to decide whether this bill came within the category of "necessary measures;" he believed it did; but if the House was of a different opinion, the alternative was, it being highly inexpedient to allow the act of 1846 to revive, to suspend that constitution for another year."

There was a pretty general concurrence in the motion, the speakers being Sir R. Inglis, Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Hume, Mr. V. Smith, Sir W. Molesworth, and Lord John Russell, who trusted that the bill would not meet with any considerable opposition; and leave was given to bring it in.

#### TENANT RIGHT.

Nothing new or interesting was brought out in the adjourned debate on Mr. Shurman Crawford's Tenant Right Bill, which took place on Wednesday. Mr. CONOLLY spoke from the landlord point of view, denouncing the Bill and its authors, and asserting that they used it only as "a means of stirring up the populace for a time with some wretched pettifogging view to electioneering." Mr. MONSELL defended the principle of the Bill, and referred the present desperate state of Ireland to the absence of a proper relation between landlord and tenant. He completely upset the argument, that as the landlord and tenant law of England worked well, it was therefore applicable to Ireland, by pointing out the vast difference between the manners, customs, habits, and religion of the people of the two countries. Lord NAAS objected to

the Bill, which he said would reduce Ireland to a mere desert. Following the example of Mr. Disraeli on the franchise question, Lord Naas taunted Mr. Crawford with having left the case of the labourers untouched, who, he said, "were as much entitled to a fair share of the emoluments of the land as the tenant farmer or landlord,"—rather a dangerous doctrine for a Conservative. You, he continued, have not proposed a valuation of their day's hire, and you don't intend them to share in the benefits of the Bill. That fact showed the "utter selfishness" of the measure!

Mr. G. H. MOORE replied chiefly to the speech of the Attorney-General for Ireland on a former occasion:—

Mr. Napier said the bill he should propose would confer freedom of contract. "It was said," continued Mr. Moore, "that everything must be done in these times in the spirit of 'freedom of contract.' What jargon! In every civilized community the right of contract was limited by considerations of public good; all contracts vicious, demoralizing, or dangerous to the State were avoided by law. From the usury laws down to the bylaws regulating the hire of cabs, freedom of contract was restricted. Shylock was for freedom of contract. It would be a return to the rudest and most elementary form of savage legislation." He denied that there was any real analogy between the law of England and Scotland and that of Ireland. "The landlord and tenant in his (Mr. Moore's) part of Ireland stood in a wholly different position from that which obtained in England. They were aliens in blood, language, and religion. The landlord was surrounded by no ancient and national recollections but those of shame; the tenant was a vassal, the descendant of a colony of exiles; and between them there was no sympathy of race. Christianity itself appeared to be an element of repulsion between them, and they hated each other for the love of God." These strong allegations were followed up by a striking description of the way improved land was appropriated by the soil owners. "The landlord's original title was confiscation, and he had since effected scarcely any other operation upon the soil than that of confiscating the labour of man. Drains and buildings, and fences, the unaided work of the tenant, were sucked in to the omnivorous vortex of what was called 'property;' and what was wanted was a law that would work out its own ends, and trust nothing to the honour or honesty of man. A peasant took land on the mountain side, and built, and fenced, and drained, and tilled; the most skilful agriculturist could not make it pay for reclaiming; the tenant gave his labour at the mere price of existence, investing in the soil all the difference between the fair wages of labour and that which supported human life. Without the aid of his landlord, he built, dug, fenced, drained, manured, and sowed and reaped, and begot a race of hardy tillers of the soil; but, at the end of his lease, the little estate he had created on the earth's surface by a life of labour was snatched from him, coolly appraised as the property of another, and he was robbed of it."

Mr. MOORE wound up by an allusion to the exodus of the Irish race, asserting that they "were passing, not to the grave—then there might be peace between the two—but to a new world, where their first hope was refuge from the power of Britain, and their next vengeance on British legislation."

The other speakers were Sir WILLIAM SOMERVILLE, Lord CLAUD HAMILTON, and Mr. NAPIER, against the bill, and Mr. REYNOLDS for it. Mr. Napier renewed his promises. He had framed three bills. "The first was a consolidation of nearly seventy statutes relating to the law between landlord and tenant. (Cheers.) The second had reference to the consolidation of leasing powers, and arranging the terms of letting land, so far as a contract between two parties was concerned; and the third bill was to provide compensation for improvements to the industrious tenant. (Cheers.)"

Mr. CRAWFORD replied, and the House divided; when there were—

For the second reading, 57; against it, 167.

Majority, 110.

The bill was consequently lost.

#### HOUSE OF LORDS.

Lord LYNDHURST moved, on Tuesday, for leave to introduce a bill to abolish certain disabilities imposed by the statute of the 6th of George I. He had been induced to consider this question on general grounds, but public attention had been recently drawn to it by a decision of the Court of Exchequer, on the case of Mr. Alderman Salomons.

Lord CAMPBELL having expressed the pleasure he felt at the motion, Lord DERBY hoped that the House would not be led away from the general question into a discussion on Jewish disabilities. He did not question the right of Lord Lyndhurst to introduce such a measure on general grounds, but he thought it unfortunate that he had chosen the present moment for bringing it forward, when the particular case to which he had alluded was still unsettled. With respect to that case, the Government thought that, if Mr. Alderman Salomons presented a petition, representing the grievances to which he was actually subjected after his appeal was decided, he would be fairly entitled to an act of indemnity.

The Marquis of LANSDOWNE hoped that Lord Lyndhurst would bring forward his bill at once, indepon-

dently of all allusions to the case of Mr. Alderman Salomons. After some further discussion, the bill was read a first time.

#### POLITICS AT THE FEAST OF ART.

ART entertained politics on Saturday at dinner; in other words, the Royal Academicians gave that annual feast, now become famous. Present in the East Room were the late and the present Premier, the "Duke," the late and actual Chancellor of the Exchequer, and other Ministers; several representatives of diplomacy, officers of both services, one or two bankers, a good sprinkling of first-rate men of letters, men of science, and men of wealth, and, of course, a garnishing of painters.

Sir Charles Eastlake, the President, was naturally chairman on the occasion, and he performed the pleasant duties of his post in a manner consistent with the character of the Academy. The 1st of May was, he reminded the guests on proposing the health of Prince Albert, the anniversary of the opening of the Exhibition; and in tagging the name of the Duke to the toast of "the Army and Navy," he did not forget that the 1st of May is the birthday of the old hero.

The Duke of Wellington said—Mr. President and Gentlemen of the Royal Academy, I beg leave to return my thanks to you for the honour you have done me in drinking my health with your good wishes for the army and navy. What I particularly request to call the attention of the company to is the fact that this happens to be my birthday. (Cheers.) By the favour with which I have been received by the Royal Academy, and most particularly on this occasion, I beg again, as I have frequently done before in this assembly, to return thanks for the navy (cheers), though I see present my noble friend the First Lord of the Admiralty, who is more nearly connected with that service. But I have to do no more than to express to you that both services are duly and highly sensible of the honour done to them, and the advantages they derive from the approbation of such gentlemen as those who compose the assembly I have the pleasure of addressing. Gentlemen, the services will be rejoiced upon learning that it is considered they continue to deserve the approbation of their country. (Cheers.) Both services, but particularly the army, have been involved in great difficulties, but I do not doubt, gentlemen, but that it will turn out that the approbation of this company is founded upon a just estimate of the manner in which they have performed their duty. (Cheers.) It has been highly satisfactory to me, as it must have been to all of you, to have observed that in the great difficulties and misfortunes which all services are liable to, the officers and soldiers of the army have conducted themselves as they ought to do. (Cheers.) They have shown, under the most difficult circumstances, the utmost subordination, order, and discipline (cheers), and the officers of the navy were in these trials the first to provide for the relief of the helpless. (Loud cheering.) The women and the children (said his Grace, with an emphasis and feeling that affected the whole company) were all saved—an account was given and rendered of every child and woman. (Cheers.) This, gentlemen, is a proud fact for the services of this country—it must have been satisfactory to you all, and it shows that, under any circumstances, you can rely upon their subordination and discipline. (Cheers.) In the name of the army and navy I beg to return you thanks for the honour you have done them.

Soon after this he left the company, to visit Miss Burdett Coutts, a visit which many years he has made on his birth-day.

The Chevalier Bunsen acknowledged "The Foreign Ministers;" and the President, proposing "Our Distinguished Guests," eulogized the patrons, and far more the critics, of art—as Landor, Froude, Sterling, Ruskin; a compliment returned, on the part of the former, by the Marquis of Salisbury, who gave "The Health of the President;" which Sir Charles acknowledged, taking the opportunity to do honour to the memory of Turner, and to propose "The Earl of Derby." In proposing this, the President said that the professors of the Fine Arts lived in "happy ignorance of politics," a remark which drew from Lord Derby, in his reply, the further confession, that one of the most satisfactory things that could happen to a public man, was to indulge sometimes in that happy ignorance of political life, meeting there old opponents, and testifying "to that which it is the pride of Englishmen to believe can subsist with political differences, namely, the sincere indulgence of personal and private friendship." (Loud cheers.) Subsequently, he said,—

"Whatever may be the term of duration of the Government to which I am proud to belong, I may venture to indulge the hope—and I believe I shall be supported by political friends and opponents—that by their assistance and friendly mediation with the right hon. gentleman on my right (Sir C. Wood, we believe), and the right hon. gentleman immediately behind me (referring to a portrait of Mr. Disraeli which was placed just behind the noble lord), we may have an opportunity of testifying our goodwill to a pleasing and delightful art, by providing a more fitting and more adequate locality (loud cheers) for those treasures of ancient and modern art, which of late years this country has been rapidly accumulating, and for the more rapid accumulation of which little more is wanting than that which I hope Government may have it in their

power to provide—a more suitable space for their accommodation." (Cheers.)

A very pretty duel came off on the same subject between the Chancellor of the Exchequer and the late Premier, who, though fencing on neutral ground, and with foils carefully padded, managed to make pretty work of it, so that no love was lost. The whole scene is interesting as politics in undress, and making holiday upon a neutral ground.

The PRESIDENT said he had a toast to propose, which he was sure they would all hear with the greatest pleasure. He begged to propose to them "the Health of the Right Hon. Benjamin Disraeli (cheers), and the interests of Literature so far as they might be found compatible with the usual views of a Chancellor of the Exchequer." (Cheers and laughter.)

The CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER, who was received with cheers and applause, after expressing his deep sense of the high honour, said—

"My name has been referred to by the noble lord who has previously addressed you; but it was in a capacity less endearing than that of a member of the republic of letters. (Cheers and laughter.) I can assure my noble friend, that any appeal made to me in my official capacity to advance the arts, will always find a ready sympathy in my breast; but I beg to remind my noble friend and the company I have now the gratification of addressing, that as regards the task I attempt to fulfil, the hope so long indulged in, that art may find a habitation worthy of its lofty mission, is one full of difficulties, and that I must look for aid and sympathy to other quarters than I can command, before I can secure success. I cannot forget that, if the House of Commons be applied to for this great object, there sits there one who is distinguished for ability, and who is—what I have no claim to be—an eminent and successful statesman. (Cheers.) If I could be assisted by the noble lord the member for London (cheers and laughter)—if he would but exert his authority in that house, on whatever side he may sit, I might, indeed, indulge in a hope that I could succeed in fulfilling your expectations, and in achieving a great result which has been too long delayed, and to which my noble friend so significantly alluded to-night. (Cheers.) I will indulge in the hope from that reference that a palace may arise in this great metropolis, worthy of the arts, worthy of the admiration of the foreigner, worthy of this mighty people, as the becoming emporium where all the genius and inventions of man may be centered and celebrated; but to accomplish that hope we must enlist all the sympathies of all the parties in the State; and it is not to me—one whom accident has placed in a position for which he is not qualified—but to those whose long services and the evidences of whose great abilities have gained the confidence of the country, you must look, and if assisted by the noble lord the member for the City of London, then, indeed, the Royal Academy and this company may expect the accomplishment of that which they have so long desired; and, in the hope that the noble lord will so assist us, I will break through the etiquette of the evening, and, with your permission, I will venture to propose to you 'The Health of the Noble Lord the member for the City of London.'" (Great laughter, cheering, and applause.)

The President, amid renewed laughter, said that he had intended to propose that toast, but his intervention was unnecessary. He called on them to drink the health of Lord J. Russell.

Lord J. RUSSELL.—Mr. President, I am extremely obliged to you and to this company for adopting and sanctioning the toast which the Chancellor of the Exchequer has somewhat irregularly proposed. (Cheers and laughter.) I thought I was safe from being called on in the course of this evening, because I remembered that last year, you said, as the Lord Mayor of London was not present, you expected me to return thanks for him, and, as I saw the Lord Mayor was present this evening, I imagined I should be excused. (Laughter and cheers.) With respect to the allusions the Chancellor of the Exchequer has made, whether they were in jest or earnest, or in both (laughter), my efforts shall be used to provide a better habitation for the Royal Academy. (Cheers.) No one knows better than the President himself that we were, as all Governments will be, afraid of taking the responsibility of fixing on a site for the building. We knew, if it were placed in the middle of the town, we should be told the pictures would be spoiled by the smoke, and dust, and crowds of idle boys (laughter), and that if it were placed at some distance from the city we should be told we were putting them where the people could not reach them, and the objects of art would be beyond their power to visit. In this difficulty we called on you to fix a site, and a commission was appointed, but neither the Government nor the commission, as it happened, assisted each other in fixing on the new site (laughter), and so nothing was done. It is a difficult matter to give satisfaction in such a case, and it will take time to decide upon the best course, but I hope we may at last be successful. I am glad to hear from my noble friend the Earl of Derby the sentiment to which I shall certainly readily respond, that differences of politics do not interrupt or dissolve private friendships. (Loud cheers.) I ventured last year to observe that it was remarkable how many persons eminent in the arts had succeeded in literature, and that we had no better works than those written by painters who at the same time were at the head of their profession; but I stated that I had not remarked that many of those great in literary eminence had shown similar proficiency in the art of painting. (Cheers and laughter.) Mr. Burke and Mr. Macaulay were both famous in literature, but I do not know that either of them could produce a picture equal to any in this room. Now, this is an arena which yet remains open for the Chancellor of the Exchequer (cheers and laughter); and, as he has succeeded in so many things already, I hope he will try to succeed

in the fine arts as he has done in literature, and, as I must say, he has done in political science. (Great laughter and cheering.)

These speeches were the salient points of the evening's proceedings. The Lord Mayor said a few words about the wonderful desire which possessed the corporation for the improvement of the city. Lord Rosse acknowledged the Royal Society, and Lord Mahon the Society of Antiquaries. Professor Owen, thanking for the Society of Arts, pronounced a kind of funeral sermon over the Great Exhibition and the vanishing building: and Lord Lansdowne said some graceful words on behalf of the British Institution. The last toast of the evening was, "The Patrons of Art," and those who opened their galleries to the student and the public last year. This was appropriately acknowledged by the Earl of Ellesmere. He regretted that the Duke of Northumberland and the Marquis of Westminster had made their escape, and left him to return thanks.

If he had, at scarcely any inconvenience to himself, done that which must have been much more inconvenient to others, and had thrown open his gallery, he and they had found their best reward in seeing on those walls ample proof that good use had been made of such opportunities, and that there were men who, without being guilty of servile imitation, could contribute to the pleasure of those who, without the power to invent, had still the ability to admire and appreciate. (Hear.) Speaking in the character of a keeper of those "old lamps," he could assure them it would be his study and gratification to afford to those who desired to catch from them some sparks of the ancient fire every facility they could wish. (Loud cheers.)

The company soon after rose; and in a bustle of apprelling and compliments departed.

#### THE BOOKSELLING QUESTION.

MR. CHARLES DICKENS presided over a meeting of booksellers, men of letters, and others, who share the interest taken in the pending dispute between the combination of booksellers and the free-traders. Letters were read from the under-written gentlemen, regretting that they could not attend, and expressing general concurrence in the views of the free-traders:—Mr. Cobden, M.P., Mr. Thomas Carlyle, Mr. John Stuart Mill, Professor de Morgan, Mr. Henry Cole, Mr. James Wilson, M.P., Mr. W. J. Fox, M.P., Mr. George Combe, Mr. J. R. McCulloch, Mr. W. E. Gladstone, M.P., Mr. R. Chambers, of Edinburgh, Mr. Leigh Hunt, Mr. R. W. Mackay, Mr. A. D. Rich, Mr. R. W. Proctor, Dr. Pereira, and others. Mr. Carlyle's letter ran as follows:—

"Chelsea, May 3, 1852.

"SIR,—Unluckily I shall not be able to attend your meeting on Tuesday evening, but I can have no hesitation in testifying my concurrence with the object of it, which I understand, in brief, to be free-trade in books, or the first step in a course leading straight towards that. Free-trade in respect of books, and indeed of most other objects, is by no means the ultimatum one aspires to, or the perfect condition that will satisfy the world's want in the matter; very far from that in many cases; and in the case of literature, farther than in any other whatsoever. But surely, in all cases, and in that of literature too, free-trade is better than trade unjustly crippled by monopolies which are merely blind and greedy; in present circumstances, free-trade were a clear improvement; and moreover, in the critical disposition of the world, it is a first stage through which all faulty things must pass, and only beyond and after trial of which can any progress that will prove true and lasting be looked for. For the rest, I fear there are few branches of human industry—and most clearly literature is not one of them—in which the shopkeeper spirit (so we may call it for the sake of definition) will suffice to regulate 'production and distribution' according to the world's real want and interest: in regard to very many there is perpetually needed a generous merchant spirit (which it may be feared free-trade and active competition will not much tend to develop among us): and in regard to some, there is needed a spirit higher than any kind of merchandise, and not looking to profit and loss for advice at all. Now, certainly, beyond all other objects, literature in its higher forms belongs to this latter class; to these two latter classes it belongs in all forms of it that have any value to mankind; for the mere shopkeeper spirit, looking only to the visible vicinity, and sharpened into ever greater eagerness for immediate returns, is smitten with eternal incompetence in even the finance of literature, and can do no good whatever there that would not otherwise be done, and does immensities of mischief there which perhaps might otherwise remain undone.

"All this is true even of the finance of literature:—and, alas! literature has many elements besides the financial, and far more important to it than the financial; in regard to all of which it would so gladly cease to be anarchic, and become well ordered, and well governed, if it only could. Truly, to consider how society at present stands related to literature may well fill the thinking man with astonishment, with anxiety, almost with terror. The duties of society towards literature in those new conditions of the world are becoming great, vital, inexpressibly intricate, little capable of being done or understood at present, but all-important to be understood and done, if society will continue to exist with it, and it along with society. From the highest business of spiritual culture and the most sacred interests of men, down to the lowest economic and ephemeral concerns where 'free press' rules supreme, society may see itself, with all its sovereignties and parliaments, depending on the thing it calls literature, and bound, under incalculable penalties, to very many duties in regard

to that!—of which duties, I perceive, finance alone, and free trade alone, will by no means be found to be the same. But such considerations lie far beyond our present business, and must not be more than alluded to here.

"What alone concerns us here is to remark that the present system of book publishing discharges none of these duties, less and less makes even the appearance of discharging them; and indeed as I believe is, by the nature of the case, incapable of ever in any perceptible degree discharging any of them in the times that now are. A century ago, there was in the bookselling-guild—if never any royalty of spirit, as how could such be looked for there?—yet a spirit of solid merchanthood, which had its value in regard to the prosaic facts of literature, and is ever to be thankfully remembered there. Of this solid merchant spirit, if we take the victualling and furnishing of such an enterprise as Samuel Johnson's English Dictionary for its English feat (as perhaps we justly may), and many a *Memoires, Encyclopædia Britannica, &c.*, in this country and in others for its lower, we most gratefully admit the real usefulness, respectability, and merit to the world. But in later times, owing to many causes which have been active, not on the book guild alone, such spirit has long been diminishing, and has now as good as disappeared, without hope of resuscitation in that quarter. The spirit of the book trade, it is mournfully evident, is that of modern trade generally, no better and no worse—a hand-to-mouth spirit, incapable of ever again paying for even a Johnson's Dictionary; not what I can call a merchant spirit, but (on the great or on the small scale) a shopkeeper one. Such is the melancholy fact, so far as my experience and observation have taught me to form an opinion. If my vote is inquired of in the matter, I grieve to say, and am not conscious of either anger or of favour in saying, it is authentically this which leads me—and, indeed, has long since led me—to infer that the publishing guild, taking large wages for doing indispensable work, and quite omitting to do it, is in no safe or lasting position before the public, and will prove incapable of standing, unless it can escape being inquired into. If the public itself (as I by no means believe, or ever believed) is adequate, by free trade or otherwise, to remunerate literature, the public ought to have at least a chance of trying to do it. The present system, by which above one-half of the selling price of a book ('from 55 to 65 per cent, including advertisements') is paid over to a man or set of men, not who write it, or print it, or bind it, or make paper for it, but who show it across the counter and draw in the money, remained, to all who look at it in this point of view, one of the most astonishing ever seen in human commerce, and seems to me, in these days, destined to speedy abrogation when once the public has got eye on it.

"My own interest in the business, I confess, is not of a lively nature; nor are my hopes for the world, from such a revolution, what they once might have been: but such is, and has long been, my view of the case now come in hand. No duty being done to literature but a shopkeeping one, let us have at least the eligible kind of shopkeeping—your 55 per cent. reduced gradually (as we find it in America just now) to 15 or to 10, with books about half the price they now bear, and with twenty times, or forty times, as many readers to them as now—after that, we shall see.

"In haste, I remain, sir, yours very truly,

(Signed)

"T. CARLYLE.

"John Chapman, Esq., publisher, 142, Strand."

Mr. John Chapman being invited to state the position of the "underselling booksellers," with regard to the Booksellers' Association, read a very long and able paper, setting forth the whole subject. He described the Association as one which originated, and was organized with the view of keeping the price of books artificially high. He met the argument that free-trade would decrease the number of booksellers, by asserting that unrestrained competition would accurately determine the number of booksellers necessary for the efficient distribution of books, and that it was by no means certain any great reduction would follow from free-trade. He pointed out the fact that there were many booksellers who did not, and would not belong to the Association, and many others who had been coerced into joining it. He showed that one at least of the great monopolist booksellers undersold in his dealings with that portion of the trade intimately connected with him, which he called an "unconscious inconsistency" on the part of Mr. Murray. On the whole, what he contended for was, that "every author and every publisher should be able to fix his own conditions of sale." He justified this by referring to the known laws of commerce, which prove that the maintenance of a fixed price is impossible, unless by means of an external force, which invariably deadens the trade to which it is applied.

The rest of the proceedings consisted in the moving of certain resolutions; Mr. Babbage moved, and Mr. Robert Bell seconded, the first:—

"The principles of Free-trade having now been established by experience, as well as by argument, it is the opinion of this meeting that they ought to be applied to books as to all other articles of commerce."

This was opposed by Mr. Trelawney Saunders, on the ground that the obnoxious regulations were intended to protect the profits of the retailer from the competition of the large publisher, and that free-trade would reduce those profits. Mr. Willis, a retailer, followed in the same track, only he used stronger language. The meeting, he said "was called to crush booksellers' profits." (Cries of "No, no.") It was

so. Books were advertized at a certain price. When a copy was ordered, the retailer could get no discount. How, then, was he to live? Mr. Sotheron, another retailer, took a similar view. Amendments were moved, and withdrawn; and the original resolution carried.

Opposition having proved ineffectual, the second resolution was moved by Mr. Charles Knight, seconded by Mr. Tom Taylor, and supported by Mr. Bush.

"That the principles of the Booksellers' Association are not only opposed to those of Free-trade, but are extremely tyrannical and vexatious in their application, and result in keeping the prices of books much higher than they otherwise would be, thus restricting their sale, to the injury of authors, the public, and all connected with literature."

The third resolution was moved by Professor Newman, and seconded by Professor Ansted.

"That this meeting considers the peculiarity of the book-trade, viz., that the publisher fixes and advertizes the retail price of his publications, no valid argument for the maintenance of the present restrictive system, and that the less the office of promoting the retail sale is centralised in the publisher, and the more it devolves on the local booksellers, the better for the commerce of literature."

Professor Owen moved, and Dr. Lankester seconded, the fourth resolution.

"That the trade restrictions, falling as they do with peculiar severity upon books of a comparatively limited circulation, greatly retard the spread of the higher branches of science and philosophy, by rendering it unprofitable, and indeed dangerous, to publish works devoted to them."

Mr. F. O. Ward and Mr. John Chapman moved and seconded the fifth resolution, which was supported by Mr. George Cruikshank, and ineffectually opposed by Mr. Saunders.

Mr. Ward moved, "That experience having repeatedly shown, that trades with artificially high profits and a small market, gain by being forced into the natural system of low profits and a large market, this meeting is of opinion, that the abolition of the present restrictions, so far from injuring the bookselling business, will greatly benefit it."

These resolutions were all carried, and after some discussion it was resolved that they should be fairly copied and transmitted to Lord Campbell, together with a letter from Mr. Charles Dickens, stating the reasons why they declined appointing a deputation to wait upon him, as they could not consent to defer to his arbitration or abandon the position they had assumed.

Letters appeared in the *Morning Herald* of the same day, which had passed between Mr. Seeley and Mr. John Chapman. Mr. Seeley wished to be allowed to attend the meeting, and Mr. Chapman declined to invite him. Mr. Seeley then charged Mr. Chapman with declining to attend the meeting at Stratheden House, and refusing to admit him as spokesman of the booksellers at the meeting above described. The explanation of this seeming impropriety of conduct is very simple. Mr. Chapman was informed of the meeting at Lord Campbell's too late to afford him time to consult with his colleagues, and he refused to act without them. As to refusing to invite Mr. Seeley, Mr. Chapman stated that the meeting of Wednesday at his house was called for a special purpose; and that if Mr. Seeley were invited, other prominent members of the Booksellers' Association ought to be invited also, and he should not have room for them.

#### BRITISH ANTI-STATE CHURCH ASSOCIATION.

THE report of this body, read at the annual meeting, on Wednesday, states that they had, during the year, sent deputations to nearly one hundred towns, from Aberdeen in the north to the other extremity of the kingdom. The public meetings had been large and animated, and though discussion had sometimes taken place, in no case had they failed to adopt the society's principle. A monthly meeting had also been held during the winter, in London, at which addresses on given topics had been delivered in the hearing of a considerable number who had not attended previous meetings. The committee had issued several new popular tracts, and had commenced a series intended to give a complete exposition of the state-church system. The literary scheme for inculcating the society's principles by means of general literature had been successfully launched; several thousand volumes of the "Library for the Times" having been circulated. The agitation for the repeal of the Maynooth Endowment Act had led the committee to give their support to the movement against all state-patronage of religion. The agitation, it was predicted, would greatly accelerate the solution of a wider question, as it would be increasingly felt that grants to Roman Catholics in Ireland could not justly be withdrawn, and at the same time the Irish church and the presbyterian *regium donum* maintained.

The most important resolution agreed to was adopted on the motion of Mr. Edward Miall, editor of the *Nonconformist*. It recommended "that, in the prospect of a general election, the meeting earnestly ex-

horted the opponents of state connexion with religion to avail themselves of the facilities it afforded for the furtherance of their views by supporting anti-state church candidates."

#### ELECTION MATTERS.

SIR FITZROY KELLY wooed the brawny electors of East Suffolk on Saturday, at Ipswich. He was severely taxed by several electors, notably by Mr. Haward, a tenant farmer, who seemed particularly well acquainted with all the ins and outs, the windings and vagaries of the coquet of so many constituencies. Sir Fitzroy met with great opposition; but brass stood him in the stead of a clean conscience, and he parried the home-thrusts of the usual impromptu commentators in the crowd with more or less success. One thing, however, was but too manifest. He had been a Free-trader, and voted for Free-trade; he now professed the creed of Protection, and his readiness to vote for it. There was a strong party who, if they were not Free-traders, were decidedly against Lord Derby. Mr. John Houghton was proposed by the section who, vehemently rejecting Kelly, rejected alike Derby and Russell. As Mr. Houghton declined to go to the poll, the Solicitor-General was declared duly elected.

Mr. Layard, [of Nineveh] late Under-Secretary for Foreign Affairs, has been addressing the electors of Aylesbury.

Mr. Lindsay, the well-known ship-owner, is put up for Dartmouth. He met the electors last week, and, in replying to an attack upon him by a Tory elector, gave the following interesting account of his fortunes:

"He should be the last to mention a word about himself had he not been taunted with falsehood. He was told he was a mere commonplace shipbroker. God knew he was commonplace enough once. He was the architect of his own fame, and he hoped no one would despise him on that account. (Cheers.) He was but a young man now, and at the age of fourteen he was left an orphan boy to push his way in the world. He left Glasgow to find his way to Liverpool with 4s. 6d. only in his pocket, and so poor was he that the captain of a steamer had pity on him, and told him that he would give him his passage if he would trim the coals in the coalhole of the steamer. He did so, and thus worked his passage. He remembered that the fireman gave him a part of his homely dinner, and never had he ate a dinner with such relish, for he felt that he had wrought for it and earned it; and he wished the young to listen to this statement—he had derived a lesson from that voyage which he had never forgot. (Cheers.) At Liverpool he remained for seven weeks before he could get employment; he abode in sheds, and 4s. 6d. maintained him, until at last he found shelter in a West Indian man; he entered as a boy, and before he was nineteen he had risen to the command of an Indian man. At 23, he retired from the sea, his friends, who when he wanted assistance had given him none, having left him that which they could no longer keep. He settled on shore; his career had been rapid; he had acquired prosperity by close industry, by constant work, and by keeping ever in view that great principle of doing to others as you would be done by. (Cheers.) And now, instead of being a commonplace shipbroker, he would tell them that at 35—for he was no older—what was the amount of business which the firm which he had established, and was at the head of and the acting partner in, transacted. During the last year alone their charters executed amounted to upwards of 700, and this year it bade fair to be larger. The amount of their insurances was 3,000,000l. sterling; they had shipped, as contractors, upwards of 100,000 tons of coal, and upwards of 150,000 tons of iron. They had imported in the famine year, as brokers, 1,500,000 quarters of corn. (Hear, hear.) Then, as to the next charge, that he was no ship-owner, and did not own a ton of shipping. In consequence of this statement he had been induced to copy out a list of the ships in which he owned a proportionate rate, and was managing owner of all, a large and high class of British built ships. He then read a list of 18 vessels, besides steamers and others, ranging from 860 to 310 tons burden, the total tonnage being 21,002—the largest portion of which he owned himself, and was manager for the whole." (Loud cheers.)

Lord Goderich has addressed the electors of Hull. He declares against the reimposition of a duty on corn, but advocates "the readjustment of those taxes which press so heavily upon the shipping interests of the country." He also advocates the extension of the suffrage, the shortening of the duration of Parliaments, and "a careful reconsideration of the present distribution of members."

As the General Election approaches, the activity of the Irish Catholics increases. A document was issued at the end of last week, to the Catholic electors of Ireland, by the Defence Association, signed by the now notorious name of Wilberforce. It has been called forth by the effort made to pledge Members of Parliament against the Maynooth grant, which it calls "an instalment of justice to Ireland."

John of Tuam has declared in favour of Saxon candidates, like Mr. Sheriff Swift, for Irish constituencies. This is an important accession. What now becomes of the cry of nationality raised by Young Ireland, and formerly supported by St. Jarlath?

Considerable activity is visible in the Tower Hamlets, which leads to the conclusion that the contest there

will be a sharp one. Mr. Ayrton, Mr. George Thompson, and Mr. William Newton, have met the electors during the week, to explain their views. Mr. Ayrton is a sound radical, and at a meeting, on Wednesday, held at Bethnal-green, it was resolved that he and Mr. Thompson were entitled to the support of the electors. A similar meeting was held at Hackney, on Monday, when, although considerable opposition was manifested to Mr. George Thompson, a resolution, approving of both candidates, was agreed to.

Mr. Leeman, who was considered safe, and Mr. Milner, have withdrawn their pretensions at York. This leaves Henry Vincent in a more favourable position.

Mr. Isaac Butt, Q.C., who rivals Mr. Freshfield in his adventures, wooings, and rebuffs with constituencies, at home and abroad, has offered himself for Harwich. What a splendid instance of high ambition!

#### PROFESSOR NEWMAN'S LECTURE ON ENGLAND'S PLACE AND DUTY IN EUROPE.\*

(Concluded.)

1. "We ought not to vacillate." Inconsistent effort destroys itself. Whig, Tory, and Radical, will agree, that England becomes contemptible if she does not know her own mind—if she holds different language in successive years—if she undoes to-day what she did yesterday. There can be no party among us who seriously approve of keeping up fleets and embassies for patronage to the Ministry, and for nothing else. But vacillation is far worse than nothing: it involves treachery and baseness. States and peoples (like the noble and unfortunate Sicilians) trust our strongly expressed sympathies, act on the expectation of our support, and find themselves cruelly abandoned. What allies, then, in future shall we get? What influence can we have if we change from year to year?

All know in what direction Russia and Austria will act: these powers are at least consistent, and hence their success. But as for England, one needs to be a very deep statesman to know what she is aiming at. [I can remember that Mr. Canning, as Prime Minister, sent a fleet into the Levant, which fought the battle of Navarino; and that the Duke of Wellington, as Prime Minister, apologized for the battle as a mistake. We supported constitutionalists in Spain and Portugal up to a certain date, and then, in 1847, we crushed the constitutionalists of Portugal. We would fight against Naples in a quarrel about sulphur, but not to save the hereditary liberties of the Sicilians, of whom (when it was convenient) we had assumed the protectorate. While constitutional Hungary was triumphant, and was not yet embittered against all monarchy, we would not risk a war with Russia to hinder an intervention which we deplored; yet, when Hungary has fallen, we risk a war with Russia to save a few Hungarian refugees. Because we have offended Russia in the Dardanelles, we gratify her in Holstein, so far as to bring Austrian armies into Hamburg, and give a stab to freedom and Protestantism in North Germany. Our envoy in Italy encourages Italian liberty in 1848,—cautiously, yet so as fully to manifest English sympathies. Soon after, Rome, righteously and legally free, is unjustly crushed by France; her unhappy refugees are treated with rude inhospitality by our Maltese Governor, and our Prime Minister defends him by gratuitous slander on the exiles! Who would have suspected that anti-papal England would dread an unpapal Rome?]

In fact, to what results in Europe can we point as won by our vast exertions and sacrifices? Which of all the nations is grateful to us? Which of all can be conscious that it would be the worse off if England for the last 150 years had lain under the waves? Or how are we ourselves better off than if we had been strictly neutral the last seventy years?

All will allow the intolerable evils of vacillation; but few seem duly to take to heart that it is the besetting sin of every free and mixed government. We have no fixed and secret senate like that of old Rome, conducting all foreign affairs coherently, ordering armies, finances, commissaries, treaties, embassies. As the Sovereign cannot overrule the Ministry, there is absolutely no organ whatever to secure consistency in our action. On a change of Ministry, all foreign powers count that there will be a change in our foreign policy. Thus England stultifies herself. If this is inevitable, ought not Tories, Whigs, and every other order of statesmen, to agree that it is far better to withdraw our fleets and embassies? If a domestic occurrence, such as a change of Ministry, is to deceive our allies or friends, what else do we become but a snare and a nuisance to Europe? We entice, and almost compel, foreign states to intrigue in our internal affairs.

2. But, again. "Non ought our ambassadors to counteract one another." This now is to be calculated on, except when they all chime in with despotism. For the despotic courts, by alternate flattery and bullying, count that they can at last get a supple ambassador. Through the Hungarian war, it was notorious that the policy and tone of Lord Ponsonby and of Sir Stratford Canning were strikingly at variance. The only cure is to abandon fixed embassies, which belong to a past age, and in Europe, as a system, are now useless or mischievous. A fixed embassy in an aggressive despotic court is liable to be corrupted by the atmosphere, and undoes the influence of constitutional England. Those who live in daily courtesy with great criminals, learn to look gently or approvingly on gigantic crime. A fixed embassy should not be the rule, but the exception.

3. "Non ought our ministry to leave darkness over our principles and purposes." Secret diplomacy exerts no influence over bad men, except as a direct threat of war. It is weighed, not by truth and righteousness, but by cannon-balls. No secret letter can make a tyrant blush, nor stir a nation into enthusiasm. Besides, the secret system gives a most mischievous importance to the hints and mild phrases; and (so to say) to the winks, and to the personality, of an ambassador: hence it is a dangerous vehicle of deception, and unsuitable to an honourable power and to a good cause. At present neither foreign nations, nor the British public, know the *motives* of our foreign proceedings, even after the facts are public: hence our past is no guide to our future. Of our recent European wars, that of Syria, in 1840, is the most famous; but how many of us know *why* we engaged in it? I have heard three reasons; but know not which to receive. Again: who of us could have guessed that our ministry would plot with Louis Bonaparte to restore the Pope by force? and what Italian can assuredly assert *why* we did so? If the King of Naples were now to run away, and the Neapolitans and Sicilians were to establish a government, as orderly and wise, as the present tyranny is horrible, the oppressed people is unable to foresee, or to know, probably, whether we should join the French in crushing their freedom, or resolutely sustain it against aggression. What more severe can be said of a foreign policy which pretends to moral influence? And this flows out of the secret system. It would be easy to show the same leads us to lose in peace all that we have hardly earned in war.

\* Vide *Leader*, No. 110.

When the great conflict with Napoleon was terminated, we had forgotten for what principle we had been fighting;—which really was, to restrain the tyrannous encroachment of a despot. We acted after victory as though no tyranny but Napoleon's was formidable; and we ensured to Europe despotism, oppression, insurrections, invasion, all the past and the impending struggles. When ministers are allowed to wield a vast power, we ought at least to insist that they shall give public reasons for every act, as a judge does: Lord Castlereagh would not have signed the Treaty of Vienna had he been expected publicly to defend the details.\*

Again: Secrecy makes it impossible to form public opinion beforehand; hence public enthusiasm is not forthcoming when the time of action arrives. Defenders of the late ministry are heard to say, that it abandoned the Sicilians because it feared that the English public would not support them! Why, how could we? Who of us can possibly unravel the web of diplomacy? A blue book comes out a year after the facts; and then, at last, a few persons who have much leisure get some insight (but a partial one only) into the case. The English public to this day is kept in total ignorance that we have any moral obligations to Sicily more than to France or to Sardinia; and then complaint is made of the apathy and selfishness of the public! If England is to be a moral power, publicity is essential for all her acts. Her state papers should be short, morally reasoned from broad and fundamental principles, and ordinarily published on the day of delivery, without any vote of Parliament; nay, most of all when Parliament is not sitting. The half year's vacation is now a time of wholly unchecked despotism. The argument of "necessity of secrecy for the public service," must be reserved strictly for details of military movements. In negotiations, conspirators and tyrants need to be secret; but a great state, with an honourable cause, has nothing to gain by it, and everything to lose.

Publicity would not all at once secure, but it would conduce to, the habit of dealing on broad moral principles. No others can be right between nations. Lawyer-like subtlety is unjust and disastrous. A war or peace which cannot be popularly and concisely expounded, is assuredly a bad cause. Not till the popular intellect is the tribunal before which our statesmen plead, will our foreign and colonial be as moral as our home policy.

4. "Nor ought we to admit, as a final criterion of international right the private decisions of a few learned men." Many of our inconsistencies rise out of uncertainties concerning right principle. To recover a few hundred pounds for Don Pacifico we blockaded Athens, spent and destroyed a hundred-fold of the sum claimed, and risked widespread hostility. Yet when an Englishman is brutally cut down in the streets of Tuscany we revenge him by meek notes that receive insulting replies. Here the principle is in controversy, whether a private Englishman voluntarily residing or travelling in a foreign country, ought to be under the protection of British law. If there is a treaty to this effect, of course he is; yet such treaties may be ordinarily undesirable. If there is no treaty, one would think that no external jurisdiction should interpose, except in the extreme cases which justify intervention even on behalf of strangers. By claiming to enforce our own law for the protection of our subjects abroad we involved ourselves in war with China, and are now again in war with Birma. These wars must be endless; and unless checked by abandoning our principle of interference, threaten ruin to our Indian empire by its own growth. Far more discriminating has hitherto been the conduct of the United States. Where their citizens trade or travel voluntarily, they have left them to the laws of the foreign country; but now they are bravely undertaking to enforce humanity on Japan, which murders or engages sailors driven by tempests on her shores. The distinction between voluntary and involuntary approach to a country seems to me here the cardinal point. But pardon me this digression: I had meant to say, that all such questions ought to be solemnly and publicly debated by Parliaments, not settled in a private study by a learned jurist or historian. Where party spirit does not intervene, English assemblies have no lack of the highest wisdom. Did our Parliament leave to local authorities local and petty questions, and the mere application of principles, and give more time to great moralities, it would be far more dignified, and do far higher service.

5. "Nor, if forced into war, ought we to attack neutrals." I believe many of my hearers will be amazed at my protruding this axiom. Many are not aware that this is our habitual practice and an avowed policy, to which no State in Europe has contributed so vehemently as England. I do not now speak of our having the other day attacked a neutral and inoffensive tribe of Kaffirs, and of having added them to our enemies by ravaging their country. This, no doubt, will be disowned as a mistake. But it was no mistake, when, having resolved to invade Afghanistan, we occupied the independent and neutral country of Sindh as passage-ground. That act of violence caused the Sindh war; and our conquest of Sindh precipitated the Sikhs upon India, with a long train of war, calamity, confusion of all moral principle, and infinite embarrassments to come.

See now how evil breeds its like. Our unjust occupation of Sindh to aid our Afghan war stopped the mouths of our ministers when Russia, in November, 1848, occupied the Danubian principalities with a view to the invasion of Hungary. We did not back Turkey in her resistance to this violation of her soil, for we had a bad conscience.

But it is from the seas that we principally attack neutrals. If we are assailed by France, we retaliate by capturing all merchant vessels which dare to trade to France. Thus, neutral interests, of indefinite amount, are confiscated at the will and convenience of any one powerful belligerent. This enormity is politely called the law of blockade. By applying it in 1798 we starved to death 20,000 oppressed Genoese, men, women, and children, in order to capture a French army. It surrendered "with the honours of war," as soon as the innocents had been immolated. This is like stabbing a friend through the heart, in order to prick an enemy who runs behind him. The atrocious deed took nine months in perpetrating; and we persevered, when from our ships we saw the starving ladies gathering herbs and digging roots on the green embankments. Our two ferocious attacks on Denmark, a peaceful and friendly power, were a still more marvellous example how, when once in a war fever, we forget all moral principle, and, of course, with it all wisdom, in the struggle for immediate victory. As to this law of blockade, it is the nuisance which makes war contagious, and forbids all real neutrality. War becomes too heavy a weapon to use; it turns our Mediterranean fleet into a sham. We fear to help an injured people—especially if it be small, like Sicily; for we cry, "Oh! it will cause a European war!" Yes, if we attack neutrals! and perhaps an American war, too, as in 1811 and 1812, when the United States joined our enemies because we fled into their merchant vessels. That American war was then our calamity. It is now our strength, if we are wise. It enables us to overturn this evil practice by uttering the word; for we know that America will join us.

6. "Nor ought we to volunteer extending a war beyond its

\* The immediate consequence of our abandoning freedom in 1814 was, that the two nations for whom we had principally fought, and whose free constitutions we had solemnly acknowledged,—Sicily and Spain,—were both overwhelmed by despotic violence. Spain we aided to deliver from French armies in the great struggle against Napoleon, in order to see it subdued by French armies at the command of the Holy Alliance. This was to us an odious and dreadful sight; but we ourselves caused it, by not protesting aloud for Poland and Italy in 1814.

most inevitable geographical limits." If Russia will attack Hungary, we may aid to repel Russian regiments from Hungarian soil: but by what moral, logical, or physical necessity does it force us to blockade or bombard St. Petersburg? In 1832, we made war on the Dutch forces in Antwerp; but we kept peace with Holland on the seas and everywhere else. If we wish to defend Sicily in Sicily, Rome in Rome, Hungary in Hungary, we are able to do something more or less effectual; and certainly with the least possible risk of moral principle. But the moment that we justify attacks on innocence, peace, and industry, by the mere plea that this conduces to victory, we go adrift on an unknown and incalculable ocean. Suppose that, in order to carry on war "more vigorously," we sail to attack St. Petersburg. It may be that the Emperor yields, to save his capital. Good! But it may also be, that he is fanatically obstinate. We then either retire abashed at our own empty threats, or we lay his city in ashes, enrage our good friends the Russian people, rouse their patriotism against us, and only do worse harm to the Hungarians. Moreover, to bombard St. Petersburg, is to ruin hundreds of English merchants, and would thus raise among ourselves a powerful party favourable to the enemy. It is as unjust to call the commercial class selfish because they deprecate having to pay for a war with their whole fortunes, as to expect provision shops to feed a town in famine. The ferocious Roman policy of habitually carrying war to the enemy's heart makes war essentially immoral, as an unlimited retaliation for a limited wrong. It is energetic! Yes! as it is to stab a man, because he will not pay us five shillings!

7. "We ought not to be too timid to speak truth publicly." I admit that prudence may positively enjoin silence on weak States, like Belgium and Switzerland. If this is our case, it follows that we have no ordinary public duties in Europe. I do not treat that opinion as absurd. It might be urged that England is like a wounded warrior, whose first duty was to heal his own wounds, before encountering fresh foes. Our National Debt is our wound. From 1823 onward, when we did not dare even to protest aloud for the liberties of Spain, which we saved from Napoleon to abandon to the despots whom we had set up in power,—our only wise policy (in my individual judgment) was to withdraw our fleets, economize, pay our debt, and nurse our strength for future service. If any one still says, we are too weak to dare to speak truth, this is the policy he ought to enjoin. But if, since 1849, it is too dangerous to be passive—if, wounded or unwounded, we must defend ourselves—if armed neutrality is more expensive than a decided second part in limited war—if on these grounds it is right to be ready for contest, it is cowardice and folly alike to shut our mouths through fear. The anger of the despots against an English minister who speaks plain truth in our Parliament, is some measure of the formidable nature of the weapon which we hold against them. The speaking of truth in English public life would before long overthrow tyrannies in Europe. For freedom is an atmosphere, truth is a subtle spirit. It pervades foreign countries, it breaks through the barriers of despots; it invades their quiet, it overturns their elaborate plans. Therefore they hate it, they dread it, they persecute it; therefore they cannot afford freedom to exist in their neighbourhood. But the ministers and statesmen who urge and entreat us not to speak truth too loudly, hereby confess that they are themselves already half enslaved. They warn us what will next come, if despotism be confirmed, and they point us to the wise course of doing the opposite of what they suggest.

Finally, to what positive conduct do these negations point? I know that if it be ever so right for England, in conjunction with the United States, to take an initiative in Europe, there is no time for the formation of a public opinion for that. Events must stir and guide opinion. But I will imagine a new revolution to neutralize the forces of France; and I then ask—What ought we to do, if some of the oppressed nations make insurrection? If National Independence be our own right, if Legitimacy is indeed of value, if we would not be accomplices in Tyranny, we surely cannot desire—none of the great parties in England could desire—to aid the despots. All will in word avow neutrality, as the least thing which we owe to the nations. But we are apt to profess neutrality, yet by an unjust interpretation, and through the odious Law of Blockade, practically to take part against the insurgents. If we would be truly neutral, we must recognise both contending parties alike, and defend our commerce to both alike, so as to enable both alike to traffic with us, whether for arms or for any other purpose.

At the same time, considering how great are our obligations to Sicily, and that we are at this moment accomplices in the oppression of Rome, we seem to me to have a deep debt to both these States, and that whenever we dare, we ought actively to restore them to freedom; but, as I said, without attacking neutrals or non-belligerents, or extending war beyond its most necessary limits. Moreover, if intervention of other despotic powers takes place, so as to manifest the conspiracy of despots, then beyond a doubt a league of free states to support liberty is just and expedient; and until it can be made, England should act alone. Do you ask what we can do? That is a military question, into which it is too late to enter; but I do not hesitate to avow a civilian's opinion, that if the forces of France were but neutral, it would only need a strong will in England, and she could, even without the aid of America, revolutionize Europe in three months, in spite of all the efforts of Russia and Austria; and to do this, at any imaginable expense of money and arms, would be to us a very economical and prudent proceeding.

Allow me one more topic. There are persons, I fear a class, among us, who love legal freedom by a sliding scale of geography. They would die for freedom in England, they abhor tyranny in France, they do not quite like it in North Germany, they are satisfied with it in Austria, they highly approve of it in Italy, and they are spiteful against freedom in Hungary. Like the ancient Persians, they value the dignity of nations by the inverse ratio of geometrical distance. To such I would wish to say: Gentlemen or peers! if you desire to lead England, know your own race more wisely! Breeds of men do differ; but the highest are soon ruined where yet law is overpowered, unless they become martyrs in struggling for its restoration; and the lowest races are quickly elevated where law and freedom are secured by antagonist forces. You love, and are proud of, English legality, English security, and perhaps English progress. Yet Englishmen have not nobler natures than Italians, or Bohemians, or Hungarians. We have no intrinsic right to liberty more than other men; our island and a Dutch army, not our virtues, saved it from James II. Let us not be high-minded. Our freedom and laws will be exposed to a struggle of infinite danger if despotism make its conquests permanent over the breadth of the continent. The Hungarians and Italians were fighting your battle, and you, alas! knew it not. You fancied their enemies to order, because they struggled against armed foreign oppression! But if there be anything certain in the future, it is, that despots will now conquer together or fall together. You cannot separate the cause of Louis Bonaparte from that of the Jesuits, from the misrule of cardinals, the brutal police of Naples, and the fortress-prisons of Austria. You cannot have liberty at home and contented slavery abroad. If ever the struggles for freedom on the continent begin to die away, despotic intrigue will enslave such Englishmen as you, and an ominous future will rise before England, which it may be too late for America to avert. We have no reasonable security that Europe shall not hereafter become what Asia is, if the forces of tyranny prevail in the present stage of events. Let the English friends of Austria look to the Eastern world, and to the old Roman empire, and learn, that despotism triumphing by soldiers is conservative of nothing but ruin and putrefaction.

## LETTERS FROM PARIS.

[FROM OUR OWN CORRESPONDENT.]

## LETTER XIX.

Paris, Tuesday Evening, 4th May, 1852.

THE noble conduct of the Magistracy of Paris, in the affair of the Orleans property, seems to have set an example, which it has become a point of honour to imitate. Instances are being recorded, on every side, of Provincial Magistrates declining to recognise the Government of Louis Napoleon, and refusing to take the oath prescribed by the new Constitution. Among these intrepid men we notice M. Estancelin, member of the *Conseil Général* of the Seine Inférieure; M. Granger de la Marinière, member of the *Conseil Général* of the Nièvre; M. Lebeau, member of the *Conseil Général* of the Pas de Calais; M. Faily, deputy, and member of the *Conseil Général* of the Deux Sèvres; and another, a member of the *Conseil Général* of the Somme. But, in addition to these individual cases, we have regularly constituted bodies adopting the same course: the Tribunals of Commerce of the towns of Havre, Thiers, and Evreux, have respectively refused to subscribe to the oath. I have also to relate another instance of the courage of the Magistracy of Paris. The journal *Le Corsair* had been seized for an article criticising the government of L. Bonaparte. The question involved was as to the application of the new law, which transfers the trials for offences of the press, from the Civil Courts, and places them under the jurisdiction of the *Police Correctionnelle*. The case having been heard by the *Conseil de Paris*, a sort of Commission of Inquiry, was dismissed, the *Conseil* having decided that the article published by the *Corsair* was not culpable. The Government considering itself disgraced by this verdict, has appealed against the decision; and the affair will be brought before the Chamber of the *Mises en Accusation* (Court of Indictment). But the celebrated M. de Belleyme is the president of this court. It was M. de Belleyme who, in 1830, on the occasion of the *ordonnances* of Charles the Tenth against the Press, delivered the famous verdict which condemned the printer of the journal *Le Commerce* to print the paper, notwithstanding the prohibition of the Government. It was M. de Belleyme who presided on the bench, in the recent trial concerning the Orleans property. We must therefore hope that in the affair of the *Corsair* he will dismiss the case. If such were to happen, it would be fatal to Bonaparte's power—it would, in fact, be the re-establishment of the liberty of the press. The journals, shielded by the verdicts of the Magistracy, would be free, openly to criticise and blame the acts of the Government.

The Empire is countermanded; there are too many obstacles in the way. Not that the soldiers will be less vociferous in their acclamation of L. Bonaparte as Emperor; but the sequel of the imperial farce is to be cut short: a third menacing *Note* having arrived from St. Petersburg. The Czar tells M. Bonaparte, that "he is aware of the farce which is being rehearsed, and forbids its representation for M. Bonaparte's benefit. That if the comedy were played out, it should be followed by a tragedy which the Czar, in person, was ready to bring to Paris." This declaration of war, in case the Empire should be proclaimed, was brought to Paris by the Generals Paskoof and Pouskine, aide-de-camps of the Emperor of Russia. These two gentlemen have been giving themselves the malicious pleasure, of repeating the words of their imperial master, in all the salons of Paris.

So then the Empire is not to be, at least for the present. The Elysée is greatly chafallen. Our swaggering brawlers have dropped their loud talking. As for the long boasted *fête* of the 10th May, it has quite lost its value in their estimation. This new state of mind was particularly visible at the review last Sunday. The Society of *Décembriards* were there as usual; but for the first time these three months, these open-mouthed knaves did not utter a single *Vive l'Empereur*. Probably their pay overnight had been forgotten!

To the flattering dreams of anticipated triumph, have succeeded a complete state of dejection. Gloomy forebodings, and the most absurd fears perplex the Elysian mind. The *fête* of the 10th of May, is to be followed by a banquet and ball on the 11th, given by the army to Louis Bonaparte. All the officers of the garrison of Paris are to be there, as well as the deputations from the rest of the army. The General Carrelet had begun to send out the invitations, when it was discovered that many of those who had been invited had given their tickets away. This caused a good deal of alarm at the Elysée, and was viewed simultaneously as a conspiracy on the part of the army, a conspiracy of the Legitimists, a conspiracy of the Orleansists, and a conspiracy of the Republicans. To prevent, therefore, the future Emperor from coming in direct contact with his enemies, it has been decided that the seat of His Imperial Majesty shall be raised at

the dinner-table, so that he may not be within reach; and that at the ball, His Majesty should be placed on a platform, above the rest of the company. It has also been decided that the original cards of invitation should be cancelled; those re-issued, instead of being transferable, to be available only to the persons whose names they bear.

It is expected that the incidents of the ball will give rise to considerable scandal, as, in consequence of the number of military men (from 1600 to 2000) who are to be present, there would not be room for civilians. The wives, therefore, of the public functionaries have been invited to attend without their husbands. Something like another Rape of the Sabines is anticipated! The proverbial gallantry of the French soldier cannot fail to do great execution on the occasion. We are to have more than one Helen, and Menelaus' in abundance. Moreover, if the *Constitutionnel* is to be believed, the ladies are specially reserved for the pleasures of the Sultan Bonaparte; and with this view, they are to form a line in front of the imperial platform; there to be ogled by his Highness. The *Constitutionnel* omits telling us whether the Sultan is expected to throw the *mouchoir* to any of these ladies!

The affairs of the Lottery of the Lingots d'Or, have just been exhibited before a court of law. You will remember that the scheme of this Californian lottery was *Seven Millions of tickets, at one franc each*, the alleged object being to provide funds for the emigration of a party of volunteers to California. But its real purpose was to raise money to pay four million's worth of Louis Bonaparte's clamorous debts. The other two millions to be divided amongst the greedy adventurers hanging about the Elysée, and the remaining million to go to M. Carlier, the prefect of police; the real projector of the lottery, under an assumed name. At first, the money came in freely; the receipts in a few days amounted to two millions and a half, and were quickly transferred from the pockets of the public to those of M. Bonaparte. Then came doubts, the papers hinting at disclosures. The receipts stopped. The directors were desirous of stimulating the enterprise of the public, and to show that the capital was really intended for an expedition to California, they determined upon making the preparations necessary for the departure of the first body of emigrants. To do this, however, money was required, but as the receipts had hitherto been handed over to Louis Bonaparte, there was no cash in hand. The following swindling expedient was, therefore, decided upon. Duplicates of the two millions and a-half of the lottery tickets already sold were despatched to the provinces. Puffing advertisements were at the same time placarded everywhere. The sale again became brisk, and in August last, the lottery again wore an air of prosperity; when, one fine day, a gentleman from the provinces, walking in the *Rue Montmartre*, noticed some lottery tickets for sale in a tobacconist's window, bearing precisely the same numbers as some which he had in his own pocket; whereupon our provincial friend demanded loudly for an explanation. A crowd gathered, and a row ensued. Great was the consternation of the directors: they resigned. Statements were forwarded to the newspapers by the prefect of police, acknowledging that a few duplicate tickets had been inadvertently issued, &c., &c., and announcing the drawing to take place on the 11th of November. Before the end of a week from that time, there were forty-three claimants for first twenty-five prizes. The directors in a fix, required a month to decide. In the meantime came the 2nd of December, bringing with it, of course, a verdict of acquittal. Not that the dupes ceased their clamour, but the scandal which the exposure produced through the newspapers, was afterwards confined to the tribunals.

It is on account of one of these claims that the Tribunal of the Seine has just condemned the directors of the lottery to pay, with costs, the holders of the tickets, and their duplicates, numbered 1,732,833 (prize 25,000 francs), and 2,898,291 (prize 50,000 francs). This verdict, as you see, affects L. Bonaparte.

On all sides the opposition to the Government is being organized. The departmental National Guard had been re-constituted. But at Marseilles, having manifested its hostility to the President, the National Guard has been suspended and disarmed; and the same steps have been taken against the National Guard of the entire department.

In the Legislative Body we have had an evasion of one of M. Bonaparte's own decrees. The autocrat, determined to anticipate the effect produced on the country by the speeches delivered in that Assembly, had, in the Constitution, forbidden the publication of any of its proceedings. One of the deputies, M. Guyard, having made a speech on the subject of the New Coinage, solicited the permission of the Assembly to have it printed, which was granted by a large majority.

The Legislative Body is equally resolved to demand an explanation relative to L. Bonaparte's recent autocratic decree, creating, without the initiative of the Chamber, four millions and a half of 3 per Cent *Rentes*. As the decree of the 14th of March provided, that in the event of the conversion of the *Rentes*, the negotiation should take place *publicly, and by competition*, the deputies require to be informed upon what ground M. Bonaparte has taken upon himself to award these four millions and a half of *rentes* to certain persons, in contempt of his own decree, that is to say, *privately, and without competition*.

I told you, about a month ago, that to parry the consequences of a coalition of bankers, L. Bonaparte had sent for Messrs. Rothschild, Fould, &c., and had entered into a secret engagement with them, by which he agreed to give these gentlemen 3 per cent. stock, at their own price, in exchange for whatever amount of 5 per cents. they would undertake to purchase in the market. This was but the beginning of a dirty job, for as soon as the bankers had bought up the 5 per cents., and had called for the promised 3 per cent. stock, L. Bonaparte demanded his share of the profits of the transaction. The following is the final arrangement come to between the parties. The 3 per cents. are to be delivered to the bankers at 60 francs 98 cents, which represents 5 per cent. interest per annum. But as the 3 per cents. are quoted in the money market at 70 francs, the net profit on the operation, which represents 4,403,436 francs dividend, amounts to 13,200,000 francs (528,000*l.*) Of this sum L. Bonaparte claimed half, and it has already been paid down to him.

This affair is the common talk at the Bourse, and in all Paris; and people go so far as to say, that in order to give M. Bonaparte a lesson, the Legislative Body will refuse to vote the stock required for the *rentes*.

The General Canrobert, who had been sent into the departments of the *centre*, has reported to L. Bonaparte, that the liberation of political offenders had produced the worst results. The consequence has been, the entire suspension of pardons. M. Peyronni, of the insurrection in the *Lot et Garonne*, whose sentence of transportation was to have been commuted to banishment, has recently been shipped to the Colonies. Transportation to Cayenne, which it had been reported was countermanded, is now being carried into execution. The first departure of prisoners for Cayenne included the courageous Miot, representative of the people. The frigate *La Forte* has just sailed with the second body of prisoners for the same destination; and the *Mogador* and the *Erigone* are to follow.

It is needless to add, that the provincial press is more persecuted than ever. The *Union de la Haute Marne*, having presumed to state that the President was not received with much enthusiasm at Chaumont, the prefect sent a *first-warning* to the editor; informing him that, on the contrary, the enthusiasm had never been greater. One of these days we shall be having the prefects decreeing, that we are the happiest people on earth. S.

#### CONTINENTAL NOTES.

Wednesday being the anniversary of the death of the Emperor Napoleon, a grand funeral service, at which the President assisted, was performed at the Church of the Invalides.

The fall of the Four-and-a-Half per Cents. excites great attention. There is a strong rumour at the Bourse that the Emperor of Russia has demanded the reimbursement of the fifty millions of 5 per Cents. *Rentes* which he holds. Cautious but significant articles appear in the independent journals. For instance, the *Débats* says:—"The Bourse was very heavy. The public cry was, 'the Emperor of Russia is selling off his *Rentes*.' By whom—since when—how does it happen—who has seen it? Useless questions all. The fact is settled. The impression, at first insignificant, has become deeper and deeper. When the Emperor bought, it was a great fact; but now that he sells, what does that mean? The day was spent in commentaries, and yet the fact is not surprising. The Emperor of Russia is not the only *rentier* whom the conversion has brought to the market."

The *Sidole* has a few words on the same delicate subject:—"The Four-and-a-Half per Cents. have fallen below par. The Bourse, which had witnessed all the efforts that had been making for some time to prevent this stock from falling below par, has been deeply affected by this result, which is the more serious as foreign holders have yet ten days before them to demand reimbursement. It is probably in consequence of this circumstance that rumours have arisen of large demands of this kind having arrived from St. Petersburg. However that may be, several heavy banking operations have been observed to end in important remissions to London. There has also re-appeared a slight premium on gold."

The *Débats* gives the following from London, on the Danish question:—"It appears certain that the treaty which is to be signed at the Foreign Office on the 4th or 5th between the plenipotentiaries of England, Austria, France, Prussia, Russia, and Sweden, will not only have for object to regulate a new order of succession in Denmark, but also to secure the integrity of the Danish monarchy. This important result will not, it is said, have

been obtained without considerable difficulty, and it is to that circumstance that may be attributed the delay of the signature. The Germanic powers, particularly Prussia, are said to have sought every means to impede the conclusion of the treaty, which is only due to the firm resolution evinced by the cabinets of St. Petersburg and Paris, which have throughout the whole negotiations acted with the most perfect and constant accord. Lord Malmesbury has, it is said, shown himself anxious to unite his efforts to those of the French and Russian governments."

On the 26th ult. the powder magazines of the Bourg Dora (Turin) blew up just when the workmen were quitting their work. The king animated by his presence the labourers engaged in suppressing the fire and extricating the workmen. The number of wounded taken to the nearest hospital amounted to fifty, including ten children and fifteen women; among the men, who are mostly soldiers, there is also a priest. The greater part are doing well. On the 29th the persons killed were interred with great solemnity; the Duke of Genoa followed the hearses on foot, together with General Maffei, Commandant of the National Guard, the Syndic of Turin, and a deputation from the municipality. The corps of artillery brought up the rear.

The Spanish Government having refused to modify the recent ordinances on the press, the opposition journals have resolved to suspend their publication for three months from the 4th of May, the eve of the day on which the new law of the press comes into operation. The editors intend to appoint a standing committee, who will prosecute *ex officio* the ministerial journals that should not have complied with all the rigorous conditions of the new law. These resolutions were adopted at a meeting of the directors on the 27th.

The *Presse* has intelligence from its correspondent at Alexandria, writing on the 22nd ult., stating that the Turco-Egyptian difference is terminated. Fuad-Effendi, justifying all the hopes which his mission had given birth to, has come to a complete understanding with the Egyptian government, whose good intentions and perfect fair dealing he admits. The Viceroy accepts the tanzimat with the modifications called for by the state of the country, and which the Turco-Egyptian Commissioners had already fixed in their conferences at Constantinople. On its side the Porte accords to the Viceroy the right of applying the punishment of death during seven years, without reference to the divan.

The King of Prussia was to start for Silesia on the 5th inst., to meet the Empress of Russia (his sister) at Breslau.

The Berlin journals of the 28th ult. bring details upon the subject of the royal message of the 26th ult. The communication was made to both chambers; and, as appears by the parliamentary reports, is not a decree abolishing the articles of the constitution, and regulating the organization of the peerage by the royal will, but a new bill, which is in the Second Chamber to go through the ordinary course. In the First Chamber it was resolved to refer the bill to the existing committee on the constitution of the body concerned. In the Second Chamber a committee was appointed to consider the measure. The minister desired that the matter might be quickly despatched. In the same sitting of the 28th, the Second Chamber came to two other important votes. It rejected by a majority of 186 to 82 the resolution of the First Chamber, and which, dividing the budget of ordinary and extraordinary expenses, decided that the first should be no longer fixed annually, but once for all, and that no future modification should take place, except by a law. It also rejected by 225 to 57 another decision of the First Chamber, by which it had declared, in opposition to the constitution, that it could vote the budget, article by article, like the Second Chamber.

Navarro, the righteous judge, has died at Naples.

#### "HILL-TOP" OR "VALLEY-BOTTOM" WATER?

THE Committee of the Metropolitan Sanitary Association have issued the following Memorandum on the metropolitan water bills now pending before the select committee of the House of Commons:—

"The Committee of the Metropolitan Sanitary Association viewing with great alarm and apprehension the present posture of the metropolitan water supply question, submit, for the consideration of the London water-consumers and rate-payers, the following important facts:—

"1. It appears from various official reports and evidence on water supply, and especially from a report of the Board of Health, dated 1850, embodying the evidence of many eminent engineers and chemists, that water from barren *hill tops* is invariably purer and better than water from cultivated *valley bottoms*; and that the sandy hills of Surrey, in particular, furnish perennial springs of water many degrees softer and purer than the water of the river Thames, which is the main-drain of a heavily manured and populous valley,

"2. The report of three eminent chemists, Professors Graham, Miller, and Hoffman, to whom the late Government referred this water report of the Board of Health, confirms its chemical conclusions as to the general superiority of hill-top over valley-bottom water, and as to the particular superiority of the water from the sandy uplands of Surrey over the valley-drained water of the Thames—polluted as that river is, even above the tidal reflux of the London sewage, with the sewage of a rapidly increasing population, already numbering three-quarters of a million, and receiving, moreover, as it does, the surface washings of numerous cattle-dunged roads and streets, and the discharges of many semi-stagnant ditches, in addition to the flood-waters from the cultivated lands.

"3. The scientific evidence further shows that the alleged power of river-water to clear itself from organic pollutions as it runs, is not a sufficient ground for sanctioning its continued supply to the population—first, because the self-purification of river water has limits which are exceeded

in the case of the Thames, even above Teddington lock; secondly, because the purifying process is of the nature of fermentation, which renders water dangerous to health, especially in hot epidemic weather, and which is often going on in the Thames water at the very time when it is pumped up for distribution through the town; thirdly, because the insalubrity of fermenting matter in water depends less on its quantity than on its peculiar state of activity, which activity may be poisonously intense, while the quantity is so minute as not to cloud the clearness of the water, or be in any way palpable to the senses; and lastly, because in rainy weather the Thames, in its whole length, becomes discoloured by the 'flood-tinge,' and is so loaded with foul surface-washings, that common sense anticipates science in dictating its rejection.

"4. The gaugings and reports of Messrs. Rammell, Bateman, and Ranger, all eminent waterwork engineers in extensive practice, bear out the conclusions of the Board of Health as to the ample abundance of the Surrey upland water for the supply of London; and as to the facility of collecting it by tile-ducts laid up to the springs, of conveying it by a cheaply formed culvert to the Wimbledon Common, and of thence delivering it through iron mains to the existing London pipes, in which it would rise by its own pressure (with the aid of a steam-lift for the highest levels only) to the top of every house in the metropolis.

"5. Careful approximative estimates of the cost of executing *de novo* the entire works necessary for thus collecting, bringing to London, and distributing to each house, at constant pressure, in unlimited abundance, this pure, soft, sand-spring water, fresh and fresh from the Surrey hills, are given in the Report of the Board of Health, and confirmed by the engineering evidence, whence it appears that the expense would be fully covered by an average rate of 2d. per house per week, being nearly 300 per cent. less than the average weekly rate (786-100d.) now charged by the monopolist water companies for intermittent cistern-service of river water, tainted with organic matter, and holding more than twenty tons of chalk dissolved in each day's supply; of which impurities the first is deleterious to health, while the latter causes a waste in soap and soda, in wear and tear of linen, in tea, malt, hops, dye woods, &c., estimated to cost the inhabitants of London above a million sterling per annum, which the change to soft water would save.

"6. It further appears from the said official reports and evidence that this water, when it has served its purpose, and taken the form of soil water, holding the drainage residua in suspension, may be removed by tubular drains from each house, and conveyed out of London in self-scouring sewers, at an average speed of three miles per hour, for an average drainage rate of 3d. per house per week; being less than half the present average cost of emptying cesspools and flushing the old fashioned sewers-of-deposit, which depress the health of the rate-payers, and increase the number of sick poor, and of orphans and widows, maintained at the ratepayers expense.

"7. The saving attainable by combining the public waterworks and sewage works with each other, and with the private-house water service and drainage works, so as to bring all under one consolidated management, is shown in the said reports to be so great as to admit of the existing water companies being bought out, the pure hill-top supplies being brought in from Surrey, and the improved distribution being accomplished, not only without any increase of the present rates, but with a considerable reduction of existing charges, as well direct as indirect.

"8. These estimates are substantiated, not only by official evidence, but also by practical experience. The town of Farnham, in Surrey, has been for sixteen years supplied with pure soft, hill-top water, collected, and delivered at constant pressure, as above described; while Croydon and Rugby are examples of towns enjoying improved service and reduced rates by the proposed consolidation of water supply and drainage. A system cheaply available for 300 houses must, *a fortiori*, be cheaply available for 300,000, nor does there appear to be any sufficient reason why London should be less excellently watered than Farnham, or less economically administered than Rugby and Croydon.

"9. The Government Metropolis Water Bill, now under discussion before a committee of the House of Commons, falls utterly short of the requirements of the metropolis, as determined by the above scientific and practical evidence, and by the strong manifestations of public opinion during the sweep of the late pestilence. In respect of the excessive water rates, the Government measure proposes only their partial and insufficient reduction; its provision for the control of the monopolist companies by the Secretary of State would in practice prove nugatory; its affirmation of the principle (now universally conceded) of the constant supply at high pressure, is coupled with the sanction of two years' delay for its introduction, which delay it has been computed will entail on London more than 200,000l. of avoidable cistern-costs, and which delay the experience of Wolverhampton and other provincial towns has shown to be unnecessary. But the main evils of the Government water bill are first, that it ignores the strongly attested superiority of the soft spring water from the Surrey hills, and indirectly sanctions the continued recourse to the condemned valley-drain sources, by permitting Thames water to be taken, for the supply of London, above Teddington Lock; secondly, that it maintains the present uneconomical severance of water and drainage works (public as well as private), which ought to be combined; and, thirdly, that it perpetuates the existence of the monopolist trading water companies, which are universally detested by the inhabitants of London, and which might be bought out and abolished, with a saving of about 200,000l. per annum.

"10. The bills of the old water companies, seven in number, now pending before the said committee, are in many respects even more objectionable than the Government measure; their general drift being to continue the levy of exorbitant rates for impure valley-drain water supplies; to sanction the outlay of another million and a

quarter (which will ultimately fall on the public to pay) for patching up a system incurably bad; to extend the powers of the monopolist companies from waterworks to sewers; to exempt them from even the nominal supervision contemplated in the Government bill; and to defer for periods varying from five to seven years, at a cost exceeding 800,000l., the introduction of the constant supply at high pressure, which ought to be given forthwith.

"11. The bills of the two proposed new water companies, known as the Watford and Wandle Companies, are also in the highest degree objectionable, as involving the ruinous principle of competition with multiplied capitals, multiplied establishment-charges, and multiplied costs of all kinds, in the same limited field of supply—a principle which has never yet been known to secure good service at low rates, but has invariably issued (as in the seven years' contest between the London water companies from 1810 to 1817) in the ruin of the weaker companies and the coalition of the stronger against the public, who are thus saddled with a virtual monopoly, and made to pay for the squandered capital in the shape of exorbitant rates for bad water. The Wandle Bill is, moreover, objectionable as proposing to take water from one of the condemned valley-drain rivers; and the Watford Bill is also objectionable (though in a less degree), as proposing a subterranean source, doubtful as to the abundance and continuity of its yield, accessible only by steam-pumps, and involving the employment of a chemical process to fit the water for domestic use. Both bills empower the levy of rates far exceeding the estimated cost of the pure hill-top water from Surrey.

"12. The metropolitan water companies are stated to command upwards of eighty votes in the House of Commons, and their great wealth enables them to secure the attendance of numerous witnesses prepossessed in their favour, as well as to retain the ablest counsel to defend their monopoly, and to make the worse appear the better cause; while no such resources are available in defence of the public interests, the House of Commons having, on Friday, April 1st, rejected the petition of the Sanitary Association to be allowed to appear before the water committee, and to show cause on behalf of the public against the pending bills.

"13. The unfairness of this position is increased by the equivocal composition of the committee itself; which comprises the author of the pending Government bill, uncounterpoised by any member known to have specially studied the advantages of the Surrey hill-top water, and of the proposed consolidated arrangements for its cheap delivery and removal.

"Under these circumstances, the committee of the Sanitary Association feel it their duty, in the first place, to protest, on behalf of the public, against the finality of any decision which may emanate from a tribunal so inadequately constituted, so imperfectly informed, and so exposed to be misled by one-sided evidence, as the water committee now sitting; secondly, to appeal to the metropolitan Press for that free audience, and that impartial sifting of the question which Parliament has seen fit to deny; and thirdly, to warn the London water-consumers and rate-payers, that their interests will certainly be overruled in committee, and one or more of the obnoxious bills now pending become law, unless public opinion be speedily brought to bear against the threatened perpetuation of the water monopoly, and in favour of pure hill-top water, with consolidated arrangements for its delivery and removal, at a large reduction of existing rates.

Signed on behalf of Committee by

"M. W. LUSIGNAN, M.A.,  
"ADOLPHUS BARNETT, M.D.,  
"CHARLES R. WALSH.

Hon.  
Secretaries.

"10, Craig's Court, April, 1852."

**WATER SUPPLY DRAFT BILL.**—The Committee of the House of Commons wound up a long inquiry on Tuesday by agreeing to a Draft Bill. This measure provides that after 1855 no water shall be taken from below Teddington Lock; that all reservoirs within five miles of St. Paul's shall be roofed in, unless proper filtration be provided; that all water shall be conveyed through pipes or covered aqueducts; that all water distributed shall be first filtered; that a Government inspector shall visit and report on any proposed new sources before they be used; that complaints may be made to the Board of Trade; that all engines used to force water shall consume their own smoke, and that all water distributed shall be supplied at such a pressure as shall reach the top story of every house. Such are the main provisions of the Bill, which, it is said, has given satisfaction both to the companies, and the promoters of the Government measure.

#### DOMESTIC DRAMA; OR, THE BRITISH MATRON AND HER RIGHTS.

Mr. Hakewell, Secretary to the Hampstead Water Works Company, married in 1839. Since that period he has become the father of eight children: and within those three years disputes have arisen between himself and the lady, who may properly be termed his better, at least stronger, half, as to who should have the custody of the children. Mrs. Hakewell was in the habit of admonishing and otherwise worrying her husband in the presence of the children; and this habit reaching a climax, Mr. Hakewell contrived to transfer his wife and family to Boulogne, where, it appears, they lived until last October. Suddenly, however, Mrs. Hakewell left that convenient place of transportation, and appeared with her infants at the "official residence" of the Secretary. As he could not accommodate them, they were transferred to Hawley Cottage, and afterwards to "various places," kept concealed from their father, and, as he alleges, ill-treated by their mother. Upon this Mr. Hakewell took measures to obtain them, and, with the assistance of his brother and others, carried them off from their last abode. Under those

circumstances, Mrs. Hakewell invoked the law, and on her behalf Mr. Kenealy, on Monday, applied to Mr. Justice Maule for an order on Mr. Hakewell, commanding him to bring his fine children into court. The case was argued before the Lord Chief Justice in the Common Pleas on Wednesday, and it was ruled that the father of legitimate children has the custody of them, and that the Court in this instance had no power to interfere.

No sooner was this trial over, than Mrs. Hakewell, who was in court, espying her husband as she left it, seized upon him, and clenching his arm tightly, declared she would not loose it until her children were restored. In this conjugal state the couple and their attorneys entered a cab and drove off.

The scene now changes. Mr. Arnold, the sitting magistrate at Westminster, is about to take up his hat and walk, when Mr. Nicholls, a solicitor, rushes in, states how Mr. Hakewell is in the custody of Mrs. Hakewell, and asks for the interference of the Court.

"Mr. Hakewell," he continued, "is in a very unpleasant position. The attorney on the opposite side has declared that he will stick to the lady for fifty years. The lady has declared that she will stick to her husband, and is at this moment tightly holding him; and in their present state of mind escape for Mr. Hakewell is hopeless, and he has accordingly entreated me to communicate his position to your worship."

Mr. Arnold suggests that the husband should come into court, when, if they were all sticking together, as described, he should be sure to see the whole party.

Mr. Nicholls immediately went for Mr. Hakewell, who, in two or three minutes, entered, evidently in a state of great trepidation, tightly secured in the grasp of a very powerful looking woman, who exclaimed in a loud tone, "Here I am; the injured wife and mother of eight children."

Mr. Arnold—Pray, madam, do not be so excited.

Mr. Hakewell, after a vain endeavour to escape his wife's custody—Pray, sir, permit me to be free.

Mrs. Hakewell hereupon exclaimed—By the laws of God and man we are man and wife, and nothing shall separate us!

Mr. Hakewell looked at his partner, who had pinned him against the rail of the dock, with an air of anxious concern, and then cast an imploring eye towards the bench.

Mr. Arnold—You must not be clinging to your husband in this way.

Mr. Hakewell—I solicit your protection, sir.

Mrs. Hakewell—He is my lawful husband, and nothing shall separate us.

Mr. Arnold—Don't be foolish, madam. I will not have a scene here. I say, endeavour to calm yourself, and release your husband. You are now committing an assault upon him by clinging to him in this way. I cannot permit such conduct here.

Mr. Evans, the lady's solicitor, having introduced himself, said that he had no other feeling in this matter, than to endeavour to settle it amicably. If Mr. Hakewell and his wife were but allowed a few minutes together by themselves, such, he was sure, would be the result.

Mr. Arnold—Surely this is not the way to settle it amicably, clinging about a man in this way. Have you not influence enough over the lady to induce her to calm herself, and release her hold of her husband. If he make an information on oath respecting her conduct, it may be my duty to call upon her to find sureties.

Mr. Hakewell—I wish to do so. She has threatened me.

Mr. Arnold directed the husband to enter the witness-box, which his wife at length permitted him to do, upon Mr. Arnold's assurance that he should not leave the court.

Mr. T. Hakewell then deposed to the assault committed that afternoon, as previously described, and then pressed for as much protection as the magistrate was willing to afford.

Mr. Arnold, after again reasoning with Mrs. Hakewell, took Mr. Evans's word that he would use his influence over her, and, in addition, required her to enter into her own recognizances to keep the peace for six months.

Mr. Hakewell and friends left in the cab while the lady was entering into the required recognizance, she having previously promised that she would not persevere in the conduct that had brought her there.

But this was not all. On the same day three men and three women were summoned before Mr. Beadon at Hammersmith for stealing one of the children from the custody of its mother; but, alas, the squabbles at Westminster prevented the "parties" complaining from arriving in time, and the summons was dismissed.

#### MURDERS.

ON Saturday evening last, Elijah Noon, a plasterer, went to a public-house in St. Giles' called the North Star, to receive his wages from his brother, Mr. Thomas Noon, builder, who usually paid his men at this house. In consequence of his not coming home at twelve o'clock his wife went to fetch him, and met him on the way, when it appeared that she continued to upbraid him for his conduct until they reached their house. On reaching home the wife told her husband, in the presence of their daughter, thirteen years of age, who had been sitting up, that he was a good-for-nothing villain for stopping out so late. He made no observation, but appeared to be greatly annoyed, although he was tipsy at the time, and shortly after he emptied his money out of his purse on the table, when his wife told him that he could go out and treat other people, but could not treat her. This put him in a passion, but he spoke not a word, and he went to a shelf in the room and took off an old sword which was kept there. He drew it out of the sheath, which he threw on the floor, and then struck his wife across the back with the flat part of the sword. The daughter unlocked the door of the sitting-room leading into the street, and tried to pull her mother out by her right arm, but she would not go, and while she was doing this, the father, who held the sword in both hands, ran it into his wife's left side, and she fell partly in the street and

partly in the house. She afterwards got up and went to a neighbour's next door but one to her own house, and there she fell again. With the assistance of her daughter she returned home, when she found her husband putting the sword back on the shelf; he afterwards took a seat by the fire, when his wife fell on her knees and begged him to take her hands, for she knew she should die. The husband sent his daughter to get some brandy, and on her return she found that her father had carried her mother up stairs to bed and undressed her. A neighbour was fetched, and in answer to her inquiry what she was suffering from, she pointed out a wound in her side, which she said her husband had inflicted with a sword. The husband was present at the time, and did not attempt to deny it, but said, "Oh, dear!" and left the room immediately. During the whole of Sunday the poor woman was attended by her neighbours, and her husband came into the room to see her several times. They were reconciled to each other, and she told him that she freely forgave him all things, and hoped that the Lord would forgive her. She also begged him to avoid passion. An inquest was held on Monday. A *post mortem* examination was made by Mr. Godfrey and Mr. F. Symonds, when it was ascertained that the sword had passed between the seventh and eighth ribs, through the pleura, wounding the left lung; it had also passed through the diaphragm and penetrated the small curvature of the stomach, wounding the coronary artery, and gone through the stomach to the opposite side. The sword had penetrated from ten to eleven inches. The jury returned a verdict of "wilful murder."

A man named Robert Clark was found, on Monday, dead in Hart-street, Long-Acre, near to a house kept for improper uses. He had been seen to enter the house, accompanied by two women. Inquiry disclosed the fact that Clark had gone there drunk without money; that the man who kept the house had kicked Clark down stairs, and after beating him as he lay at the foot of the stairs, flung him into the street. The "unfortunate females" gave the above evidence at Bow-street, and the keeper of the house, his wife, and servant, were remanded. An inquest has been held, and a verdict of "Manslaughter" recorded against the keeper of the house, Belasco.

#### MISCELLANEOUS.

The Queen gave a brilliant State Ball at Buckingham Palace on Wednesday.

Lord John Russell laid the foundation stone of a new church in St. Pancras on Thursday.

Mr. Robert Stephenson's yacht, *Titanica*, was destroyed by fire off Cowes on Thursday.

At a Court of Directors on Wednesday, held at the East India House, Lieutenant-General Lord Frederick Fitz-Clarence, G.C.H., was appointed Commander-in-Chief of the Company's Forces on the Bombay Establishment.

The Committee of the Taxes on Knowledge Association met on Saturday, and unanimously agreed that Mr. Milner Gibson should be earnestly requested to press to a division the motions for the repeal of the Stamp and Advertisement duties.

Instructions were issued on Wednesday night by the Postmaster-General, warning all postmasters, sub-postmasters, postmasters-clerks, letter-carriers, letter-receivers, and others, employed in the receiving, collecting, or managing the revenue of the post-office, from interference in election of members of parliament.

The escape of Thomas Francis Meagher requires confirmation. Letters were received by some members of his family from Smith O'Brien yesterday (Monday) bearing a date subsequent to the rumoured escape, and they contain nothing relative to the subject.—*Freeman's Journal*.

The latest news from the Cape is dated the 10th March. Up to that date successful forays had been made by the British troops into the strongholds of the Kafirs, a great many head of cattle, a vast quantity of crops, and several huts, had been captured and destroyed. A letter from King William's Town says that the troops were returning to rofit for another great expedition. Sir Harry Smith was about to lead a strong division into the Waterkloof against Macomo.

A goodly company of noblemen and gentlemen, with bishops and clergy to match, assembled on Thursday at Willis's Rooms, under the presidency of the Duke of Cambridge. They were the Society for Improving the Dwellings of the Working Classes. Their objects and aims are expressed in the above title. The speakers were the Chairman, the Bishop of London, Mr. J. E. Denison, the Earl of Ellesmere, the Bishop of Oxford, Sir John Villiers Shelley, Mr. Monckton Milnes, Sir W. Fraser, Mr. Slaney, and Viscount Ingestre. The utmost sympathy was expressed for the people.

The *Morning Chronicle* says, that "the Episcopal Synod of Scotland, has, at a recent meeting, decided, by four to two, in favour of submitting to their diocesan synods the recommendation to admit the laity to a share of synodical action. Mr. Gladstone's letter to the Primus was the immediate cause of this movement, which we cannot but make sure will be carried out with prudence and moderation, and an entire regard to Church principles. We look forward to its results with hope for the future strengthening and extension of the Church."

At a meeting of the Lambeth Parliamentary Reform Association held on Wednesday, it was resolved—"That this meeting being impressed with the necessity, under the present aspect of political parties in the House of Commons, for firmness and unanimity to prevail among all classes of reformers, calls upon the liberal electors of Lambeth to resist, by every constitutional means, any attempt to reimpose a bread tax; and, at the same time, urges the return to parliament, at the next election, of none but tried and experienced men."

Mr. Thomas Duncombe, M.P., has obtained a return, which was printed on Monday, showing that under the Metropolitan Interment Act Dr. Southwood Smith has been

paid a salary of 1,200*l.* a-year; Mr. C. Macaulay, appointed secretary, 500*l.* a-year; Mr. H. R. Williams, a treasurer, at 600*l.* a-year (from the 8th of August last the office has been vacant); and Mr. H. C. Edwards, statistical clerk, appointed on the 14th of May, 1851, at 150*l.* The salaries have been advanced by the Lords Commissioners of her Majesty's Treasury out of the fund available for civil contingencies.

Lord Dudley Stuart presided over the annual meeting of the Literary Association of the Friends of Poland on Saturday. Six members of the Commons and three Peers attended. The monetary facts of the report read are interesting. The income for the past year was 1,494*l.* 6*s.* 6*d.*, of which 800*l.* was contributed by the Poles. The expenditure for relief in distress, sickness, for the emigration of refugees, and education, amounted to 1,026*l.* 1*s.* 6*d.* The number of refugees now in England is about 820, of whom 200 receive assistance from the British Government; 160 refugees had left this country, of whom 92 proceeded to America, and 13 were removed by death, showing an increase of sixty over the number of last year, during which there were nearly 1,000 refugees in England. The report concluded with an earnest appeal to Europe generally, and especially to England, on the policy and necessity of preserving inviolate the rights of individuals and of nations.

Mr. John Dalrymple, F.R.S., a distinguished member of the medical profession, consulting surgeon to the Royal Ophthalmic Hospital and North London Infirmary, and holding a seat at the council table of the Royal College of Surgeons, died, on Sunday morning.

Colonel Charlton, late Deputy Adjutant-General at Ceylon, died at Bath, on the 26th ultimo. Colonel Charlton served in the Peninsular war, and was twice severely wounded at Toulouse; the second wound was received when he commanded the 61st regiment. He had received the gold medal for Toulouse, and the silver medal with five clasps for Talavera, Pyrenees, Nivelle, Nive, and Orthes. He was, in 1836, nominated a Knight of Hanover.

Mr. Alexander Mackay, who was selected by the Manchester Chamber of Commerce two years ago, to investigate the capabilities of Bombay as a cotton-growing country, has fallen a victim to the climate, and died on the 15th of April, on his voyage home. He was born in 1820, at Inverness, and educated at Elgin and Aberdeen. After passing some time in Canada, he returned to England, and was engaged on the *Morning Chronicle*. By the proprietors of this journal he was sent as correspondent to America; and the result was his work, now well known, entitled *The Western World*. Mr. Mackay rendered good service to the cause of reform, and was a rising politician when he left for India. The *Morning Chronicle* has paid a just and noble tribute to his memory, describing him as "a highly promising politician, an accomplished gentleman, and a most amiable man."

General Arthur O'Connor expired at his residence near Montargis, on the 25th ult., aged 89. He was an Irishman by birth, and in early life was a member of the Irish Parliament. He belonged to the United Irishmen, and formed one of the five members of the directory, which was to put in movement that vast association. In 1796 the United Irishmen aiming openly at throwing off the rule of England, General Hoche's expedition was decided on. It however failed signally, and Arthur O'Connor and another member of the Irish directory came over to the Continent, and had an interview with Gen. Hoche at Frankfurt, but it was not that general who attempted the second descent. General Humbert landed on August 22, 1798, at Killala, with 1500 men, but the second French division not having followed from want of funds, Humbert and all his men were obliged to lay down their arms on September 8th following. Arthur O'Connor, meanwhile, had been arrested at Margate, and all his papers seized. This brought to light the correspondence of the United Irishmen with the French Directory, and several of the Irish leaders were arrested. O'Connor, before the day fixed for his trial had arrived, succeeded in escaping to France, and was well received by the First Consul, who gave him the title of general of division in the French army. He afterwards married Madlle. de Condorcet, and was intimate with all the persons who used to meet at the house of Mme. Helvetius, and afterwards at M. de Tracy's. He published an edition of Condorcet's works, and some pamphlets on the political position of Great Britain and Ireland. Of late years he has lived on his estate at Bignon, near Montargis, where he died. His only son, M. Daniel O'Connor, preceded him to the tomb about two years back.—*Galignani*.

The foundation stone of a school for the children of Westmoreland parents was laid on Wednesday in Norwood-lane, near the Tulse-hill Hotel, by the Hon. Colonel Lowther, M.P., in the absence of the Earl of Lonsdale.

The sixteenth annual dinner of the Master Boot and Shoemakers' Provident Institution took place on Tuesday, at the London Tavern. The Lord Mayor occupied the chair, supported by several city notables. The report showed that 800*l.* had been subscribed last year; and that a balance of 45*l.* remained in the hands of the bankers. The subscriptions for the day amounted to 200*l.*

A festival was held on Wednesday to celebrate the commencement of the east wing of the Consumption Hospital at Brompton. The company, under the hereditary chairmanship of the Duke of Cambridge, dined luxuriantly at the famous Albion in Aldersgate-street. The institution is decidedly a great public benefit. The number of in-patients was 474, of whom 316 had been discharged much benefited, 68 had died, and 90 were now in the hospital. The number of out-patients had been 3,197, being an increase on those of last year of 136.

The tenth annual meeting of the Field-lane Ragged Schools took place on Wednesday. The annual report, which was read by the secretary, showed that during the past year there had been an increase of 300 scholars, between 120 and 150 of whom had attended daily in summer, and between 150 and 200 in winter. Of the adult

pupils twelve had emigrated during the year. Attached to the schools there is also a night refuge for the entirely destitute, in which 2,000 persons were housed and provided with bread since its opening in May last. During the year the receipts by subscriptions and donations have been 1,068*l.*, and the expenditure 964*l.*, leaving a balance of 104*l.* in the hands of the treasurer.

The Arctic Expedition, commanded by Sir Edward Belcher, left Stromness on the 23th of April, all well.

A court-martial has been sitting this week on the surviving officers of the *Birkenhead*. Nothing new has transpired yet. Mr. Culhane was to be tried yesterday.

The Rajah of Coorg, a principality of Hindostan, on the Western Ghauts, arrived on Wednesday at Southampton by the Euxine. He has come over to England to have his daughter educated.

A meeting of committees, formed for promoting the National Exhibition at Cork during the summer, was held on Saturday at the Central Rooms, Cork, under the presidency of the Mayor. Hitherto, success has attended their endeavours.

It is said the purchasers of the Crystal Palace intend to re-erect it behind Prince's-place. This place faces the building. Its inhabitants have been the determined opponents of its retention. The entrance to the new palace will be close by, and the "nuisances" increased tenfold.

At a meeting of the Royal Irish Academy, Dr. Todd read an autograph letter of the late Dean Swift, which has been just discovered. It appears to have been addressed to the Lord Mayor of Dublin, and is as follows:—

"My Lord—I entirely forgot yesterday a small affair—which I did intend to mention to your lordship. About six months ago my Lord Orrery desired me to recommend the son of an old faithful servant, who is still his domestick in England, one Catherine Reily, to be admitted into the blue coat Hospital. I applyd accordingly to the Late Lord Mayor very frequently, but could never obtain that justice.

"I have been these many years a governor of that hospital, and have recommended fewer boys than perhaps any other governor, and my Lord Orrery, as he is a most valuable person in all respects, as well as a great friend to this kingdom, hath a good title to recommend for so small a favour. The boy's name is Edward Reily. I have sent him with his brother to attend, and get one of the servants to deliver this letter to your lordship, and I hope you will please to order his admittance this day. He hath been already measured, and is tall enough for the standard.

"I wish your lordship success in your administration, equal if possible, to your deserts, and am with the greatest respect, my lord, your lordship's most obedient and humble servant,  
"JONATH. SWIFT."

"Deanery House, October 7th, 1737."

A large paper manufactory at Bermondsey, and a granary adjoining were burned down on Tuesday.

A large fire at Messrs. Myers', clothiers, Houndsditch, took place on Thursday.

Twenty men and boys were killed by an explosion of fire-damp in a coal-pit near Shields. There were 200 men and boys in the pit at the time of the explosion.

A woman at Guildford, named Chitty, ferociously beat her two children so severely on Thursday, that one died almost immediately, and the other is not expected to recover. She is said to be insane. Her husband is in an asylum.

Fourteen persons were, on Tuesday, at the Worship-street Police Court severely punished for taking an active part in the disgusting "amusement" of dog-fighting. Two of them were committed to the House of Correction for three months, two were fined 5*l.* each, and the ten others 2*l.* each.

Captain Sutton, brother of Sir Robert Gunning, was riding out of Hyde-park on Saturday, in company with his daughter. Suddenly he found himself between two omnibuses. His horse plunged and threw him, inflicting a dangerous wound in his abdomen. He died shortly after. The jury found "Accidental Death."

A woman named Normanton leaped into the Irwell, which runs along the eastern side of the Peel Park at Salford. Gibbons, the head gardener, saw her, and jumped at once into the river, seizing her by her clothes. But she convulsively grasped his neck, forcing him under water, and both were drowned! The unfortunate woman was insane.

By the snapping of a portion of the machinery at the Malago Vale Colliery, the steam-engine was set loose to work at its own pleasure. This consisted in tearing itself and all around, dashing a cart of coal weighing a ton and a half to the bottom of the shaft, whirling a vast wheel six tons in weight like a tambourine, breaking with ease an immense iron shaft, on which the drum-wheel worked, driving cogs in all directions, ripping up masonry, and snapping the enormous pit-rope like packthread. All these pranks were played with astonishing celerity. Fortunately no one was injured; and the man in the pit safely brought up.

One of the arrangements for the dinner at the Royal Academy nearly resulted in the destruction of the whole Exhibition. Among the preparations for the banquet in the evening was the arrangement of a large number of gas jets near the roof of the saloon where the dinner took place. Beneath these jets a large sheet of strained canvas was extended, in order to shut out the glare from the pictures on the walls. The man in charge of the gas was in the act of testing its action, when a small quantity of ignited spirit of wine fell upon the canvas, and in an instant the whole was in a blaze. Happily, the fragile frame and the canvas were soon consumed, and, beyond the mischief occasioned by a destruction of the table-cloths, and part of the dinner service, no damage happened.

Among the advertisements which appeared in *The Times* on the 25th of last month, there was one directed "To the charitable and affluent." It spoke of a person in the last extremity of suffering, who, at the eleventh hour, invoked the aid of her fellow-creatures to alleviate the severity of her distress. This advertisement caught the eye of a benevolent man, a Mr. Richard Forster, an architect, residing at No. 9, New Ormond-street. He answered the anouncing, and immediately received a reply, which stated that the writer was an unfortunate young woman, the daughter of a merchant, who had been seduced, but who bitterly repented of her crime. Mr. Forster sent her a 5l. note, and subsequently a sovereign. A short time afterwards he received a second letter from the same person, breathing the warmest gratitude for his past kindness, and imploring yet a little further assistance to enable her to remove to a comfortable lodging in the Hampstead-road, which had been offered to her. "I was deceived, Mr. Forster,"—so runs the letter—"cruelly deceived, by a base and heartless villain. A license was even purchased for our marriage. I believed all; my heart knew no guile; the deceptions of the world I had scarcely ever heard of; but too soon I found myself destroyed and lost—the best affections of my heart trampled on, and myself infamous and disgraced. But I did not continue to live in sin! Oh, no! I was despised, and loathed the villain who had so deceived me. Neither have I received, nor would I, one shilling from him." In this piteous strain the letter continues. Poor Mr. Forster again fell into the snare. He forwarded a post-office order for 3l. 19s. 6d., which was duly received and pocketed by the rascal who concocted the letter. But this was his last victory. He was caught in the act, tried at the Middlesex sessions, and convicted. He is a very old offender and swindler on a large scale.

#### HEALTH OF LONDON DURING THE WEEK.

In the week that ended last Saturday the number of deaths registered in London was 1026, which is nearly the same as in the previous week. In the ten corresponding weeks of the years 1842-51 the average was 903, which, if raised in proportion to increase of population, becomes 993. Compared with the calculated amount, the mortality of last week exhibits an excess of 93; and hence it appears that though, as was shown in last return, the public health has improved since March, it is not yet in so favourable a state as might be expected at this period of the year.

In comparing the results of the last two weeks it will be seen that there is again a slight increase in deaths referred to the principal pulmonary complaints, except consumption, those caused by bronchitis having risen from 71 to 86, those by pneumonia from 61 to 67, and the total of this class from 172 to 187, while the corrected average of the ten weeks corresponding to last is 145. The zymotic class has also increased in the two weeks from 204 deaths to 232 (while the corrected average is 490), arising partly from scarlatina. This disease, which was fatal in the previous week to 38 children, numbered last week 45 cases, and prevails considerably at present; hooping cough rose from 35 to 42.

Last week the births of 806 boys and 730 girls, in all 1536 children, were registered in London. In the seven corresponding weeks of the years 1845-52 the average number was 1433.

At the Royal Observatory, Greenwich, the mean daily reading of the barometer was above 30 inches on Tuesday; the mean of the week was 29.762 inches. The mean temperature of the week was 48 min. 6 deg., which is rather below the average of the same week in ten years. The mean daily temperature was below the average on Sunday, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Saturday, and above it on Monday, Thursday, and Friday. It was lowest on Tuesday, when it was only 42 min. 5 deg., and highest on Friday, when it was 53 min. 8 deg. The general direction of the wind was E.N.E. during the first three days, then S.W., and on Saturday N.N.E.

#### BIRTHS, MARRIAGES, AND DEATHS.

##### BIRTHS.

On the 29th ult., at Vernon-hill, Bishop's Waltham, Mrs. Arthur Helps: a daughter.

On Thursday, the 29th ult., at Swanscomb, Kent, Mrs. Robert Owen White: a daughter.

On the 2nd inst., at Ryde, the wife of Captain Belgrave, of H.M.S. *Hydra*: a daughter.

On Tuesday, the 4th inst., at 15, Dean's-yard, Westminster, the wife of the Rev. H. G. Liddell: a daughter.

##### MARRIAGES.

On the 20th ult., at Boxmoor, Herts, Robert Michael Laffan, Captain Royal Engineers, of Otham, Kent, to Emma, eldest surviving daughter of the late William Norworthy, Esq., of Oxford-terrace, Hyde-park.

On the 1st inst., at Brussels, at the British Embassy, Hildebrand Henry, eldest surviving son of Sir Henry T. Oakes, Bart., to Sophia, widow of the late John Bond, Esq., of Londonderry.

On the 4th inst., at St. Pancras New Church, Francis Henry Plumtre, Esq., of Lyme Regis, Dorset, third son of the late Edward Hallows Plumtre, Esq., of Queen's-square, Bloomsbury, to Catherine Frances Alsager, sixth daughter of the late Thomas Massa Alsager, Esq., also of Queen's-square.

##### DEATHS.

On board the ship *Agincoort*, returning from India, on Sunday, the 14th of March, Major George Tebbs, 38rd Regiment Bengal Native Infantry, Commandant of the Regiment of Ferozepore, in the 42nd year of his age.

On the 25th ult., at Holmesdale-lodge, Nutfield, Surrey, in the 88th year of his age, Thomas Bugden, Esq., for many years Major of the 2nd Royal Surrey, and the oldest magistrate and deputy-lieutenant of the county.

On the 1st inst., at Thetford, Norfolk, aged 70, Thomas Bidwell, Esq., of Gloucester-place, Portman-square, formerly Chief-clerk in the Secretary of State's-office for Foreign Affairs.

On the 2nd inst., at his residence, 60, Grosvenor-street, to the inexpressible grief of his family, John Dalrymple, F.R.S., in the 48th year of his age.

On Monday, the 3rd inst., at 10, Chester-place, Regent's-park, Sara, only daughter of Samuel Taylor Coleridge, and widow of Henry Nelson Coleridge, Esq., aged 40.

On the 4th inst., at 12, St. James's-square, aged 71, John George Cochrane, Esq., Secretary and Librarian to the London Library, deeply lamented and much respected.

#### 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.

## Postscript.

SATURDAY, May 8.

In the House of Commons, on the question that at its rising it do adjourn until Monday, Mr. HUME complained that the Property Tax Bill had been read a second time at nearly two o'clock that morning, after many members had left the House, not expecting that a bill of so much importance should have been proceeded with at so late an hour; and he took occasion to say, that the House ought not to continue a bill so unjust in its operation without a pledge from the Government that they would carry out the Free-trade principle by removing all protective duties, so as to put the agriculturist and all other interests upon an equal footing.

An animated but somewhat irregular discussion followed, which occupied nearly two hours. The House then went again into committee upon the Militia Bill.

A division took place upon the question of filling up the second blank in the 7th clause with the words "fifty thousand;" which was affirmed by 135 against 61. The next blank was filled by the words "thirty thousand," the number of men to be raised in 1853, without a division.

Mr. BRIGHT moved a proviso to the clause, exempting officers and men from any corporal punishment. Major BERESFORD objected that this distinction between the regular army and the militia would be derogatory to the former, and that no case had been made out for placing two portions of our military force under different laws. The proposition gave rise to a discussion upon the general question of flogging in the army, which went on to a great length, and grew at last so warm as to call for the interference of the Chairman.

At the close of the discussion, Mr. WALPOLE said, the general question, whether it was advisable to do away with corporal punishment, could not be determined at that moment; but as the Mutiny Act had passed, whereby the soldiers of the regular army were liable to corporal punishment, the only question was whether the militia should be placed upon a better footing. He thought that the soldiers in the regular army would in such a case feel themselves degraded, and that if corporal punishment were done away with in the militia, it should be done away with in all the forces. The Committee having divided, the proviso was rejected by 199 against 92.

The CHAIRMAN then reported progress, and obtained leave to sit again on Monday; so that the 7th clause is not yet decided upon.

In the course of the debate, Lord JOHN RUSSELL made the following general reply to the observations of Mr. Disraeli, respecting the training of the people to the use of arms.

"If it were said, as he understood the Chancellor of the Exchequer had said, that it was desirable a portion of the population should be trained to the use of arms, then it was not only desirable, but it was essential, that those men should have the good of the country at heart, and that they should be men of respectable character, upon whom reliance might be placed, not merely when the enemy was at the gates, but under all circumstances, as men of loyalty and good conduct. That was an essential object which the House ought to secure, and if it were an essential object, then he thought the manner in which it was proposed to raise this body of men was most unsatisfactory. He should say that this provision was of the very essence of the bill. But then he was told that if the House expressed any distrust upon this point, they would be expressing distrust of the people of England. Now, for his part, he could conceive no answer more absurd, with regard to a question of this kind, than that of saying that, because it was supposed possible that persons would enlist for the sake of the six guineas, and then not be forthcoming, that therefore those who might so think actually mistrusted the people of England. Why, the people of England were certainly divided into many different classes, and he could not conscientiously say that the whole population of this great country were fit to be trusted on every occasion." (Hear, hear.)

Sir EDWARD BUXTON's bill to authorize treating at County Elections was defeated. On the motion that it be read a first time, Mr. COBDEN protested against the principle of the bill, which, as he considered, autho-

rized corruption. The bill was supported by Lord Galway, Mr. K. Seymour, Lord R. Grosvenor, Sir J. Tyrell and Mr. Booker; and opposed by Mr. Roebuck, Mr. W. Brown, and Mr. W. Williams. Sir E. BUXTON said, his reason for introducing his bill was that it was almost if not quite impossible that, according to the spirit of the rules of that House, a member could positively declare that his election had been conducted in a perfectly pure manner. Upon a division the motion was negatived by 77 against 61: so the bill is lost.

News up to the 1st of April arrived yesterday from the Cape by the *Harbinger*. The *Megara* had reached her destination after a passage of 77 days. So slow was her progress that the crew and soldiers were placed on half-rations during the last part of her voyage. She took fire three times during the voyage. The ships of the General Screw Steam Packet Company perform the voyage in half the time.

The *Hydra*, carrying General Cathcart and his suite, arrived at the Cape on the 31st of March. On the arrival of the Governor an address was presented to him, when his Excellency expressed his hope that the Constitution would do for the Cape colonists all that they expected from it.

The intelligence from the seat of war is, on the whole, satisfactory; Sir Harry Smith had left King William's Town, entered the Waterkloof, and seemed determined to follow the enemy to the Amatola mountains, where they were assembled under Sandilli.

"The principal events in Caffraria says a Cape paper, since the last steamer, comprise some successful operations under the Civil Commissioners of Colesberg and Cradock against the Tambookies; Colonel Percival's attack on Stock Camp, which he destroyed, and two severe engagements in the Waterkloof. The first was an attack on a force under Colonel Yarborough (forming part of General Somerset's division), which was compelled to fall back on some ruins at Bushneck, after sustaining considerable loss. Colonel Yarborough was severely wounded in the thigh, and his party placed in imminent danger, until relieved by a squadron of rifles under Captain Carey. The other was the successful operations in the Waterkloof against Macomo, by the divisions under Colonels Eyre and Michel, when his head-quarters, which had hitherto been deemed inaccessible, were destroyed. The loss sustained by the enemy has been very great, and their expulsion from this quarter may be regarded as the most favourable event during the present war. Our casualties on these two occasions were—killed: Lieutenant the Hon. H. Wrottesley, 43rd Light Infantry, and 12 rank and file. Wounded: Colonel Yarborough, 91st; Captain Bramley, Cape Mounted Rifles; and Ensign Hibbert, 91st (all severely); and 37 rank and file."

The Caffres continue to avoid a general action, and they frequently leave their wives and families to the mercy of their opponents. The cruelty of their conduct to their unfortunate English captives is of a most horrible character, and the details given by the Caffre women of the protracted tortures inflicted are in the highest degree painful.

By the *Herman*, which reached Liverpool yesterday, from New York, we have news up to the 24th of April. Kossuth had been well received at New Haven. A telegraphic despatch from Washington, in the New York papers, says, that—"Chevalier Hulsmann has obtained leave of absence from his Government, for an indefinite period, and will shortly leave for Europe. This has been granted him in consequence of his representations that he could hold no intercourse of any kind with Mr. Webster. He will, therefore, absent himself till Mr. Webster retires from the State department. The friendly relations between the two Governments are not, however, interrupted."

Yesterday Mr. Bethel was heard on behalf of Miss Wagner, before Sir J. Parker. The court was crowded to excess. Mr. Bethel asked that the order for the *ex parte* injunction might be discharged. His grounds were, that Dr. Bacher, who had negotiated the alleged engagement of Miss Wagner with Mr. Lumley, had transcended his powers by signing a contract, containing a prohibitory clause, to which Miss Wagner and her father did not consent; that, further, the contract was broken by the non-payment of the caution money on the appointed day, against which a notorious protest had been duly made; that the phrase "England was only to be valued for the sake of her money," had been so mistranslated by Mr. Lumley, and that the original simply meant, "England rewards only by money;" that Mr. Lumley had also misdated an important letter by one week; and he also mentioned that Miss Wagner was seriously affected in health by these proceedings. The further hearing was deferred to this day.

Mr. Hadfield has been reintroduced to the electors of Sheffield, and consequently Mr. Overend (Tory) will be put up, thus perilling the return of Mr. Roebuck.

Sir F. Thesiger has addressed the electors of Stamford as a "supporter of Lord Derby."

Lord Norreys retires from Oxfordshire, taunting the present ministry with leading the farmers to expect a return of protective duties when in opposition, and now adopting a contrary principle.

A deputation from Chelsea, Kensington, Hammersmith, and Fulham, headed by Mr. Simpson, of Hammersmith, and introduced by Lord Robert Grosvenor, waited on Lord Derby on Thursday, to urge their claims on the vacant seats at the disposal of Parliament.

The following letter is extracted from the *Times* of today. It has been forwarded to that journal by Mr. William Amos, of Whitstable, who states that it was written by James Silk, one of the crew of the brig *Renovation*. He gives it *verbatim et literatim*, and we follow his example:—

“June the 18th, 1851.

“Dear father and mother, these brothers and sisters, this comes with my kind love to you, in hoping to find you in good health, as, thank God, it leaves me at present; thank God for it, my dear friends. I am going to give you a little Account of my last voyage to the North of America, in which will make you think that you not would like to be there, my dear friends. We sailed on the 6th of April last in 1851 from the port of Limerick and was favored with a fair wind from the eastward; the 7th of April the wind still remained, we were running with our lower and topmast studdings sail, and on the 9th of April the same wind continued, and the 10th and the 11, 12, and 13, and then we had it very cold, and on the 14th day in the morning we saw a very large hicc Burgh to windward of us, and 12 o'clock, 14th, we saw as many as 6 hicc Burg, and one of them we went very close to us in which it appeared to be the High of 250 feet, in which there is but one third of third of them in the water, in which makes the hicc burgh 750 feet, that so, my dear friends, you might have read of the hicc Burgh in the frozen reagents, so, my dear friends, I am not Asay what I have read of, for this is what I have seen witnessed myself, and likewise, my dear friends, Apon one of the very large burghs in which we see there was 2 large ships on them, 1 were laying Apon her broad broad side, and the other where A laying as comfortable as if she was in the dock fast to her moreings. The wether was very fine and the wather very smooth, but the captain being laid up at the same time it was not reported to him until 8 o'clock, And we out of sight of them, so, my dear friends, I cannot tell you whether there was any living soul there are not. So, my dear friends, I cannot tell you any more About them now. I\*—and 16th and 17th weand contenedoued, but on the 17th we run amonst the ice again, but that was the feald ice which came down from the river St. larence and gulf, but the ice was so thick and heavy that we thought it would Jamed our ship together, but there was but a life whind but a hevey sea A running. But thank God there soon sprung up a fine brease, in which wee gaver all canvass we could get on her, but the sails were all frose so hard that wee was truble to Bend them, and the rope of our rigan, which in thair proper state was about the size of our fingers, where about 3 inches thick with the ice. wee were 15 days sailing about the the ice, but at last wee got clear of it, and in a few day we reached quback, which were the 10th, and on the 13th I went to the hospital, as I told you before, dear friends. we sailed again on the 30th of the month, and then proceeded on our passage home, but in all passges that ever i had, this exceeded them all, for we scarce had a fine day all the way home, for it was thick, foggy, and rainy all the Head quick passage home, we was 26 days, in which that was a very good passage home. we arrived at Limerick last friday morning,” &c.

We have received the following letter from a friend who was lately passing through Prague, on his road to the East:—

Prague, Tuesday, May 4.

This evening, as I was leaving my hotel, the Blauen Stern (Blue Star), to take a walk with my friend, we saw a great bustle and crowd of people, with several police officers, on the stairs which lead from the Porte Cochère to the upper stories, up which two ladies were proceeding. A carriage and two horses stood at the door. Police officers, abounding in Austrian cities, we did not take particular notice of their presence, but asked one of them who stood near, what was the matter. “Nothing, nothing,” said he; “only the *hausfrau* (landlord's wife) has returned from a long absence, and the people are all glad to see her.” We thought no more of it, but about nine o'clock at night, in a café, an intimate friend of my companion's, a retired captain of Austrian cavalry, whispered to him—“Don't you live at the Blauen Stern?” “Yes,” was the reply. “Was there not a great crowd and disturbance there, today?” “I didn't see any disturbance; there was a good deal of excitement, apparently at the return of the landlord's wife.” “My good fellow, that was not the landlord's wife, it was Kossuth's sister, and some other of his relations: they are on their way to America; but not a hundred people in the town know it, besides the police, and they don't want it to be known.” “And how did you know it, you were not there?” “Oh, I know everything.” From this, and from other signs, I believe that sympathy exists in many bosoms besides the Hungarians, in favour of those who have made a stand against that frightful tyranny which makes politics, foreign or domestic, a forbidden subject of conversation in Austria; and, therefore, conceals beneath a veil of prudential reserve the real sentiments of the majority. I saw the report spread through a small circle at the café, and I watched the manner in which it was received. And this among Germans, and Bohemians—not Hungarians—many of them officials. There are several regiments of Hungarians here, Grenadiers and Hussars, fine-looking fellows.

The *Moniteur* announces that M. Villemain, professor of French Eloquence at the Faculty of Letters of Paris, and M. Cousin, professor of Ancient Philosophy, have been allowed, at their own request, to make good their claims to a retiring pension.

\* A word here not legible.

# The Leader

SATURDAY, MAY 8, 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.

### “COTTONING” TO DESPOTISM.

HISTORY indicates with unerring certainty the sequel to the present condition of England. After the repose of a peace which, so far as her own lands are concerned, is unprecedented in duration, she is absorbed in the business of enjoyment, thoroughly broken in to peaceful pursuits, and disinclined to arouse herself to action. True, the enjoyment is of a highly artificial kind—not the most delightful, and much limited to particular classes: it consists chiefly, not in the natural enjoyments, but in the material refinements of superior cookery, excellent furniture, and house-fittings, in greatly improved door-handles, bell-pulls, steel fenders, and drawing-room chairs, in remarkably fine cloth, extra-superfine ‘genuine’ silks at ‘tremendous sacrifice’ per yard, and largely extended *bienséance* among domestic servants, after a fashion, in the conduct of parties. As for the enjoyment of the people—whither has it gone? Where is the frolic of the village green? where the manly games? Much boasting is there, because the people have enough bread to eat, and because it is ‘white!’ which is most ‘economical.’ As to the village sports, they are declining, North and South. In Cornwall itself, wrestling has diminished within the observation of men still young. Manly sports have been ‘put down,’ and the people with them; until at last the people is content to ask for ‘education,’ to keep up a kind of grumbling in the towns about ‘the charter,’ to emigrate, and meanwhile, to go on working from morn till night. The chosen representatives of the most newly enfranchised classes—the classes that have obtained political recognition by possessing social influence—are now in Parliament, refusing to see the possibility of ever more needing the manly energies of the nation itself to defend its shores, advocating the disarmed condition of the people, and upholding that opprobrium of free states, that instrument of central authority which extinguishes national freedom, an exclusive paid fighting class to do the bravery of the nation for it.

The arguments with which this school of politicians upholds its unpracticable positions are reckless in the extreme. Mr. John Bright, for example, ventured to assert of the old militia, that “so far as their industrious avocations were concerned, the men, on retiring from the service, were injured in character, morals, and their prospects in life,”—a hazardous romance even of the ill contrived militia of the beginning of the century: but what would even Mr. Bright say of the Volunteer Companies with which it is the boast of many a successful man in business to have been enrolled? What would he say of the Uniform Companies of the United States—are not the members sharp enough for business? or what would he say of the Swiss militia men, who can not only fight, who can not only maintain their country free in the very midst of despotism, but can work? for a more industrious people than the Swiss does not exist. John Bright in himself we take to be a fine fellow—a good specimen of your sturdy Englishman: it is therefore the more lamentable to see him speaking in terms of sly toleration respecting the French President, and blaming the English press for outspeaking; for indeed, so small has the step become between a Manchester man and an Austria-man!

Mr. Cobden boasts of the eight hundred petitions which Englishmen have been induced to sign against the Militia Bill on various pretexts: he said nothing of the number of signatures; on the contrary, he assumed that sectarian meetings which adopted those petitions represented whole places. There might, indeed, he admitted, “in

some parts of the country, and in country constituencies, be found men who believed in the possibility of a French invasion; but in the circles in which he moved, among people of well regulated minds, and free trade opinions, he could not find any one who really imagined that the French were coming to invade us.” But they *might* do so; or rather, the Adventurer-in-Chief who has conquered France by surprise, might; and if he did, are we prepared for him? Granting our supremacy in coal and cotton, on which Mr. Cobden so fondly relies, the question is, whether we could bring that to bear instantly? We doubt, indeed, whether all the steam power of Manchester could be of much service in case of a simultaneous landing along the South-eastern and Southern coast. None, as drivers in London well know, are so incessantly and blindly running into danger as women; none so helpless when it comes. Women, especially old women, appear to ignore the existence of omnibuses and dog-carts; and Mr. Cobden “begs pardon of the French people for having even hypothetically dealt with this question;” he begs pardon of that nation, namely, that has “annexed” Algiers—that occupies Rome—that seized Spain as a kingdom for one Jerome whom Louis Napoleon has restored to quasi-regal condition,—that was preparing under Louis Napoleon's boasted uncle and model to invade England,—that has not many years since burned with an open war fever against this country,—that exulted in the Prince de Joinville's “Note,” discussing an invasion of England,—that possessed Generals who prepared a plan of invasion for Louis Philippe, the “Napoleon of Peace,”—that has accepted as one of its Governors the exulting author of the *Decay of England*,—that has, according to the bland recognition of the Manchester school, voted into the dictatorship, Louis Napoleon, “heir to my uncle,” heir to the unaccomplished Boulogne expedition, who believes himself destined to the conquest, while regretting, such is his courteous gratitude, that he must thus requite the country of his refuge; but, of course, he cannot disobey “his star.”

How continually the mistake is made of judging all other men by one's self, and none makes that mistake so constantly as the political parvenu. Mr. Cobden has forsworn war, as an occupation that does not “pay,” and he seems to think that whole nations have done so. He thinks as much, not only just before 1848, but after it. He thinks so when he has before him Islay, Mogador, Meeanee, Moultan, Milan, Hungary, Schleswig-Holstein, Europe! History exists not for him.

But it exists for others: and it tells us that when a nation becomes so sunk in peace as England has been, it becomes enervated; that when it is enervated, it betakes itself to philosophies like that which Mr. Cobden boasts, and which has unquestionably corrupted and unmanned the nation to a very large extent; and that when the corruption becomes very apparent, then some Goth accepts the invitation, and then the wealth which peaceful industry, dreaming of nought but industry and wealth, has accumulated, becomes the booty of the incapable invader. England is now in the last stage but one.

Thank God, however, for that England is not all of Manchester stuff. Manchester itself is not so—nor the West Riding. At one time Government might have been most anxious to “put down” our people: the time has come to arouse the people; and we are glad to see that we have a Government not unmindful of the duty. In such cases national objects are superior to party distinctions; and we are bound to say, that in more than one respect the present Government has shown a superiority to party unknown since the days when the Whigs filched place out of Peel's hands. Peel, be it remembered, contemplated a consolidation of militia laws for practical use; so well did he read history. The so-called friends of “humanity,”—who have held the hands of the Cape colonists against the savages, and have sent more and more English soldiers to be shot down like beasts before an ambushed foe—the so-called friends of “peace,” who would disarm England in the face of Cossack and Croat,—may for a moment flatter the philosophy of gaping assemblages; a Russell or a Grey, forgetting an hereditary patriotism, may court the tyranny of cotton; but many of our public men are more long-sighted; there are “circles” besides those in which a Cobden moves; there is still amongst us, differing from the Manchester stuff,

that stouter stuff of which a Napier can give some account, and of which even the West Riding can furnish good supplies. There still beats in England a heart stouter than that selfish and cruel Humanitarianism of the counter and the mill, which faints at the sight of blood, shuts its eyes at the bright gleam of a sword, closes its ears to the cry of bleeding nations, and contemplates, without horror—at a distance—the possibility that a foreign foe might violate our sacred homes. And in rousing that heart to its duty before it be too late, many a severed political party might join.

#### BREAK-UP OF THE BOOK-TRADE SYSTEM.

THE book-buying world has outgrown the present system of bookselling, and that system is falling to pieces by force of the struggles which its members make to accommodate their own condition to the circumstances; but in the present aspect of the contest, it appears to us that Reformers lose sight of two or three facts which ought not to be omitted from the account.

If the present restrictions be burst, the whole character of the trade will alter, the number of books will augment beyond calculation; any check upon their character, which is already failing in practice, will be destroyed; and, as we believe, a very general deterioration will spread over the vast field of book-making, reducing it to the level of all other trades. Adulteration will become, not the exception, but the rule. Already, most books are bad enough—but to have books like ordinary coffee! yet such, with much lowered price, quantities beyond control, incessant competition, and no end to mercenary tools that are but waiting for employment, is the inevitable result. We say nothing against the free trade; although we hold that literature is not well engaged when it is subject to any trading process at all; we believe that it must go through that stage of *laissez aller*; therefore let us at least face the immediate consequences. If the impending evil were distinctly, yet generally foreseen, some suggestion might be thrown out to mitigate it.

To regulate literature by supply and demand, is to invert the natural order of sense. Ignorance never knows its own want, and never will demand the supply it needs. On the other hand, love of gain, mercantile "demand," is not the true motive to good teaching, to good art, or to any intellectual or moral good. Give schoolboys the kind of tutor they demand, select for tutor the man who will be guided entirely by popularity-hunting, or by the motive for screwing pence out of the boys, and you would convert the school into the casino. Adulteration awaits a literature regulated by supply and demand, even more than it is now: we are going to be flooded with catchpenny trifles, "fast" books, and works too slight even to be powerfully mischievous—idle things which he that runs may read; and those which one must stop to read will be left to shift for themselves by the universal dictator.

Books are to be treated as ordinary manufactures, to be sold as ordinary merchandize: let authors, however, remember, that cotton goods have no "authors," unless the designer, with his 40s. fee, is to stand for the author. The original workman of most goods goes by the wall; and now the rule is to be applied to books. It is so decreed past revocation, and we seek not to revoke it: but the authors might as well consider what is going to happen. At present they seem to be establishing, not a republic of letters, but anarchy—abolishing Protection, and substituting Proudhonism.

In replying to the question put forth by Messrs. John W. Parker and Son, they should consider something beyond the mere process of undoing. Messrs. Parker and Son ask the authors' opinion as to the maintenance of the fixed selling price, or the licence for retailers to sell at any lower price. The whole movement, we believe, involves the abandonment of the fixed selling price, and will leave the publishing price, if any, as the fixed point. But what is likely to happen subsequently? The publishers, not wishing to become entangled in complicated accounts, will again make preferential reductions to allied friends; the publishing price will be calculated with a view to those reductions, and then we shall be where we are now.

We presume such ulterior combination, since it is the very essence of perfect freedom, to prohibit nothing, not even combination. Under per-

fect freedom, of course, it would still be competent to form an association of booksellers, like the present, refusing to deal with any persons but those who conform to *all* its rules. And in some degree such a combination is almost certain to exist.

Men will combine wherever they see that a common interest is to be promoted or expedited by the combination. Free trade is but a negation, after all; it only settles the question of restrictions rendered compulsory by some power *ab extra*: it has not prevented railway amalgamations, nor even combinations against the public by railway companies, though competing between themselves. It has not prevented the Amalgamated Masters of the engineering trades from combining against the workmen, whom they force to work longer at low wages than the men desire. Free trade, in short, cannot regulate the wants and wishes of society. It will be therefore but to share in a vulgar infatuation, if authors or publishers, or even booksellers of any foresight, should trust *solely* to free trade, into which they are now invited to plunge without reservation.

It is the more needful for authors to reflect, since, strictly speaking, they do not enter into trade at all, except in rare cases. Nor is the training of mind suited to most kinds of literature, suited to the pursuits of commerce. Unless therefore they secure a machinery for securing their interests,—some broad plan which, settled once for all, shall be self-working, except under exceptional stipulations—they will only hand themselves over, bodily, to be swamped among a new creation of jobbing book-makers, and literature will be buried under the heap of books—a Pompeii under the dust and ashes belched forward by a volcano of hireling fervour.

Alter the present system by all means; it is bad, obsolete, indefensible: and though it were best of the best, as little to be kept alive as a man whose last hour is come: but when you pull down, know what is to stand in the place of the old structure—if you are diligent with the pickaxe, have your trowel ready—or at least *know what you are doing*.

#### THE HAUNTED CAMP.

SCHWARZENBERG, the Mahomet of Austria, who added to the spirit of Metternich the aggressive sabre of proselytism, is dead, but still survives in spirit: and his coadjutors are of two orders—those who work in the councils of Austria, and those who work in the councils of the patriots.

"When the revolution of 1848 broke out," says the Vienna correspondent of the *Times*, "there were no Austrians;" and so now it is resolved to have some. They are not to be grown, but made out of materials ready at hand; for the military doctors of Vienna have discovered how to make an Austrian out of a Bohemian, a Magyar, a Croat, or an Italian. The army is the instrument. The plan is not to enlist them as soldiers; to put the badge of the two-beaked eagle does not suffice to convert a Magyar or a Venetian into an Austrian; but the army, numbering four or five hundred thousand, is to be used as a school for teaching the alien members of the Provinces German, to Germanize them; and thus, in seven years or so, Hungarians, Bohemians, Italians, will be Austrianized. The dead Italian will become a live Austrian. Such is the scheme. Let the Englishman understand it. It is not as if England were to forbid Gaelic to Ireland or hilly Scotland, French to Jersey, and Norse to the Orkneys; but as if the Isle of Man were to forbid those other provinces their language, and English to England,—to crush the language of Burke, of Shakespeare, of Burns, of Scott, of Gibbon, and make the tongue of literature Manx. The high patriotic strain of Dante, the pictured song of Ariosto, are to be obsolete. Of course, so mad and criminal a scheme is forbidden by its impracticability; but the project betrays the extremes to which the active despotism of Austria will go. Metternich said that "Italy was a geographical expression;" the sworded Metternich would erase her language.

We have still around us the multiplying instances of the wide extent over which this merciless despotism is spreading its machinery. By accepting Russian aid in Hungary Schwarzenberg riveted anew the alliance between the empires; and he managed that alliance so well, that the *protégé* has become the co-ordinate, the initiator. Prussia, despite lingering schemes of her own, is dragged into the Holy Alliance. And

in France, although the Holy Alliance is evidently unpledged to support the new family, there is a congenial machinery in active operation at its service.

The working of this machinery on the model of St. Petersburg or Vienna is complete. Louis Napoleon sits at the centre and dictates, and his subordinates, one under the other, manage the affairs of Frenchmen for them. The press is edited by a Censorship. The Professors of Colleges are weeded, shaved, and instructed, by the Interior. The Prefects are set to watch the effects of literature, social converse, instruction, amusements, on the people. The Minister summons the managers of theatres and tells them that nothing hazardous to the morals of the people will henceforth be permitted. In short, all France is in tutelage to Gore House. It may be amusing to us who look on; but imagine the feelings of a Frenchman who remembers what it was to be free, in act, tongue, and thought! As if to show what the solicitude for the public morals does *not* mean, the President attends the performance of the *Dame aux Camélias*—not young Alexandre Dumas's delicately daring novel of that name, but a "fast" drama founded on it, with no little heightening of midnight orgies and slack vicissitudes. And to mark his enjoyment of the scene, Louis Napoleon sends round a present to Mademoiselle Doche, the representative of the not inaccessible lady in the play: thus the Pericles of Leicester Square lies at the feet of Aspasia, and issues decrees to keep France in good nursing.

The French machinery is ready to be incorporated in that of Austria, with or without the present tenant at will, as the case may be, but in capital working order. Already it is in excellent understanding with Austria in Rome; and is helping to settle the Danish succession on the Baltic. The Holy Alliance stands prepared, with its two millions or three millions of armies; and its guiding power talks of expunging Bohemia, Hungary, and Italy, as Poland has been expunged.

At such a time, what is the conduct of the patriot party, whose mission, if it has a mission, is to oppose that gigantic conspiracy? We shall divulge no secrets, we shall make no comments; we shall maintain the neutrality, the silence that we believe to be the duty of every patriot of Europe when good men are at fault. But we must note a few, a very few facts, patent to all the world. Let the mention suffice. A most eminent Italian patriot, teaching his countrymen their duty, makes a sudden and unprovoked assault on a party in France that includes men earnest and steadfast, who have worked and suffered, unchanged through all changes. The aggrieved party retorts, with disclosures intended fatally to diminish the influence of that Italian patriot, with asseverations that he is not *the* leader of the Italians. Maybe so. But if he is not, who is? We look in vain for any one man who is at least the leader of so considerable a portion. Yet unquestionably mistakes have been made. Let one fact speak. Few men have done more to bring the despotic influences into discredit than the stinging satirist Giusti—a Peter Pindar with the polish of Voltaire! Who has more contributed to keep alive the fire of patriotism, even in the very heart of slavery, than the sweet and impassioned writer of "The Conscript's Mother,"—Berchet? Yet Berchet and Giusti are not of much account among patriots, *par excellence*. They were moderates, monarchists, or modified in some heterodox way; and they are of comparatively little use to "United Italy." Where such results are, there must be something wrong. Where genius finds not its vocation, where devotion survives the trust which it has but once commanded, where a people with a common interest are divided, the common cause must have had an erroneous utterance. With Italy, the one question was, or ought to have been, the expulsion of the Stranger; but that was merged in ulterior and sectional questions. It is the same all over Europe: the people, social or democratic, is divided against the great tyrant Alien—for the tyrant is ever an alien, even amid his own kin. The peoples *want* more scourging. The ghost of Schwarzenberg prowls about the camp of the patriots, sowing discord; the patriots, forgetting the sacred duty of union, consent to be against each other the instruments of an immortal Austria—immortal while they are divided. Is this right? Let conscience ask itself the question in the anxious calm of midnight thought.

## THE BLACK STATISTICS.

POLITICAL arithmetic tells us any tale it pleases: the poet of the Board of Trade "lisp in numbers, for the numbers come," and can make you out a Progress of the Nation in any direction. Crime has diminished during the half century: studious men can prove the fact by figures. Crime has increased during the half century: men not less studious prove that also. The *Morning Herald* shows us, after Moreau, that murders in Ireland, from 1823 to 1837 had increased from 69 to 264. From 1826 to 1845, 5519 persons were committed to prison on the charge of murder; 4900 escaped by acquittal or want of prosecution; 619 were convicted; 202 hanged.

Yes, in Ireland, you say, criminal Ireland. But in England, as Henry Mayhew calculates, from data which he gives, the annual rate of criminal offenders in every ten thousand of the population has increased from 9 during the ten years ending 1821, to 16.5 during the ten years ending 1851.

The *Herald* is arguing to show that conciliation fostered crime in Ireland; and ranged in the *Herald* fashion, the figures damn conciliation altogether:—

1823	...	69	— Lord Wellesley arrived in Dublin
1824	...	57	to assume the office of Lord Lieutenant, on the 30th December, 1822. The work of conciliation system then first began—
1825	...	78	crime advances <i>pari passu</i> .
1826	...	96	Year of Catholic emancipation.
1827	...	94	
1828	...	84	
1829	...	143	
1830	...	100	
1831	...	106	} Years of reform agitation.
1832	...	136	
1833	...	231	
1834	...	180	— Decrease under the Coercion Bill.
1835	...	218	} Halyon days of Lord Normanby's system fully organized and in complete operation.
1836	...	231	
1837	...	264	

Possibly a Staunton or a Somerville could make out the exact opposite by the help of figures; but he would not deny that Ireland has undergone a horrible famine; that wretchedness has exiled more than a quarter of a million yearly of her population; that landlords are still "evicting," and people still idling; that Ribandism still haunts the land, and reddens it with blood; or that the authors of "conciliation" have followed it up with anti-papal hostilities, embittering the whole country. Nor would he deny that the Encumbered Estates Commissioners have sold up 100 landowners, and transferred property worth 4,000,000Z. sterling! What a state for a country! We believe that conciliation *has* failed, that coercion has "succeeded;" but why? Because Ireland is held, and governed, as a conquered country; with the ideas, the manners, the laws, of the conquering country. A conquered country is best kept down by force, inexorable force. If Ireland is to be soothed, she must be freed—left to govern herself, with Irish ideas, Irish sympathies, Irish machinery. Till such time as she be depopulated, or released, will her black statistics go on.

Henry Mayhew was arguing to show that Free-trade has not diminished crime; and, whatever feats a Ewart or a Cobden might perform with statistical Marionettes, he is right. We see many proofs, without need for figures. We see how adulteration is eating into the very body of trade. We know that tradesmen, ruinously competing with each other, are stealing their profits from the parcel under the customer's arm. The marvellous spread of bankruptcy is open to every newspaper reader. Commercial men dare not guess at the aggregate yearly amount. Tradesmen feel that their position is uncertain. What is to happen next? is the frequent question. Yet shops multiply, shop windows become better furnished; luxury devises new niceties for every house. We can all notice the constant appearance of mysterious notices in the *Times*—daily multiplying, often many in a day—addressed to fugitives and hidens—mostly either to persons run away from creditors and employers, or ladies evading some domestic responsibilities and bonds. Occasionally domestic bliss explodes, as in the case where the "injured wife" seizes her husband, and drags him into court. Enough transpires to indicate the volcano beneath. Free-trade assuredly has *not* organized society; nor has it established the millennium; nor, as Free-traders promised, has it made every working man sought by two masters. Ask the sullen

engineers how that is. Neither has it established peace all over the world.

Lord Norbury's murderer was never discovered, although, says the astonished statistician, three thousand pounds were offered for his detection. It proves the fidelity of the Irishman to crime—and to Ireland. It proves that there are other motives besides cash, even for the very poor. When they were told in Ireland that Meagher had escaped, they disbelieved it, because he would have broken his parole. The statistics are black; but probably if Irishmen and Englishmen, if people's men of every country, understood each other better, they would improve the statistics. Nay, it is the same with society in its intimate relation. Half of crime is caused by the attempt to conceal from each other temptations, importunate wants, difficulties common to most of us; and if we would but state them frankly, or hear them kindly, we might save ourselves much waste of crime.

## PATAGONIAN MISSIONARIES.

THERE are several parts of the surface of the earth of which even yet, with all our spirit of adventure, we know next to nothing; and among these is Patagonia. The region so called, together with its continuation, the large island of Tierra del Fuego, forms the southern extremity of South America. A vast number of small islands line the western shore of Patagonia, and the western and southern shores of Tierra del Fuego; stormy seas roar along the channels formed by these islands; and ships, in rounding the extremity of the continent on their way to Chili and Peru, have such windy work of it that they make as little acquaintance with the land as possible. In fact, so far as present convenience for all but the Patagonians themselves is concerned, the annihilation of Patagonia and Tierra del Fuego too, and the truncation of South America about the 40th parallel of southern latitude, might seem a geographical improvement. There the countries are, however; and, doubtless, something or other is yet to be made of them. Patagonia is nearly a thousand miles long, with an average breadth of about three hundred and fifty miles; and Tierra del Fuego is as large as Scotland. Here, as elsewhere on the earth, there are mountains, plains, vegetation, desert, fowls, fish, and wild animals. Situated so far to the south, and blown on by the sea-winds, the country is, on the whole, cold and damp, as compared with the better known South American lands. Yet the climate must permit touches of natural beauty peculiar to the warmer latitudes; for humming-birds have been seen in Tierra del Fuego itself, fluttering, during a snow-shower, over the red bells of native fuschias.

Neither as colonists, nor as tourists, have Europeans of any nation yet set foot in Patagonia. The inhabitants who, for both the mainland and Tierra del Fuego, are estimated at half a million, are relics of the native Indian races that possessed these regions when America was first colonized from the old world. At least two varieties of these natives have been recognised—the Patagonians proper, tall, stalwart fellows of "a rich reddish brown colour, between that of rusty iron and clean copper," who lead a nomadic life in the interior, and on the east of Patagonia, wear skins and eat game—and the Fuegians, a shorter breed of men, with stout bodies, crooked legs, and complexions like old mahogany, or between "dark copper and bronze," and who inhabit Tierra del Fuego, and the western coasts and islands of the mainland, where they go about almost naked, and catch fish and seals. Neither race is very promising intellectually, both having the low, projecting forehead, and the small restless villanous eyes peculiar to the inveterate savage; but, if there is a difference, the Patagonians are probably the superior. The distinction between Patagonians and Fuegians, however, is, for ordinary purposes, superfluous; and both may very well rank among the outcasts of human history under the single name of Patagonians.

High browed or low browed, stalwart or dwarfish, copper-coloured or mahogany-coloured, these Patagonians, according to the doctrines of the Christian Churches, are *men*—having souls to be saved or lost; destined, like all other men to an immortality of existence, either happy or miserable, beyond this life—beyond Patagonia, as beyond Europe. Nay more, as the Christian Churches teach, there is only one way in which these Patagonians can be "saved"—can be made

spiritually better beings here, and inheritors of the blessed state hereafter; and that is the way appointed for the salvation of all men—alike in all countries and in all ages—the knowledge, namely, of Jesus Christ, crucified eighteen hundred years ago in Jerusalem. To bring this gospel, therefore, to those Patagonians—to present, somehow or other, to their villanous little eyes the symbol of that ancient and stupendous fact transacted in a part of the world they never dreamt of, and never could conceive; or to communicate, somehow or other, to their scanty brains, through their ears, sounds that would convey a tantamount meaning;—this, according to all Christian teaching, in any genuine accepted sense of the word Christian, is the one duty, *par excellence*, owing by all the rest of the world to that wretched region of it. Strange, strange thought—to the Jews verily a stumbling-block, and to the Greeks foolishness! Yet to this thought, in all its strangeness, Christianity is bound; this and no other is the thought of Christianity; this very strangeness, this very "foolishness to the Greek" is its exultation; and that soul which, from any sense of shame, would abate one jot of the absoluteness of the seeming folly, is, by a sublime spurning clause in the articles of Christianity itself, *not* the soul of a Christian. True, Christian citizens, and Christian newspapers, are now accustomed to set themselves against such views of matters; but this is because citizens and newspapers retain the *name* of Christian long after, so far as they are concerned, the *thing* has been banished to the winds. Whoever asserts a Patagonian or any other mission to be "foolish" is a "Greek," and no Christian—and this, though he should read his prayer-book daily, or wear a bishop's mitre.

Well, but there are some among us, it seems, who do believe in missions to the heathen. The belief may be a mere mental fashion inherited along with the Puritan class of notions, and the people who hold it may be, in essential respects, no better than their neighbours; still the belief is held, and people meet to talk about it, and are willing to put their hands into their pockets for it. Now to persons of this class, a Patagonian mission had all the charms of a new idea. There were Indian missions, African missions, South Sea missions—why should there not be a Patagonian mission? The possibilities of such a mission were large enough to captivate the missionary imagination. Christianity inserted into South America, at Cape Horn, and thence to make its way northward among untold tribes of nomadic natives! So, after various preliminaries unknown as yet to the public, the thing was arranged; and under the auspices of a society, whose honorary secretary is a clergyman residing in Bristol, a party of seven persons left England in the year 1850 to found the mission. These seven persons were,—Captain Allen Gardiner, of the Royal Navy, as head, or superintendent, (a religious seaman, we suppose, who had, in some of his voyages, looked with a Christian eye on the Patagonian coast, and so became possessed with the idea which he was selected to carry out); Mr. Williams, surgeon and catechist; Mr. Maidment, catechist; John Erwin, carpenter; and John Badcock, John Bryant, and John Pearce, Cornish fishermen. All were pious men, we are to imagine, full of the Methodist spirit and tenets, not clergymen, either, it will be observed, but hardy laymen fit for manual labour, and prepared for rough usage at sea or on shore. Captain Gardiner, we learn, was a man of resource—a man after the stamp of the South Sea missionary Williams, who, while he preached the gospel, could steer a ship, or show the carpenters how to build one.

The vessel that took the missionaries out, landed them at Picton Island, a small island off the southern coast of Tierra del Fuego, on the 6th of December, 1850, and kept hovering about to see how they got on in their first dealings with the natives. The Picton people, however, were menacing; and the missionaries went on board again till their two boats could be got ready. At length, on the 18th of December, they left the ship snally, and embarked with their stores (clothes, provisions, firearms, gunpowder, tools, Bibles, and a manuscript Patagonian vocabulary or two,) in these two boats, meaning to make for the coast of Tierra del Fuego. On the 19th the ship sailed, and the seven men were left beating about among the Patagonian waves.

No news of them having reached England from

that time, and fears for their safety beginning to be entertained, grounded chiefly on the circumstance that, as ships rarely touched the Fuegian coast, they had little chance of receiving supplies, should their own resources fail, instructions were issued by the Admiralty in October, 1851, ordering Captain Morshead, of her Majesty's ship *Dido*, to touch at Tierra del Fuego on his way to the Pacific, and ascertain, if possible, the fate of the missionaries. Captain Morshead reached the southern coast of Tierra del Fuego about the 9th of January in the present year; and after some ten or twelve days of search, during which signals were made, and guns fired at every likely point of the coast, traces of the missionaries were found at the place of their first landing—Picton Island. On a rock by the side of a stream near the shore of this island, the searchers found written these words:—"Go to Spaniard Harbour." To Spaniard Harbour, accordingly, Captain Morshead went—a harbour on the coast of the Fuegian mainland, opposite Picton Island. He reached it on the 21st of January; and here, on the same evening, near a boat lying on the beach, in the near vicinity of a large cavern, were found the unburied bodies of Captain Gardiner and Mr. Maidment. Next day, at a little distance of about a mile and a half along the coast, two other unburied bodies were found beside the other boat, supposed to be those of Mr. Williams, the surgeon, and John Pearce, one of the Cornish fishermen. The papers and other relics left by the unfortunate men were secured; their bleached remains were buried; three volleys of musketry were fired over their graves in token of respect, and the *Dido* continued her voyage.

The story of the mission, as gathered from papers found in Captain Gardiner's handwriting, was printed in the newspapers last week, and is by this time known to all our readers. Driven away by the natives wherever they attempted to land, the missionaries went backwards and forwards for some time in their boats between Picton island and the Fuegian mainland; and at last took refuge in Spaniard harbour as the only spot where they could be safe. Here they lived for eight months, partly in one of their boats which they hauled up on the beach, partly in a cavern swept by the tide. After incredible suffering, three of them died of sickness; the others were literally starved to death. Four months elapsed between the death of the last of them and the finding of their bodies by the crew of the *Dido*.

What, now, are we to say of all this? We may very well say, at least, with Captain Morshead, that the mission was ill-planned. "There could not be a doubt," says the captain, "as to the ultimate success of a mission here, if liberally supported;" (mark that!) "but I venture to express a hope that no society will hazard another, without entrusting their supplies to practical men acquainted with commercial affairs, who would have seen at a glance the hopeless improbability of any ship, not chartered for the occasion, sailing out of the way, breaking her articles, and forfeiting her insurance, for the freightage of a few stores from the Falkland Islands." This is perfectly sensible, and every one, whether a member of a missionary society or not, must agree with it. But the *Times*, speaking for Englishmen in general, gives the speculation a different turn. "Misdirected energy." "What have we to do with the Patagonians?" "Have we no misery, no heathenism at home, that we must waste our energies on a horde of savages, separated from us by every line of demarcation which Providence can set between human beings?" Such are the phrases of the *Times*, commenting on this Patagonian tragedy! Shallow! we say in reply, shallow!—true, and not true! In the first place, as we have already hinted, the sentiment involved in such phrases may be just, may be wholesome; but all the quibbling in the world will not convince any one who knows what Christianity is, either essentially or historically, that the sentiment is not radically anti-Christian. Moreover, it virtually asserts against the mission-supporting part of the public a charge which facts disprove. *Telescopic* charity, as it has been called—charity in behalf of distant objects—does not imply a corresponding diminution of charitable energy in behalf of objects that are near. The Christian congregations and churches that contribute most largely to Indian and African missions and the like, are precisely

those that contribute most largely to all home charities too; and those seven men who went to convert the savages in Tierra del Fuego were, we verily believe, men that would have shamed most of our philanthropists by their activity among the heathen in St. Giles's. And why, then, in the name of common sense, did they not stay in St. Giles's? It is hard to say, in the name of common sense; but this at least we will venture to say in a higher name, that "the quality of mercy is not strained;" which, being interpreted, means, as we believe, that mercy, like other electric forces, will capriciously leap from point to point, taking and rejecting as it chooses, and that all this caprice only subserves decree and law. Ah! if charity proceeded only in concentric circles, never dashing at distant points till all the vicinity were organized and beautiful, where had we ourselves been now? Let the *Times* bethink itself! On the bank of the Thames, where the *Times* office now stands, there once wandered British savages; the Italian and German missionaries that came to Britain to convert these savages doubtless left much work undone in their own Italian and German homes; nevertheless, was not this "misdirected energy," as it might then have been called, one of the things that have helped to make a *Times* newspaper, and all that is contemporary with it, possible? True, our British forefathers were not Patagonians; but the missionaries had to find that out.

Such criticism as we should have to make on the Patagonian mission may be very well left to be supplied by the reflection of our readers. One thing only we will say in conclusion—and it is becoming that we, in particular, should say it—that those seven men, who were starved to death on Tierra del Fuego, were heroes. Ah! and is there not a spirit in those antique Christian phrases in which they couched their heroism, that our modern forms of thought, our teeming funds of fine opinion, have not as yet produced anything to equal? "Fearing that I might suffer from thirst," wrote Captain Gardiner, in his boat two days before his death, and after he had been without food for four days, "I prayed that the Lord would strengthen me to procure some water. He graciously answered my petition, and yesterday I was enabled to get out, and scoop up a sufficient supply from some that trickled down at the stern of the boat, by means of one of my India-rubber shoes. "God," the "stern of the boat," the "India-rubber shoe"—what a meaning in that quaint conjunction of words and things! In the power of such a mental conjunction, and in nothing else, lies what we call *Religion*. And what is characteristic of these days of ours is precisely this—that, while we see the "stern of the boat" and the "India-rubber shoe" plain enough, we do not recognise the "God"!

#### THE PARIS CO-OPERATIVE ASSOCIATIONS IN 1852.

(LETTER I.)

(To the Editor of the Leader.)

"NOTHING can be more absurd than to imagine that men in general would work less when they work for themselves, than when they work for other people. A poor, independent workman will generally be more industrious than even a journeyman who works by the piece. The one enjoys the whole produce of his own industry, the other shares it with his master."

ADAM SMITH.

In the *Leader* of August 2, 1851, you did me the favour to publish my lecture on the "Self-organized Co-operative Associations in Paris," and you now ask me for a report on their present position and prospects; a request with which I willingly comply.

Having recently devoted several days to visiting my old friends, I am happy to say that the result of my tour of inspection is highly satisfactory. Some of the associations, the *Coiffeurs* and *Limonadiers* for instance, have been suppressed by the Government as political clubs; but, with the exception of the Tanners, almost all the *bond fide* operative associations have been enabled to withstand the political storms, which, at one time, threatened them with destruction.

My first visit, on the morning after my arrival in Paris, was to the pianoforte makers, Detir et C<sup>ie</sup>, in the Rue St. Denis; in which I found that the only change which had taken place was the retirement of the book-keeper—he had resumed his original occupation as a cabinet-maker on his own account. They are now thirty-two in number, with a steadily increasing trade, and have never been out of work, nor even on short time. They now find that their capital is too small for efficiently carrying on the ordinary business of the establishment, and are therefore about to in-

crease the amount of their shares from 40*l.* to 80*l.* In 1851 they sold one hundred and thirty-three pianos, at an average price of 26*l.*; and in the first quarter of 1852, the sale of pianos has risen to 38, in spite of the *coup d'état*. In 1851, their profits amounted to 430*l.*, which were divided in equal proportions among the associates, who work ten hours a day *au pieces*. Wages range from four to ten francs a day. They have had no disputes, and they all agreed that it would be now impossible for them to return to a state of servile dependence upon the will of others. By limiting the hours of labour, by sharing the amount of work among the whole of their members, and distributing production more equably throughout the year, they have been enabled to employ themselves fully and regularly. Instead of being worked to death by systematic overtime, under *marchandeurs*, or piece masters, and then turned into the streets, they have preserved their health, and gained time for study and recreation, and for the fulfilment of their social duties, as well as for the enjoyments of domestic life. They are now self-employing, self-reliant men, no longer mere operative drudges, the property of masters who not only claim a right to do what they like with their own, and to monopolize the whole profits of labour, but might compel their workmen, with the alternative of the workhouse or the gaol, to sign away their birth-right as freemen, and to write themselves down *slaves*, although branding their employers as *tyrants*.

The most important, perhaps, and certainly the most successful and prosperous of the Paris associations, is that of the arm-chair and sofa manufacturers, Auguste Antoine et C<sup>ie</sup>, in the Rue Charonne, which is constituted in a peculiar manner. Most of the French co-operative societies are registered *en nom collectif*, by which all the members become personally responsible for the liabilities of the association. But this establishment is managed by a permanent committee of nine members, who alone are responsible; the rest of the associates being *commanditaires*, and liable only for the amount of their respective shares. The *gerant*, or manager, however, has to pass through the ordeal of an annual election. He receives a fixed stipend of sixty pounds a year, with an allowance of twenty-four pounds for his travelling expenses. The *caissier*, or bookkeeper, has five francs for every day that he is employed. Each of the associates is required to work fifty-five hours a week, under the penalty of a fine, but no one is permitted to work more than eleven hours a-day. Wages, which are paid at the end of every alternate week, range from 36*l.* to 80*l.* a year. Twenty per cent. (one hundred francs) is deducted from the first twenty pounds earned by each member, and placed in the *fond social*. The hundred francs are refunded to him if the member retire from the association. Profits and losses are divided in the ratio of the annual rate of wages. Ten per cent., however, is deducted for the "*fond de retenue indivisible*," and forty per cent. for the "*fond de reserve*," besides four hundred francs taken from the first profits of each of the associates, which are capitalized, and form one of the elements of their success.

The association opens a credit for each of its members, to the amount of his first hundred francs deposit, paying in cash for the goods supplied every three months, and at the same time deducting from his wages a per centage sufficient to cover the expenditure. This operation is performed in a regular manner, by means of a printed form, or bill, drawn, accepted, and endorsed; and thus the society is enabled not only to give employment to the tailors, hatters, shoemakers, and the *marchands de nouveautés* in the faubourg, who supply the wants of the women and children, but, its credit being good, and its notes in request, it acquires by this means a *fond de roulement*, in cash or bullion, which increases its commercial power.

Apprentices have to pass through a noviciate of from three to six months, before they are admitted into the association, which is now composed of 112 members, of whom 16 are carvers; and in addition to these, 110 women and young persons are employed in polishing, &c. When I visited them at the beginning of April, they had work sufficient for 15 additional members, but unfortunately their shops were full.

This association was founded by six working men, on the 16th of November, 1848, with a capital of 504 francs 20 centimes; namely, 135 francs in money, 309 frs. 90 cents. in tools, &c., and 54 frs. 20 cents. in goods; and, at different times, has obtained from the government loans to the amount of 1000*l.*, repayable with interest, at 3½ per cent., in fourteen years.

The following extract from the annual balance-sheets, which are, without exaggeration, models in the art of book-keeping, will show a regular and progressive improvement down to the present moment. The following was their "*Actif*" or creditor account on the 31st December, 1849:—

Cash . . . . .	francs 4,357	90
Goods . . . . .	18,667	5
Materials, tools, &c. . . . .	3,113	10
Bills, &c. . . . .	10,513	40
<b>Total . . . . .</b>	<b>36,651</b>	<b>45</b>

"Passif," or Dr.

For Goods . . . . .	francs 600	
State Loan . . . . .	15,125	
Fonds d'Association . . . . .	4,338	95
Debts . . . . .	7,352	87

	27,416	82
Nett capital . . . . .	9,234	63

36,651 45

31st DECEMBER, 1850.

"Actif."

Cash . . . . .	francs 6,291	85
Goods . . . . .	41,004	
Materials, &c. . . . .	5,185	25
Bills . . . . .	23,701	

<b>Total . . . . .</b>	<b>76,182</b>	<b>10</b>
------------------------	---------------	-----------

"Passif."

Goods . . . . .	francs 3,393	
State Loans . . . . .	25,000	
Caisse de Secours . . . . .	334	40
Fonds Indivisible . . . . .	2,148	67
Fonds d'Association . . . . .	10,241	45
Debts . . . . .	11,891	88

	53,009	40
Nett capital . . . . .	23,172	70

76,182 10

31st DECEMBER, 1851.

"Actif."

Cash . . . . .	francs 3,556	95
Goods . . . . .	49,966	6
Materials, &c. . . . .	6,159	30
Bills . . . . .	25,300	85

<b>Total . . . . .</b>	<b>84,983</b>	<b>16</b>
------------------------	---------------	-----------

"Passif."

Goods . . . . .	francs 7,437	85
Caisse de Secours . . . . .	1,271	85
Fonds d'Association . . . . .	10,820	40
Fonds Indivisible . . . . .	3,683	31
State Loan . . . . .	24,500	
Debts . . . . .	466	75

	48,180	16
Nett capital . . . . .	36,803	0

84,983 16

But as the *Caisse de Secours*, the *Fonds Indivisible*, and the *Fonds d'Association*, placed in the Dr.'s account, are in reality due to themselves, their capital account stands thus:—

Capital, nett . . . . .	francs 36,803	
Caisse de Secours . . . . .	1,271	85
Fonds Indivisible . . . . .	3,683	31
Fonds d'Association . . . . .	10,820	40

<b>Total . . . . .</b>	<b>52,578</b>	<b>56</b>
------------------------	---------------	-----------

This Association has become the largest manufacturing house in the trade in Paris; and one of the working partners, Dupont, is now President of the *Conseil des Prudhommes*.

As a commercial speculation, therefore, it is eminently successful; the important principle of SELF-EMPLOYMENT and SELF-GOVERNMENT has been established beyond dispute; and coöperative association proves not only practicable, but highly beneficial in its effects upon the moral and social condition of its disciples. Yet, as M. Proudhon truly observes—

"L'Association, en elle-même, ne résout point le problème révolutionnaire. Loin de là, elle se présente elle-même comme un problème, dont la solution implique que les associés jouissent de toute leur indépendance en conservant tous les avantages de l'union: ce qui veut dire que la meilleure des associations est celle où, grâce à une organisation supérieure, la liberté entre le plus, et le dévouement le moins."\*

WILLIAM CONINGHAM.

Kemp Town, May 1st.

\* "Association of itself does not resolve the revolutionary problem. Far from that, it presents itself as a problem, the solution of which implies that the associates shall enjoy their own entire independence, and that they preserve all the advantages of union,—in other words, that the best of associations is that in which, owing to a superior organization, liberty has the largest share, and devotedness is least required."

TAXATION REDUCED TO UNITY AND SIMPLICITY.

II.

If the ground were not already occupied with cumbrous systems of indirect taxation and their supporting sophisms; there would be little difficulty in seeing the principles on which a true system of taxation must be based. What is it that rules the proportion in which government acts beneficially for each of us? In what proportion do we each occasion cost to the government? In that proportion let each pay his share.

A complete and accurate examination of the subject would require us to define the duties of the government, and to fix the limits of those duties, in order to determine with precision the causes of the cost to which taxation professes to be the common contribution. We must not, however, embarrass the present question with a discussion so certain, in the present state of opinions, to lead to results disputable by as many parties as opinions. It suffices for our present purpose that the first direct duty of government is to provide security of life and property. If it have any other (which some have taken the liberty to doubt,) that duty can only be secondary and contingent, not essential and direct; and the expense bestowed by any regular government on any such subsidiary functions, always bears but an insignificant proportion to the burden of the primary and indispensable one of order and security.

It follows, then, that the due proportion to be contributed by each tax-payer is incident to the number of persons under his care, and the amount of property in his possession.

So long as taxation was tribute, a uniform poll-tax was justly hateful as an impost grossly unequal in its pressure on unequal means; and no doubt some remains of the old feeling would discover themselves on any new proposal being made to establish such an impost. But truth vindicates itself in time, and a tax which was resented as an oppression enforced by the rapacity of an unscrupulous feudal lord, would soon commend itself to reasonable men as a just contribution to a common expense. A working man would easily acknowledge that his seven children could be no more protected than fed at the same cost as one.

Property occasions expense to the state mainly in proportion to its value, with perhaps some variations, easily ascertained in practice. Nothing, therefore, seems clearer than that it should contribute according to what it is worth.

This part of the question has, however, been much mystified by taking, without warrant, the question of profit into account. We say, without warrant; for, let us consider an extreme case, that of an empty house, or a depreciated tradesman's stock. These require the same care from the Government for the maintenance of all rights connected with them, as though they were profitable to their owners; and why should any man lay on his fellows the cost of protecting his profitless goods, and of keeping courts open ready to hear all disputes about them?

On the same ground that his property yields him no profit, let him ask an insurance company to indemnify him for nothing against risk of fire; and the answer may reconcile him to the consequences of the fact that neither can his property be protected for nothing.

If in this extreme case the incidence of taxation ought to follow the value of property, so should it in cases which differ amongst themselves as to profit, only in degree. The substantial object of taxation is the actually realized possession, not the continuously nascent advantage derivable from use, whether greater, less, or none at all.

Profit is legitimately taxable only when it has survived the current need into something tangible and realized. What we now possess is the nett result of past savings. Taxation should fall on that as realized property which once was only profit. Income-tax, as distinguished from property-tax, stands, therefore, we conceive, on a false foundation.

Although taxation only partially conforms in character to insurance, we commend to our readers, as a convenient guide to thought, that view of the case which assumes their similarity. Deem taxation a premium for insurance against violence and wrong, and nearly all the incidents and consequences of insurance will fall into their right places in a just theory of taxation. Appropriateness and proportionality of charge, directness of relation, recognised efficiency of service, with its consequent contentment, mutuality of advantage, a just combination of chances for neutralizing the severity of individual cases,—spring just as truly from one as from the other, if taxation be made direct, but not otherwise. In the light of this view of the case little mystery is left.

The administrative inconveniences of direct taxation are, however, commonly alleged to nullify the conclu-

sions in its favour so obviously to be drawn from the consideration of the uses and purposes of government, and of the causes of the cost of maintaining it. This part of the question is therefore the next to be examined.

PROBLEM FOR LORD ROSSE.

To discover Louis Napoleon's "star." Having dissolved so many nebulae, Lord Rosse may be equally successful with that nebular hypothesis.

Should he succeed, it would at once place the destiny of this country beyond doubt; and in such case, it would save trouble, as well as expense and bloodshed, to make the arrangements for a quiet transfer from Queen Victoria to her cousin.

We would suggest that a Commissioner should be at once appointed: and no person would be more proper or competent than Mr. Cobden—none, perhaps, so willing.

The Commissioner would, of course, secure by stipulation the requisite freedom for our looms, and "jennies." As to the press, it would be all the better for some supervision.

THE WATERS ARE COMING.

It is virtually settled by the Select Committee of the Commons, that in future London is not to have the very worst supply of water; that the stream is not to be drawn direct from the very filthiest sources, but that, at least, moderation in impurity is to be enforced. This is what the cant of the day calls a "step in the right direction."

Above Teddington, below which the supply is interdicted, the Thames is the drain, not of a huge empire city, but only of an extensive population, with its attendant herds. That is an improvement.

The Committee thinks the impurity in that quarter too small to affect health. But why have any? Londoners, we imagine, would rather have no impurity at all. Why drink even a fractional probability of cholera—especially "when there is no occasion for it?" The Memorandum from the Committee of the Sanitary Association shows that water distilled by nature, but not deprived, like artificial distilled water, of its air, can be obtained from hill-top. Why, then, have it from valley-bottom, down among the dead dogs, and other relics of corruption?

D. V.

THE annual meeting, we are told by advertisement, is to be held by an extremely Christian society, "D.V."—"Deo volente," or, God willing; and the annual sermon also is to be preached "D.V."

Why is it that the "unco guid" always announce when they intend to perform anything "D.V.?" It tends to suggest an idea, that at times they may undertake transactions "D.N."—*noiente Deo*, in spite of all permission. Nobody else ventures to keep a reservation implied in the special announcement. We all make our plans "humanly speaking;" and, even when we do not trumpet it, are resigned to the possibility of an interdict.

Nay, few of us would desire to do anything otherwise than under the acquiescence implied in the two letters. Their use is offensive: it implies the monopoly of a virtuous resignation, which everybody must feel; it betrays the notion of a possibility which the omission of the letters would suggest, but which nobody except the over-righteous would imagine. No committee can alter events by inserting or omitting the two capital letters—not even an Exeter Hall committee, though it may have arrogated a special influence.

One who signs himself "Ultra," objects to the reasoning in the recent letter by "Ion," entitled "Sixty Years Lost." "Ultra" thinks that the "entire multitude" need not be so very considerate of the "scholastic and eminent few." Certainly not, if the multitude can get what they want without the consent of the few. But it happens that the eminent few are influential, which "Ultra" overlooks. "Ultra" cannot conceive how doing simple justice to the entire multitude can be an offensive tyranny to the eminent few." The argument, however, turns upon this—do the "eminent few" consider that the act they are called upon to perform, is an act of "simple justice?" They do not believe it is: and this is the reason why they have to be consulted. Nor are the "eminent few" so few as "Ultra" thinks. They are numerous enough to garrison the country.

AFFECTATION APING UNAFFECTEDNESS.—Let not the demure Puritan, however, think that the joke lies all against the gay cavalier or beau. There may be as much of the sin of cultivation in the stroked and glossy hair of the Roundhead, or plain man, as in the love-locks and bunches of their antipodes in sentiment. I have seen some men, who affected to be very unaffected, cultivate a peak on the top and centre of their brows as sedulously, and with as much inward gratulation on account of it; as ever I saw a dandy cultivate a tuft or train a side-curl.—*Chambers's Pocket Miscellany*, vol. iv.



## 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.*

No sooner does one of the herd die, than the swift-scented crows swoop upon his carcase, and turn his death into the nourishment of their life. We "gentlemen of the Press" have something instinctively corvine, it would seem, in the hungry haste with which we pounce upon the dead to convert them into "articles." This is not said sarcastically. Does not Nature everywhere manifest this same subjection of death to life—of what is past to the continuance, under new forms, of what is present? Do we not all pass from hand to hand the lamps of life, and so keep the circle for ever luminous and active. MOORE dies; England feels a gentle elegiac sadness in thinking of this bright happy spirit passing away; and England's active writers wish to record something of that fugitive feeling in review articles and magazine memoirs. Foremost among those we have seen is that in the *British Quarterly*, which is not only a deep and genial glance into MOORE'S poetry, but is, at the same time, a suggestive article; the paper in *Blackwood* takes up wholly different ground; while the memoir in the *Biographical Magazine* has the advantage of being a biographical sketch, copious in its details, and well put together.

Recurring to the *British Quarterly* to glance at its contents, we notice that it is less amusing and less striking than usual. The heavy articles predominate; and although none of them are unworthy of their place, they have not left any durable impression on us. The *North British Review*, with four articles less, has greater attractions. There is an elaborate essay on *British Statesmanship*—a discussion of *Binocular Vision and the Stereoscope*—and a discursive, yet suggestive paper on *Life and Chemistry*, to which we would call attention. But the most attractive paper to be found in this month's periodicals is, in our opinion, that on *Sharks and their Cartilaginous Cousins*, in *Fraser*; it is not only an instructive chapter of natural history, but also an entertaining piece of writing. *Fraser* is very varied this month. Besides *Hypatia* and *Digby Grand*, it has a lively paper on the reign of George III., a review of *Tauromachia*, and a protest against ultra peace doctrines in a defence of *Nursery Rhymes*. *Blackwood* opens with an elaborate paper on *Gold*—a subject which California and Australia have brought into sudden prominence; a delightful paper on *Niebuhr*, which contains a truth set forth in so beautiful an image, that we must pause in this our rapid indication, to present it to the reader:—"Once for all, let no man parade his love of poetry, with the least hope of being respected for it, who has not a still greater love of truth. Nay, if we reflect patiently and calmly upon this matter, we shall find that there is but one way to keep this flower of poesy in perennial bloom—it is to see that the waters of truth are flowing free and clear around it. We may be quite sure, that to whatever level this stream by its own vital force shall rise or sink, the same fair lily will be seen floating just on the surface of it. Just where these waters lie open to the light of heaven do we find this beautiful creation looking up from them into the sky." Bulwer's endless *My Novel*, continues to evolve its lengthy life, and *Our London Commissioner* concludes his commission. The idea of this paper was good; the writing, though pleasant, has not been up to the idea; and the judgments delivered have a most unmistakeably provincial accent.

Foreign Literature is unusually dull. Germany is silent. France waits till she may speak. Meanwhile, Brussels sends us two new volumes by ALEXANDRE DUMAS, and one by LEON GOZLAN. The last named writer deserves peculiar mention: he has written a novel called *George III. et Caroline de Brunswick*, without any of those magnificent mistakes which may be called the birthright of Frenchmen speaking of things English! Having said so much, we cannot greatly praise this novel for its interest. DUMAS is better worth reading—Is he not always worth reading? especially his prefaces? DUMAS is the most French of Frenchmen, and a Frenchman is never more naïf than when speaking of himself: a preface is always his arena for display. Do take up *La Comtesse de Charny*, if only for its preface: the novel you will find to be a continuation of *Ange Pitou*, which was itself a continuation of *Les Mémoires d'un Médecin*; but the preface is unadulterated DUMAS. In it, among other delicious sentences, there is one where his religious indignation stigmatizes the insolence of newspaper proprietors who proposed to him to write the history of papal crimes—proposed it to him, DUMAS, the man κατ' ἐξοχήν religious, the man who, whatever else he may be, is confessedly and pre-eminently religious—he says so, "Ou vient me proposer, à moi, l'homme religieux par excellence!" But, to add to the list of indignities contained in their proposals to him, at last came the proposal that he should not write any more! However, here we have the first volume of *La Comtesse de Charny*, and the first volume also of a new novel, *Conscience l'Innocent*, which is amusing.

## OWEN JONES ON DECORATIVE ART.

An Attempt to define the Principles which should regulate the Employment of Colour in the Decorative Arts; with a few words on the Present Necessity of an Architectural Education on the Part of the Public. Read before the Society of Arts, April 28th, 1852. By Owen Jones.

THE anarchy which reigns in Art at the present day is like that which reigns in Philosophy and Society, the substitution of an undirected caprice for the action of ascertained law. Here, as elsewhere, we see the absolute

need of a Faith—of some common Belief in fixed principles—of some rule of life, comprehensive enough to embrace all details, powerful enough to coerce all divergent tendencies. No sooner is Art separated from Religion, or what comes to the same thing, no sooner is there antagonism, dissent in Religion, than Art falls into individual caprice. In this strikingly suggestive Lecture, Owen Jones emphatically recognises the want of intellectual unity as the cause of the anarchy:—

"In all ages but our own, the same ornaments, the same system of colouring, which prevailed upon their buildings, pervaded all they did, even to their humblest utensils: the ornaments on a mummy-case are analogous with those of the Egyptian temple; the painted vases of the Greeks are but the reflex of the paintings of their temples; the beautiful cushions and slippers of Morocco of the present day are adorned with similar ornaments, having the same colours as are to be found on the walls of the Alhambra.

"It is far different with ourselves. We have no principles, no unity; the architect, the upholsterer, the paper-stainer, the weaver, the calico-printer, and the potter, run each their independent course; each struggles fruitlessly, each produces in art novelty without beauty, or beauty without intelligence.

"The architect, the natural head and chief of all who minister to the comforts and adornments of our homes, has abdicated his high office; he has been content to form the skeleton which it should also have been his task to clothe, and has relinquished to inferior and unguided hands the delicate modelling of the tissues and the varied colouring of the surface: who can wonder at the discordance and incongruity of the result?"

And again,—

"It would be very desirable that we should be made acquainted with the manner in which, in the education of the Eastern artists, the management of colour is made so perfect. It is most probable that they work only from tradition and a highly-endowed natural instinct, for which all Eastern nations have ever been remarkable; they have the further advantage of working out the style which grew up with their religion, with which every thought and action of their daily life is interwoven.

"Since the Reformation, which with us separated the tie which should exist between Religion and Art, we have been deprived of this advantage: the want of unity in feeling has caused a want of unity in expression; there is the same disorder in the art, as scepticism in the mind. This acting, generation on generation, each descends lower and lower."

The purport of his lecture is to introduce something like unity, by calling attention to certain fixed principles, by him named Propositions, which lie at the very basis of Decorative Art, and which, if carried in the mind will serve as rules to guide against the many discordancies of individual caprice. We have already spoken highly of this lecture, and refer our readers to the printed copy of it, published by the *Society of Arts*. There are points in it from which we withhold assent; notably that so-called Law of Simultaneous Contrast of Colours, attributed to the French chemist Chevreuil, which, as an explanation of a well known fact, that two colours in contrast are both heightened in force, the dark darker and the light lighter, we take to be an attempt to explain objectively what is a purely subjective phenomenon. But we have no space for discussion, and must limit ourselves to such extracts from Owen Jones's lecture as may be of interest and service to the general reader:—

## "PROPOSITION I.

"Colour is used to assist in the development of form, and to distinguish objects or parts of objects one from another.

"The most cursory glance at the works of nature will establish the truth of our first proposition. We see everywhere in nature colour assisting form, in producing distinctness: thus, flowers are separated by colour from their leaves and stalks, and these again from the earth in which they are planted; and, not to fatigue you with examples, it is at once evident how much in nature would be meaningless, but for the many charms of colour spread over the earth so lavishly.

"Had nature applied but one colour to all objects, they would have been indistinct; but, by an ever-changing variety, each has its proper tone and hue, from the modest lily of the field to the parent of all colour, the glorious sun in the heavens.

"The ancients ever obeyed this law; thus the capitals of their columns are separated by colour from the shafts, and these, again, by colour from their bases or pedestals.

## "PROPOSITION II.

"Colour is used to assist light and shade, helping the undulations of form by the proper distribution of the several colours.

"But for light and shade we should have been unable to recognise the distinctive forms of objects; without it a globe would be but a circle, the light on the exposed surface and the shade on the retiring surface alone convince us of its rotundity.

"We find, therefore, in nature's works colour assisting light and shade; by its help the modulations of form are rendered more apparent: were it otherwise, it would be to little purpose that the flower should be distinguished by colour from the leaf, if the individual form of the flower and the leaf had been extinguished in the process.

## "PROPOSITION III.

"These objects are best attained (i.e. objects or parts of objects are distinguished one from another, and the undulations of form are assisted) by the use of the primary colours on small surfaces, and in small quantities, balanced and supported by the secondary and tertiary colours on the larger masses.

"This proposition will not so readily be accepted as the two preceding. There are many who will object that the primary colours are the delight only of the savage and the uncultivated, but I answer that the primary colours are never vulgar or discordant when properly applied; the defect will lie, not with the colours, but with the want of skill of the hand that applies them. They must be used as in nature, with a sparing hand, on small surfaces, and in small quantities; the secondaries and tertiaries in larger masses, and on larger surfaces, atoning for their lesser brilliancy by their greater volume.

"We find in the works of the Egyptians, Greeks, Arabs, and Moors, during the best periods of their art, this beautiful law invariably followed: but, on the contrary, when the art of each civilization declined, the primaries are no longer the

ruling harmonies; the secondaries and tertiaries, from being subordinate, became dominant, and muddiness and indistinctness resulted.

"In Egypt, during the reigns of her native kings, the primaries mainly prevailed; whilst under her Greek rulers art languished, and being practised rather from imperfect tradition than from poetic inspiration, the secondaries usurped the place of the primaries, and the beautiful harmonies which had before been produced by their combination were lost.

"The progress to further decline is again remarkable under the Romans, who taught the Egyptians to build up temples of greater magnitude, with stones more nicely fitted, with the mechanical processes more advanced, but with the poetic fire wanting, and naught but a barren work of skill remaining.

"The same decline may be observed with Greek architecture. In the temples of Greece, as far as we are acquainted with them, the primaries were dominant; whilst in Greek towns under Roman rule, the true principles of their noble ancestors were thrown aside, and the caprices of their Roman masters substituted."

It is very strange, considering the amount of trouble (not to mention money), people bestow on the furnishing of their houses, how much research, discussion, shopping, and consultation with ignorant shopmen, and still more ignorant friends, that they never think of settling a few general principles, and acting upon them. If you are going to furnish a room look at it as if you were going to paint a picture. If you have a fancy, for the Gothic, for the Renaissance, for the Rococo, or the modern Manchester, it matters not, so that in the first place you adhere to the style chosen, and in the next place you arrange the details into an ensemble. For this purpose bear in mind the following—especially the concluding sentences:—

"PROPOSITION IV.

"The primary colours should be used on the upper portions of objects, the secondary and tertiary on the lower.

"This proposition, founded also on observation of Nature's works, was generally obeyed in the best periods of art, but nowhere so well or so universally as in the buildings of the Moors, who confined the primary colours entirely to the upper portions of their buildings, and the secondary and tertiary to the lower. In Egypt we do see occasionally the secondary (green) used in the upper portions of their temples; but this arises from the fact that ornaments in Egypt were symbolical, and more nearly represented natural objects than in other styles. If a lotus-leaf were used in the upper portions of a building, it would necessarily be coloured green, but the law is true in the main: the general aspect of an Egyptian building gives us the primaries above and the secondaries below.

"Even in Pompeii, we find this sometimes; in the interior of their houses there is a gradual gradation of colour downwards from the roof, from light to dark, ending with black: but this is by no means so usual as to convince us that they felt it as a law, for there are many examples of black immediately under the ceiling. This law will be found of great use in the decoration of the interiors of our dwellings. Ceilings and cornices may be decorated with the primaries of prismatic intensity on the small surfaces of their mouldings; the walls, on the contrary, from presenting larger masses, should be of secondary colour, of low tones and hues. The dados still stronger in colour, and more broken in hue. The carpets should be darkest of all, composed of broken secondaries and tertiaries, so interwoven and neutralized that they retire from the eye, both as furnishing repose for the colouring of the upper portions and as backgrounds to the furniture placed upon them."

And this,—

"PROPOSITION XXI.

"Imitations, such as the graining of woods and of the various coloured marbles, allowable only when the employment of the thing imitated would not have been inconsistent.

"There has often been much discussion upon the propriety of imitations in Decorative Art, such as imitations of the graining of woods and various coloured marbles; there is no doubt that, of late years, the skill obtained by our artisans in producing these imitations, has caused the practice to be very much abused, but it need not for that be entirely discouraged.

"The principle which should regulate the employment of imitations has never yet been defined: it appears to me, that imitations are allowable whenever the employment of the thing imitated would not have been inconsistent.

"For instance, there can be no objection to grain a deal door in imitation of oak, because the mind would be perfectly satisfied if the door were oak; but it would be an absurdity and abuse of means to paint it in imitation of marble.

"Again, the practice of covering the walls of halls and staircases with paper, in imitation of costly marbles, is very objectionable, because the employment of marble to such an extent would be inconsistent with the character of most houses, and consequently the sham is much too glaring: on the contrary, were the pilasters and columns of a hall only painted, the objection would cease, seeing that the mind would be satisfied with the reality. A violent instance of the abuse of graining existed formerly in the Elgin Room at the British Museum, where beams on the ceiling, thirty feet long, were splashed in imitation of granite. Here was a manifold absurdity, as no granite beam could have supported itself in any such situation. The door-jambs of an opening, on the contrary, might be imitation granite without inconsistency, as in such a situation granite would be useful as indicating strength."

Indeed we would recommend you to study the whole lecture, and master its principles.

To the extracts already made we must add this on

NATIONAL STYLE IN ARCHITECTURE.

"As each new architectural publication appears, it immediately generates a mania for that particular style. When Stuart and Revett returned from Athens, and published their work on Greece, it generated a mania for Greek architecture, from which we are barely yet recovered. Taylor and Cr sy did as much for the architecture of Rome. The travels of Belzoni and his successors produced the Egyptian Hall, and even Egyptian-faced railway tunnels. The celebrated French work on the architecture of Tuscany, and Letarouilly's *Modern Rome*, have more recently inspired us with a desire for Italian palaces.

"The works of the elder Pugin and Britton, with a host of followers, have flooded the country with Gothic buildings; with which, notwithstanding the learning and research they exhibit, I must frankly avow I have but little sympathy. I admire and appreciate the Gothic buildings, which were the expression of the feelings of the age in which they were created, but I mourn over the loss which this

age has suffered, and still continues to suffer, by so many fine minds devoting all their talents to the reproduction of a galvanized corpse.

"Instead of exhausting themselves in the vain attempt, who will dare say that had these same men of genius, as they certainly are, directed their steps forward instead of backward, architecture would not have made some progress towards becoming, as it is its office, the true expression of the wants, the faculties, and the sentiments of the age in which we live?"

"Could the new wants to be supplied, the new materials at command, the new sentiments to be expressed, find no echo to their admonitions? Alas! iron has been forged in vain,—the teachings of science disregarded,—the voice of the poet has fallen upon ears like those of the deaf adder, which move not, charm the musician never so wisely.

"More than this, instead of new materials and processes suggesting to the artist new forms, more in harmony with them, he has moulded them to his own will, and made them, so to speak, accomplices of his crime. The tracery of Gothic windows, generated by the mason's art, have been reproduced in cast iron; the Doric columns of Greek temples, which owe their peculiar form and bulk to the necessities of stone, have been a hollow iron sham.

"We have gone on from bad to worse: from the Gothic mania we fell into the Elizabethan—a malady, fortunately, of shorter duration; for we then even worshipped not only a dead body, but a corrupt one.

"We have had an Italian mania without an Italian sky; and we are even now threatened with the importation of a Renaissance mania from France. It would be most unfortunate if the attention which has been directed to the peculiar beauties of the East Indian collection of the Great Exhibition should result in an Indian mania; but if this disease, like measles, must come, the sooner it comes and goes the better. What we want to be convinced of is, that there is good mixed with evil in all these styles; and I trust, when each has strutted its brief hour on the stage, recording for posterity the prevailing affectation of the day, we shall. We want to be convinced that all these styles do but express the same eternal truth, but in a different language: let us retain the ideas, but discard the language in which they are expressed, and endeavour to employ our own for the same purpose. We have no more business to clothe ourselves in mediæval garments, than to shut ourselves in cloisters and talk Latin; to wrap ourselves in Indian robes than to sit all day on divans, leading a life of voluptuous contemplation.

"After the expression of so much heresy, I must beg to say that the fault does not at all lie with the architectural profession, to which I esteem it an honour to belong. The fault lies with the public; the public must educate themselves on this question. Architects, unfortunately, can but obey their clients: this one will have an Elizabethan mansion; this clergyman can admit no other than a mediæval church; this club of gentlemen must be accommodated in an Italian palace; this mechanics' institute committee must be located in a Greek temple, for there alone wisdom can be found or philosophy taught; this railway director has a fancy for Moorish tunnels or Doric termini; this company, again, an Egyptian suspension-bridge—the happy union of the alpha and the omega of science; the retired merchant must spend his surplus in Chinese follies and pagodas. And, to wind up the list of these melancholy reproductions, I will cite the worst I ever saw, though, fortunately, not an English one. We have here a client, who, requiring a steam-engine for the purposes of irrigation for his garden, caused his architect to build an engine-house in facsimile of one of the beautiful mosque tombs of the caliphs of Cairo. The minaret was the chimney-shaft. Nothing was omitted: even the beautiful galleries, which you all know were used for the purpose of calling the Moslem to his prayers, here surrounded a chimney without a means of access.

"I again repeat, the fault lies with the public; an ignorant public will make complacent and indolent architects. Manufacturers, again, will always tell you, in answer to a reproach for the bad designs they produce, that they are only what the public require, and will have: let us trust that this excuse will no longer avail them. The Great Exhibition has opened the eyes of the British public to our deficiencies in art; although they were unable to suggest better things, they were found quite able to appreciate them when put before them. There must be on the part of manufacturers, architects, artists, and all who in any way minister to the wants and luxuries of life, a long pull and a strong pull, and a pull all together; they have one and all, like dramatic authors, written down to the taste of the audience, instead of trying to elevate it. The public, on the other hand, must do their part, and exercise a little pressure from without.

"I know that I shall be told that the production of a new style of architecture is not so easy a matter; that it has never been the work of any one man, or set of men, but rather something in the like of a revelation, for which, probably, we may be told to wait. Much of what I have said here this evening will be set down as the ravings of folly. Some will say, Architecture is a thing of five orders, discovered and perfected once for all, beyond which we cannot go, and all that is left us is an adaptation of it to our own wants; others will tell you that a Christian people should have no other than Christian architecture, and will tell us to go back to the thirteenth century in search of architecture, and beyond this there is no salvation: but I answer, that this architecture is dead and gone; it has passed through its several periods of faith, prosperity, and decay; and had it not been so, the Reformation, which separated the tie which ever existed between Religion and Art, gave to Christian architecture its death-blow."

GRANT'S HISTORY OF ASTRONOMY.

*History of Physical Astronomy. From the Earliest Ages to the Middle of the Nineteenth Century. Comprehending a Detailed Account of the establishment of the Theory of Gravitation, by Newton, and its development by successors. By Robert Grant, F.R.A.S. R. Baldwin.*

THIS is a valuable though a misnamed book. A history of Astronomy we cannot call it. There is neither the progression nor the continuity of history; but in lieu thereof several important essays on the history of astronomical discovery, and on the efforts to elucidate the mechanical principles which regulate celestial movements. As a philosophic survey of astronomical history we can say little in its favour; but we cannot too highly applaud the diligence, erudition, pains-taking exactitude, and ample details of these chapters, especially those devoted to the Theory of Gravitation, which are truly exhaustive. The whole book is, so to speak, a hymn to the glory of Newton, of whom Mr. Grant mentions a curious reservation with respect to the movement of the lunar apogee. In the first edition of the *Principia* he gave the results of an investigation of the movement of the lunar apogee which seemed to imply that he had treated

the subject by a method of a sufficiently comprehensive character. These results were suppressed by him in the second edition, doubtless in consequence of their not exhibiting so complete an accordance with observation as was manifest in his other researches on the lunar theory. But, as Mr. Grant observes, that Newton really was in possession of a method adequate to a complete investigation of the subject, is rendered still further probable by the researches of Mr. Adams, who, by aid of geometrical considerations analogous to those expounded with so much elegance in the *Principia*, has obtained results relative to the movement of the lunar apogee, which present a complete accordance with observation.

Besides the chapters devoted to the all important subject of Gravitation, we would direct special attention to those on the Precession of the Equinoxes, and on the Perturbations of the Planets. Indeed, for the union of the exposition of principles with the historical erudition necessary to set forth their rise and progress, this work must take a worthy place. Had it been differently named, criticism would only have had praise to award; and now that we have briefly told the reader what the book really is, we must leave it in his hands.

THE MELVILLES.

*The Melvilles.* By the author of "John Drayton." In three volumes. Bentley.

WE opened the *Melvilles* with an eagerness such as rarely moves us towards the three volume task we have so often to undergo; we were moved by the recollection of *John Drayton*, a novel animated by a spirit we were forced to admire and respect, even in the heat of conflict; a novel exhibiting very remarkable faculties on the part of the writer, whom we then supposed to be a clergyman, whom we now understand to be a lady; a novel, in short, that predisposed us to look with indulgent interest upon anything else coming from the same pen.

It is useless hovering about the conclusion! We must come to it at last, so we may at once express our disappointment. The *Melvilles* is very inferior to *John Drayton*. The story is languid, spun out by details and episodes, that do not justify their appearance by their interest, and wanting the reality and purpose of the former book. The style is as graphic, as musical, and as poetical as before; but the characters are faint, lacking the strong lines of individuality, looking like what they are—persons in a novel.

The construction of the story has a simplicity, which, desirable in a philosophic novel, or in one wherein the attention would be centred on the minute, progressive development of character, is ruinous to the interest of a novel without character. Every change is foreseen; and as the change brings with it no corresponding influence on the characters of the drama, its being foreseen makes it uninteresting. If you could actually anticipate all that Smith would say to you in the course of a conversation, it would require immense politeness to listen to him, but the element of unexpectedness invests even Smith with a momentary interest. So it is with novels and plays. Only the good can be read twice, and it is like a second reading, the task of reading with a distinct foreknowledge of what is to come.

When Mr. Melville dies, and his widow is left penniless, we foresee that Hugh Melville will fail in getting a clerkship; we foresee that he will try and be disappointed through several episodes; we foresee that Isabella and her mother will apply for needlework to support the family, and after some baffling will manage to make enough by the needle to support themselves; so when John Aikman comes to take lessons of Hugh, we foresee that this not very intelligible version of Dobbin will fall in love with Isabella, and be happy with her when the three volumes draw to a close; we foresee that Esther will love her cousin, we foresee that the uncle from India will be the *deus ex machina*. In short, without any exercise of the imagination, the whole story unfolds itself, always some chapters ahead; and the consequence is, that if we read on, it is merely because there is a charm in the style.

To the author of *John Drayton* we should say: You have failed; but be not discouraged; there can be no doubt of your faculties, but guineas are only coined from gold, and if, instead of golden experience, you attempt to use the materials of circulating libraries, all the faculty in the world will not do. Try what can be done with the thoughts you have thought, and the feelings you have felt, and then you may say, as Touchstone says of Audrey,—“An ill-favoured thing, my lord, but my own!”

BOOKS ON OUR TABLE.

*Physiology applied to Health and Education.* By Andrew Combe, M.D. Fourteenth Edition, revised and enlarged. Edited by Robert Coxo, M.D. Simpkin, Marshall and Co.

DR. ANDREW COMBE was not only an admirable writer and a clear thinker, he was enabled to preach from the text of his own sufferings, and to transmute his experience into lessons for mankind. The delicate health which robbed the world so early of his services, he turned to good account, in writing of health and education. His books are masterpieces of popular exposition. The basis is sound, the materials excellent, the style captivating. “Fourteenth edition” on the title-page of a really solid scientific work are magical words; and we deliberately say they promise nothing which the work will not fulfil. Dr. Robert Coxo has very considerably enlarged this edition by some valuable additions, bringing the physiology down to the latest discoveries and ideas. It is a cheap edition, printed in double columns, and has an useful index.

*The Orations of Cicero.* Literally Translated by C. D. Yonge, B.A. (Bohn's Classical Library.) Vols. II. and III. H. G. Bohn.

Two more volumes of Mr. Yonge's *Cicero* do not alter the opinion we formerly expressed on the translation. Had Cicero not written a totally different style from that of his translator, there would have been no “Classical Library” ready to publish his orations. As a “crib” this translation will be useful; but only as a crib.

*Sir Joshua Reynolds's Literary Works.* Edited by W. H. Beechey. In Two Volumes. (Bohn's Standard Library.) Vol. II. H. G. Bohn.

The conclusion of these charming works, the first reading of which we envy any man.

*The Works of Sir Thomas Browne.* Edited by Simon Wilkin, F.L.S. (Bohn's Anti-quarian Library.) Vol. III.

THIS third volume concludes the enterprising reprint of Sir Thomas Browne, and contains—besides the *Urn Burial*, *Christian Morals*, *Miscellanies*, and *Correspondence*—an excellent Index to the whole work. Browne is a subject to which we must return for an article when the publishing season gives us a little leisure and space.

*Sir John Franklin and the Arctic Regions: A Letter to Lord John Russell.* By Peter Livingston. Smith and Son.

MR. LIVINGSTON, one of the intelligent lecturers at Mr. Wyld's Great Globe, availing himself of his admirable opportunities of studying the details of the Arctic Expedition, has drawn up considerations why it would be desirable to send out other vessels in search of the Northern explorers. Somewhat more rhetorical than an appeal to a statesman need be, the Letter has scientific information told with a fervour likely to interest the public, whose sympathies will be entirely with the writer.

*Use and Abuse of Capital, Machinery, and Land.* By William M'Crombie. Ward and Co.

AN author, who has won credit for the useful treatment of an abstract moral question, devotes himself here to the theme of the day—the “Use and Abuse” of Capital and its agencies. The essay is written under a just sense of the responsibilities of the subject, and is far more impartial in its treatment than there was reason to expect. It will be read with instruction and pleasure.

*A Hand-book of Organic Chemistry.* By W. Gregory, M.D. Taylor, Walton, and Co.

*Democritus in London, with the Mad Pranks and Comical Conceits of Molley and Robin Good-fellow.* William Pickering.

*The Exhibition Lay.* Groombridge and Son.

*Lionel Lincoln.* Parts I. and II. By J. F. Cooper. J. K. Chapman.

*Lyrical Poems.* By P. De Beranger. Sutherland and Knox.

*Lectures on the History of Moral Philosophy in England.* By W. Whewell. J. W. Parker and Son.

*Career of Louis Napoleon.* John King.

*An Essay upon the Ghost-Belief of Shakespeare.* By A. Roffe. Hope and Co.

*Account of the Public Prison of Valencia.* Charles Gilpin.

*Reminiscences and Reflections of an Old Operative.* Smith, Elder, and Co.

*The Physiology of the Human Voice.* By F. Romer. Leader and Cook.

*The Laws of Health in relation to Mind and Body.* By L. J. Beale. John Churchill.

*Irish Popular Superstitions.* By M. R. Wilde. J. M'Glashan.

*Course of the History of Modern Philosophy.* 2 vols. By M. V. Cousin. D. Appleton and Co.

*The Suitor's County Court Guide.* By W. W. Charnock. C. Mitchell.

*Michaud's History of the Crusades.* Vol. 2. Translated by W. Robson. George Routledge and Co.

*The Melvilles.* 3 vols. R. Bentley.

*Great Artists and Great Anatomists.* By R. Knox. John Van Voorst.

*The Natural History of Animals.* Vols. 1 and 2. By T. R. Jones. John Van Voorst.

*Alphonse Karr—Contes et Nouvelles.* W. Jeffs.

*Conscience L'innocent.* Tome 1. Par A. Dumas. W. Jeffs.

*George III. et Caroline de Brunswick.* Tome 1. Par L. Gozlon. W. Jeffs.

*La Comtesse De Charny.* Tome 1. Par A. Dumas. W. Jeffs.

*Life and Times of Francesco Sforza, Duke of Milan.* 2 vols. By W. P. Urquhart. Blackwood and Sons.

*Home Circle.* Part XXXIV. W. S. Johnson.

*Poetic Works of Louis Napoleon.* David Bogue.

*Zingra the Gipsy.* By A. M. Maillard. G. Routledge and Co.

*Mrs. Caudle's Curtain Lectures.* By Douglas Jerrold. Bradbury and Evans.

*Republic of Plato.* Translated by J. L. Davies and D. J. Vaughan. Macmillan and Co.

*Tales and Ballads.* By J. Telfer. W. Tweedie.

*Catherine Sinclair.* W. Tweedie.

*The Rabbi of York.* A Tragedy. Baily Brothers.

*Moral and Social Songs.* John Robertson.

*Future Prospects of Christianity.* By Professor Newman. John Robertson.

*Blackwood's Edinburgh Magazine.* W. Blackwood and Sons.

*British Quarterly Review.* Jackson and Walford.

*Bleak House.* Part III. By Charles Dickens. Bradbury and Evans.

*Writings of Douglas Jerrold—Cakes and Ale.* Part I. Punch Office.

*Mr. Sponge's Sporting Tour.* Part V. Bradbury and Evans.

*Tait's Edinburgh Magazine.* Sutherland and Knox.

*Royal Military Magazine.* W. Kent and Co.

*Household Narrative.* 16, Wellington-street.

*Fraser's Magazine.* J. W. Parker and Son.

*Colburn's United Service Magazine.* Colburn and Co.

*British Journal.* Aylott and Jones.

*Letters on Church Matters.* James Ridgway.

*Biographical Magazine.* J. Passmore Edwards.

*Law, Constitution, and Reform of Convocation.* J. H. Parker.

*Penny Maps.* Part XXII. Chapman and Hall.

*Cowie's Bookbinder's Pocket Book and Manual.* W. Strange, jun.

*Chambers' Pocket Miscellany.* W. S. Orr and Co.

*Climate of Italy in Relation to Pulmonary Consumption.* By T. H. Burgess. Longman, Brown, Green and Co.

*The Portrait Gallery.* Part V. W. S. Orr and Co.

*Free-Trade Fallacies Refuted.* By G. F. Young. James Madden.

*Parlour Library—Scalp Hunters.* By Capt. M. Reid. Simms and M'Intyre.

*The Bookcase—Italian Sketch Book.* By Fanny Lewald. Simms and M'Intyre.

*Prospective Review.* John Chapman.

*North British Review.* Hamilton, Adams and Co.

*Records of the School of Mines, and of Science applied to the Arts.* Vol. I. Part I. Longman and Co.

*Class Book of Botany, being an Introduction to the Study of the Vegetable Kingdom.* By J. H. Balfour, M.D., F.R.S.E., &c. Longman and Co.

Portfolia.

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

COMTE'S POSITIVE PHILOSOPHY.

By G. H. LEWES.

PART VI.—What are the Laws of Nature?

THE three great initial conceptions of the Positive Philosophy having been set forth in the preceding sections, I will now give some analysis of the six volumes of scientific exposition forming the *Cours de Philosophie Positive*. But before finally leaving the subject of Comte's Law of Evolution, I will insert a note addressed to me by a friend, which may help to clear up some obscurities in my own exposition. The importance of the law warrants our dwelling on it:—

“The following observations may perhaps prove serviceable to the younger students of the Positive Philosophy. In the Law of Evolution, they must not suppose, as many do, that each of the three periods had a separate and exclusive existence. On the contrary, the Theological, Metaphysical, and Positive elements, have always co-existed. But in the first period, The-

ology has been the *predominating* element; in the second, Metaphysical; in the third, Positive conception has predominated. The germ of Positivism will be found even in the Fetichistic stage; nor was man ever absolutely incapable of Abstraction. On the other hand, the Positive period will not entirely exclude the initial and intermediate tendencies of the human mind. It should be observed, too, that these three states are all closely connected; for the Metaphysical is a transition state, and is partly theological and partly scientific. The chasm between Supernaturalism and Positivism is bridged over by Metaphysics. Without it Humanity would never have arisen; for *natura non agit per saltum*. The principle of gradation or continuity, the characteristic of nature, is also the characteristic of the new Philosophy, and will be found to underlie all its logical and scientific conceptions. As an illustration, I subjoin a passage from Sir John Herschel's *Discourse*:—"There can be little doubt that the solid, liquid, and æriform states of bodies are merely stages in a progress of gradual transition from one extreme to the other; and that, however strongly marked the distinctions between them may appear, they will ultimately turn out to be separated by no sudden or violent line of demarcation, but shade into each other by insensible gradations. M."

The present is a favourable occasion for bringing forward a criticism on the much-used and much-abused term, "Laws of Nature," which for nearly twenty years I have employed with misgiving. The phrase has two vices: it is inaccurate, and it is misleading; and I think that a severe critic might not unreasonably condemn its employment as peculiarly improper in Positive Philosophy. The conception implied in, or suggested by, the phrase "Laws of Nature," is the last and most refined expression of the Metaphysical stage of speculation: in it Law replaces the old term Principle; in it Law is the delicate abstract Entity *superadded* to the phenomena. For observe: When you say that it is according to a law that bodies gravitate, that fluids ascend to their level, or that the needle points towards the north, you are superadding to the *facts* an abstract entity (law), which you believe coerces the facts, makes them to be what they are; you give a generalized statement of the facts, and out of that you make an entity—a something *ab extra*. What is this Law which produces the phenomena, but a more subtle, a more impersonal substitute for the Supernatural Power which, in the Theological epoch, was believed to superintend all things,

"To guide the whirlwind and direct the storm?"

If the Savage says it is a Demon who directs the storm, does not the man of science say it is a Law which directs it? These two conceptions, are they not identical?

I know it will be answered, that men of science do *not* so conceive Law. They do not believe that the everliving activities we in our profound ignorance christen Nature, are moved according to certain celestial Statutes, with "pains and penalties" thereunto attached. But my objection is not the less valid. The current language of men habitually expresses this conception; and although, when their attention is directed to it, when they begin rigorously to define terms, they call a Law the "expression of the relations of coexistence and succession," yet I say their language about "breaking the laws of Nature," acting "contrary to the laws of Nature," indicates the misleading suggestions of the term, and much of their reasoning is vitiated by it. Thus, to go no farther than the Development theory, which assumes a certain fixed and definite Plan in the universe—are not the Laws which work out this Plan endowed with a mysterious *prescience* of the end they are to reach? And what are prescient laws but metaphysical entities? Nevertheless, that the Creator has subjected matter to certain immutable laws, is a conception which most men of science loudly proclaim; and however they may refine upon terms, and sublimate the idea of Law, its *human* element cannot always be eliminated. But this, I must confess, seems to me a *mechanical* theory of the universe, both sterile and irreligious: it makes God necessary as a postulate, and there leaves him. He having legislated for the universe once for all, the *laws* are now sufficient to sustain the great life of the universe! According to my own *dynamic* conceptions, which admit God only as Life, and the Universe as his Activity, such notions of Law are profoundly erroneous; and I object therefore to the term Laws of Nature, because its direct meaning points to a *mechanical* conception of Nature, and because, however we may circumscribe its meaning, as expressive simply of the relations of coexistence and succession, the word Law does and must bring with it its human associations, and must therein be delusive. Rather than the popular, and, as I call it, mechanical theory of the Universe, let me have the primitive spontaneous theory of the earlier stages of Humanity: I can accommodate myself better with the old Deities—capricious and human as they are—than with the modern Laws; for the Deities at least were *living* powers! Spinoza and Goethe teach us something better than the mechanical theory, and to them I refer the reader, upon whose lips a scornful smile has been raised by what has just been said.

Let me suppose it granted that the term Law is objectionable. What shall be the substitute? The difficulty of finding one has been very great. The "mind in the spacious circuit of its musing" alighted on terms all clogged with intrusive and delusive meanings, which unfitted them for replacing the old term. The one upon which I finally settled does not altogether satisfy me, but it fulfils the main requisites.

I propose to call the relations of coexistence and succession, usually named Laws, by the name of Methods. Etymologically, Method (*μεθοδος*) is a *path* leading onwards, a way of transit. The Methods of Nature would

therefore express the paths along which the activities of Nature travelled to results (phenomena). I cannot avoid figurative language, and it is useful, because expressive; but the conception here expressed is limited to the facts, with nothing superadded. Given the phenomena, we name the process by which they are called forth, the *Way* of Nature—the path Forces take to that particular result. These paths may be intersected by the paths of other Forces. For instance, a spark will ignite dry gunpowder. Here a particular path is opened along which Forces can travel to a particular issue (explosion); but if we throw water on the powder, the particular path is blocked up, and another issue is reached. Fire raises the temperature of water. Yet if you pour water into a red-hot crucible containing liquid sulphuric acid, the temperature of the water is *not* raised; nay, so far from that, it is lowered to the freezing point, and in lieu of steam you have ice! This is no contradiction to the Laws of Nature; no law is broken; the path is intersected by another path, thus: The rapid evaporation of the sulphuric acid produces cold so intense that the water which (the acid absent) would have hissed off in steam, now not only loses in evaporation all the heat given it by the fire, but also loses a portion of that heat which kept it liquid. And this is simply because the Method of Nature—the true path of its activity as regards sulphuric acid subjected to heat—is what we call rapid evaporation.

To understand this conception of Methods, let us place ourselves at the most abstract point of view: let us consider Nature as the sum of Forces, which because they *are*, and are Forces, must act, and must act along some pathway or other—and let us further consider these Forces about to leap into results—we can only consider them as travelling along certain definite paths to reach certain definite results. We thus see that the path of activity is one of the *conditions* of an act; and that to the observed actions we superadd nothing not given in the actions themselves, by declaring such and such to be the Methods of Nature.

I try various forms of expression, and various illustrations, to familiarize my meaning. Let me take one from the science of Mechanics. Matter is said to be *inert*: as a scientific artifice this may be useful in mechanics, but out of that domain to consider matter as incapable of spontaneously modifying the action of forces applied to it, is a remnant of the old Metaphysical notion, that all states of activity and movement are produced *from without*: a notion in accordance with that phase of mental development when movement was explained by supernatural entities; a notion in accordance with the mechanical theory that all matter is a "lifeless mass of clay in the potter's hands." I cannot bring myself so to consider it. I desire some considerable rectification of these gross conceptions of matter, and would view it as the phenomena of Forces, and say that all matter, animate and inanimate, is everywhere in a state of spontaneous activity—of Life, in short; a conception, I need scarcely add, to which all modern science is rapidly tending. And having once so conceived it, we should conclude that the movements of matter are not *obedient to Laws*, but are the spontaneous activities of the Forces; and what we call Laws are nothing but the paths, or Methods, along which the Forces move.

That there are objections incident to the use of the term Methods, I am aware; is it possible to avoid objections? Moreover, I am not Quixotic Neologist enough to expect that the old term will fall out of use, could even a new term, wholly free from objection, be suggested. But I think this digression will not have been superfluous, if it serve to fix the students' attention on the characteristic defect of the conception of Law, and if it cause him, when he meets with the term Law, mentally to correct it into Method. Without at once altering our scientific phraseology, we may at once accustom our thoughts to Methods of Nature, and so familiarize ourselves with the positive spirit of regarding Nature.

I know not what Comte will say to this criticism, but I have noticed the effect of the term Law as decidedly misleading; and I think the direction in which it points—to the *mechanical* theory of the universe—a direction Philosophy should energetically be warned against.

To quit this discussion, and return to the *Cours de Philosophie Positive*, let me advise those who have some mathematical attainment, to study the chapters devoted to Mathematics in the first volume (pp. 117-739), as I despair of giving any useful account of them within the space at my disposal, even though a friend has submitted to me his analysis. Those unacquainted with Mathematics will do well just to skim through the chapters, picking out the general principles, and then commencing the Lectures on Astronomy—which I will open next week.\*

#### THE TWO SISTERS.

Awake! awake! the royal hills  
Are diademed with rosy light,  
The waving forests, warbling rills,  
All worship God aright.  
Where trees like emerald pillars rise,  
A child is kneeling on the sod,  
Her face is looking on the skies,  
Her heart is gone to God,  
Her prayer is said, she rises now,  
She seeks the dear familiar bower,

\* For the Comte Subscription Fund I have to acknowledge 2l. from Mr. Wyndham Harding, and 10s. "from a German."

Shadowed by many a leafy bough,  
 Perfumed by many a flower.  
 With fingers pale the bridal vine  
 Still clasps her forest lord, and strays  
 Where warm voluptuous sunbeams shine,  
 A thousand various ways ;  
 Or hangs the curtain that she weaves  
 In folds before that temple fair :  
 A lovely tapestry of leaves,  
 That stirs with every air.  
 The child approacht the lone retreat,  
 With quickened step and eager eye ;  
 She called—Awake ! O sister, sweet !  
 But there was no reply.  
 She drew the leafy veil apart,  
 She looked above, but nothing said,  
 And entering with a beating heart,  
 She stood before the dead.  
 Alone and with the Dead she stood,  
 The Dead, asleep among the flowers,  
 That yesternight her hand had strewed,  
 Marked not the changing hours.  
 She knew not it was morning prime,  
 Shall never know the silent noon,  
 Shall never heed the twilight time,  
 Nor chronicle the moon.  
 A broken lily in her hand,  
 A drooping rose on drooping head ;  
 Even Nature seemed to understand  
 Her queenliest flower lay dead.  
 The Child, with aspect sad and still,  
 Stood gazing at her sister's side,  
 Content, if it had been God's will,  
 That moment to have died.  
 She felt like Eve when Eden's gate  
 Had closed on her for evermore,  
 She felt that life was desolate,  
 That Paradise was o'er.  
 No tears are hers, for tears are vain,  
 The heart and not the robe is rent,  
 If God who gives will take again,  
 'Tis folly to lament.  
 Then drop the curtain, fold by fold,  
 Over the consecrated Bower,  
 And veil from curious eyes and cold  
 The dead and living Flower.

M.

## The Arts.

### THE OPERAS.

THE *rentrée* of Mario in the *Huguenots* was, as it always is, the attraction of a crowded and enthusiastic audience. He was looking in admirable health, but his voice has, I fear, lost for ever its delicate beauty—its bouquet, as the French say of wine ; and when the demands upon his high chest notes came, he either evaded them, or delivered them without that thrilling tone we were accustomed to hear. I think it is a pity he should continue to sing in Meyerbeer's operas, especially with Tamberlik in the house. There is a charming *repertoire* still open to him, and one that will not tear his voice to pieces. Grisi was in high spirits, and sang as grandly as ever her duet with Marcel and her duet with Raoul. Formes was very fine, but occasionally bellowed more lustily than was tolerable. What a pity so fine an actor, and so excellent a singer as he sometimes is, does not learn to restrain the vulgar force he seems to delight in letting loose !

On Thursday, *Don Giovanni* introduced Ronconi to an English audience in the character of that splendid reprobate—*ribaldo audace* ! Of his performance, and of Tamberlik's unparalleled singing of *Il mio tesoro*, I will discourse next week.

At HER MAJESTY'S, Cruvelli has been gaining fresh admirers in *Fidelio*, and is to startle them by her versatility in *Don Pasquale* ; her *repertoire* seems limitless ! Why does she not take *Cenerentola* ? She would be ten times more effective in it than Angri, who is not competent to support the weight of an entire opera. Meanwhile the Wagner controversy rages, and keeps HER MAJESTY'S in a state of suspensive discomfort. If this said Wagner should after all turn out a mediocrity—if the *cantatrice* should prove no *incantatrice*—what immense comfort to the manager who loses her ; and, as Plato would say, what a "sell" to the public !

### ROSE CHERI.

LAST week you may remember the avowal of my passion for Rose Cheri, and how, when the impertinent thought of her being married crossed me, a swift ingenuity suggested "arsenic" ! Since then I have seen her. The arsenic is not wanted. I will give it to Miss Martha Brown's amatory cat, who makes my garden his concert-room. Here, puss ! puss ! O Rose, why did you marry ! Marriage ! 'tis such an awkward thing—*comme ça vous gate une femme* ! It takes a young girl with the bloom and beauty, the mystery and infinite charm of youth, and depopetizes her. I never

married ! Now I look at Rose, and remember how charming she was, I bless my inconstant stars that saved me from . . . .

The meaning of that rhapsody is, that if you now go and see Rose Cheri (and by all means go) you will see a charming actress, but you will not see the Vision I once had. She is thinner everyway : thinner in face, thinner in figure ; thinner in voice ; thinner in manner. Her *naïveté* is no longer innocent ; her innocence betrays the least possible *souçon* of the serpent under it ; her gestures are not graceful—perhaps they never were, but they must have had the charming awkwardness of youth !

The two pieces she played were *Geneviève* and *Brutus lache César*. The former is an amusingly disagreeable comedy by Scribe, the pivot of which is essentially French. Imagine a father's *jealousy* of his daughter treated as the subject of facile laughter, The very suggestion points to diseased corners of selfish hearts, and outrages the sanctity of paternal affection. It is possible that a father may so love his daughter as to look upon all her lovers in the light of enemies,—rivals ; it is possible that he would force her to marry the man she did not love, rather than see her happy in another affection than his own. I can imagine this as possible—probable even ;—but possible with whom, probable with whom ? And are such exceptional diseases the right subjects for a dramatist to hold up ? I do not call upon the stage for sermons ; I do not insist upon any puritanical severity ; far from it ; I think the stage may be permitted the licenses of life—but except to nail them on the cross of infamy I do not see why the outrages of Nature's code—the diseases which will sometimes vitiate the hearts of men, should be presented to us on the stage. If *Clérambaut* (the father in this piece) were of our own set, should we laugh at him ? We should loathe him. His egoism would be revolting ; his love for his daughter would excite disgust instead of sympathy. Yet Scribe makes us laugh at it—treats it as a foible, fit for gay comedy ! Numa's acting in the part of the father was a study of nature, and almost reconciled us to the comedy. The brusquerie, the fondness, the impatience, and the unconscious egoism of the man was worthy of all praise. In the character of the *avoué* in *Midi à quatorze heures*—of which I only saw a bit—I did not much like him ; but to play *Clérambaut* as he played it, a man must be a fine actor.

In *Brutus lache César*, Rose Cheri was supported by Lafont, whose performance was the better of the two. Those who have seen Charles Mathews and Madame Vestris in *Delicate Ground* will be glad to compare notes in this, the original of that piece. I did not see them, but I can imagine them. If you can imagine a company of light comedians revelling in tragedy, you will understand the amount of pleasure derived from

### THE WARDEN OF GALWAY,

produced at the OLYMPIC on Wednesday, the more so when I add that the said tragedy was in the dreariest style of High Art. There we had Mr. Hoskins removed from his sphere of "rattling" vivacity into rant, madness, and agonies of hysteria, throwing himself with reckless *abandon* upon the tragic green baize, and altogether making a determined "set" at tragedy ; Mr. W. Farren was the conscience-stricken murderer, having to undergo a fearful amount of inexplicable emotion ; Mrs. Walter Lacy was the distressed virgin in white, given up to agonies. Not that I mean to attribute to these performers the failure of the piece. It is a dreary play, with no spark of poetry or passion ; with no touch of nature, no hint of character. The performers really deserve praise for having carried it through to the close. They produced no effect, for no effect was producible with those materials. But to see comedians labouring thus out of their sphere, and in the vainest of efforts to make a parody of *Brutus* interesting, was not a pleasing spectacle. I cannot bring myself to criticise the play : the cordial hisses of the audience rendered criticism needless ; but I will say a word in praise of the painstaking and occasionally effective performance of Henry Farren in the *Warden*. He marred it by two bursts of explosive vehemence, not sufficiently graduated for success ; and he has yet to learn the proper management of his voice in passionate situations ; but in the quieter portions he exhibited a very marked advance in his art.

I must borrow from the *Times* the notice of the novelty at that really amusing place, the

### MARIONETTE THEATRE.

"The drama of the *Corsican Brothers* having already received a tolerably fair portion of burlesque treatment, has at last been turned to political account by the puppets of the Adelaide Gallery, under the title of the *Arcadian Brothers*—i. e., the brothers of the Lowther Arcade. Paris remains Paris as in the serious piece, but Corsica is metamorphosed into England, whence *Punch* beholds the murder of his French brother, the *Charivari*, by the President Louis Napoleon. Thus prompted by a sympathy, which the drama at the Princess's has rendered universally familiar, he hastens to Paris, armed with a pen, and triumphs over Napoleon, who vainly wields a sabre, gallantly carrying out the idea of the "Captain Pen and Captain Sword," as laid down by Mr. Leigh Hunt. All the effects of the drama are carefully preserved in the squib, and great pains have been taken to make the President as like as possible to the actual dictator. A loud call for the author was raised at the conclusion, when Mr. Albany Brown, the puppet manager, came forward and stated that Mr. Hugo Vamp, the puppet dramatist, was too nervous to appear, at the same time announcing the piece for repetition every evening until further notice. The consistency with which every detail of theatrical exhibition is carried out by marionettes, without the intrusion of a single human being, is not the least attractive feature of the entertainment."

And while on these entertainments, let me not forget to mention the most amusing of them all—

### THE ASCENT OF MONT BLANC,

which Albert Smith has now rendered a standing topic. I went for the second time the other day, for the pleasure of seeing the pleasure sparkle in lovely eyes, but I found myself laughing as heartily, and listening as eagerly, and applauding as joyously as if I had never been there before ! Having seen it a second time, I promised myself the pleasure of seeing it a third, when the crush to get in has become milder.

## THE MUSICAL UNION

of Tuesday last was a brilliant affair. Madame Pleyel and Joachim were very properly regarded as "immense attractions." Of her playing it is difficult to speak in terms not feeble from their exaggeration; (and what is so feeble as exaggeration?) but those who have heard Liszt, Mendelssohn, and Mendelssohn's sister play, may be told that Madame Pleyel has the qualities of all three; she is less brilliant, perhaps, than Liszt, but also less mannered; she has not the power of Mendelssohn, but more grace and delicacy. There is a peculiarly caressing delicacy in her touch, which no one has equalled; and she is equal to all styles. Her playing of that exquisite trio D minor (49)—Mendelssohn's most brilliant trio to me thinking—was bewitching; and wonderfully was she seconded by Joachim and Piatti. The two compositions by Liszt served to exhibit her variety and power as an executant, but the trio was to me the most convincing proof of her immense talent. Joachim is a first-rate player—worthy to be heard after Ernst; and thoroughly conscientious, disdaining all trick.

VIVIAN.

## EXHIBITION OF THE ROYAL ACADEMY.

[FIRST NOTICE.]

IN our opening notice of the Royal Academy Exhibition we follow our usual course, and rapidly survey the prominent pictures in the order of the catalogue.

The first that collects around it a knot of spectators, not very easily penetrated, is "The Battle of Meeanee," by Mr. G. Jones—a composition, however, which makes far less impression on the mind than the written despatches. Probably the ground has been mapped out with some research, and there is a degree of action. No one can deny the fact of horses galloping, or of Beloochees receiving their quietus; but, on the whole, the effect is excessively tame. One has an idea that Mr. Jones might be able to get on better in battles if he were to go and see "life" under some fast gent, or to place himself as pupil with Mr. Michael Angelo Hayes. He must have been overlaid by "the documents" to which the catalogue alludes; insomuch that, with a desire for literal accuracy, he has forgotten to give us General Napier in characteristic career.

Above is "The Parting of Lord and Lady (William) Russell," the night before the death of the noble convict—a simple subject, treated by Lacy with much good feeling, but scarcely needing the space devoted to it. In "The Woodland Mirror," Redgrave makes a still further advance in his landscape career: an amphitheatre of wood and tall grass encloses the bay-like edge of a small lake or pool; the vegetation treated in the manner which Redgrave has helped to develop, portraying the plants separately and distinctly with surprising fidelity, not only to the individual trees, but to the harmonious effect of the whole. The relation of the distance, seen in an opening at the corner, to the foreground, is not preserved with equal fidelity; it is harsh, heavy, and obtrusive. In "Venice," David Roberts brings the scene before you with his usual power and reality, but with less of the brilliancy characteristic of the place. The visitor will like to see Mr. Swinton's grouped portrait of Mrs. Norton, Lady Dufferin, and Lady Seymour, for the sake of the originals. Charles Landseer's "Death of Edward the Third" has the merit of a matter-of-fact industry in the getting up. Stanfield's "Bay of Baia" has the expressiveness and beauty of the original view, but not the life: it is tame. May we not use exactly the same expressions to Francis Grant's portrait of Mr. Disraeli? "A School Playground," by Webster, implies an Homeric volume of vicissitude and character. "Antwerp," with its eternal tower, never looked more majestic nor more gloomy than in Roberts's view. Frith paints a mother teaching her child to say its prayers. Lee and Sidney Cooper we again find associated in an evening meadow scene: both of them have several works in the Exhibition, and on the whole we think they work best apart: Lee cannot come up to Cooper's sunshine, nor does Cooper do so well without it. A little picture of Webster's might escape notice for its quiet and small size, but it is one of his happiest "bits"—we mean the "A B C." "Blackheath Park" is painted by Mulready, after the manner of the landscape in his illustration of the Vicar of Wakefield—a curious compromise of extreme minuteness and coarseness—a cross between Præ-Raphaelism and scene-painting. "A Scene from Cymbeline" enables Frank Stone to portray a very beautiful woman's countenance. "Beech-trees and Fern" is a large picture, with nothing but a view, *under* the trees, of trunks and ground herbage; freed from the gloomy blackness, and also from the want of keeping, which usually mar Anthony's pictures. "The Sunset Hour" is Creswick's best picture in the collection—a mill elevated on a bank, a smooth mill-stream, the crimson glow of the setting sun reflected in the stream and in the little pools of water that encroach on the lowland—a scene of much beauty and intense quiet. The reverse in both those respects of Maelise's "Alfred in the tent of Guthrum;" the Danes, like "the Senaccheribs," "wallowing in wantonness," and Alfred "egging them on by his sweet musicke"—all as John Speed notes, and painters innumerable have painted. There are two things of which one is intensely conscious in Mr. Maelise's pictures—the outline of every figure and every object, or part of an object, and the great mastoid muscle in the neck of every man. The colouring appeared to us, on a hasty view, not less startling than usual, but not so much adulterated with black and white chalk. Let us not, however, pass Harding's good picture, "The Falls of the Rhine," although the hanging committee have hung it below the line; nor the interesting portrait of Mr. Thomas Vaughan, by Knight. "A Letter from the Colonies" is a composition much like Webster's "Rubber of Whist;" the figure at the window being the village postman; a father and daughter appear to be intently scanning the direction, while the mother is more intently awaiting the contents, and the postman not less impatiently awaiting his fee. It is one of Webster's admirable bits of real life. Mr. Leslie's "Juliet," whom the catalogue represents as saying, "What if it be a poison which the friar," &c., looks more like a young lady of our own day, in delicate health; and reluctantly preparing her soul to take "the mixture as before." Let us notice the detestable portrait of Mrs. Coventry K. Patmore after we have seen what the noble painter of it can really do. To judge by "The Marquis of Saluce

marries Griselde," we should say that Mr. Cope has had no acquaintance either with the royal Marquis or the patient girl. The luxuriant face and wavering attitude of the Griselda, the empty-headed weakness of the Marquis, bely the attempt to pass them off for the black blooded tyrant or the unconquerable woman whose patience conquered his obstinacy. In "The Port of La Rochelle," Stanfield is quite himself. An amphitheatre of hills, with an old castled height, a sea with boats and its restless waters, are old subjects with Stanfield; but one tires of them as little as of the sea itself, and for the same reason—the ceaseless life. Mr. Hart illustrates an elaborate piece of bibliographic research respecting the three inventors of printing, "Gutenberg, Faust, and Scheffer," with that curious perversity of our present artists, that makes them bestow their greatest vigour on the most abstract subjects. The Battle of Meeanee is reduced to an ornamental tableau, which needs not disturb a drawing-room; while a British compositor, setting up the advertisements in the *Times* newspaper, shall be represented in an ecstatic condition, wholly at variance with one's notions of practical business.

In the middle room, "The Mountain Lake" will strike you as one of the best works that Creswick has ever produced, being, like the one we have already mentioned, broader, and more powerful than his compositions are apt to be. "Florence Cope, at Dinner-time," is an agreeable exercise of paternal pride—a careful and vigorous portrait of a very good model. According to the testimony of this picture, Cope appears to be among those who are inclining towards the truth which is in the half-truthful Præ-Raphaelite school. In "A Subject from Pepys' Diary,"—[why will educated Englishmen break the laws that regulate the inflection of the genitive case in Pepys's affairs?—] Elmore sets forth the ingenious diarist singing with Mercer and Knipp, while his wife sits for her picture—a good combination of fancy portraits founded on fact. Redgrave's "Love and Labour"—typified by half-a-dozen mowers all of a row, and a couple whose courtship seems rather to hang on hand—answers no particular purpose that we can discern. Ansdell is buckling to fact, and his "Cattle Fair" is a great advance on previous works in accuracy of execution. M. Winterhaller's "Florinde," a graceful composition of ladies, after the manner of the critical lower Italian schools,—Phillips's "Magdalen" surveying the distant Calvary,—Rankley's "Eugene Aram," in school,—Wehnert's "Elopement, the Eve of St. Agnes,"—E. M. Ward's "Charlotte Corday going to Execution," we shall pass over hastily, precisely for the reason that they will strike the visitor without our help, and we shall have to notice them all again. Ward's picture has a weightier interest in it than any that he has yet produced—the character is very impressive. Frith's painful scene from Lord Wharnclyff's memoirs of Lady Mary Wortley Montague—"Pope makes love to Lady Mary"—is a triumph of storytelling; the insolent laughter which is the beauty's reply to Pope's "declaration"—the beauty so complete, so unimpaired, the laughter, so ringing, so *intentional*, the poet, so bodiless, so beaten down, so writhing under the sense of the unwarrantable and unjust insolence—are expressed with a subtlety, and, at the same time, a force, not often seen together, if even apart, on the walls of the respectable and Royal Academy. "A Grazier's Place on the Marshes" is the picture that made us think how much better Sidney Cooper is alone, although we have so often admired his joint labour with Lee. Turner's "Lodging-house" at Chelsea, should be noted; also Inchbold's "Study"—præ-Raphaelitism, among the twigs. Elmore's "Novice," for much expression and sweetness, an excellent Protestant picture; Boxall's "Portrait of General Edgar Wyatt," for its life-like character; Roberts' "Interior of St. Stephen's, at Vienna," for its vast space and grandeur; Frith's "Portrait of a Lady," for its gentle and quiet, real-life grace, should not be overlooked in the hastiest survey.

First in the West Room is Armitage's great picture of "Hagar," a spacious piece of mannerism inferior to the painter's own faculties. "Antwerp Market" we notice as the promising work of a very young exhibitor, who is triply allied to the arts—Mrs. E. M. Ward. There is much Præ-Raphaelitish merit in Thomas's "Laura in Avignon." "The Timber Wagon" is one of Linnell's most characteristic landscapes, and therefore, to us, one of his most unpleasing: nature does not present every substance in the form of agglomerated particles like mouldy cheese. Millais's "Huguenot" declining to accept from his betrothed a Roman Catholic badge, is the master-piece of the Exhibition; excellent in design, brilliant enough to put out the light of every other painting in the place,—except Millais's other—Ophelia, in the "weeping brook," where she died her "muddy death,"—a most literal and a most beautiful copy of Shakespeare's Ophelia. More of our controversy with this chief of the Præ-Raphaelite brethren hereafter. He is a strong man, and fit to be a painter, which no weak man is. Hunt is worthy to be his companion, as witness "The Hireling Shepherd," in spite of its flustered, brickdust cheeks: but Hunt has not done so well this year as he did last, in his "Two Gentlemen of Verona;"—there is not less of manner, there is less of idea. The visitor will not pass, as we have, Harding's "Crystal Palace," next to Millais's Ophelia, a monument to illustrate for posterity the barbarism of the destroying Manners. Nor will he pass Maence's portrait of Douglas Jerrold—welcome once more to the weekly press!—nor Goodall's "Last Load," though it is not his most animated picture.

In the Miniature, Thorburn, as usual, rules supreme; but a better kind of merit is appearing in the younger men, amongst whom we may name Wells. The sculpture is not in any way overpowering.

## EXHIBITION OF THE AMATEUR SOCIETY.

A SMALL room contains 262 works, hung on the walls and on two screens, mostly of the character of hasty water-colour sketches. It is interesting to see evidence that an elegant accomplishment is pursued largely and successfully by *dilettanti* ladies and gentlemen of the "easy" classes. In many of the sketches we discern much natural power, and some few, like Miss Blake, Mrs. Bridgman Simpson, and Mr. Thomas Macdonald, like Miss Blake, Mrs. Bridgman Simpson, and Mr. Thomas Macdonald, can work as well as professional artists. But the Amateurs have not put forth their strength: there is nothing to mate with the engraved works which some few have published.



## MACMILLAN & CO.'S (Cambridge) PUBLICATIONS

May be had by order from any bookseller, and  
are always kept in Stock by

GEORGE BELL, London; HODGES & SMITH, Dublin;  
EDMONDSTON & DOUGLAS, Edinburgh;  
AND  
JAMES MACLEHOSE, Glasgow.

Just ready, crown 8vo, price 2s. 6d.

### THE RESTORATION OF BELIEF.

PART I.

"Before indicating the profound differences which separate us, let us express the unfeigned respect inspired by the dignified liberality of his tone, the breadth of his purpose, and the beauty and *largo* of his style."—*The Leader*.

"Whoever the author may be, our readers may take our word for it, that he is a man of mettle and well trained and equipped for the encounter to which he has committed himself."—*British Quarterly*.

Cambridge: Macmillan & Co. London: George Bell.

This day, crown 8vo, cloth, price 7s. 6d.

### THE REPUBLIC OF PLATO.

Translated into English. With an INTRODUCTION, an ANALYSIS, and NOTES. By two Fellows of Trinity College, Cambridge (D. J. VAUGHAN, M.A., and the Rev. J. LL. DAVIES, M.A.)

Cambridge: Macmillan & Co. London: George Bell.

Just ready, price 5s. 6d., small 8vo, cloth,

### LETTERS FROM ITALY & VIENNA.

"Living and life-like."—*Spectator*.

"Since Mr. Mathews' well-known and ever fresh 'Diary of an Invalid,' we have not met with a more pleasant and readable volume of this class than the little work before us."—*English Churchman*.

"Liberal without licence, and decided without dogmatism."—*Athenaeum*.

"More freshness of interest than most books of European travel."—*The Nonconformist*.

"He paints with great vividness, and now and then with a good deal of quiet poetry."—*The Guardian*.

"A pleasant companion."—*The Leader*.

"The style is pointed and clever, and the letters very readable."—*Daily News*.

"The writer is observant, candid, and fair. He sees with his own eyes."—*Christian Remembrancer*.

Cambridge: Macmillan and Co. London: George Bell.

Just published, price 2s. 6d.

### THE RABBI OF YORK.

A TRAGEDY IN FIVE ACTS.

London: Baily Brothers, 3, Royal Exchange Buildings, Cornhill.

This day, 3s.

**GERMAN PHRASE-BOOK;** a Guide to the Formation of Sentences for Conversation and Composition. For the use of Students and Travellers. By A. BERNAYS, Phil. Doc., Professor of German in King's College, London.

By the same Author,

**GERMAN WORD-BOOK.** 3s.

**GERMAN GRAMMAR.** Eighth Edit. 5s.

**GERMAN EXERCISES.** Tenth Edition.

5s. 6d.

**GERMAN EXAMPLES.** Fifth Edit. 3s.

**GERMAN READER.** Fifth Edition. 5s.

**GERMAN HISTORICAL ANTHOLOGY.**

Second Edition. 5s.

**GERMAN POETICAL ANTHOLOGY.**

Fourth Edition. 7s.

**SCHILLER'S MAID OF ORLEANS.**

With Notes. 2s.

**SCHILLER'S WILLIAM TELL.** With

Notes. 2s.

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

This day, post 8vo,

### POLITICAL ELEMENTS; or, the Progress of Modern Legislation.

By JOSEPH MOSELEY, Esq., B.C.L.

CONTENTS: The Principles of Reform—The Principles of Conservatism—Political Parties—Political Progress—Public Opinion—Legislative Science—Whom a Member Represents—In what Sense he Represents—The Functions of a Legislator—The Character of a Legislator.

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

Next week, Two Volumes, 8vo,

### ON THE METHODS OF OBSERVATION AND REASONING IN POLITICS.

By G. CORNELL LEWIS, M.P.

By the same,

### ON THE INFLUENCE OF AUTHORITY IN MATTERS OF OPINION.

Octavo. 10s. 6d.

**FABLES OF BABRIUS.** With Notes.

5s. 6d.

**BECKH'S ECONOMY OF ATHENS.**

Octavo. 18s.

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

This day, post 8vo, 2s. 6d.

### THE POLICY OF RETALIATION, AND ITS PROBABLE EFFECT ON THE CONSUMER, PRODUCER, AND SELLER.

By WM. PATRICK ADAM.

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

## ART-EXHIBITION OF ALL NATIONS.

THE

### "PEOPLE'S ILLUSTRATED JOURNAL,"

For MAY 8th, (price 2d.).

Contains an interesting Article on this important subject. Also, the New Palace of Westminster—A Plea for the Drama—Vandyck and his Works—The Water Question—Nineveh and its Palaces—Recreations in Geology—and a variety of Miscellaneous Articles in Literature and Art. Embellished with Twenty-five Engravings.

Office, 11, BOUVERIE STREET, WHITEFRIARS. Orders received by all Booksellers and Newsmen.

### New Works on Gardening and Botany.

#### PAXTON'S BOTANICAL DICTIONARY.

Comprising the Names, History, and Culture of all Plants known in Britain; with a full Explanation of Technical Terms. Crown 8vo. 16s.

#### HOW TO LAY OUT A SMALL GARDEN.

Intended as a Guide to Amateurs in Choosing, Forming, or Improving a Place, with reference to both Design and Execution. By EDWARD KEMP. Price 3s. 6d. cloth.

#### THE LADIES' COMPANION TO THE

FLOWER-GARDEN. By Mrs. LOUDON. The Fifth Edition. Price 7s. cloth.

#### PAXTON'S FLOWER-GARDEN. Edited

by Sir JOSEPH PAXTON and Dr. LINDLEY. Volumes I. and II. are published, price 33s. each, elegantly bound in cloth. Also in Parts, price 2s. 6d. each.

Bradbury and Evans, 11, Bouverie-street.

This day is published, in crown octavo, price 6s., with Illustrations,

#### THE STORY OF NELL GWYN AND

THE SAYINGS OF KING CHARLES II. Related and Collected by PETER CUNNINGHAM, F.S.A.

Complete in One Volume, price 2s. 6d., bound in cloth,

#### HOW TO SEE THE BRITISH MUSEUM.

IN FOUR VISITS.

By WILLIAM BLANCHARD JERROLD.

In One Volume 8vo, price 11s., illustrated with Ten large coloured Engravings and numerous Woodcuts by JOHN LEECH,

#### THE COMIC HISTORY OF ROME.

By G. A. A'BECKETT,

Author of "The Comic History of England."

Bradbury and Evans, 11, Bouverie Street.

Next week will be published, price 9s.

#### ON MUNDANE MORAL GOVERN-

MENT. Demonstrating its Analogy with the System of Material Government. By THOMAS DOUBLEDAY. Author of the "Financial History of England," the "True Law of Population," &c.

William Blackwood and Sons, Edinburgh and London.

D. APPLETON & Co. have just published,

#### COURSE of the HISTORY of MODERN

PHILOSOPHY. By M. VICTOR COUSIN. Translated by O. W. WIGHT. 2 vols. 8vo, cloth 16s.

"The most important of M. Cousin's original works is his Course of Lectures on the 'History of Philosophy,'—a writer for whom, notwithstanding our dissent from some of his opinions, we entertain great and sincere admiration and respect."—*Edinburgh Review*, No. 120, Notice of Paris Edition.

D. Appleton and Co., 16, Little Britain.

#### ROBERT OWEN'S BIRTH-DAY.—A

Party of the friends of ROBERT OWEN will dine together on his Birth-day—the 14th of May—when Mr. Owen will be present. Application for particulars and tickets to be made to Mr. H. A. Ivory, 52, College-place, Camden Town; or to Mr. Truelove, Publisher, John-street, Fitzroy-square.

HENRY TRAVIS, Hon. Sec.

#### 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, Birch 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.

#### THE ROYAL EXHIBITION.—A valuable

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

#### THE HAHNEMAN HOSPITAL, for the

Treatment of Patients on the Homeopathic Principle, 39, Bloomsbury-square. Supported by Voluntary Contributions. The Board of Management have the pleasure of announcing that the THIRD ANNUAL COMMEMORATION DINNER in Aid of the Funds of the Hospital, will take place at the London Tavern, Bishopsgate-street, on MONDAY, the 10th of May next,

The Lord ROBERT GROSVENOR, M.P., President,

in the Chair.

Tickets to be had of the Stewards, at the Hospital, at the London Tavern, or of the Honorary Secretary, 9, Gresham-street West.

W. WARNE,

April 10, 1852.

Hon. Secretary.

#### CITY OF LONDON BREWING AND

MALTING COMPANY. (Provisionally Registered, pursuant to the Act 7th and 8th Victoria, c. 110.)—For supplying the Public with SUPERIOR MALT LIQUORS AT REDUCED PRICES, and in accordance with the Market Value of Malt and Hops.

CAPITAL, £300,000, IN 60,000 SHARES OF £5 EACH. DEPOSIT, 10s. per Share.—(With power to increase the same to £1,000,000, at such periods and in such sums as the necessities of the Company's trade may require.)

In order that no Director or Shareholder of the Company shall be liable or held personally responsible for any debt or claim against the Company beyond the amount of his Shares:

Every Contract or Engagement shall contain a condition binding the party or parties with whom such Contract shall be made, to look solely and exclusively to the Funds and Property of the Company for payment, and engaging that neither the Directors nor Shareholders of the Company shall, under any pretence whatsoever, be subject to any personal liability in respect thereof.

MANAGING DIRECTOR.

John Lloyd, Esq., Hornsey-road, Middlesex.

PROVISIONAL DIRECTORS.

Charles Barnard, Esq., Twickenham, Middlesex, and Margaretting, Essex.

Edward T. Bradford, Esq., Hill-house, Shinfield, Wilts.

T. H. Harding, Esq., 130, Piccadilly.

Edward Charles Richards, Esq., Spa-terrace, Bermondsey.

Richard Henry Moore, Esq., 4, Queen's-terrace, Regent's-park.

SECRETARY.

William Campbell, Esq.

BANKERS.

The Royal British Bank, Tokenhouse-yard, City, and 1, Agar-street, Strand.

BROKERS.

Leeds—Matthew B. Beverley. (Glasgow—William Mudie, jun.

Bristol—J. Kempson Thomas. (Dublin—A. Wm. Labertouche.

Hull—T. W. Flint and Co.

As the *bona fide* holders of 100 Shares are eligible for Directors, the permanent direction of this Company will eventually rest in the choice made from amongst those so qualified at the General Meeting of Shareholders—thus ensuring an efficient and business-like management from their own body.

OFFICES, 18, CORNHILL, LONDON.

The object of this Company is to supply the Public with an unsurpassed Malt Liquor, pure and genuine, at a considerable reduction compared with the present extravagant prices of that article, giving the Consumers the benefit of low markets, which the present existing monopoly denies them, and at the same time securing to the Shareholders a most ample and undoubted return for the capital employed.

In the allotment of Shares, preference will be given to Licensed Victuallers, to whom unusual advantages are offered by the Company.

The holder of Five Shares will be entitled to One Vote, and the holder of One Hundred Shares will be qualified for a Director.

Applications for Shares and Prospectuses may be made to any of the Company's Agents, as above, or to the Secretary, at the Company's offices.

18, Cornhill, April, 1852.

WILLIAM CAMPBELL,

Secretary.

LONDON: Printed by GEORGE HOOPER, (of No. 3, Portland Place Kensington, in the County of Middlesex,) at the Office of Messrs. SAVILL and EDWARDS, No. 4, Chandos Street, in the Parish of St. Paul, Covent Garden, in the same County; and Published by THORNTON LEIGH HUNT, (of Broadway House, Hammermith,) at THE LEADER OFFICE, No. 10, WELLINGTON STREET, STRAND, in the Precinct of the Savoy, both in the same County.—SATURDAY, May 8, 1852.