







**DR. McDouall AND MR. JAMES LEACH.**—*KILMARNOCK, FRIDAY.*—On Sunday night last, about fourteen men, whose faces were blackened, and most of whom were armed, attacked the house of Michael McGillycuddy, of Trimingham, in the parish of Aghish, a respectable farmer, and having discharged a shot through the parlour window, they effected an entrance through it, and first secured the servants by binding them firmly in ropes. They then proceeded to the bed-chamber, where they violently dragged out of bed, and, regardless of the necessaries of life, forced entreaties of the most abject nature from the maid-servants. They were, in all probability, not a line of it would have appeared.]

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "NORTHERN STAR."

DEAR SIR.—I am sorry to have again to trouble you on the subject of McDouall's letters, as there is a committee formed in Manchester, who have fixed upon next Monday week as the day on which the investigation into the matters alluded to in those letters shall take place. But the false and scandalous nature of McDouall's last letter renders it impossible for me to allow that time to pass over without a reply. You will, by inserting the following, greatly oblige,

Yours truly,

JAMES LEACH.

TO P. M. McDouall.

SIR.—Whatever might have been the odium attached to me on the suspicion raised by your first letter, I should have endeavoured to have borne them under an open承认 presented itself, and I have done so in the course of my correspondence with you, in Manchester, where the matters which have called forth these letters can be fully investigated; but, in some passages of your last letter there is so much of *cruelty* and *fraudulent iniquity*, that I cannot desist as I am to protect a character at least as honest as your own, from replying to them previous to our meeting.

You say, "Mr. James Leach, of Manchester, considers the whole of my letter to apply to him." Sir, that letter applied to every one that had had any money transaction with you; and as my name and no other was mentioned, I think I had a right to consider myself as one of the individuals alluded to. Men who engage under cover of motives to effect a bad purpose, should "have good motives." Do you not know that I possess a letter of yours, which clearly proves that I was one of the persons alluded to? You say, "If the mention of facts which ought never to have been concealed, can be construed into a base attack; and if any man chooses to fit the cap on his own head, it is his fault, not mine." Further on you say: "Mr. Leach places my statement that I only received £5, against a receipt for £18, therefore he is liable to a charge of perjury, and the mind of the reader that he did actually pay me £18. Again you say: "Some persons may naturally enquire the reason why I gave him a receipt for £18, when I only received £5. I did so after repeated conversations with Doyle, Clark, and Leach himself; I did it to save the character of the very man who would now make the act of friendship I was guilty of, a weapon wherewith to shield himself, and cast a doubt upon my word."

Sir, your cap does not fit me. It is made of bad materials, *treacherous*, *foolish*, and *stupid*. I will not say that it is *wholly* bad; but, when you manufacture it, it is a professed friend to an open foe. It shall remain suspended in the hands of the committee until we meet, when I have no doubt those gentlemen will award it to those whose conduct best merits the distinction of wearing it."

I did place your receipt for £5 against your statement of only having received £5. You say "that Mr. Leach does not, he dare not, declare that he paid me £18." I have no desire, Sir, to "dare" anything but that which is honourable and fair betwixt man and man; but it will yet be proved that you have received considerably more than £18. Your memory fails to be much better than that of the rest of your account than that of the outgoing; or, you would have remembered the letter you sent me whilst in your voluntary exile, authorising me to print a letter of which you sent the manuscript, and for which I was to pay out of the funds that I held on your account; and for which I did pay four pounds fifteen shillings.

You, sir, was to have the whole of the profits arising from the sale of those letters. The people, from some cause or other, did not think proper to purchase them; and therefore they were left on hand, and they were pointed out to you in my shop when you were in Manchester. This seems entirely to have sprung from your cap; when it surely ought not to have sprung from your cap, and from the other part of the account. There are several other items too of expenditure that I have borne for you, which shall be laid before the committee.

So, you gave me the "receipt" after repeated conversations with Doyle, Clark, and myself; and "that to save the character of the very man who would now make the act of friendship you were guilty of a weapon wherewith to shield himself and cast a doubt upon our word." How could you, for sheer shame, put such a charge into your paper, and proceed so impudently to make the people believe that the committee we had was a sort of *legion* and *prophets* that you would screen my delinquencies and deceptions? You are pleased to make them out. Had you given that conversation, the people who have read your letter would have drawn very different conclusions than those you intended them to draw; but that did not suit your purpose. All must come out now, however. The people must know what are the real characters of the men in whom they place their confidence. I must confess that I am, for some time, at a loss to know who was, or was not, in possession of the secret. I have done; but from circumstances which have only come to my knowledge, there is now no doubt upon my mind as to your ultimate intentions, and the unscrupulous means by which you intended carrying them out. You have formed a very different opinion if appears of me than you used to hold; and, in an insolent letter you have sent me, you speak of "my bad conduct towards you while you were in France." In reply, I have only to say, that while I desire to have the good opinion of all good men, I care very little what opinion the bad may have of me. I worked very hard for you, when you were in France; I defended you every way, when you were in France; I have corresponded with you, and I have been in communication with you, and I was the means of getting you support. This is known to thousands, and I am repaid by insolence and ingratitude—the reward, I know, but two generally accorded to those who toil to feed and clothe others who are too proud to work and too poor to live with out. You make a bounce about the papers that shall be forthcoming, and have connected with them every moment, and every day, and every day, and I do not know of any one of my brethren that I am not able to tell how the Leagues got on. If you want to know, take a peep at the League, and you will get "nothing but the truth." On Thursday night there was a great muster in the same place, principally of working men, to hear Sharman Crawford, John Fielding, James Taylor, and others, explain their views on the production of the Poor Law. Mr. Thomas Livesey was called to the chair, and in speech of some length opened the business. Several resolutions were adopted and speeches made, which were repeatedly cheered. S. Crawford, Esq., and Mr. T. Livesey were deputed to convey a memorial to Mr. Graham himself, signed by nearly 12,000 rate-payers. Only nineteen persons in the whole union have refused to sign.

**REPEAL OF THE MALT-TAX.**—The London Committee have just issued a circular, inviting the co-operation of parties favourable to a repeal of the malt-tax, and urging the necessity of forming local committees in the agricultural districts. It is evident that those who have taken the subject in hand are determined not to relax their exertions, but have the subject thoroughly canvassed. The first general meeting of the society, we understand, is fixed to take place on Friday, the 13th of December, at the Freemasons' Tavern, London.

**RE-ASSEMBLY OF PARLIAMENT.**—By a Royal proclamation in Friday's *Globe*, we learn that Parliament stands prorogued from the 12th of December next, to the 1st of February, 1845, then to meet "for the despatch of divers urgent and important affairs."

**ROCHDALE.**—Last Wednesday there was "a grand meeting" of Friends in the New Hall, Bayley-street, "to get their bearings" at once, and each, and to hear Messrs. Crawford, Bratt, Colden, and Co., advocate their fondly-chosen nostrum of "cheap bread," *to cover* "cheap labour;" but I was not there, and as I cannot find any one of my brethren that I am not able to tell how the Leagues got on. If you want to know, take a peep at the League, and you will get "nothing but the truth."

On Thursday night there was a great muster in the same place, principally of working men, to hear Sharman Crawford, John Fielding, James Taylor, and others, explain their views on the production of the Poor Law. Mr. Thomas Livesey was called to the chair, and in speech of some length opened the business. Several resolutions were adopted and speeches made, which were repeatedly cheered. S. Crawford, Esq., and Mr. T. Livesey were deputed to convey a memorial to Mr. Graham himself, signed by nearly 12,000 rate-payers. Only nineteen persons in the whole union have refused to sign?

**DUNCOME TESTIMONIAL.—CENTRAL COMMITTEE OR TRADER.**—Savile House, Leicester-square, Wednesday evening, November 27. Mr. Grasby in the chair. The committee having found it impracticable to bring the business to a close at present, it was unanimously resolved that the subscription be still kept open. The following sum was received:—Mr. Whitmore's book, £5. Per Mr. James Scott, £1. Let us hope that the Committee will profit by the example of Mr. T. Selfe, Newport, Isle of Wight, on behalf of the Chartist of that place, enclosing £2 0s. 1d.; from Mr. Newington, £1 1s. Let us hope that the Committee will profit by the example of Mr. T. Selfe, Newport, Isle of Wight, on behalf of the Chartist of that place, enclosing £2 0s. 1d.; from Mr. Watson, of Grantham, £d.; per William Bratt, few friends, £1 6d.; per Mr. Firth, from the men employed in the firm of Clowes, Stamford, £1 1s.; per Mr. M. H. Hilditch, £1. Messrs. Collier and Johnson were appointed to wait on the carpenters. George-street, Chelsea. Mr. Humphries handed in £1 from the Suners Town-lawn Committee. Messrs. Gammon and Conoly were deputed to wait on the smiths, Hole-in-the-Wall, Chancery-lane.

With a heart full of hope—with aspiration as pure and as holy as ever animated the breasts of a conductor of the press—with determination never yet unworthily subdued—and with every confidence in the success of the cause of UNIVERSAL PROGRESS, we commence anew our career. May it be always that we desire it to be, for LABOUR'S SAKES!

#### POLK—PRESIDENT OF AMERICA.

**GLORIOUS TRIUMPH OF CHARTISM.**—While our sympathising contemporaries are busy in denouncing grievances upon which they live and suffer, and would not therefore mitigate or correct, we turn with ordinary gratification to the consideration of the greatest triumph the popular voice has achieved for the last century. Of course we refer to the all-but certain election of President Mr. JAMES POLK—a king with christian surname; and all will join in his triumph over the Tory tool, Mr. KITE CLAY. Just at this moment, when the monarch of Europe had fondly flattered themselves with a prospect that the principle of centralization had been established, and the details for its enforcement ratified, and agreed to—after a sufficient amount of Royal visits, fulsome exchange of Royal compliments, and exchange of Royal presents made at the expense of their starving people—the Tory press, ever ready to offer a paying and harmless defence in behalf of the "rights of Labour," and as harmless an opposition to the aggressions of Capital, is horrified, and stands aghast, at the news of this, the greatest of Labour's triumphs.

We have given a copious report of the proceedings which preceded the struggle, as well as of the tricks resorted to by the monopolists to secure the election of their *paying master*. It is not wonderful, because it is characteristic of Toryism, that the crest-fallen faction should conspire after defeat in the hope that the recent struggle in America may bring the principles of democracy into odium, contempt, and distrust. If, however, there is not to be one law for the rich and another for the poor—one practice for the enfranchised wealthy and another for the enfranchised pauper—we have but to direct attention, not to cows with long horns off to, but to our own domestic golden-headed calves, whose value at a contested election is estimated by the amount of treachery, bribery, and corruption—not stopping at perjury, of which they can boast.

The great value of the American triumph will be found in the fact that the superior wealth of POLK's opponents was not able to purchase the sweet voices of his pauper supporters; a fact to which we opine the Tories attach the most significant importance, lest the day may arrive when the popular voice of England will be found virtuous and strong enough to resist the oppressor's gold. As it is a truth not to be denied, that in our present complicated commercial jeopardy our institutions stand up to the whim of legitimacy; and as America, above all nations, has the least reason to dread its fall as well as the least interest in upholding its ascendancy, we have the greatest reason to rejoice in the triumph of her Charlist President.

Although the policy of the tyrant of Russia, the French despot, and that of Sir ROBERT PEEL, may differ on minor points, there can be but little doubt that the return of Mr. CLAY would have either confirmed those little differences within safe limits, or might perhaps have rendered them still less noxious; but the return of POLK, and a pursuance of that policy to which he stands pledged, will go far to increase those differences, and to destroy the "snugger" of kings.

Those who rely on our want of union, and on the amount of money, of physical force, and all the unholy appliances that can be brought to bear against us at the command of legitimacy, should bear in mind that England is but a link in the chain of nations. The tyrant GEORGE was compelled to receive, as Ambassador from the Court of free America, the man whose unfeigned presence he would not tolerate as a delegate from her struggling people! Let them remember that the French Revolution of 1789 led to the Irish Insurrection of 1798! Let them bear in mind that the three glorious days of 1830 in Paris, though professed to be a disunited people, extracted the Reform Bill from a reluctant English Oligarchy, separated Belgium from Holland, revolutionized the Germanic States and drove petty tyrant princes from their capitals by torchlight; and, above all, let them ponder well upon the fact that faction can no longer balk democracy of its fair share in any future change because our people are united upon a principle, and we shall have no disastrous *interregnum*, a time for the evil passions to marshal, between the going out of the old light of legitimacy, and gripping capitalists, by the most despotic and callous Minister that ever held office in the British Cabinet. PARLIMENT meets on the 4th of February for the "dispatch of business;" no time, therefore, is to be lost. The evil passions are summoned to war against unprotected Labour. Let the same herald rouse the sleeping from their slumber, let them utter marshal, decide, and rally round their own standard. Let them remember that SIR JAMES GRAHAM shall propose. This plan is safe and inexpensive; and if required to be put into operation, must be protective. There can be no harry in being prepared with the machinery; for although we were enabled to rally a hurried opposition against the Masters and Servants Bill of last session, we will not venture to rely on such scattered elements to resist the will of the "strong Government," enforced, as it will be, upon timid landholders and grasping capitalists, by the most despotic and callous Minister that ever held office in the British Cabinet. PARLIMENT meets on the 4th of February for the "dispatch of business;" no time, therefore, is to be lost. The evil passions are summoned to war against unprotected Labour. Let the same herald rouse the sleeping from their slumber, let them utter marshal, decide, and rally round their own standard. Let them remember that SIR JAMES GRAHAM shall propose. This plan is safe and inexpensive; and if required to be put into operation, must be protective. There can be no harry in being prepared with the machinery; for although we were enabled to rally a hurried opposition against the Masters and Servants Bill of last session, we will not venture to rely on such scattered elements to resist the will of the "strong Government," enforced, as it will be, upon timid landholders and grasping capitalists, by the most despotic and callous Minister that ever held office in the British Cabinet.

THOSE WHO RELY ON OUR FRIENDS.

Ir is a "bran, spanking new dress" we present ourselves to our friends on this our introduction to the Metropolis, after serving full apprenticeship in the provinces under circumstances that have given us no little insight into the "art and mystery" of newspaper making: and we trust that our new appearance, whether in *local* or *form*, will not be displeasing to those who have long known us in our "other" garb, nor distasteful to those who for the first time may venture to "take a peep," even if the determination to do so arises from a strong curiosity to see one who has already made "some noise" in his day and generation.

Though far from deeming any apology necessary, either for master or for appearance, we must say that it was utterly impossible for us, in the first week, to make the paper *all* that we desire it to be. Removals of steam-engines, printing-machines, types and presses; travelling by day and by night; coming into new offices, with new "hands"; getting new material into working order; "setting" the paper up in one place, and "printing" it in another—our "own" machine being on its way from Leeds to London; all these things are not the easiest to shield himself and cast a doubt upon my word. How could you, for sheer shame, put such a charge into your paper, and proceed so impudently to make the people believe that the committee we had was a sort of *legion* and *prophets* that you would screen my delinquencies and deceptions? You are pleased to make them out. Had you given that conversation, the people who have read your letter would have drawn very different conclusions than those you intended them to draw; but that did not suit your purpose. All must come out now, however. The people must know what are the real characters of the men in whom they place their confidence. I must confess that I am, for some time, at a loss to know who was, or was not, in possession of the secret. I have done; but from circumstances which have only come to my knowledge, there is now no doubt upon my mind as to your ultimate intentions, and the unscrupulous means by which you intended carrying them out. You have formed a very different opinion if appears of me than you used to hold; and, in an insolent letter you have sent me, you speak of "my bad conduct towards you while you were in France." In reply, I have only to say, that while I desire to have the good opinion of all good men, I care very little what opinion the bad may have of me. I worked very hard for you, when you were in France; I defended you every way, when you were in France; I have corresponded with you, and I have been in communication with you, and I was the means of getting you support. This is known to thousands, and I am repaid by insolence and ingratitude—the reward, I know, but two generally accorded to those who toil to feed and clothe others who are too proud to work and too poor to live with out. You make a bounce about the papers that shall be forthcoming, and have connected with them every moment, and every day, and every day, and I do not know of any one of my brethren that I am not able to tell how the Leagues got on. If you want to know, take a peep at the League, and you will get "nothing but the truth."

On Thursday night there was a great muster in the same place, principally of working men, to hear Sharman Crawford, John Fielding, James Taylor, and others, explain their views on the production of the Poor Law.

Mr. Thomas Livesey was called to the chair, and in speech of some length opened the business.

Several resolutions were adopted and speeches made, which were repeatedly cheered. S. Crawford, Esq., and Mr. T. Livesey were deputed to convey a memorial to Mr. Graham himself, signed by nearly 12,000 rate-payers. Only nineteen persons in the whole union have refused to sign?

In entering on our new lease of existence as a Journalist, we throw ourselves thus entirely and unreservedly on the people. THEY have given us power to be of use in our old position: IT IS THEY who can make us feel and feared now. LABOUR's organ with the labourers at its back can organize Labour against the organization of Capital: labour's organ without the people would be a scold and a scold. The people we have: the organization we will have: for out of it only can the "EMANCIPATION OF INDUSTRIES" come. To that end shall our efforts be constantly directed: to that end shall we as constantly endeavour to direct the efforts of others.

In entering on our new lease of existence as a Journalist, we throw ourselves thus entirely and unreservedly on the people. THEY have given us power to be of use in our old position: IT IS THEY who can make us feel and feared now. LABOUR's organ with the labourers at its back can organize Labour against the organization of Capital: labour's organ without the people would be a scold and a scold.

The people we have: the organization we will have: for out of it only can the "EMANCIPATION OF INDUSTRIES" come. To that end shall our efforts be constantly directed: to that end shall we as constantly endeavour to direct the efforts of others.

With a heart full of hope—with aspiration as pure and as holy as ever animated the breasts of a conductor of the press—with determination never yet unworthily subdued—and with every confidence in the success of the cause of UNIVERSAL PROGRESS, we commence anew our career. May it be always that we desire it to be, for LABOUR'S SAKES!

In entering on our new lease of existence as a Journalist, we throw ourselves thus entirely and unreservedly on the people. THEY have given us power to be of use in our old position: IT IS THEY who can make us feel and feared now. LABOUR's organ with the labourers at its back can organize Labour against the organization of Capital: labour's organ without the people would be a scold and a scold.

The people we have: the organization we will have: for out of it only can the "EMANCIPATION OF INDUSTRIES" come. To that end shall our efforts be constantly directed: to that end shall we as constantly endeavour to direct the efforts of others.

With a heart full of hope—with aspiration as pure and as holy as ever animated the breasts of a conductor of the press—with determination never yet unworthily subdued—and with every confidence in the success of the cause of UNIVERSAL PROGRESS, we commence anew our career. May it be always that we desire it to be, for LABOUR'S SAKES!

In entering on our new lease of existence as a Journalist, we throw ourselves thus entirely and unreservedly on the people. THEY have given us power to be of use in our old position: IT IS THEY who can make us feel and feared now. LABOUR's organ with the labourers at its back can organize Labour against the organization of Capital: labour's organ without the people would be a scold and a scold.

The people we have: the organization we will have: for out of it only can the "EMANCIPATION OF INDUSTRIES" come. To that end shall our efforts be constantly directed: to that end shall we as constantly endeavour to direct the efforts of others.

With a heart full of hope—with aspiration as pure and as holy as ever animated the breasts of a conductor of the press—with determination never yet unworthily subdued—and with every confidence in the success of the cause of UNIVERSAL PROGRESS, we commence anew our career. May it be always that we desire it to be, for LABOUR'S SAKES!

In entering on our new lease of existence as a Journalist, we throw ourselves thus entirely and unreservedly on the people. THEY have given us power to be of use in our old position: IT IS THEY who can make us feel and feared now. LABOUR's organ with the labourers at its back can organize Labour against the organization of Capital: labour's organ without the people would be a scold and a scold.

The people we have: the organization we will have: for out of it only can the "EMANCIPATION OF INDUSTRIES" come. To that end shall our efforts be constantly directed: to that end shall we as constantly endeavour to direct the efforts of others.

With a heart full of hope—with aspiration as pure and as holy as ever animated the breasts of a conductor of the press—with determination never yet unworthily subdued—and with every confidence in the success of the cause of UNIVERSAL PROGRESS, we commence anew our career. May it be always that we desire it to be, for LABOUR'S SAKES!

In entering on our new lease of existence as a Journalist, we throw ourselves thus entirely and unreservedly on the people. THEY have given us power to be of use in our old position: IT IS THEY who can make us feel and feared now. LABOUR's organ with the labourers at its back can organize Labour against the organization of Capital: labour's organ without the people would be a scold and a scold.

The people we have: the organization we will have: for out of it only can the "EMANCIPATION OF INDUSTRIES" come. To that end shall our efforts be constantly directed: to that end shall we as constantly endeavour to direct the efforts of others.

With a heart full of hope—with aspiration as pure and as holy as ever animated the breasts of a conductor of the press—with determination never yet unworthily subdued—and with every confidence in the success of the cause of UNIVERSAL PROGRESS, we commence anew our career. May it be always that we desire it to be, for LABOUR'S SAKES!

In entering on our new lease of existence as a Journalist, we throw ourselves thus entirely and unreservedly on the people. THEY have given us power to be of use in our old position: IT IS THEY who can make us feel and feared now. LABOUR's organ with the labourers at its back can organize Labour against the organization of Capital: labour's organ without the people would be a scold and a



## Foreign Movements.

## FRANCE.

**SUICIDE AND MURDER.**—The *Gazette des Tribunaux* states that on Wednesday last a deplorable event caused a considerable excitement amongst the inhabitants of the house No. 2, in the Rue des Filles-du-Calvaire, Paris. A poor man, Mr. Léon Marquier, was found dead from asphyxiation in his bed-chamber. The husband, who was a clockmaker, sent his apprentice with a message to a distant part of the town, in order to have time to carry his project into execution. When the apprentice returned, he found the door closed, and after having vainly knocked for some time he determined to apply to a locksmith. When the door was opened the unfortunate couple were found dead on their bed, locked in each other's arms. A large chafing dish, containing the remains of a quantity of charcoal, was found in the centre of the chamber. The cause of this double suicide has not been ascertained. Their friends showed that they were both affluent and orderly. The same journal states that a considerable multitude assembled Saturday last at the Court of Assize of Melun. The serious nature of the charge to be investigated, the talents of the public prosecutor, and the number of objects which were to be produced in evidence, amongst the rest the head of a certain victim—stimulated the curiosity of the inhabitants of Melun. The facts, as stated by the Attorney-General, were as follows:—An aged woman, named Neven, a widow, without children, having conceived a warm affection for a certain gentleman, son of a prominent and distinguished family, had been received at a residence in Melun, where he was a student, and a month or two afterwards, when the widow Neven went to reside with the family of the Mergers, enriching the family with her money; and by her attention to their affairs, she perished, the victim of a horrible murder. On the 19th of July last the lifeless body of the widow Neven was found in a well attached to the house of the Mergers. At first it was considered that her death was the effect of accident, but on a closer examination it was discovered that she had been shot through the head. The opinions then fell upon the son of Mergers, who had remained at home, and who was known to have purchased pocket pistols, which he had denied. A long chain of circumstantial evidence having been established, Mergers the younger was found guilty of the murder of the widow Neven, and sentenced to hard labour for life. He was removed from court uttering the most solemn protestations of innocence.

## SPAIN.

## DISTRESS IN PARIS.

The greatest attention was still excited by the condemnation of General Prim to an imprisonment of six years in a fortress of the Pyrenees.

The result of the appearance of the Supreme Council of War and the Insurrection.

The silence of the French government.

The progress of the insurrection.

The arrival of the Spanish Legation in Paris.

The progress of the insurrection.

The movement of the French Legation in Paris.

The movement of the French Legation in Paris.</p

## ON THE REMOVAL OF THE "STAR" TO LONDON.

MR. EDITOR.—Allow me to add my feeble note to the merry chorus of popular voices that welcome London's organ to the metropolis. As a simple unit of that heterogeneous mass of which our motley population is composed, my communications will appear but as one man's opinion. When we consider that classes are influenced and led by individual conception, I desire no more proneness than the value of my suggestions may achieve; while, if I can turn error into the course of truth, and aid knowledge in the accomplishment of its greatest object—the redemption of the working classes from the slavery to which ignorance, disunion, and neglect has consigned them—I shall stimulate by a proper vanity and laudable ambition, struggle for that place in fame's record to which my services may entitle it.

The first step towards reclamation is repentance for past offences; and the greatest protection that can be thrown round a public man is to be able to discriminate between his friends and his foes. You have commenced the work of reclamation well, by closing the columns of an organ which should create and represent the harmony and union of its supporters against selfish complaint and interested denunciation: while, by its removal to the Capital, you manifest a manly disposition of submitting your actions to a more vigilant popular control. To enable you to distinguish between your friends and your foes, shall be the object of this, my first communication.

Mixing in all societies, I have frequent opportunities of learning the sentiments of each. The aristocracy believe that the Northern Star pronounces "edition," and aims at plunder through anarchy; while they affect to believe that but for its influence over the working classes they would be yet able to resist their great enemy—the League—without detriment to their own interests. The middle classes deny the capability of the people to achieve any great political change by their own strength, and therefore denounce the Northern Star as a false light—as the herald of hopes and anticipations that cannot be realised; while the dependency of a large portion of the working classes upon the aristocracy and the middle classes induces the leaders of those sections to cater for an easy livelihood by subscribing to the dogmas and carrying out the plans of their respective masters.

In truth, it is curious to see how both the aristocracy and middle classes are, after all, compelled to seek supporters for their own crochets from the ranks of the working classes. And this I take to be the greatest proof that it is not the power of either, or of both united, within their own ranks—but the power which they derive from the working class, that constitutes their strength. Hence we may come to the legitimate conclusion that the strength of the aristocracy and the middle class is a consequence, not of the soundness of their plans, or belief in their integrity, but of the effect of their money upon the easy consciences of the working-class propounders of their schemes and theories.

Those two powerful classes are, then, your bitter, unfriendly, and irreconcileable enemies: and their enmity is augmented and perpetuated by the interest which the working men in their employ have in misrepresenting you, whereby the value of their own services in opposing you may be enhanced. Your friends, your only friends, are those who labour for their daily bread; and in order to prove the fallacy of those who deny the capability of the working classes to work out their own salvation, so as to make them inaccessible to the threats, the gold, and the persuasion of the seducer.

The real meaning of the assertion that the working classes of themselves are not able to effect any great political change will be found in the determination of the other classes to resist that union by which alone the proposed change can be effected. In illustration of my position, allow me to put the question thus—suppose the working classes, as a body, were thoroughly united, and suppose the body to have virtue enough to resist the soft persuasions of the other classes, leaving them to their own resources for lectures, spires, and disturbers; what possible obstacle could they offer to the accomplishment of any rational object upon which the national will did not decide? The middle classes who deny the efficiency of popular combination are propters with a power of fulfilling their own predictions. Instead of saying of the people, "you cannot of yourselves work any great change," they should say, "you shall not—we will not allow you."

The reader may erroneously suppose that the will of those classes thus interposed would offer an irresistible and legitimate barrier in the way of any scheme propounded by themselves; whereas the power emanates from popular subversiveness, and not from the will, the ability of the middle classes to resist it. And although the wealthier orders are inconstant and uniring in their promulgation of the error that the working classes cannot do without them, their every move proves the reverse—that they cannot do without the working classes. Not only do we see their weakness strikingly developed by as much of union as does exist in the ranks of the people, but we further discover that they see the necessity of sinking all minor differences, and of uniting all these elements of discord which would otherwise present themselves as a hindrance to the working classes.

If it is not a proof of error, it is a reason why you have not been tried in any court, but circumstances have arisen which have given you by an eminent lawyer, Sir John Campbell, a perfect title to trial. His argument, however, may not be considered as coming within the letter of the provisions of the statutes respecting officiated societies; but it appears to be a very legal, moral, useful, and prudently conducted plan, and I think the members may continue to meet according to the rules of the order, as they have long done, without any danger of being called in question for a breach of the law—"I DO NOT SEE ANY NECESSITY FOR THE SOCIETY BEING REMODELED."

In January, 1837, Sir John Campbell, then Attorney-General, was consulted upon the lawfulness of the order of Odd Fellows, and upon what was necessary to be adopted render it perfectly legal. His answer was, "That the order of Odd Fellows, when all the circumstances are considered, may not be considered as coming within the letter of the provisions of the statutes respecting officiated societies; but it appears to be a very legal, moral, useful, and prudently conducted plan, and I think the members may continue to meet according to the rules of the order, as they have long done, without any danger of being called in question for a breach of the law."

In January, 1837, Sir John Campbell, then Attorney-General, was consulted upon the lawfulness of the order of Odd Fellows, and upon what was necessary to be adopted render it perfectly legal. His answer was, "That the order of Odd Fellows, when all the circumstances are considered, may not be considered as coming within the letter of the provisions of the statutes respecting officiated societies; but it appears to be a very legal, moral, useful, and prudently conducted plan, and I think the members may continue to meet according to the rules of the order, as they have long done, without any danger of being called in question for a breach of the law."

In January, 1837, Sir John Campbell, then Attorney-General, was consulted upon the lawfulness of the order of Odd Fellows, and upon what was necessary to be adopted render it perfectly legal. His answer was, "That the order of Odd Fellows, when all the circumstances are considered, may not be considered as coming within the letter of the provisions of the statutes respecting officiated societies; but it appears to be a very legal, moral, useful, and prudently conducted plan, and I think the members may continue to meet according to the rules of the order, as they have long done, without any danger of being called in question for a breach of the law."

In January, 1837, Sir John Campbell, then Attorney-General, was consulted upon the lawfulness of the order of Odd Fellows, and upon what was necessary to be adopted render it perfectly legal. His answer was, "That the order of Odd Fellows, when all the circumstances are considered, may not be considered as coming within the letter of the provisions of the statutes respecting officiated societies; but it appears to be a very legal, moral, useful, and prudently conducted plan, and I think the members may continue to meet according to the rules of the order, as they have long done, without any danger of being called in question for a breach of the law."

In January, 1837, Sir John Campbell, then Attorney-General, was consulted upon the lawfulness of the order of Odd Fellows, and upon what was necessary to be adopted render it perfectly legal. His answer was, "That the order of Odd Fellows, when all the circumstances are considered, may not be considered as coming within the letter of the provisions of the statutes respecting officiated societies; but it appears to be a very legal, moral, useful, and prudently conducted plan, and I think the members may continue to meet according to the rules of the order, as they have long done, without any danger of being called in question for a breach of the law."

In January, 1837, Sir John Campbell, then Attorney-General, was consulted upon the lawfulness of the order of Odd Fellows, and upon what was necessary to be adopted render it perfectly legal. His answer was, "That the order of Odd Fellows, when all the circumstances are considered, may not be considered as coming within the letter of the provisions of the statutes respecting officiated societies; but it appears to be a very legal, moral, useful, and prudently conducted plan, and I think the members may continue to meet according to the rules of the order, as they have long done, without any danger of being called in question for a breach of the law."

In January, 1837, Sir John Campbell, then Attorney-General, was consulted upon the lawfulness of the order of Odd Fellows, and upon what was necessary to be adopted render it perfectly legal. His answer was, "That the order of Odd Fellows, when all the circumstances are considered, may not be considered as coming within the letter of the provisions of the statutes respecting officiated societies; but it appears to be a very legal, moral, useful, and prudently conducted plan, and I think the members may continue to meet according to the rules of the order, as they have long done, without any danger of being called in question for a breach of the law."

In January, 1837, Sir John Campbell, then Attorney-General, was consulted upon the lawfulness of the order of Odd Fellows, and upon what was necessary to be adopted render it perfectly legal. His answer was, "That the order of Odd Fellows, when all the circumstances are considered, may not be considered as coming within the letter of the provisions of the statutes respecting officiated societies; but it appears to be a very legal, moral, useful, and prudently conducted plan, and I think the members may continue to meet according to the rules of the order, as they have long done, without any danger of being called in question for a breach of the law."

In January, 1837, Sir John Campbell, then Attorney-General, was consulted upon the lawfulness of the order of Odd Fellows, and upon what was necessary to be adopted render it perfectly legal. His answer was, "That the order of Odd Fellows, when all the circumstances are considered, may not be considered as coming within the letter of the provisions of the statutes respecting officiated societies; but it appears to be a very legal, moral, useful, and prudently conducted plan, and I think the members may continue to meet according to the rules of the order, as they have long done, without any danger of being called in question for a breach of the law."

In January, 1837, Sir John Campbell, then Attorney-General, was consulted upon the lawfulness of the order of Odd Fellows, and upon what was necessary to be adopted render it perfectly legal. His answer was, "That the order of Odd Fellows, when all the circumstances are considered, may not be considered as coming within the letter of the provisions of the statutes respecting officiated societies; but it appears to be a very legal, moral, useful, and prudently conducted plan, and I think the members may continue to meet according to the rules of the order, as they have long done, without any danger of being called in question for a breach of the law."

In January, 1837, Sir John Campbell, then Attorney-General, was consulted upon the lawfulness of the order of Odd Fellows, and upon what was necessary to be adopted render it perfectly legal. His answer was, "That the order of Odd Fellows, when all the circumstances are considered, may not be considered as coming within the letter of the provisions of the statutes respecting officiated societies; but it appears to be a very legal, moral, useful, and prudently conducted plan, and I think the members may continue to meet according to the rules of the order, as they have long done, without any danger of being called in question for a breach of the law."

In January, 1837, Sir John Campbell, then Attorney-General, was consulted upon the lawfulness of the order of Odd Fellows, and upon what was necessary to be adopted render it perfectly legal. His answer was, "That the order of Odd Fellows, when all the circumstances are considered, may not be considered as coming within the letter of the provisions of the statutes respecting officiated societies; but it appears to be a very legal, moral, useful, and prudently conducted plan, and I think the members may continue to meet according to the rules of the order, as they have long done, without any danger of being called in question for a breach of the law."

In January, 1837, Sir John Campbell, then Attorney-General, was consulted upon the lawfulness of the order of Odd Fellows, and upon what was necessary to be adopted render it perfectly legal. His answer was, "That the order of Odd Fellows, when all the circumstances are considered, may not be considered as coming within the letter of the provisions of the statutes respecting officiated societies; but it appears to be a very legal, moral, useful, and prudently conducted plan, and I think the members may continue to meet according to the rules of the order, as they have long done, without any danger of being called in question for a breach of the law."

In January, 1837, Sir John Campbell, then Attorney-General, was consulted upon the lawfulness of the order of Odd Fellows, and upon what was necessary to be adopted render it perfectly legal. His answer was, "That the order of Odd Fellows, when all the circumstances are considered, may not be considered as coming within the letter of the provisions of the statutes respecting officiated societies; but it appears to be a very legal, moral, useful, and prudently conducted plan, and I think the members may continue to meet according to the rules of the order, as they have long done, without any danger of being called in question for a breach of the law."

In January, 1837, Sir John Campbell, then Attorney-General, was consulted upon the lawfulness of the order of Odd Fellows, and upon what was necessary to be adopted render it perfectly legal. His answer was, "That the order of Odd Fellows, when all the circumstances are considered, may not be considered as coming within the letter of the provisions of the statutes respecting officiated societies; but it appears to be a very legal, moral, useful, and prudently conducted plan, and I think the members may continue to meet according to the rules of the order, as they have long done, without any danger of being called in question for a breach of the law."

In January, 1837, Sir John Campbell, then Attorney-General, was consulted upon the lawfulness of the order of Odd Fellows, and upon what was necessary to be adopted render it perfectly legal. His answer was, "That the order of Odd Fellows, when all the circumstances are considered, may not be considered as coming within the letter of the provisions of the statutes respecting officiated societies; but it appears to be a very legal, moral, useful, and prudently conducted plan, and I think the members may continue to meet according to the rules of the order, as they have long done, without any danger of being called in question for a breach of the law."

In January, 1837, Sir John Campbell, then Attorney-General, was consulted upon the lawfulness of the order of Odd Fellows, and upon what was necessary to be adopted render it perfectly legal. His answer was, "That the order of Odd Fellows, when all the circumstances are considered, may not be considered as coming within the letter of the provisions of the statutes respecting officiated societies; but it appears to be a very legal, moral, useful, and prudently conducted plan, and I think the members may continue to meet according to the rules of the order, as they have long done, without any danger of being called in question for a breach of the law."

In January, 1837, Sir John Campbell, then Attorney-General, was consulted upon the lawfulness of the order of Odd Fellows, and upon what was necessary to be adopted render it perfectly legal. His answer was, "That the order of Odd Fellows, when all the circumstances are considered, may not be considered as coming within the letter of the provisions of the statutes respecting officiated societies; but it appears to be a very legal, moral, useful, and prudently conducted plan, and I think the members may continue to meet according to the rules of the order, as they have long done, without any danger of being called in question for a breach of the law."

In January, 1837, Sir John Campbell, then Attorney-General, was consulted upon the lawfulness of the order of Odd Fellows, and upon what was necessary to be adopted render it perfectly legal. His answer was, "That the order of Odd Fellows, when all the circumstances are considered, may not be considered as coming within the letter of the provisions of the statutes respecting officiated societies; but it appears to be a very legal, moral, useful, and prudently conducted plan, and I think the members may continue to meet according to the rules of the order, as they have long done, without any danger of being called in question for a breach of the law."

In January, 1837, Sir John Campbell, then Attorney-General, was consulted upon the lawfulness of the order of Odd Fellows, and upon what was necessary to be adopted render it perfectly legal. His answer was, "That the order of Odd Fellows, when all the circumstances are considered, may not be considered as coming within the letter of the provisions of the statutes respecting officiated societies; but it appears to be a very legal, moral, useful, and prudently conducted plan, and I think the members may continue to meet according to the rules of the order, as they have long done, without any danger of being called in question for a breach of the law."

In January, 1837, Sir John Campbell, then Attorney-General, was consulted upon the lawfulness of the order of Odd Fellows, and upon what was necessary to be adopted render it perfectly legal. His answer was, "That the order of Odd Fellows, when all the circumstances are considered, may not be considered as coming within the letter of the provisions of the statutes respecting officiated societies; but it appears to be a very legal, moral, useful, and prudently conducted plan, and I think the members may continue to meet according to the rules of the order, as they have long done, without any danger of being called in question for a breach of the law."

In January, 1837, Sir John Campbell, then Attorney-General, was consulted upon the lawfulness of the order of Odd Fellows, and upon what was necessary to be adopted render it perfectly legal. His answer was, "That the order of Odd Fellows, when all the circumstances are considered, may not be considered as coming within the letter of the provisions of the statutes respecting officiated societies; but it appears to be a very legal, moral, useful, and prudently conducted plan, and I think the members may continue to meet according to the rules of the order, as they have long done, without any danger of being called in question for a breach of the law."

In January, 1837, Sir John Campbell, then Attorney-General, was consulted upon the lawfulness of the order of Odd Fellows, and upon what was necessary to be adopted render it perfectly legal. His answer was, "That the order of Odd Fellows, when all the circumstances are considered, may not be considered as coming within the letter of the provisions of the statutes respecting officiated societies; but it appears to be a very legal, moral, useful, and prudently conducted plan, and I think the members may continue to meet according to the rules of the order, as they have long done, without any danger of being called in question for a breach of the law."

In January, 1837, Sir John Campbell, then Attorney-General, was consulted upon the lawfulness of the order of Odd Fellows, and upon what was necessary to be adopted render it perfectly legal. His answer was, "That the order of Odd Fellows, when all the circumstances are considered, may not be considered as coming within the letter of the provisions of the statutes respecting officiated societies; but it appears to be a very legal, moral, useful, and prudently conducted plan, and I think the members may continue to meet according to the rules of the order, as they have long done, without any danger of being called in question for a breach of the law."

In January, 1837, Sir John Campbell, then Attorney-General, was consulted upon the lawfulness of the order of Odd Fellows, and upon what was necessary to be adopted render it perfectly legal. His answer was, "That the order of Odd Fellows, when all the circumstances are considered, may not be considered as coming within the letter of the provisions of the statutes respecting officiated societies; but it appears to be a very legal, moral, useful, and prudently conducted plan, and I think the members may continue to meet according to the rules of the order, as they have long done, without any danger of being called in question for a breach of the law."

In January, 1837, Sir John Campbell, then Attorney-General, was consulted upon the lawfulness of the order of Odd Fellows, and upon what was necessary to be adopted render it perfectly legal. His answer was, "That the order of Odd Fellows, when all the circumstances are considered, may not be considered as coming within the letter of the provisions of the statutes respecting officiated societies; but it appears to be a very legal, moral, useful, and prudently conducted plan, and I think the members may continue to meet according to the rules of the order, as they have long done, without any danger of being called in question for a breach of the law."

In January, 1837, Sir John Campbell, then Attorney-General, was consulted upon the lawfulness of the order of Odd Fellows, and upon what was necessary to be adopted render it perfectly legal. His answer was, "That the order of Odd Fellows, when all the circumstances are considered, may not be considered as coming within the letter of the provisions of the statutes respecting officiated societies; but it appears to be a very legal, moral, useful, and prudently conducted plan, and I think the members may continue to meet according to the rules of the order, as they have long done, without any danger of being called in question for a breach of the law."

In January, 1837, Sir John Campbell, then Attorney-General, was consulted upon the lawfulness of the order of Odd Fellows, and upon what was necessary to be adopted render it perfectly legal. His answer was, "That the order of Odd Fellows, when all the circumstances are considered, may not be considered as coming within the letter of the provisions of the statutes respecting officiated societies; but it appears to be a very legal, moral, useful, and prudently conducted plan, and I think the members may continue to meet according to the rules of the order, as they have long done, without any danger of being called in question for a breach of the law."

In January, 1837, Sir John Campbell, then Attorney-General, was consulted upon the lawfulness of the order of Odd Fellows, and upon what was necessary to be adopted render it perfectly legal. His answer was, "That the order of Odd Fellows, when all the circumstances are considered, may not be considered as coming within the letter of the provisions of the statutes respecting officiated societies; but it appears to be a very legal, moral, useful, and prudently conducted plan, and I think the members may continue to meet according to the rules of the order, as they have long done, without any danger of being called in question for a breach of the law."

In January, 1837, Sir John Campbell, then Attorney-General, was consulted upon the lawfulness of the order of Odd Fellows, and upon what was necessary to be adopted render it perfectly legal. His answer was, "That the order of Odd Fellows, when all the circumstances are considered, may not be considered as coming within the letter of the provisions of the statutes respecting officiated societies; but it appears to be a very legal, moral, useful, and prudently conducted plan, and I think the members may continue to meet according to the rules of the order, as they have long done, without any danger of being called in question for a breach of the law."

In January, 1837, Sir John Campbell, then Attorney-General, was consulted upon the lawfulness of the order of Odd Fellows, and upon what was necessary to be adopted render it perfectly legal. His answer was, "That the order of Odd Fellows, when all the circumstances are considered, may not be considered as coming within the letter of the provisions of the statutes respecting officiated societies; but it appears to be a very legal, moral, useful, and prudently conducted plan, and I think the members may continue to meet according to the rules of the order, as they have long done, without any danger of being called in question for a breach of the law."

In January, 1837, Sir John Campbell, then Attorney-General, was consulted upon the lawfulness of the order of Odd Fellows, and upon what was necessary to be adopted render it perfectly legal. His answer was, "That the order of Odd Fellows, when all the circumstances are considered, may not be considered as coming within the letter of the provisions of the statutes respecting officiated societies; but it appears to be a very legal, moral, useful, and prudently conducted plan, and I think the members may continue to meet according to the rules of the order, as they have long done, without any danger of being called in question for a breach of the law."

In January, 1837, Sir John Campbell, then Attorney-General, was consulted upon the lawfulness of the order of Odd Fellows, and upon what was necessary to be adopted render it perfectly legal. His answer was, "That the order of Odd Fellows, when all the circumstances are considered, may not be considered as coming within the letter of the provisions of the statutes respecting officiated societies; but it appears to be a very legal, moral, useful, and prudently conducted plan, and I think the members may continue to meet according to the rules of the order, as they have long done, without any danger of being called in question for a breach of the law."

In January, 1837, Sir John Campbell, then Attorney-General, was consulted upon the lawfulness of the order of Odd Fellows, and upon what was necessary to be adopted render it perfectly legal. His answer was, "That the order of Odd Fellows, when all the circumstances are considered, may not be considered as coming within the letter of the provisions of the statutes respecting officiated societies; but it appears to be a very legal, moral, useful, and prudently conducted plan, and I think the members may continue to meet according to the rules of the order, as they have long done, without any danger of being called in question for a breach of the law."

In January, 1837, Sir John Campbell, then Attorney-General, was consulted upon the lawfulness of the order of Odd Fellows, and upon what was necessary to be adopted render it perfectly legal. His answer was, "That the order of Odd Fellows, when all the circumstances are considered, may not be considered as coming within the letter of the provisions of the statutes respecting officiated societies; but it appears to be a very legal, moral, useful, and prudently conducted plan, and I think the members may continue to meet according to the rules of the order, as they have long done, without any danger of being called in question for a breach of the law."

In January, 1837, Sir John Campbell, then Attorney-General, was consulted upon the lawfulness of the order of Odd Fellows, and upon what was

## Metropolitan Police Intelligence.

GUILDFHALL.

SATURDAY, Nov. 23.—**BURGLARY.**—John King, 18, and John Scott, 23, two wretched-looking objects, were placed at the bar, charged with beggary in the streets.

The prisoners were sentenced to one month's imprisonment, with hard labour.

Mr. Greenwood said if the men were the very worst characters that could be—they were all returned to court, and they should not have been arrested and imprisoned on such slight grounds. The men must be somewhere. He would discharge them.

The prisoners, who, whatever their characters might be, conducted themselves with perfect decorum, were then set at liberty.

MARYLEBONE.

**MARYLEBONE.**—A tall thin young man, who gave his name George Cook, was brought up to the court handcuffed, and placed at the bar before Mr. Rawlinson, charged with having stolen plate of different descriptions to a considerable amount, the property of Mr. Thomas Sydenham Clarke, a barrister, residing at 36, Gloucester-place, Finsbury-square. He was also charged with stealing a pocket-book belonging to the footman.

Mr. Clarke desired to be present at the same morning, at a quarter past nine, his servants came up as usual to the dining-room to pray, and were there about twenty minutes; soon after they had gone down stairs the cook ran up in a great hurry, informing him that there had been a robbery in the house, and that the thief had made his escape up the area steps.

John Hempstock, a bookshop-keeper, stated that he was passing along Gloucester-place, when he saw the prisoner come out of the prosecutor's office, having evidently something concealed under his coat. Witness further said that a robbery had been committed, for he saw the prisoner crying, "Stop! I'm a thief," and he was in tears.

The prisoner, who was brought to the bar, was very nervous.

**TUESDAY.**—**IMPORTANT DECISION.**—Several persons engaged in the United Kingdom insurance business, and in London and abroad, were summoned to appear before the Committee of Trade, at the Royal Exchange, on Friday, Nov. 24.

It appeared that the defendants were for a compensation of their losses, caused from the books of the said and that they had refused to pay up to the period at which they were solicited.

Mr. Threlkeld said that he should remand the prisoner, and with his colleagues to give him an opportunity of proving his innocence, but that he was desirous of this time it was alleged he had by violence caused the death of one individual and such injuries to another as to preclude the hope of his recovery.

Thomas Magoe, a merchant, stated that he was engaged in the performance of that duty, bearing a noise, and seeing his friend in a struggle below him, ran down to his assistance, and that while he was below the banisters gave way, and the deceased and Mr. King fell from the landing as already described; that he was the first to pick up the deceased himself, and was busily engaged in holding up his head, and keeping him from drowning, when the deceased recovered, and drew out his hand, which he afterwards returned. Witness found the next day that three sovereigns out of five had been abstracted. Quite safe his sovereigns were safe when he was at the public-house.

The jury, after retiring from the court forty minutes, returned with a verdict of "Acquitted."

There were symptoms of approbation manifested in the course of the trial, in the return of the verdict, in which one of the jurors joined.

The learned Judge looked at the offender with indignation, and said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."

John Smith, a solicitor, said, "I do not know what you are about."