The Northern Star,
AND NATIONAL TRADES' JOURNAL.

VOL. XII. No. 595. LODON, SATURDAY, MARCH 17, 1849. PRICE FIVEPENCE or Five Shillings and Sixpence per Quarter

"One enemy can do you more harm than a thousand friends can do you good."—*Lord Barrymore.*

TO THE CHARTISTS.

MY FRIENDS,

I always have, and always shall, submit my every act, connected with the cause of Chartism, to the most vigilant popular control—nay, if necessary, to the most malignant criticism; as, although "one enemy can do you more harm than a thousand friends can do you good," the malice of the enemy is sure to fall before the good sense of the people, as the people "are seldom wrong, and never very long wrong."

With so much of a preface, I shall now offer a few comments upon the letter which appeared in the "*Northern Star*" of last week, signed by six persons, "on behalf of the Republicans of Nottingham," and my comment shall be free from all acrimony.

I shall take those paragraphs upon which I intend to comment from the letter.

"We tell him we have not gathered our opinions from him, and will not hold ourselves responsible to him. We tell him we do sympathise with the Democrats of France; and, indeed, with suffering humanity everywhere."

I tell them, that I have not gathered my opinions from them, and that I will not hold myself responsible to them, and that I, too, sympathise—and really sympathise—with the Democrats of France, and with suffering humanity everywhere; and I tell them that the sufferings of the Democrats of France have taught me a wholesome lesson—not to trust too much in the sympathies of the living for the murdered dead. Their suffering has taught me the necessity of taking care that the Democrats of England should not suffer an equal amount of misery by an equal amount of confidence in those who create it.

"It appears to us rather strange that any man professing the opinions Mr. O'Connor professes should have taken offence, because we and others have thought right to celebrate the Revolution of February, and do honour to the Democrats of France and other countries."

I do not only profess, but I hold, and am wedded to the opinions that I have supported and fearlessly advocated through the whole of my life, and I defy the critics to point out one sentence, line, or word in my letter upon which they comment, reproaching, disapproving of, or hinting at disapproval of, the celebration of the Revolution of February. It is not even hinted at in my letter.

"Now, we frequently read American papers, but cannot perceive that such is the fact; there may be a little noise with the free soil party, but still the Americans are wedded to their institutions."

I suspect that I read more American papers, and receive more American letters, than my Nottingham friends—and, perhaps, they are not aware that there are now between two and three hundred American papers advocating the Free Soil Question, and that those papers—one and all—complain of the monopoly of land in America. While my critics designate this national feeling as a "little noise," may I not, with equal propriety and justice, characterise their criticism upon my sentiments as a "LITTLE NOISE?"

"But what is the use of Mr. O'Connor blaming us for holding ultra-democratic opinions and promulgating them, when he tells us that there is not a "particle of difference between a Republic and a Monarchy with the Charter?" If he really thinks so, his letter of last week is a mere string of words without meaning, a flight of the imagination which conjured up a sort of bugbear in the shape of Republicanism."

I have never blamed them, or any other parties, for holding ultra-Democratic principles, but what I have blamed them for is the adoption of a course which is likely to retard the accomplishment of those principles—and, notwithstanding their professions of Democracy, I venture to assert that my principles are more Democratic than theirs. They may achieve a little convivial popularity, and a little local distinction, by the advocacy of their principles, while my advocacy of my own principles subjects me to class reproach, to legal tyranny, and to individual insult. And yet I have never changed. And I repeat, that there would not be a particle of difference between a Monarchy and a Republic with the Charter, as the power behind the throne would *then* be greater than the throne itself, as *then* the people could make and unmake, and their every suffering, and every act of injustice to which they were subjected, would be of their own creation, and they alone would be responsible.

"But he seems to be afraid of offending the middle classes; we beg to remind him that the middle classes are always behind on the march for reform. When we have advanced a little further they will become Chartists, and will carry the Charter as they recently carried Corn Law Repeal."

My dread of the middle classes is manifest in my continuous opposition to that class, while to the subserviency of a large portion of the industrious class to the middle class, is popular suffering to be attributed. I have never in my life pandered to the middle classes, nor have I ever gone an inch with them except in the road of patronage-destroying retrenchment; and I should like to know what the feeling of my friends and constituents would have been, if my name had been found in the list of the majority who voted for keeping up taxation to the patronage-point, instead of in the list of the minority that voted for its reduction? And I must remind my friends, who boast of being such old and consistent politicians, that I have told the people over and over again, that Free Trade would ultimately drive the middle classes into the ranks of Chartism; but I also told them—and now repeat it—that the very fact of advocating, or even agitating Republicanism, would scare those who would otherwise be a powerful auxiliary from our ranks.

"There is no evidence in Mr. O'Connor's letter to prove that in Switzerland there is one law for the rich, and another for the poor, because one man knocked another man down. We fancy that in every country of the civilised world (Switzerland not excepted,) there is a law to protect the weak against the strong."

I gave the fact that I witnessed with my own eyes in Switzerland, as one proof of my assertion; and I gave the words of my Swiss landlord as proof of the fact; and I do not know what change my friends can require in the form of government, the constitution, or the laws, if in every "CIVILISED COUNTRY IN THE WORLD THE LAWS PROTECT THE WEAK AGAINST THE STRONG." Do they mean that England is not a civilised country, and that they are barbarians? Or do they mean to say, that in England the laws *do* protect the weak against the strong? If so, every Chartist, and every political offender has been legally convicted, and justly punished; and every man who has stolen a loaf of bread in the hope of preserving his family from death, has been legally, constitutionally, and justly transported. I cannot acquiesce in this doctrine of my friends, it would so entirely put you and me—and all of us—in the wrong; and would so completely justify every act of oppression to which we have been subjected; and, perhaps, my friends are not aware that Switzerland is the nursery of the world for hired mercenaries, to defend, for pay, any description of government.

Mr. O'Connor tells us that in Belgium the people have got all but the Charter, and cheerfully pay from £5 to £18 per acre for land. We are not aware what this "all but" means; but if "all but" the Charter would raise the rent of the land in this country from £1 an acre, to £5 or £18 an acre, we say, emphatically, from such an "all but" as this, "Good Lord, deliver us!"

My friends although so long enlisted in the Democratic ranks, and so ready to criticise one letter of mine, appear to have passed over many others, and in the above passage they appear to have come to a very flighty and erroneous conclusion. They forget that I have always contended that the increase of population would increase the value of land; perhaps they are not aware that Belgium, according to its extent, is much more densely populated than either England or Ireland, and they do not appear to be aware that, although the Belgians do pay so much higher rent than in England or Ireland, that in nine years, which is the usual tenure in that country, those paying these high rents are able to purchase their farms at an enormous price. But, surely they cannot charge me, under this head, with either folly or inconsistency, as I have shown them a thousand times over that land, which may be worth but a pound an acre in the wholesale market, would be worth thirty shillings or forty shillings, or even more, in the retail market; but I might have gone to the Channel Islands if I wished to establish a higher standard of rent, and now I shall submit the question in so simple a form that even my friends will understand it.

Suppose, then, that England had a population of not more than two millions—the land, in that case—I mean to purchase it out and out—would not be worth £5 an acre, while if she had a population of fifty millions, the land would be worth £200 an acre and more, and the fifty millions with the land at that standard price, would be more prosperous, more happy, and comfortable than at the lower price with the smaller population. Men before they criticise should make themselves masters of their subject. The potato rot was equally as bad in Belgium as in Ireland. Potatoes there also constitute a great portion of the produce, yet the Belgians did not die in thousands, or hundreds of thousands in consequence of the calamity—and why? Because from the land, however high the rent, they are enabled in prosperity to lay up a sufficient store to bear temporary casualty, calamity, or adversity.

"If the time intervening between the election in America of one President and another, be 'one continuous period of turmoil,' what turmoil would there not be in this country with annual elections for Members of Parliament."

Surely, no thoughtful or right-minded Chartist will require an answer to this incomprehensible folly. In the one case the election divides the whole nation into parties and factions for months—nay, years, while in the other case the contest is not national and would be over in a day. But our friends appear to be against Annual Parliaments, which I prefer to any other point of the Charter; because, as I have often stated, short accounts make long friends, and the master who has hired a servant for a year instead of seven, could discharge him before he had done much mischief, instead of being compelled to submit to his dictatorship and masterdom for seven years.

"In fact, we cannot perceive the use of a President under any circumstances; the office, in our opinions, is a relic of Monarchy—of barbarism, and will ultimately be dispensed with; a President for life we consider not only useless, but a positive evil."

In the above passage my friends have clapped the climax, and have entirely thrown overboard their laudations of the American form of government and constitution. What, then, do they mean to say that they would have no head, no Executive Government, or what do they mean to say? Is all to be at sixes and sevens? Is every constituency to be embroiled with its representative? Is the House of Commons and the Upper House to be divided into factions by canvassings for ministerial offices, places and patronage? or upon whom are the duties of the Executive Government to devolve? Now I do not think my friends have read the form of government that I proposed, and which appeared in the *Northern Star* of the 1st of April, 1848, immediately after the French Revolution, and therefore it shall follow this letter.

My friends state that they are as old as I am, and have been as long in the cause. I will not attempt to deny this assertion, but I should wish to know if any of them have suffered as much in the cause; if any of them have adhered for twenty-seven years come next December to the cause, without turning to the right hand or to the left; whether any of them have been banished their country, been tried in England and Ireland, have lost the affection of friends, relatives, and connections, as I have, for my continuous advocacy of Democratic principles through evil report and good report, in the midst of most trying circumstances—circumstances which justified the apostacy, the delinquency, and the prostitution of thousands who advocated Democracy for no earthly purpose but that of achieving power to destroy it?

I shall be glad if my friends would point out another instance of a gentleman devoting every hour of his time, his intellect, and every farthing of his money, to the advocacy of Democratic principles. Are my friends aware that when the "*Northern Star*" was making nearly £13,000 a year profit, that every single fraction of it went to the support of the Democratic cause, besides leaving me in debt some thousands, and my reward not unfrequently being insult, slander, and insolence, in exact proportion to my generosity? But I dare say they know me well know enough to believe, that while such ingratitude to others would justify desertion from the popular cause, that in my case it is my own cause, and no calumny or ingratitude can drive me from it. And, in concluding my reply to my Nottingham friends, let me ask—while they sympathise with the Democrats of France—how much they have contributed towards the support of the Democrats of England?

I now give a letter received by the Editor from the Tower Hamlets, and, as I desire neither secrecy nor misconstruction, I give it at full length. Here it is:—

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NORTHERN STAR.

SIR,—A letter having appeared in your paper of the 3rd ult., written by Mr. O'Connor, advocating opinions and sentiments, also recommending a certain line of policy regarding the question of Republicanism, that letter having been thoroughly debated in our locality, the members have come to a determination to repudiate the opinions set forth and the policy recommended. Persons were appointed to draw up this letter as an exposition of their views, in order that a proper understanding might be effected with the democratic party, not only of this country, but also the democracy of France, and the world universally. Mr. O'Connor cautions the people against allowing "the apple of discord" to be thrown amongst their ranks; but in our opinion that gentleman's antidote will prove an entire abortion. The question as to whether Monarchical or Republican forms of government are most conducive and congenial to the well-being of society, has rested entirely in abeyance. Our speakers and writers deemed the deep under-current of popular intelligence, opinion and sentiment, ample enough to enable the masses to make a just and wise decision, and we are not aware of any effort being put forth to "supersede the Chartist agitation, by raising the standard of Republicanism," unless it was by Mr. O'Connor, when that gentleman declared, in the Commons' House of Parliament, "That, should the Gagging Bill pass, he would then become a Republican." Sir, our opinion of monarchy is simply this—that it could not exist in connexion with a free and enlightened people, and that great radical changes, such as the Charter proposes, would sweep away the key-stone of that mighty incubus which preys upon the vitals of the people, and holds back the immortal rights of man. While there is a monarchy, an aristocracy must also exist—though not in name—who will wage a deadly warfare against the liberty, prosperity, and enjoyments of the millions, in their efforts to arrest the march of human progression. We cannot understand the right or utility of kings, unless to gratify morbid ambition, and lust of power. Nations are plunged into bloody wars, engendering hatred and revenge; thus preventing the universal brotherhood of the human family. We recognise no princely or noble distinction but that belonging to and springing from the inherent greatness, grandeur, and majesty of the people. There is another point in Mr. O'Connor's letter, where he speaks of the Constitution of France as "a bag of moonshine." Sir, we are astounded at this assertion. The people of France possess a mighty lever to work out those great social reforms necessary to improve and elevate their physical and moral existence: here is a great fact without a particle of fiction. Rome was not built in a day, neither could the people of this or any other country achieve political freedom and social regeneration in that short space of time transpired from the last French revolution. Were Chartism a mere phantom in France it would prove the same hollow thing in England. The reputed leader's argument is downright Toryism, and direct insult to the struggling spirit of liberty. Mr. O'Connor, in advocating perpetual monarchy, speaks of the election every four years, in America, of a candidate to fill the Presidential chair: he tells us there is cabal and irritation the whole of that period. Does not such an argument virtually repudiate one great feature of Chartism—Annual Parliaments—and confirm septennial election, as in that case there would be three years' peace? How can Mr. O'Connor, in the Commons' House of Parliament—in the face of inconsistency, incongruity, and strange anomaly, combat for the People's Charter? That gentleman would be answered by his strictures on the constitution of France and American President's election. An awkward position for the leader of a great and enlightened party, which is struggling to effect radical and comprehensive changes in our form of constitution. Still, further, we have yet to learn the need of President or King. Mr. O'Connor denounces any expression of opinion or interference on behalf of foreign nations who are battling for their liberties, as giving licence of oppression to British rulers. Did not that gentleman interfere when Poland was struck down and bleeding at the feet of Russian spoliation, rapine, and murder? And shall we not continue the same line of action? Why cease this duty and change our policy? Why this truckling to the British Minister? Are not *all* men brothers, belonging to one great human family? How can we stand passive by and behold with indifference immortal liberty contending with the iron rule of kings and despots, without an expression of sympathy, or to hurl a protest at the murderers of our race?

Signed on behalf of the Tower Hamlets' Hall locality by the Council,

JOHN FERDINAND, HENRY BUOYD, EDWARD STOKES, RICHARD VAUGHAN, WILLIAM DAVIS, HENRY STYLE, JAS. HENRY BLIGHT, ROBERT STOKES, JOHN ALLEN, NICHOLAS KIRBY, S. REYNOLDS, Sec.

Now the first observation I shall make—and I do not do it disparagingly, as, in fact, it may bespeak my own ignorance—is, that I never heard of the name of any single individual who has signed the letter, on behalf of the men of the locality. That I should rather rejoice in—as we want recruits just now—if the production was calculated to give energy to the democratic cause. However, I shall make a few comments, with perfect temper, upon the letter.

The first sentence is highly illustrative of the position in which every Editor of the "*Northern Star*" has sought to place himself. It begins thus:—

"To the Editor of the *Northern Star*.—A letter having appeared in YOUR paper of the 3rd ult., written by Mr. O'Connor."

I only notice this, as before I conclude, it will be my duty to comment more at length upon this part of the subject. The reference in this letter to "Constitutions," "Elections for President," and "Annual Parliaments," are answered in my reply to my Nottingham friends.

There is one curious passage, however, which is not only a reply to the whole of the letter, but it also furnishes—not my defence for I required none—but in the most forcible language strengthens my every position; and, therefore, all other commentators upon my letter of the 3rd of March, must erect their battery against the recruits of the Tower Hamlets. This passage will prove how much better sensible men can write upon sensible subjects than upon moonshine, and airy and metaphysical nothings; and now I pray the closest attention of the reader to the following passage—the pith, the marrow, and the substance of the whole letter. Here it is:—

"SIR,—OUR OPINION OF MONARCHY IS SIMPLY THIS, THAT IT COULD NOT EXIST IN CONNEXION WITH A FREE AND ENLIGHTENED PEOPLE, AND THAT GREAT RADICAL CHANGES—SUCH AS THE CHARTER PROPOSES—WOULD SWEEP AWAY THE KEYSTONE OF THAT MIGHTY INCUBUS WHICH PREYS UPON THE VITALS OF THE PEOPLE, AND HOLDS BACK THE IMMORTAL RIGHTS OF MAN."

Now, I beg of every Chartist to read the above extract, and then contrast it with my stereotyped opinions:—

"Get the Charter, and depend upon it, that when the power behind the throne is greater than the throne itself, the large majority will establish what form of government they please, but let us not cause division in our ranks, by affrighting many from the advocacy of our cause, by declaring for changes to which they might be opposed. Get the Charter, and then you will have all you want."

I shall give one more extract. It is the last passage in the letter, and bears upon the achievement of the Charter. It runs thus:—

"Why cease this duty and change our policy? Why this truckling to the British Minister? Are not all men brothers belonging to one great human family? How can we stand passive by, and behold with indifference immortal liberty contending with the iron rule of Kings and despots, without an expression of sympathy, or to hurl a protest at the murderers of our race."

This is, doubtless, a most energetic and patriotic *finale*; but to what policy do my friends refer? Is it to that policy which is to achieve the Charter, and thereby destroy all oppression and misrule? for, if so, that is my policy—while the policy I contend against, is mixing up any other question with that from the accomplishment of which they anticipate man's liberation, and the world's regeneration. Why do THEY thus truckle to the British Minister? Why do THEY—according to their own confession—attempt to strengthen his hands by arming him with strong arguments against the People's Charter—while the very manacles that I seek to rid myself of, when moving the Charter in the House of Commons, they would seek to impose upon me? And one of the reasons—and the principal reason—I had for writing my letter was, to arm myself when Lord ARUNDEL and SURREY, Mr. DRUMMOND, and Mr. HUME, flashed the Republican doctrines, preached in the "*Star*," in my face, in the House of Commons—and the gentlemen of the Tower Hamlets may rest assured, that when I move the adoption of the People's Charter, I shall be able to combat the proclaimed enthusiasm of the few, by the steady principle and fixed opinion of the many. I shall not shrink from the performance of my duty, but, being longer trained and better disciplined than most men in Chartist tactics, I do not wish to enter the lists under unnecessary disadvantages; and when I make my speech upon the subject, my friends will be at perfect liberty to criticise it, and then they will be able to discover my truculency to the British Minister.

The terms "brotherhood," "human family," "immortal liberty," "sympathy," and "murderers of our race," are very exciting, but there is something more substantial required to dry the tears of those whose protectors have suffered in the cause of Chartism, and I do not mean to deny that the Tower Hamlet district has contributed its fair share.

I now submit the following letter, written in a manly, honest, and friendly tone:—

Cripplegate Locality, 28, Golden-lane,
Sunday, March 4th, 1849.

SIR,—I am requested, by the members of that society, to respectfully submit to your notice the following resolution, which was unanimously agreed to by the meeting at the above named place. Moved by Mr. Brown, seconded by Mr. Bentley:—"That the letter of Mr. O'Connor, in the NORTHERN STAR of this week, wherein Mr. F. O'Connor has stated that he is an enemy to *Republicans*, has caused much surprise in our minds, and will, we have no doubt, be used by the political enemies of that gentleman in their own peculiar way, inasmuch that it is an established fact that, on the passing of the Government Security Bill, Mr. O'Connor declared if that un-English and unconstitutional law was carried he would then avow himself a Republican. We, therefore, hope that Mr. O'Connor will, with his usual candour, refer briefly to this matter in the next week's STAR, in order to elucidate the two positions—the avowed Republican of 1848, the Monarchist of 1849—at the same time we beg to inform that gentleman that we cannot too highly appreciate the noble and determined efforts that he has hitherto displayed in the cause of Political Freedom, and yet hope he will follow up the fight until the battle's won.

(Signed) J. FOWLER, Chairman.

My friends, with regard to my declaration in the House of Commons, I beg to refer you to my letter of the 1st of April, 1848, as it appeared in the *Star*, and to the principles there laid down, I still adhere, as the best form of government. You ask me to elucidate my positions of 1848 and 1849. My position, my principles and opinions, are the same in 1849 as in 1848, without a particle of change; and your hope shall be cheerfully realised, as I am determined to follow up the fight till the battle is won, and with the assistance of men like you—who know how to appreciate a life's devotion to your cause—I have no doubt of ultimate success.

I now turn to the strictures of "L'Ami du Peuple" upon my letter, and although the whole of the composition is one entangled skein of *pros* and *cons*, *for* and *against*, of agitation for Republicanism, existing for the present only in the brain, I think I shall be able satisfactorily to unravel the mystery, and place the commentator and myself in our proper positions. Every man is aware of the facility with which any writer may dilate upon an existing abuse, or upon a popular proposition. Let the ATTORNEY-GENERAL accord me a licence of exemption from the penalties of the Gagging Bill for three months only, and I would undertake to leave Mons. "L'Ami du Peuple" wholly in the shade.

The writer, in one part of his letter, assuming to himself not only the power to criticise the present, but to dive into and to divine as to the future, presumes that as he gathers and culls his Democratic principles—or, rather, notions of Democratic opinions—from Ghent in Belgium, and from Chartists smarting under the oppression of Monarchial or rather Oligarchical misrule—presumes at the same time that my sphere of knowledge is limited within the compass of the fancy of some "fool or designing knave;" and as I wish to partake of all that responsibility which the writer would impose upon those my teachers and instructors, I submit to you the opinions of the knave and fool, not from whom I wholly gathered my opinions, but by whom I am strengthened in those opinions, and you shall judge of the weight which ought to be attached to them. Here then follows the opinion of the knave and the fool:—

"You know I have often expressed to you my opinion on mixing up Repeal or ANY OTHER question, with that of the Charter, and now depend upon it that Chartist advocacy of Republicanism would raise hosts of enemies. Once establish popular control through the Charter, and it will then be the People's own fault if abuses continue. Errors are too often discovered when it is too late to correct them, and foolish steps are not easily retraced.

"THOMAS SLINGSBY DUNCOMBE."

Now, then, I am not at all ashamed of being found in unison of opinion with such a "knave" and such a "fool"—a knave and fool who joined our ranks, not in our strength, but in our weakness; not to achieve power for himself, but to confer power upon the people, and who has undauntedly advocated our principles in and out of Parliament—the man whose health has suffered, and whose life has been endangered, by unremitting devotion to the people's cause.

Now, just read the following extract:—

"The true Republicans of this country, whilst very properly expressing their sympathy for their Republican brethren of the Continent, quite as properly keep their mouths shut as regards this nation. They know that 'the pear is not ripe,' and they 'bide their time.'"

Now, in the name of common sense, what can be more ridiculous than the above, when contrasted with the assurance that the Republicans have no intention of interfering with the Chartist movement. Presuming that the writer is the ear, if not the tongue of the party—what are we to gather from the extract but this—namely, that the Republican party in this country "bides its time," and waits till "the pear is ripe." Does not this, of itself, bear a strange contrast to the assurance that the question of Republicanism merely stands in abeyance until the "pear is ripe?" and, although a pear, does it not as naturally follow that it would constitute the "apple of discord" in the democratic ranks? But, latterly, every line of this writer which has appeared in the "*Star*" so far from keeping the Chartist movement distinct, has been devoted to foreign policy, and the anticipated glories of Republicanism, and scarcely a word of enlightenment as to those social and political changes, which the writer describes as indispensable to the enlistment of public opinion on behalf of the Charter. All his theory is a laudation of Republicanism; and, therefore, as the *Star* is considered the organ of popular opinion, the natural—nay, the only—inference is, that the popular mind is to be disciplined, not for the achievement of the PEOPLE'S CHARTER, but for the accomplishment of a Republic; and there is not a reader of the "*Northern Star*" that is not shrewd enough to understand with what glib facility an irresponsible writer may deal with the views of a responsible teacher; but before I conclude I shall give you a few instances of the fact.

Now, I beg the attention of the reader to the following extract:—

"Considering, therefore, that the question of 'king, or no king,' is a matter of—to say the least—secondary importance, and one, moreover, the agitation of which would, at the present time, be premature, and consequently impolitic, no true Republican would have thought of raising that question at *this time*, had Mr. O'Connor's letter not appeared. That letter containing sentiments which I am sure a large number of my brother Chartists dissent from, I think, as one of that number, that I am bound, as an honest man, to show wherein and why I differ from Mr. O'Connor."

Let me now ask, if I required any justification for my letter, whether I could furnish stronger than will be found in the above?

Firstly,—It is admitted that the question of "king or no king" is a matter of but secondary importance. Well, I thought this was the question of paramount importance; with me, at all events, it is, as you will learn from my proposed Constitution, printed in April in last year; and as you will also have learned, from my frequent announcements, that the league of people would become too strong for the league of kings; but as the Charter would proclaim the will of the majority, to the choice of that majority, I would leave the form of Government, so that I think I am more essentially democratic than the critic. Then, again, if this question of Republicanism had not been mooted, how would the writer have known that a LARGE NUMBER of Chartists dissented from my views of the subject? But I always have been supposed to play second fiddle to editors of the "*Northern Star*;" and, therefore, though held responsible for every Chartist act and every Chartist word, it appears I am kept in utter ignorance of Chartist feelings, until the expression of them leads to persecution, and then the responsibility of defence devolves upon me. Now, it is a very remarkable fact, that both in the House of Commons and out of the House of Commons, I have been taunted with this cry of Republicanism, and so has Mr. DUNCOMBE; but there is no duty more easy than that of writing enthusiastically, when it is accompanied by perfect irresponsibility.

"But I am not prepared to censure those who believe that the shortest road to the establishment of the Charter is through the enlightenment of the people, as to the *social* value of that measure. The blunders of the 'Provisional Government' and the intrigues of the rich would, both combined, have failed to damage the glorious victory of February, provided the people had been sufficiently enlightened to have elected an honourable Assembly. Unhappily, common *sense* had not preceded common Suffrage."

Well, I candidly confess that those extracts bewilder me. The writer, while criticising, and not in a good spirit either—as it was merely intended as the grape shot which was to be followed by the chain shot—adopts my every sentiment in those parts of his letter which are at all reconcilable. As I have told you, scores of times, that the French people were not prepared for the great change, inasmuch as the free expression of opinion was not permitted, while, I have told you as often, that the English people through free discussion, are the most enlightened people upon politics in the world; and that, therefore, changes which have failed to produce the promised results abroad, would be sure to produce them at home, in consequence of popular enlightenment. I have explained to you that in France and other countries, the people struggling for liberty are martial people, disciplined in the art of war, and always seek change through physical Revolution, in which many of the upper and middle class take part, in the hope of turning the change to their own advantage. There they enlist but for a certain number of years, and they learn the use of arms, while you are a clodpole race, the higher and middle class opposed to you, disunited yourselves and compelled to enlist as slaves for life; the poor gentlemen alone, who are too proud to work and too poor to live without labour, now and then enlisting you, each to rally around his own bag of moonshine, while each deserter makes popular indifference a justification for his retreat.

Not so with me, however; I unfurl the banner, and through evil report and good report, through sunshine and shade, through eulogium and persecution, I have never furled it, and I never will, even at the bidding of Republicans.

"If Mr. O'Connor means that the first general election, under the provisions of that Constitution, is likely to give birth to an Assembly no better than the present. I share his anticipations; but even that will not prove the Constitution 'a bag of moonshine.' I am not at all confident that a first, or even second election under the provisions of the Charter, would produce a House of Commons containing a majority of real Reformers."

Here the writer confounds the form of Government with Constitution, while they have nothing whatever to do with each other; but I should say that the writings of the critic and my writings and teachings, and all our lucubrations, were moonshine, indeed, and I should abandon the field of politics to-morrow, if I could entertain the notion, that the first or second election under the provisions of the Charter would not supply a Reformed House of Commons. If so, my friends, you and I, and all of us, have been grasping after moonshine, as, rely upon it, that what the first session did badly the second would do worse, and each, in succession, improving upon the delinquency of its predecessors, while my hope is, that the first session would establish landmarks to the Constitution, which no subsequent gathering could destroy or remove.

"Mr. O'Connor says that 'In America there is as much class-distinction, national suffering, and popular discontent, as in any monarchy in the world.' There *is* 'class-distinction,' there *is* 'suffering,' and there *is* 'discontent' in America, but certainly not so much, nor anything near so much, as in *many* monarchies. I believe *Ireland* is a monarchy! The alleged state of society in America, used by Mr. O'Connor as an argument against Republicanism, is also made use of, by our opponents, as an argument against the Charter. Their cry is 'Look at America! Behold *the results of Universal Suffrage*:—slavery, 'class-distinction,' 'suffering,' and discontent.'' But neither Chartism nor Republicanism are to be damaged by such arguments. The existence of slavery, class distinction, suffering, and discontent in America, testify to the wickedness of the few and the ignorance of the many; but the principles of Eternal Justice proclaimed in the Declaration of Independence, are true and glorious, nevertheless."

Well, I am blessed with the best temper that ever man possessed, for if the above is not sufficient to make a Quaker kick his mother, I do not know what would be. Here, then, is the very pivot upon which the whole question hinges; not only Mr. O'CONNOR, and other persons, but even Mons. "L'AMI" himself admits the slavery, tyranny, class-distinction, suffering, and oppression which exists in America; but by contrast the commentator says that they are greater in some Monarchies. Well, what does this all prove? Why the very fact that I have urged—namely, that with the Charter, and the most popular political liberty—or rather representative freedom—the whole blessing that would otherwise emanate from the system is utterly destroyed by the mode of electing a President, which causes incessant dissension, inquietude and class-cabals. Now, what can the reader think, after seventy years' experience, of a democratic writer informing us, that all American grievances are consequent upon "THE WICKEDNESS OF THE FEW, AND IGNORANCE OF THE MANY." Well, then, here is a large extension of English suffering developed. In the first instance it was not to have exceeded the first or second election. But now from the American precedent—indeed, I should have said, the American *President*—we are supplied with hope that the effect of the English Charter may be seventy years of long and continuous suffering. But hold! what matters that; why fret we? Cannot we live upon the principles of "Eternal Justice, proclaimed in the Declaration of Independence?" Now, surely, that is not "moonshine:" that is "a fair day's wages for a fair day's work"—there is a gleam of hope cast upon the suffering millions, through the solar microscope of the oracle of the future. "Live horse and you'll get grass," Chartists, wait for seventy years, and then you shall see what you shall see.

I quite agree that the discussion of those social benefits, likely to result from the attainment of the Charter, is not only right and constitutional, but also indispensable, and no one has gone as far as I have in showing what those social results would be, but I have never hampered them with any new form of Government, or with those vexed and irritating questions which must end in class-dissension.

"Certainly no man, in the possession of his senses, will think of condemning the Swiss Confederation on the strength of Mr. O'Connor's *striking* anecdote of a lusty innkeeper cuffing a peasant, who, I suppose, was not quite so lusty. Mr. O'Connor, to have given his story the slightest weight, should have shown that there was no law in the canton to punish a man for assaulting another."

I must declare myself very much perplexed with those comments, but it is from the space they occupy, and not from the difficulty of answering them. I did not say that there was no law in Switzerland to punish one man for cuffing another, nor will the commentator say that there is no law in England to punish one man for cuffing another—but, as in Switzerland, so in England, there is no justice for the poor man who is cuffed by the rich man, and the commentator should understand the difference between justice and law.

"Mr. O'Connor has been in Belgium—I have not; nevertheless I take exception to the very charming picture he has drawn of the loyalty of the Belgians, and their social happiness. I can assure Mr. O'Connor that a very numerous Republican party exists in Belgium; indeed in Ghent—the Manchester of Belgium—the working men are, to say the least, quite as much Republicans as the working men of Manchester are Chartists. I have reason to believe that the peasantry are not in favour of Republicanism. Why? Because, with the exception of the peasantry of one other nation, they are more priest-ridden than any other portion of the Catholic population of Europe. The priests keep Leopold on his throne."

Well, your friend appears to be in very extensive communication with foreign countries, and, in his dissertation, he furnishes me with the very strongest argument in favour of the Land Plan, while he most unmercifully cuts his own throat. The reason why the *peasantry* are satisfied, is because they can devote their free labour to agricultural pursuits; while the allegation—that satisfaction with the present form of Government is based upon priestly influence—is well answered, by the fact that the mechanics, artificers, and artisans of Ghent, are just as much subject to priestly dominion as the rural peasants; while it illustrates the striking fact, that an agricultural population, to which the Charter would lead, where each husbandman would have the fruits of his own industry, is the one thing to make all rally around any form of Government, and any Constitution, which the majority would accept, as the means of protecting the rights of all.

"Mr. O'Connor seems to be unaware of the fact, that his version of Republicanism is out of date. It was correct, perhaps sixty years since, but the true Republicans of the present day—*the men of the future*—reject President as well as King, and will no more vote for one than the other. All Mr. O'Connor's reasoning, therefore, against Presidential elections every four years, falls to the ground."

It is almost ungenerous to expose the number of fallacies contained in the letter upon which I am commenting—but, as I write for all classes of labour—the enlightened, the sagacious, and the ignorant—it needs must be done. We find, then, that, although the question of Republicanism has not been mooted, yet nevertheless, in the above, we are put in possession of the fact, that it is the adopted principle of the MEN OF THE FUTURE. Now, all that I can say is, that, if the question of the present is to be based upon the anticipations of the men of the future, as I am no diviner, I am puzzled—the labour that I thought we had cut out for ourselves, was to establish a present system for the present generation, but, if we are to do nothing for the men of the future, and if the men of the future are to do all for us, then I adopt the hopeful motto of the hope inspiring "L'Ami," "BIDE YOUR TIME," "WAIT TILL THE PEAR IS RIPE." Let your teeth water for it, and don't you wish you may get it?

In conclusion, the writer tells us that America was once a Monarchy—if Canada declares its independence, the men of the future may tell us that Canada was a Monarchy. Indeed, with more truth, as Canada does possess a representative system; but he might just as well tell us that the child was its own mother as that America was once a Monarchy.

My friends, I have now commented upon the letter of the Nottingham Republicans, the Chartist Council of the Tower Hamlets, the kind letter and resolution of the men of Cripplegate, and the very long letter of "L'Ami du Penple," which appeared in the "*Star*" of last week; and as nothing is more easy than for irresponsible persons to urge their own opinions against those of responsible persons, and as the easiest thing in the world is to write most enthusiastic and high-spirited letters upon political subjects, national grievances, and heroic performances, and although much pressed for time, I must make a few comments upon the general subject.

The letter of the six gentlemen from Nottingham which appeared in the "*Star*" of last week, was in possession of the Editor before it was printed. I was at the office between twelve and one o'clock on Friday morning, when it was printed, and yet he never showed it to me, nor did he show me or say one word about his own letter; if he had, late as it was, and tired as I was, my defence (or, rather, my answer) should have accompanied the charge. Now this comes strangely from a professed lover of justice; however, I rejoice to think that your confidence guarantees to me more than a week to defend myself against the most solemn charge.

My letter of the 3rd was written after considerable reflection, based as well upon my own opinions as upon those of Mr. DUNCOMBE, and I do not retract or qualify one single word or sentence in that letter.

Perhaps there is no instance upon record of a man and a newspaper adhering as strictly to Democratic principle, as I have through the whole of my life, and as the "*Northern Star*" has from the first number to the present moment; and no doubt you have very frequently seen a snarling cur barking at the heels of a high-mettled horse, but always keeping out of length—and having embarked in the cause of Democracy, and having abandoned family connexion, relatives and friends, it was likely that I also should be subject to a like annoyance.

As you are aware, I have always courted the most strict and rigid investigation into my every act; and you are also aware that I have gone through many trials, and come out of all unblemished, and without surrendering a particle of my principles, or in any wise sullying your cause.

Of late I have received many letters, assuring me that a Republican party was doing much damage to the cause of Chartism, and I considered it my duty to warn the Chartists against the trap that was being laid for them.

My position as connected with the "*Northern Star*," has been most curious as regards my editors. The first I employed, I paid him the usual salary paid to editors of provincial papers—£104 a year; and I never had a more diligent or a better servant. I doubled his salary—I raised it to £208 a year—and I never had a worse servant; being elevated in his own estimation, he resolved upon becoming master.

The next editor I had I raised his salary from £104 to £312 a year, and he looked upon the "*Northern Star*" as his property, and upon me as his servant. He endeavoured to make it the organ of Socialism, and to merge the question of Chartism in that of Socialism. At present I have three editors, and write all the leading articles myself. They have all been working men, which gives me great pleasure; and I have never from the day they entered my service to the present moment, said an angry or unkind word to one of them; and recently I have discovered that the principal editor has become strongly imbued with foreign politics, to the all-but exclusion of all other matter.

Now this I do not object to, because I think every man has a perfect right to the free exercise of his own genius, and to the free expression of his own opinion. But now I will give you a taste of editorial irresponsibility, and the proprietor's responsibility. Upon one occasion my first editor published a most flagrant libel upon a clergyman; the clergyman wrote to him, assuring him of his error, and asking him to retract, but editorial dignity forbid such a compromise, and I paid over four hundred pounds for his majesty.

My second editor published two libels—the one I knew was not only a libel but a falsehood, and I wrote a retractation for publication in the "*Star*," but editorial dignity was roused, and MY MASTER qualified the retractation in such a way that Chief-Justice WILDE told the jury that the qualification was rather an aggravation than a palliation of the offence, and those libels cost me nearly £300. "L'Ami du Peuple" published a libel upon Mr. FOWLER, which cost me over £100. Now, so much for editorial spirit and proprietors' responsibility.

It has often struck me that the editor of a newspaper critically represents the unmarried sister of a married woman, and for whom she keeps house; the unmarried lady is considered kind, indulgent, and generous, because she deals with her sister's property. Miss SOPHY is a great deal better than Mistress; but the very moment that Miss SOPHY gets married herself, and takes her unmarried sister DOLLY as a housekeeper, SOPHY becomes more penurious and careful, and DOLLY, in turn, receives the affection and gratitude of the domestics. Now, such is precisely the position of the irresponsible editor to the responsible proprietor: no wonder, therefore, that the Republicans of the Tower Hamlets, in addressing the editor, should say—"YOUR PAPER."

(Continued to the Fifth Page.)

A HINT TO ENTERPRISING PUBLICANS AND SINNERS.—An individual intends opening an hotel at San Francisco. We don't know what the sign will be but we suggest the "Golden Fleece."

Foreign Intelligence.

FRANCE.

TRIAL OF THE REPUBLICAN CHIEFS AT BOURGES.

M. M. CAUSSIDIERE AND LOUIS BLANC.

The following letters have been addressed to the *Reforme*, by MM. Caussidiere and Louis Blanc:—

To my Co-Citizens.—In refusing to appear to-day before the high court of justice which it has pleased my enemies to institute to judge the facts of the 15th of May, I am bound to explain my refusal. The conviction of my innocence ought to induce me to appear before my judges; but, as it has not protected me before my accusers, before my colleagues of the Assembly, who condemned me without hearing me, I am induced to think that the same spirit of partiality and hatred which pursued me in the midst of my colleagues would accompany me to Bourges. The days of truth and justice are not yet come. I must wait for them when they shall be beyond the reach of royalist attacks. If I have not been defended against these by 147,000 votes, obtained from the population of Paris one month after the events in which they would implicate me; if the Assembly to which I belonged allowed to be placed on its bureau a formal act of accusation against me, even before I had addressed to it the explanations it demanded; if the reports of vile spies are to prevail against the conduct the declarations of a citizen who from the 24th of February to the 24th of May—that is in the midst of the most difficult circumstances and the most lively irritation—maintained tranquillity in Paris and respect for person and property; if even, when expatriated, the hate of the reactionaries attached to my steps mixes up my name every day with attempts at supposed disorder, ought I to increase the number of the victims of the enemies of social harmony? Are not the prisons and the hulks sufficiently full? To deliver myself into the hands of those who betray the real interests of the *ouvriers* and commerce, of those who sacrifice the dignity and honour of the country to satisfy their ambition and personal interests, would be a folly, and for a long time the democrats have been the victims of their confidence and of the spirit of fraternity which animates them. It behoves us to exercise some caution, for the only object is to put down the Republicans. It is not justice before whom I am called to appear.

London March 3, 1849. Caussidiere.

In quitting Paris on the 25th of August, I said that on the day of trial I would present myself before a jury, and that nothing in the world should prevent me from keeping this promise, the observance of his word being one of the duties of an honest man and the virtue of a Republican. But in August I did not pledge myself to appear before a tribunal, constituted in November. In August I did not engage to present myself before an exceptional jurisdiction, created three months later by the very men who proscribed me, and with the view of obtaining my conviction by a retroactive measure, in contempt of the principles of eternal justice. The decision to which the National Assembly, in contradiction with itself, has given rise, and the indictment, which does not contain a single serious charge, afford sufficient proof that evidence is nothing where political passions are dominant. Paris is abandoned to the sway of force more than ever. The scandal of arbitrary arrests is extreme. The counter-revolution is dominant and furious; under such circumstances, and placed under the dominion of the most shameful injustice ever exhibited, I reserve to myself the right of deciding, if to serve my cause, I can do better than to throw myself into hands of my enemies. The day cannot be far distant when party hatred shall yield to the voice of truth. I protest and bide my time. I have read the act of accusation, and feel my heart divided between indignation and pity. It states that I succeeded, on the 15th of May, in escaping from the Hotel de Ville; that a rumour to that effect had been spread; that, on the 15th of May, far from endeavouring to disperse the people, I felicitated it on having conquered the right to petition; and a few lines further down I am shown advising the people to allow the Assembly to deliberate freely; that, on the 15th of May, at the Luxembourg, I held certain factious language; and the Moniteur shows that on the 15th of May I was no longer at the Luxembourg, which had been given up to the executive commission. This is now called justice in France. I add no more.

London, March 3. Louis Blanc.

[We beg to express our cordial approbation of the decision expressed by Citizens Louis Blanc and Caussidiere in the above letters. Better remain in exile than commit themselves to the power of their enemies—the enemies of Democracy—who, insensible to the principles of honour and justice, would only be too happy to glut their hatred by adding the above-named patriots to their already long list of victims.]

Bourges, Wednesday, March 7.—Long before the hour fixed for the commencement of business, every avenue leading to the court, which is held in the Palais de Pacques Cœur, was thronged with persons anxious to obtain an entrance. The accommodation offered to the public was, from the small dimensions of the court, extremely limited. A large detachment of sergens de ville had come from Paris with the prisoners, and remained to assist in carrying out the regulations during the trial. Few military, except the local gendarmiere, appeared under arms; all were, however, kept in readiness in case of need. On a table in front of that of the president lay the various articles seized, and which were brought forward in support of the prosecution; amongst them stood out in prominent relief the casque and uniform of the *pompier*, as well as a large flag carried at the head of the invaders of the Chamber afterwards displayed at the Hotel de Ville. The jurymen, drawn together from all parts of France, come, some of them, a distance of 100 leagues. Among the company in the gallery were Mme. Borme, the wife of one of the prisoners; and the two daughters of the ex-General Courtais, and his mother.

The jury, to the number of eighty-six, were drawn by lot. The members of the Council-General of the Cher were required to be present.

At a quarter before eleven o'clock, M. de Berenger, the president, with the other judges, dressed in their official costume, entered the court and the proceedings commenced. The decree of the National Assembly was first read by M. Baroche, the Procureur-General, declaring the constitution of the High Court of Justice; after which the names of the jury were called over. The huissier called aloud the name of M. Martin Bernard, representative of the people; and that gentleman, having answered, entered the jury-room.

At a quarter to one the prisoners were introduced, and seated with a gendarme between each. They were all well-dressed, and on entering cast their eyes round the court, and saluted such of their acquaintances as they recognised in the gallery. They all appeared rather pale, doubtless from their long confinement, but did not seem much cast down, occasionally looking round with an air of the coolest indifference. Raspail, immediately on entering, occupied himself in taking notes. The prisoners were then momentarily withdrawn, and recalled in the following order!—Raspail, Sobrier, Barbes, Albert, Blanqui, Larget, Quentin, Flotte, Courtais.

At half-past one the president and the judges again entered the court, and the names of the prisoners were called over.

Blanqui, on his name being pronounced, addressed the president, protesting against being tried by the exceptional court which had been constituted for the trial, both in his own name, and in that of his fellow accused; he therefore refused to take any part in the discussion.

Albert said, on hearing his name read, that he would not answer any question. Barbes did the same, declaring that he would not recognise the competency of the court to try him. Sobrier gave his name and age, but declared that he should make no defence. Raspail said he was ready to reply under certain reservations; and Flotte refused to reply.

The President then addressed the jury, after which Blanqui again rose, and complained that the charges to be brought against the accused had not been communicated to them. Raspail next made a similar complaint.

Barbes again rose to protect *in toto* against the competency of the High Court of Justice; but he was stopped by the president, who said his remarks must be reserved until a future stage in the proceedings.

The registrar of the court then commenced reading the indictment, which enters into a long and detailed account of the procession along the boulevards to the National Assembly, and of the invasion of the Chamber, the particulars of which are sufficiently known to our readers; and then proceeds to state the conduct of Barbes on that occasion, when he mounted the tribune and demanded the immediate marching of an army to Poland, and the imposition of a milliard on the wealthy. It next details the conduct of Barbes on leaving the Chamber for the Hotel de Ville, and there issuing a list of a new Provisional Government, and of his arrest in that building in company with Albert, Borme, and Thomas. The indictment then points out the part taken by each respectively in the affair of the 15th May. Caussidiere is represented as the author of a plan concocted with Sobrier to overthrow a part of the Provisional Government. 'The coalition of these two men,' continues the indictment, 'explains the manner in which the large quantity of arms and ammunition was divided between the Prefecture of Police and the house in the rue de Rivoli. The question was at one time discussed at the latter place of setting fire to the capital. Caussidiere recommended the manufacturing of fire-balls in the provinces, and allowed Borme to try an experiment with some in the Court of the Prefecture.' After some further details of matters already well-known, the indictment concludes as follows:—'Considering that from the examinations and documents produced, there are, first, against Blanqui, Flotte, Albert, Barbes, Sobrier, Raspail, Quentin, Degre, Larger, Borme, Thomas, Louis Blanc, Seigneuret, Honneau, Huber, Lavirron, and Chancel, sufficient proofs of their having, in May, 1848, been guilty of an attempt to destroy or change the Government, and also for having attempted to excite civil war by armone citizen against another; and against Courtais, Caussidiere, and Villain for making themselves accomplices in the said attempt, having a knowledge of all the facts connected therewith, orders them to be placed on their trial according to law.'

During the reading of that part of the indictment, in which it is set forth that after Barbes had demanded the imposition of a milliard on the rich, and that a voice exclaimed, 'It is not that we want—we want two hours' pillage of Paris,' all the accused rose in the greatest emotion. Blanqui declared in the most forcible manner that no such proposition had been made; Barbes repeated a like contradiction, and denounced it as a falsehood and calumny. Raspail protested against it with the most animated gestures he designated it as an official falsehood, which it was disgraceful on the part of the Procureur-General to have inserted in the indictment. The Procureur-General appealed to the President against such language. This incident causes a certain sensation in the court. Quentin afterwards rose, and protested against the calumnies uttered against them in the indictment.

When the reading of the indictment had been completed, Barbes again rose to protest against the competency of the court, but was stopped by the President, on which Barbes declared that he would not again enter the court unless compelled.

The names of the witnesses were then called over, and the court broke up at six o'clock.

Thursday, March 8. — The court opened at ten o'clock, when the attendance was again very numerous, all the tribunes being filled. On taking his seat, the President announced that the two prisoners Barbes and Albert having refused to be present at the sitting of the court, they had been summoned to attend in the usual form by the huissier, who then read the *proces verbal* of his visit, and their refusal. The President declared that, as their presence in the court was absolutely essential to the ends of justice, he should once more command their presence, and that if they again refused they should be brought into court by force. The two prisoners were consequently in a few minutes led in by gendarmes, and placed in their seats. Barbes was not dressed with the same care as on the previous day; Albert presented precisely the same appearance. Immediately on his entrance, Barbes, addressing the President, said that, as he had been compelled to attend the court, he should refrain from taking any part in the proceedings, and refuse to reply to any questions that might be put him. Blanqui complained that, from the crowded state of the bench on which he was placed, he could not take notes. A gendarme was consequently removed, in order to give him more room. Courtais addressed the President, declaring his acceptance of the jury and the court which had been constituted for his trial; Borme and Decre, on the contrary, intimated that they would not accept it.

Raspail said: Gentlemen of the High Court, in declining your competence, I only follow the course pursued in the Court of Cassation. Your high jurisdiction is not consistent with the law, and you are the sole judges of its competence. The offence of the 15th of May was committed in open day, and a fortnight would have sufficed to identify the guilty, and now ten months have passed over us in confinement without having been tried. This appears to me to prove that an exceptional law has been made to reach us. The judicial power performs its usual functions. The Chamber of accusations might have sent us before a jury. It has done so and has discharged its duty, but the National Assembly in directing our trial before you, an extraordinary tribunal, has voted a law and overthrown our institutions. When we applied to the Court of Cassation, we were told: "It was enough that there should be a decree of the legislative authority; we are here to pronounce the execution of its decrees." Have we been treated as persons guilty of a misdemeanour? No, we have been treated as guilty of the blackest crime, as wild beasts, brought here in cases. And now, if we be acquitted, who will recompense all our sufferings? I will accept willingly the judges who are now before me, because they have been appointed by the Republic—that Republic to which I am devoted. I, Raspail, whom they would prevent from being a representative; I, who desired the happiness of the people, and who, if deceived, am ready to sacrifice myself on the altar of my country, it is I who am accused of having betrayed the Republic! Raspail then delivered some written objections to the competence of the court, in which most of the accused joined.

Blanqui said: 'The invasion of the 15th of May was only an unforeseen tumult, of which we have been the victims; thus it was necessary, to meet the exigency of this anomalous trial, to create a jurisdiction more complying than usual; and it has been done amongst the great proprietors, for the ardent defenders of popular rights at Paris are not here represented, because they are afraid of Paris.' It was determined that they should be brought before a tribunal where conviction was not only certain, but where it was evidently desired that they should be torn and lacerated, as it were with the claws of a wild cat. The President here interposed recommending the prisoner to be more guarded in his language. Blanqui, bowing to the President, continued at great length vehemently to declaim against the illegality of the entire proceedings, and concluded by warmly protesting against the competency of the court before which he had been made to appear.

A gentleman dressed in plain clothes, who was seated amongst the counsel for the prisoners, here rose and addressed the President.

The President: In which quality do you address the court?

M. Levy, the individual in question, explained that he was counsel for one of the accused. The President then accorded him permission to speak, which he did, by simply protesting on behalf of his client against the competency of the court.

Larger rose and declared that he adhered to the remarks made by Raspail.

Flotte, by his counsel, said that he too protested against the competency of the court, without, however, adhering to all that had been said by Raspail.

M. Riviere next addressed the court as counsel for Villain.

M. Baroche: How is it that you do not appear in your official costume?

M. Riviere explained that he had not brought his gown with him, as he expected to be able to procure one at Bourges, but, not succeeding, he had been forced to send to Paris for one, which had not yet arrived. (Laughter.) His excuse having been admitted, he limited his address to an expression of the fact that his client did not recognise the competency of the High Court of Justice.

M. Baroche, Procureur-General, replied at some length to the complaints made against the judicial authorities, and contended that no delay uncalled for by the great number of witnesses to be examined and documents to be prepared had taken place in the proceedings. The sitting was suspended for some time, during which the jury withdrew, and the prisoners were led out of court. At four o'clock the jury returned to their seats, the prisoners were brought in; and the President and judges entered.

The President replied at some length to the objections made by the accused to the competency of the High Court of Justice, declaring it to have been in perfect accordance with the provisions of the laws, and in keeping with the letter and spirit of the Constitution. The President next quoted various articles from the Codes and the Constitution bearing on the point at issue, and then pronounced the judgment come to by the court, overruling all the objections brought forward by the prisoners and their counsel, and declaring its competence to proceed with the trial. The court then adjourned.

Friday, March 9th.—A number of witnesses arrived this day; among them were MM. Buchez and Flocon.

At a quarter past ten the accused were introduced. Barbes, Albert, Sobrier, Raspail, Flotte, and Borme, were not among them. The commissaire central, left the court, accompanied by eight or ten gendarmes, and a moment afterwards Borme and Sobrier arrived, followed by Albert and Barbes, the last two held under the arms by gendarmes. Raspail arrived immediately afterwards, escorted by police agents. Flotte alone was absent. It seemed that the agents found him in bed, and that he refused to rise. At half-past ten an officer announced the court opened, and all the accused arose, with the exception of Barbes and Albert. The President announced that Flotte, having refused to appear, he had given orders that he should be summoned. A clerk announced that Flotte had been found in bed, and without clothing of any kind; and when summoned he answered that as he did not acknowledge the jurisdiction of the High Court, he refused to attend its sitting. He was summoned to sign, and refused. The President having read the section of the law giving him power to use force in such cases, ordered that Flotte should be obliged to attend, and in ten minutes he was carried in by two gendarmes. He was placed on the bench of the accused, and immediately arose, saying, 'I declare—' The President: 'You have not the parole.'—Flotte: 'I demand it.'—The President: 'You have not the parole.'—'Flotte: 'I declare that I have had enough of your exceptional tribunal, of your royalist presence.'—The President: 'You have not the parole; call the witnesses.'—Some discussion then took place concerning the witnesses, and some merely formal, and therefore quite uninteresting points, when Blanqui contended that the accused, according to law, could not be interrogated at the commencement of the trial, and that questions could only be addressed to them during the confrontation with witnesses. He was overruled. Blacqui, Albert, Barbes, and Sobrier declared they would not answer. The President proceeded to interrogate Raspail, who admitted the jurisdiction of the High Court. He was accused of having marched at the head of his club to the National Assembly to present a petition in favour of Poland. He was asked, 'How did you enter the National Assembly?' He answered, 'Some tumult had already manifested itself on the Place de la Concorde. As proved by the accusation, I did not arrive at the Assembly until an hour after it was invaded. I said to my club, 'In former times petitions were presented at the bar of the Convention; the National Assembly has removed that bar to the tribune; we must there peaceably deposit our petition.' I then entered the hall, which was crowded to excess. I recognised many men belonging to the police, and pointed them out to the *juge d'instruction*, but he would not follow the plan I pointed out for again finding them The President himself and the representatives persuaded me to ascend the tribune, and to read the petition. After reading it I descended.'—The Procureur-General: 'When you ascended the tribune to read the petition, did you not hear protestations in various parts of the hall against your presence in the tribune?'—Raspail: 'I would have wished to have seen you in my place amidst the tumult. I saw some few representatives move; if I had heard them, I would have answered that I was there to protect them and to empty the hall. It was impossible for me from the tribune to hear the little squeaking voice of the witness Adelsward. If I had entered the Assembly to overthrow it, I would have said so. It was not the prison which affrighted me; it was the illusion.'—A juror: 'I know not whether a juror has a right to put a question.'—The President: 'You may speak.'—Juror: 'I would ask the accused Raspail, in what manner he was introduced by the accused Courtais.' — Raspail: The 'General said the delegates might enter, and having given my name, I entered.'—Blanqui: 'The representative who came to say that the delegates of the club might enter the Hall of Conference was citizen Xavier Durrieu.'—Raspail: 'I knew it was some one who had authority.'—The Procureur-General: 'M. Durrieu is called as a witness.'

The accused Courtais energetically defended himself from the accusation of having betrayed his duty. The court rose at six o'clock.

Saturday, March 10.—The court sat at half-past ten. The President desired the witnesses to be called.—M. Dagueaux, restaurateur, went to the house of Doulais on the 12th of May, and there learned that a resolution had been come to to make a manifestation on the 15th, to carry to the Assembly a petition in favour of Poland. Had known some of the accused a long time, and particularly Blanqui, having been at his club in 1831.—M Bourquet confirmed the above witness.—M. Bandurau, civil engineer, said that in the central club, of which he was the vice-president, a resolution was come to to make a manifestation in favour of Poland on the 15th of May. That this manifestation was to be pacific, and respectful to the Assembly. That some men who were at the head of the *cortege* on the bridge at once changed its character. He went into the hall of the Assembly, and there saw Blanqui at the tribune. He then quitted the Assembly, and went instinctively to the house of Sobrier, in the Rue Rivoli, to obtain some information on the affair, but did not find him at home.—M. Dautriche made a long and remarkable statement of occurrences at which he happened to be present. He was driven by the crowd almost to the court of the Assembly, where he saw Barbes, Louis Blanc, and Albert round a large flag addressing the people.—At this, Barbes rose and defended Louis Blanc, assuming himself all the responsibility of the address attributed to Louis Blanc.—M. Bertroylid, a commissary of police, knew the greater part of the accused. He arrested some of them. On the 15th of May he made a search at the house of Villani, where he seized many plans of machines.—Villani said those plans had no relation to political plots, and claimed their restoration.—M. Douet, a commissary of police, also made a deposition, but containing no facts of importance.—M. Yon, commissary of police, was called, but was absent.—M. Dupin, tailor, gave a statement of the occurrences of the 15th of May. He could not identify any of the prisoners, not even Raspail, whom he described as having worn on that day coloured pantaloons.—Raspail denied this, saying he never wore other than black.—M. Sanieski, a Polish refugee, said that on the 14th of May he had been solicited to take part in the manifestation, and that he refused, saying it could only injure their cause.—The court rose at six o'clock.

Monday, March 12.—The proceedings in the High Court of Justice, were resumed at half-past 12 o'clock. The witnesses for the prosecution examined were Joseph Alceste, Pierre Hyppolyte, and La Grange. Ernest Eugoin was also called on, but he declined giving his evidence, which he alleged he could not consistently do before the High Court, inasmuch as he considered its creation a violation of the Constitution. He was fined 100f., and his previous evidence before the examining magistrate put in and read. Dufrey, a secretary of the Assembly; M. Yon, Commissary of Police; and M. Buchez, ex-President of the Chamber, were subsequently examined for the prosecution. The Court adjourned at six o'clock.

Tuesday, March 13.—The proceedings were resumed at half-past ten o'clock. The tribunes were still more crowded than the day before, and the interest seemed to increase. The witnesses called and examined for the prosecution yesterday were MM. Buchez, ex-President of the National Assembly, Etienne Arago, General Tampoure, Eugene Picard Delacour, Chef de Batailon of the 5th Legion of the National Guard of Paris; De Ballerouche d'Adam, and Beaumont, Commandant of the Hotel de Ville on the 15th of May. The Court adjourned at six o'clock.

Wednesday, March 14.—In the commencement of the judicial proceedings at Bourges yesterday, which were resumed at half-past ten o'clock with a very crowded court, the prisoner Raspail handed in a written protest against the discrepancies of the report published by the *Moniteur* of the sitting of the National Assembly on the 15th of May, and the insertion of expressions about the pillage of Paris, which it was proved by several witnesses had not been uttered. He demanded that the author of the calumny should be punished.—The Court retired to deliberate on the incidents, and in a few minutes gave its decision—that as the words said to have been uttered had not been attributed to Raspail or any of the prisoners, it was irrelevant to the affair. The conclusions of Raspail were therefore rejected.—Several witnesses for the prosecution were then examined, after which the Court adjourned.

Trial and Acquittal of the Editor of 'The People.'—The editor of *Le People* was tried before the Court of Assize of Paris on Wednesday week, for having published, on the 2nd of January, an article 'calculated to excite the hatred of the people against the government and against each other.' The jury remained about twenty minutes in deliberation, and when they returned delivered a verdict of 'Not Guilty.' The audience cried out, on hearing the verdict, 'Vive le Jury! Vive la Republique!' The President immediately ordered the court to be cleared.

The Forthcoming Elections.—The *Courrier Francais* says:—'The democratic and social party has already made out its list of candidates for the elections of the Seine. The following, we are assured, is its composition:—MM. Ledru Rollin, Lagrange, Lamennais, Felix Pyat, Caussidiere, Kersausie, Albert, Barbes, Louis Blanc, Baune, Dupoty, Martin Bernard, Perdiguier, Lacambre, D'Alton Shee, Proudhon, Pierre Lerroux, Greppo, Raspail, Cabet, Esquiros, P. Dupont, Nadaud, Toussenel, Thomassin, Lachambaudie, Thore, and Pierre Vingard.'

The Red Republic.—A Socialist family banquet, given by the inhabitants of the 11th arrondissement, took place on Sunday at the Barriere de Sevres. Seven hundred persons, including a few women and children, attended. The company principally consisted of the leaders of the late clubs and chiefs of the Socialist party. M. Joly was the only member of the Mountain present. He made a speech, and repeated that the Socialist banquet of the non-commissioned officers did take place. A commissary of police demanded admission by virtue of the law of 1790 and the decree of the Assembly of the 28th of July last. He was refused on the plea that it was a family party, and not a club. He took a note of this 'violation of the law,' and retired.

More Persecution.—The *Peuple* states, that a few days ago fifteen' 'non-commissioned officers' were committed to the military prison of the Abbaye for having attended a Socialist banquet. It adds, that before they entered the prison, they cried, *several times*, 'Vive la Republique Democratique et Sociale.'

M. Delecluze the editor of *La Revolution Democratique et Sociale*, was tried and convicted in Paris on Monday last, for articles calculated to excite hatred against General Cavaignac and the National Assembly. He was sentenced to imprisonment for one year, and to pay a fine of 1,000f.

The War against the Bonnet Rouge.—The warfare against the Phrygian caps, 'those glorious emblems of liberty,' as *La Reforme* terms them, continues as determined as ever. It appears that the centimes hitherto issued were cast in the old mould of Dupre, which represents the head of the Republic covered with a Phrygian cap. Orders are said to have been given to remove from the coin that revolutionary emblem.—*Times.*

Some disturbances took place at Blois on the 5th instant, in consequence of the removal by the police of a *bonnet rouge* from a tree of liberty. The *rappel* was beaten, and the National Guard having taken arms, tranquillity was promptly restored.

Letters from Carpentios, in the department of the Vaucluse; from Bartantarne, in the Bouches du Rhone; and from Beyies, in the Herault, mention that disturbances of rather a serious nature took place there on the 3rd and 4th instant, in consequence of an attack made by the Red Republicans on the Moderate party. The authorities finally restored order after some persons had been wounded.

THE IMPERIAL APE.

La Liberte states that M. Odillon Barrot assured a friend, some days since, that the President of the Republic has renounced all the financial and social reforms, the senseless Utopia, and impossible doctrines which are to be found in the various works composed by him during his captivity. *La Liberte* is of opinion that M. Odillon Barrot, in saying so, calumniated the President.—[We are the other way of thinking. The '*Extinction of Pauperism*' was not written *by*, but *for* Mister Louis Napoleon, for a purpose which now being achieved the paupers may go to the devil for what the ex-'special' cares. —*Ed. N. S.*]

The Way to Promote the 'Extinction of Pauperism'!—A tumultuous scene took place in the Assembly on Monday, on the subject of the demand made by the Minister of Finance for an additional allowance of 600,000 francs a year to the President of the Republic, to cover the expenses of his public receptions and entertainments. The uproar excited among the party of the Mountain was prodigious. After much uproar the point was carried by a majority of 77.

Miscellaneous.—The Polish Count Lamoyaki left Paris on Friday last for Turin, with forty two of the most experienced officers of the old Polish army. M. Marbrart, a member of the Hungarian Diet, has arrived in Paris. He is said to be charged with a special mission from Kossuth and the Chiefs of the Magyar party. He is to proceed from Paris to England. The appeal of the five persons condemned to death for the murder of General de Brea and his aide-de-camp, Captain Mangin, was yesterday rejected by the Court of Cassation. The application for mercy is now before the Minister of Justice, and will be laid by him before the President of the Republic.

Hardy, a private in the 4th Regiment of the Line, was sentenced to death by court-martial in Paris on Monday for having struck a sergeant of his company.

THE 'HOLY ALLIANCE' AGAINST ITALY.

Paris, Monday.—The only news given by the Paris papers of this morning is contained in a letter from Toulon, from which it appears that the French Government has renewed its intention of sending an armed expedition to the assistance of his Holiness the Pope. For some time past it has been the evident intention of the Catholic powers that a joint intervention should take place in favour of his Holiness, and this expedition will co-operate by sea, while the Neapolitan and Austrian forces, which have been for the last fortnight on the Roman frontier, will attack by land.

ITALY.

The Roman Republic.—The *Contemporaneo* of the 28th ult. announces that M. Mazzini was proclaimed member of the Roman Constituent Assembly on the 27th. On the same day that assembly adopted the law on judiciary organisation which abolished all privileged jurisdictions, suppressed the ecclesiastical tribunals, and established at Rome a Court of Appeal and a Court of Cassation. The Assembly next voted by acclamation a project of decree abolishing the Holy Office (the Inquisition) and decided that a pillar should be erected on the site of the palace where it had been installed. The Minister of Finance had ordered, under the severest penalties, the deposit in the Treasury of all the funds accruing from mortmain property, which, by a decision of the Constituent Assembly of the 21st ult., were to be applied to the urgent wants of the country. Eight days only were allowed to effect that payment. It was reported that an engagement had taken place at Epitaffio, on the 24th, between the Roman and Neapolitan advanced posts, the particulars of which were not known.

The *Epoca* of Rome states that 4,000 Greeks, now in Epirus, ready armed and disciplined, have offered their services to the Roman Republic.

Tuscany.—The *Alba* of the 2nd inst. announces that the Tuscans were in possession of the important defile of Correto, and that the troops of Este still remained at Castelnuovo-dei-Monti. No military movements towards the frontier of Tuscany were observable in the Duchy of Modena.

Naples and Sicily.—On the 26th ult., MM. Temple and Rayneval, and Admirals Parker and Baudin, went to Gaeta to settle with the King the *ultimatum* to be offered to the Sicilians, on the refusal of which the mediating powers would retire, and leave the parties to act for themselves.

The following were the conditions submitted to the King:—A general amnesty, excepting thirty leaders of the revolution, who were to receive passports; the constitution of 1812, modified; one army only, with a Sicilian contingent; independent parliament; finances, municipalities, and tribunals; lieutenant to be named by the King, either a prince-royal or a Sicilian. The head of the household, the foreign affairs, war, and marine, to depend on the King; a contribution of four millions of arrears, and one million of war indemnity to be made.

The following letter from Naples, dated the 27th ult., appears in the *Gazette du Midi*:—'I have only a moment to announce to you the pacific conclusion of the affairs of Sicily. The Sicilians return to their allegiance to Ferdinand II., who accords them a full and complete amnesty and the constitution of 1812, with the modifications required by the present times. The day after to-morrow the French and English squadrons will take their departure for Palermo, where they are to instal the lieutenant-general and all the king's government.'

[We advise our readers, before accepting the above as gospel truth, to wait a little longer, and ascertain for themselves what the Sicilians have to say to these arrangements.]

Anticipated Renewal of the War in Lombardy.—The address of the Chamber of Deputies of Turin, in answer to a speech from the throne, was presented to the king on the 5th instant. Both the address and the royal answer expressed a firm determination to resume the war. Preparations for re-opening the campaign are in active progress. Minister Buffa has published an energetic proclamation, inviting the Genoese to enrol themselves, and great numbers of horses are being bought up in Switzerland for the Piedmontese army.

A letter, dated Paris, Sunday evening, says:—'The accounts received from Turin to-day are of the most warlike description. Active preparations are making for a new campaign, and troops are flocking to the frontiers of Lombardy. Several corps of artillery, which were stationed at Turin and other places in the interior, have also been despatched to Novarre and Mortara. The rumour is current to-day, that hostilities have actually commenced between the Piedmontese and the Austrians; but this is not likely, as the attack must come from the side of the Piedmontese, and we have not yet heard of their crossing the Tessino. The general impression appears, however, to be that hostilities cannot be much longer delayed.'

Letters from Turin, of the 7th instant, received in Paris to-day, announce that the King had appointed M. Ratazzi, late Minister of the Interior, to be Minister-at-War. It may be recollected that it was he who, in opposition to M. Gioberti, proposed to recognise the Republics of Rome and of Tuscany. Charles Albert is said to have declared, on a late occasion, that he would rather die on the field of battle, with a *bonnet rouge* on his head, than to remain in exile wearing a diadem. [We have not much faith in you, Charlie; but if you stick to that you will do.]

Paris, Tuesday, 6. p. m.—Reported Recommencement of War between Austria and Sardinia.—News has reached Paris this day, by telegraph, that war has recommenced between Austria and Sardinia. A modification has taken place in the Piedmontese Ministry. Great excitement prevailed at Turin. Crowds paraded the streets, shouting, 'War, war! Lead us against the Austrians.'

THE WAR IN HUNGARY.

(From the correspondent of the *Times*.)

Vienna, March 5.—Since the 26th bulletin we have received no further official news from the headquarters of Prince Windischgratz, and this silence makes people here afraid that matters are not going on so favourably for the Austrian arms as could be wished.

Although our bulletins are quite silent as to the strength of the Hungarian army which took the field on the 26th and 27th of February, as well as to the names of its commanders, there is every reason to suppose that it amounted to 45,000 men, under the supreme command of General Dembinski.

SPAIN.

The *Fomento* of Barcelona, of the 6th, publishes a proclamation addressed by Cabrera to the insurgents of Catalonia, in which he announces his resumption of the command, thanks them for their efforts, states that Navarre, the Basque provinces, Gallicia, and Austria second them, and that Aragon and Valentia will imitate them. He adds, that the King (Count de Mortemolin) promises institutions in harmony with the spirit of the times, and will support his promises by the sword.

MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS CONNECTED WITH THE ARMY AND NAVY WHO VOTED AGAINST MR. COBDEN'S MOTION.

T. N. Abdy, son of a captain in the navy, by the daughter of an admiral.
Hon. George Anson, a colonel in the army, and clerk of the Ordnance.
Viscount Anson, a captain of yeomanry cavalry.
Hon. Hugh Arbuthnott, a lieutenant-general and clothing colonel in the army.
E. M. Archdale, a captain in the dragoons, on half-pay, unattached.
Earl of Arundel, has been an officer in the Royal Horse Guards.
H. J. Baillie, son of a colonel in the army.
T. Bennet, a captain of yeomanry.
William Beresford, formerly a major in the army.
C. L. G. Berkeley, son of an admiral, and himself formerly a captain of foot.
Hon. Grantley Berkeley, a lieutenant in the army.
Ralph Bernal, married the daughter of a surgeon in the navy.
S. W. Blackall, son of a major in the army, and himself a major.
H. G. Boldero, has been clerk of the Ordnance.
R. S. Bourke, married the daughter of a colonel in the army.
W. Bowles, a rear-admiral, has been a Lord of the Admiralty.
T. W. Bramston, married the daughter of an admiral.
T. Brand, son of a lieutenant-general.
Lord Brooke, a lieutenant-colonel of yeomanry.
Sir A. B. Brooke, married the daughter of a general, and has several brothers in the army.
Lord John Chichester, has been a captain in the army.
Hon. C. Clements, has been a captain in the army.
Sir George Clerk, has been a Lord of the Admiralty.
Hon. R. H. Clive, has been a lieutenant-colonel in the army, and is a colonel of yeomanry.
Hon. W. F. Cowper, married the daughter of an admiral, has been a lieutenant in the Horse Guards.
William Cubitt, has served in the navy.
H. Currie, married the daughter of a colonel in the Grenadier Guards.
Sir H. R. F. Davie, a colonel in the army.
D. A. S. Davies, married the daughter of a colonel in the army.
W. Dedes, a major-commandant of yeomanry cavalry.
Q. Dick, lieutenant-colonel in the North Essex Militia.
J. W. Dod, captain-commandant of yeomanry cavalry.
Sir J. T. B. Duckworth, son of an admiral, himself a major of yeomanry cavalry.
G. S. Duff, son of a general.
Sir J. W. D. Dundas, a rear-admiral of the white and Lord of the Admiralty.
G. Dundas, grandson of an admiral, himself formerly an officer in the Rifle Brigade.
F. P. Dunne, son of a general, himself a major in the army and lieutenant-colonel of militia.
H. Edwards, a captain of yeomanry cavalry.
Right Hon. E. Ellice, married the widow of a captain in the navy.
Hon. J. E. Elliott, his relations swarm in the navy.
Viscount Emlyn, son of a general, married to the daughter of a general, himself a captain in the army.
R. Ferguson, son of a general, himself a lieutenant colonel in the army.
Hon. J. W. Fitzpatrick, "related to General Fitzpatrick," was himself formerly in the army.
Hon. G. C. Forester, a captain in the Horse Guards.
S. C. Fortescue, son of a lieut.-col. in the army.
R. M. Fox, married the daughter and grand-daughter of admirals.
A. E. Fuller, married grand-daughter of a general.
E. S. Gooch, has been a captain in the army.
Hon. W. Gordon, a rear-admiral of the blue, has been a Lord of the Admiralty.
Sir J. Graham, has been a Lord of the Admiralty.
Sir G. Grey, son of the late resident commissioner of Portsmouth Dockyard.
Hon. E. J. Harris, is captain in the navy.
Lord John Hay, a captain in the navy and Lord of the Admiralty.
Right Hon. W. G. Hayter, Judge Advocate.
Right Hon. S. Herbert, married the daughter of a major-general.
Right Hon. J. C. Herries, son of a colonel and brother of a major-general.
Lord A. Hervey, married the daughter of a lieut.-colonel.
T. L. Hodges, formerly colonel of militia.
Sir A. Hood, son of a captain in the navy and nephew of an admiral.
Sir J. Hope, colonel of yeomanry cavalry.
Lord Hotham, a colonel in the army.
Hon. E. Howard, a captain in the navy.
Sir W. G. H. Jolliffe, has a brother a lieutenant of dragoons; had an uncle a lieutenant in the navy.
Theobald Jones, a captain in the navy.
Hon. T. G. Keppel, a lieut.-colonel in the army.
Marquis of Kildare, has a brother a lieutenant in the Scots Fusileer Guards, and an aunt married to a general officer.
Hon. W. S. S. Lascelles, brother to the colonel of the Yorkshire Hussar Yeomanry; has a nephew in the Grenadier Guards.
G. C. Legh, married a niece of Lieut.-Gen. Sir Herbert Taylor.
Sir T. F. Lewis, has been lieut.-col. of local militia, grandson of an admiral.
G. C. Lewis, son of the preceding.
Earl of Lincoln, has two brothers in the Life Guards, and aunt married to a general officer, &c., &c.
Hon. James Lindsay, a lieut.-col. in the army.
H. Lowther, is a lieutenant in the Guards, and son of a colonel in the army.
W. N. Macnamara, a colonel of militia.
Viscount Mandeville, a captain in the Grenadier Guards.
Lord Mahon, married the daughter of a lieutenant-general.
Lord George Manners, a captain in the Royal Horse Guards.
Thomas Matheson, a colonel on half-pay.
Hon. Fox Maule, held a commission in the 79th Highlanders 12 years, is Secretary at War.
Hon. J. T. Maxwell, a captain in the army.
Viscount Melgund, married the daughter of a general.
P. W. S. Miles, married a daughter of Major-General Sir William Napier.
Sir W. Morrison, a major-general in the East India Company's service.
Hon. E. W. M. Lloyd, has a cousin an officer in the navy.
Earl of Mulgrave, a lieutenant in the Guards, and a major of militia.
Viscount Newport, has one uncle a captain in the navy, and another a captain in the army.
Lord Norreys, has a brother an officer in the Life Guards.
Sir D. Norreys, son of a lieut.-col. in the army.
Sir P. Nugent, son of a commander in the navy.
Lord Ossulston, has an uncle a captain in the navy.
Sir John Owen has a son a colonel in the army.
Lord Clarence Paget, a captain in the navy, son and secretary to the Master-General of the Ordnance.
Lord George Paget, a lieut.-colonel of dragoons, son of the Master-General of the Ordnance.
Lord Palmerston, lieut.-colonel of the Hampshire militia.
John Parker, has been secretary to the Admiralty.
J. W. Patten, a colonel of militia.
Sir Robert Peel, married a daughter of a general, has a brother a colonel in the army.
Jonathan Peel, brother of the preceding, a colonel in the army, and has been Surveyor-General of the Ordnance.
Hon. E. G. D. Pennant, a colonel in the army.
Sir R. Pigot, son of a general, is further connected with the army through the marriage of his daughter to one of the Fitzroys.
W. Penney, a captain of yeomanry cavalry.
D. Pugh, a major of yeomanry cavalry.
G. A. Reid, was colonel in the Life Guards.
E. R. Rice, a captain of yeomanry cavalry.
Henry Rich, son of an admiral.
G. Rushout, a captain in the Life Guards.
Lord John Russell, has four brothers in the army, three in the navy, a nephew in the army, a cousin in the navy, &c. &c. &c. &c.

Poetry.

RETRIBUTION!

(*Vide* the accounts, in the daily papers, of a late "disastrous triumph" (!) in the Punjaub, and the critical position of the *victors.*)

(From Campbell's "*Pleasures of Hope.*")

When Europe sought your subject realms to gain,
And stretched her giant-sceptre o'er the main,
Taught her proud barks the winding way to shape,
And braved the stormy spirit of the Cape;
Children of Brama; then was mercy nigh,
To wash the stain of blood's eternal dye?
Did Peace descend to triumph and to save,
When freeborn (?) Britons cross'd the Indian wave?
Ah, no!—*to more than Rome's ambition true,*
The nurse of Freedom gave it not to you!
She the bold route of Europe's guilt began,
And in the march of nations led the van!
Rich in the gems of India's gaudy zone,
And plunder pil'd from kingdoms not their own—
Degenerate trade! thy minions could despise
The heart-born anguish of a thousand cries;
Could lock, with impious hands, the teeming store,
While famished nations died along the shore;*
Could mock the groans of fellow-men and bear
The curse of kingdoms peopled with despair;
Could stamp disgrace on man's polluted name,
And barter, with their gold, eternal shame?
But hark! as bow'd to earth the Bramin kneels,
From heavenly climes propitious thunder peals!
Of India's fate her guardian spirits tell,
Prophetic murmurs breathing on the spell,
And solemn sounds that awe the listening mind,
Roll on the azure paths of every wind.
"Foes of mankind (her guardian spirits say),
Revolving ages bring the bitter day,
When Heaven's unerring arm shall fall on you,
And blood for blood these Indian plains bedew;
Nine times have Brama's wheels of lightning hurl'd
His awful presence o'er the alarmed world;†
Nine times hath Guilt, through all his giant frame,
Convulsive trembled as the Mighty came;
Nine times hath suffering Mercy spar'd in vain—
But Heaven shall burst her starry gates again!
He comes! dread Brama shakes the sunless sky
With murm'ring wrath, and thunders from on high!
Heaven's fiery horse, beneath his warrior form,
Paws the light clouds, and gallops on the storm!
Wide waves his flickering sword; his bright arms glow
Like summer suns, and light the world below!
Earth, and her trembling isles in Ocean's bed,
Are shook; and Nature rocks beneath his tread!
* * * *
To pour redress on India's injured realm,
The oppressor to dethrone, the proud to whelm;
To chase destruction from her plundered shore
With arts and arms that triumphed once before,
The tenth Avatar comes! at Heaven's command,
Shall Seriswatter wave her hallowed wand!
And Camdes bright and Ganesa sublime,
Shall bless with joy their own propitious clime!
Come Heavenly Power! primeval peace restore!
Love! Mercy! Wisdom!—rule for evermore!

CAMPBELL.

* *While famished nations died along the shore.* The following account of British conduct, and its consequences in Bengal, will afford a sufficient idea of the fact alluded to in this passage. After describing the monopoly of salt, bitel nut, and tobacco, the historian proceeds thus:—"Money in this current came only in drops; it could not quench the thirst of those who waited in India to receive it. An expedient, such as it was, remained to quicken its pace. The natives could live with little salt, but could not want food. Some of the agents saw themselves well situated for collecting the rice into stores—they did so. They knew the Gentoos would rather die than violate the principles of their religion by eating flesh. The alternative would, therefore, be giving what they had, or dying. The inhabitants sunk; they that cultivated the land, and saw the harvest at the disposal of others planted in doubt—scarcity ensued. Then the monopoly was easier managed—sickness ensued. In several districts the languid living left the bodies of their numerous dead unburied."—*Short History of the English Transactions in the East Indies*, page 145.

† *Nine times have Brama's wheels, &c.* Among the sublime fictions of the Hindoo mythology, it is one article of belief, that the Deity, Brama, has descended nine times upon the world in various forms, and that he is yet to appear a tenth time, in the figure of a warrior, upon a white horse, to cut off all incorrigible offenders. "Avatar" is the word used to express his descent. [The Sikhs are not orthodox followers of Brama and his kindred deities, their religion being more akin to that promulgated by him of Mecca, Carlyle's "true prophet;" but the late events in the region of the five rivers, may, nevertheless, prove "the voice of one crying in the wilderness." And the sooner the real Simon Pure shows his bronze visage (for black men's gods are of the colour of white men's devils, and *vice versâ*) the better for humanity.

A FRATERNAL DEMOCRAT.]

Dumfries, March 6th, 1849.

Review.

THE AUTOBIOGRAPHY OF FRANCOIS-RENE, VISCOUNT DE CHATEAUBRIAND. Volume 1. London: SIMMS and M'INTYRE, Paternoster-row.

[*Second Notice.*]

The charge of egotism is too generally levelled at men who write their own memoirs. If an author takes himself for his subject, how can he avoid continually speaking of himself? The critic who expects anything else is a fool. Certainly, there are two ways of speaking of one's self—a modest and a boastful way. We can conceive a man writing his autobiography and not one tinge of egotism shading his story, but we admit that autobiographies of that kind are not to be met with every day. Disinclined as we are to raise the cry of "egotist," we must acknowledge that CHATEAUBRIAND seems to have had no ordinary conceit of himself, and he takes care to let his readers know it. In describing his indifference to the great revolution of 1789, he says, "*I attached no importance to the questions then discussed*, except as viewed in their general relation to liberty, and the dignity of human nature." This is a large exception, an exception which should have made him attach the utmost importance to the questions then discussed. But he goes on:—"Personal politics wearied me. *My true atmosphere was in loftier regions!*" O! the vanity of some men! His true atmosphere was in regions loftier than those occupied by all the genius—well or ill-directed—of France—occupied by a ROBESPIERRE and a MIRABEAU!!! We could cull a hundred similar samples of the autobiographist's overweening vanity from these pages.

But we will do him justice. His egotism seems to have been unaccompanied by haughtiness, or any offensive outward exhibition of the worship of self. That worship was an inward adoration, which, probably, is now for the first time fully revealed. It will be seen in an extract we purpose quoting, that, when Ambassador in London, he was wearied and disgusted with the incense of *flunkeydom*, and happiest when he could quit his carriage to walk with "King Mob," or be relieved from the attendance of all his servants, even though left to open his own door himself! This exhibits his personal demeanour in a most pleasing light, and contrasts, oddly enough, with his undoubted, self-proclaimed vanity.

Like most men who do themselves more than justice, CHATEAUBRIAND, in spite of his possession of a feeling heart, is not free from the charge of being occasionally unjust to others. He says:—"In vain does ROUSSEAU tell us that he had two charming little eyes; it is not the less certain—witness his portraits—that he had the air of a schoolmaster, or of a morose shoemaker." We beg to say that our portrait of ROUSSEAU gives a flat denial to CHATEAUBRIAND'S assertion. We, however, place small reliance on the evidence of portraits, which almost always either flatter or caricature the original. But even though the portraits of ROUSSEAU universally confirmed CHATEAUBRIAND'S not very flattering pen-and-ink picture of the great philosopher, our autobiographist should have borne in mind that portraits of ROUSSEAU were taken only after he had become famous—after he had lost his youth—and after persecution and unhappiness had made his physiognomy the outward portrait of the tempest-tost man within. When ROUSSEAU wrote his "Confessions," and described himself as possessing "two charming little eyes," he was describing himself not as he then appeared, but as he was in his youth, when he captivated the heart of Madame de WARENS, and Madame N——, and turned the heads of nearly all the girls of his acquaintance. In love matters to the full as bashful and silly as CHATEAUBRIAND himself, ROUSSEAU was, nevertheless, carried by storm by his female admirers. Would that have happened had he had "the air of a schoolmaster, or of a morose shoemaker?" ROUSSEAU, though a long way off being faultless, was not vain, and in his extraordinary memoirs has said but little of his own personal appearance; but we would wager a trifle that could we summon before us the shades of both himself and his critic, and compare both at the same youthful age, justice would bid us award the palm not to the Breton, but to the Genevese.

CHATEAUBRIAND, viewed as a politician must be pronounced contemptible. His glances at the Revolution show him in the light of a prejudiced aristocrat, utterly incapable of tracing that tremendous effect to its causes. So far as he witnessed the Revolution he saw nothing but the phantasmagoric movements of a grim and gory mob. On the memoorable "5th of October" he could see nothing but "filthy fishwomen," "pickpockets," "prostitutes," "*bacchantes*," "rag-gatherers," "butchers with their bloody aprons tied before them," and "swarthy ourang-outangs," surrounding the Royal Family on their way from Versailles to the Tuileries. Supposing no exaggeration in all this, these creatures were not manufactured by the Revolution; they had been made what the Revolution found them—ignorant, brutalised, and desperate—by that venerable system of which CHATEAUBRIAND was so devoted an admirer. Governments, priesthoods, and aristocracies brutalise the masses, and drive them mad, and then pretend to be horror-struck at the work of their hands. The pickpockets, prostitutes, &c., described with such disgust by CHATEAUBRIAND, never offended him or his order, as long as they were content to live and die quietly under the rule of that system which doomed them to misery and crime. Not the people, but kings, priests, and profitmongers, are answerable for all the "horrors" of the French Revolution.

The following chapter is worth reading, although we must warn the reader not to swallow all CHATEAUBRIAND'S big words: exaggeration is a sin with which he is fairly chargeable.

MIRABEAU.

A sharer by the disorders and the vicissitudes of his life in the greatest events, and connected with the existence of culprits, ravishers, and adventurers, Mirabeau, the tribune of the aristocracy, and the deputy of the democracy, had in his nature something of Gracchus and Don Juan, of Catiline and Guzman D'Alfrache, of Cardinal de Richelieu and Cardinal de Retz, of the *roué* of the Regency and of the savage of the Revolution. Besides this, he had something of *the Mirabeaus*, a Florentine family who had been exiled from their native country, and who retained some characteristics of those armed palaces and those grand factions celebrated by Dante, a family naturalised in France, and in which the republican spirit of the middle ages of Italy, and the feudal spirit of our own middle ages, were united in a succession of extraordinary men.

The ugliness of Mirabeau, overlaid on the groundwork of the peculiar beauty of his race, produced a sort of powerful face like those of the "Last Judgment" of Michael Angelo, the compatriot of the Arrighetti. The seams furrowed by the small-pox in the features of the orator had rather the appearance of scars left by the flames. Nature seemed to have moulded his head for empire or for the gibbet, and formed his arms to strangle a nation or to carry off a woman. When he shook his mane and glared at the populace, he arrested their progress; when he raised his paw and showed his claws, the people rushed on in fury. Amidst the frightful disorders of a sitting I have seen him at the tribuno, sombre, ugly, and motionless; he reminded one of the Chaos of Milton, impassible and without form, brooding in the centre of its own confusion.

Mirabeau resembled his father and his uncle, who, like St. Simon, wrote immortal pages to the devil. He was sometimes furnished with discourses for the tribune. He took from them what his mind could amalgamate with its own nature. If he adopted them entirely he pronounced them badly; one could perceive that they were not his own by words which he interspersed here and there, and which revealed their origin. He drew his energy from his vices. These vices have not their birth in a frigid temperament; they are the offspring of deep, burning, stormy passion. A rudeness and brutality of manners, by annihilating all moral sense, introduces into society a species of barbarians. These barbarians of civilisation, skilled in destruction like the Goths, have not, like them, the power of founding other structures. The latter were the huge children of a virgin nature—the former are the monstrous abortions of the same nature when depraved.

Twice I met Mirabeau at a banquet; on the first occasion at the house of Voltaire's niece, the Marchioness de Vilette, and on the second occasion at the Palais Royal, along with some deputies of the opposition, to whom Chapelier had introduced me. Chapelier went to the scaffold in the same tumbril as my brother and M. de Malesherbes.

Mirabeau spoke much, and above all, much about himself. This cub of a lion race—a lion himself with the head of a Chimera—this man, so positive in facts, was all romance, all poetry, all enthusiasm, in imagination and language. You could recognise in him the lover of Sophia, lofty in his sentiments, and capable of any sacrifice. "I found her," said he, "that adorable woman—I learned to know what her soul was—that soul formed by the hands of nature in a moment of magnificence."

Mirabeau enchanted me with tales of love, with longings after retirement, with which he relieved and varied our dry discussions. He interested me also in another point of view. Like me he had been severely treated by his father, who had retained, as mine had done, the inflexible traditions of absolute parental authority.

The great guest launched out on foreign, but said almost nothing respecting domestic, politics. Nevertheless it was the latter which occupied his thoughts. He allowed a few words to escape him of sovereign contempt for those men who proclaimed themselves superior, by reason of the indifference which they affected for misfortunes and crimes. Mirabeau was born with a generous disposition, sensible to friendship, and ready to pardon offences. Notwithstanding his immorality, he never succeeded in stifling his conscience. He was corrupted only as regards himself. His upright and firm intellect never could view murder in the light of a lofty stretch of intellect. He had no admiration for slaughter-houses and receptacles of offal.

Nevertheless, Mirabeau did not want for pride; he boasted outrageously. Although he had got himself appointed a woollen-draper for the purpose of being elected by the third estate, the order of the noblesse having had the honourable madness to reject him, he was proud of his birth: "*A wild and untameable bird, whose nest was perched between four turrets*," is his father's expression. He never forgot that he had been presented at court, ridden in the king's carriages, and hunted with his Majesty. He required that he should be distinguished by the title of count. He was particular as to his colours, and clad his retainers in livery when every one else left it off. He spoke on all occasions, and on no occasion, about his *relative*, the Admiral de Coligny. The MONITEUR having called him "Riqueti," "Do you know," said he angrily to the journalist, "that with your Riqueti you have puzzled Europe during three days." He repeated often the following impudent pleasantry which is so well known:—"In any other family my brother the Viscount would be the man of wit and the rake; in my family he is the fool and the upright man." Biographers represent the Viscount as intending by his speech to compare himself in humility with the other members of his family.

At bottom, M. Mirabeau was a monarchist, and he left on record the following noble saying:—"I wished to cure the French of their superstition for monarchy, and to substitute in its place a proper worship." In another letter, intended to be seen by Louis XVI., he wrote thus, "I was unwilling to have laboured solely for a vast destruction." Nevertheless that is what he did. Heaven, to punish us for our talents ill employed, afflicts us with remorse for our success.

Mirabeau moved public opinion with two levers. On the one side he took as his fulcrum the masses, whose defender he had constituted himself whilst despising them. On the other, although a traitor to his order, he retained its sympathy by affinities of caste and ties of common interest. That could never happen with a plebeian who should make himself the champion of the privileged classes. He would be abandoned by his own party without gaining the aristocracy, which is in its nature ungrateful, and not to be won by any who is not born in its ranks. Moreover, aristocracy cannot make a nobleman on the spur of the moment, since nobility is the result of time.

Mirabeau has had many imitators. By freeing themselves from the ties of morality, people fancied that they were transforming themselves into statesmen. These imitations produced only petty villains. He who flatters himself that he is corrupted and a robber, is only a debauchee and a scoundrel. He who thinks himself vicious is only vile; he who boasts that he is criminal is only infamous.

Too soon for himself, too late for it, Mirabeau sold himself to the court, and the court bought him. He staked his renown against a pension and an embassy. Cromwell was on the point of bartering his future glory for a title and the order of the Garter. Notwithstanding his pride, Mirabeau did not value himself highly enough. In the present day, when the abundance of money and of places has raised the price of consciences, there is not a common jackanapes whose acquisition does not cost hundreds of thousands of francs, and the first honours of the state. The grave freed Mirabeau from his promises, and placed him out of the reach of perils which most probably he could not have overcome. His life would have shown his weakness as regards good. His death has left him in possession of his power for doing evil.

On leaving the dinner-table a discussion arose respecting the enemies of Mirabeau. I was placed next him, and had not uttered a single word. He looked me in the face with his eyes so expressive of pride, of vice, and of genius, and pressing his hand on my shoulder, he said to me, "They will never pardon me for my superiority!" I still fancy I feel the impress of that hand, as if satan had touched me with his fiery claw.

When Mirabeau fixed his gaze on the young mute, had he a presentiment of my future fate? Did he ever think he would one day appear before the tribunal of my recollections? I was destined to become the historian of high personages. They have defiled past before me without my having clung to their mantle and been drawn by them down to posterity.

Mirabeau has already undergone the metamorphosis which takes place in those whose memory is to live after them. Carried from the Pantheon to the gutter, and back again from the gutter to the Pantheon, he is elevated by the lapse of time, which serves him at the present day as a pedestal. People no longer see the real Mirabeau, but the ideal Mirabeau; Mirabeau, such as he was drawn by painters to express the symbol or the myth of the epoch which he represented. He thus becomes more false and more true than the reality. Of so many reputations, so many actors, so many events, so many vices, there remain but three men, each attached to one of the three great revolutionary epochs,—Mirabeau to the aristocracy, Robespierre to the democracy, Bonaparte to despotism. Monarchy has none! France has paid dearly for the three renowns which virtue cannot claim as her own.

We must correct CHATEAUBRIAND. Virtue *does* claim the renown of ROBESPIERRE as her own; and thousands of his and her followers are ready to back her claim.

In 1791, CHATEAUBRIAND left France for the United States, influenced by the mad idea of discovering, by some sort of an overland expedition, *the north-west passage*. *Arrived in* the States, a letter of introduction, procured him admission to WASHINGTON, with whom he dined. He is amongst the Indians of the Northern States of the Union when this volume closes.

The Prologue to Book II. (devoted to an account of CHATEAUBRIAND'S voyage to, and travels in, the United States) written in London, April, 1822, is, to our fancy, the most charming bit in the volume. Here it is:—

POWER AND OBSCURITY.

Thirty-one years after I had embarked a simple sub-lieutenant for America, I embarked for London with a passport couched in the following terms:—"Permit," said this pasport, "his Lordship the Viscount de Chateaubriand, peer of France, Ambassador of the king to his Britannic Majesty, &c.. &c. to pass." No description of my person. My greatness was to make my features known in all places. A steam-vessel, chartered for myself alone, carried me from Calais to Dover. On placing my foot upon the English soil, on the 5th of April, 1822, I was saluted by the cannon of the fort. An officer arrived, sent by the commandant to offer me a guard of honour. Having driven to the *Shipwright Inn*, the proprietor and waiters received me with low bows and uncovered heads. The Lady Mayoress invites me to a *soirée* in the name of the fairest ladies of the town. M. Billing, an *attaché* of my embassy, attended me. A dinner of enormous fish, and monstrous joints of beef, recruits his Lordship the Ambassador, who has no appetite and who was not at all fatigued. The populace, collected beneath my windows, make the air resound with huzzas. The officer returns, and in spite of me, places sentinels at my door. The following morning, after having distributed a considerable amount of the money of the king my master, I set out *en route* for London, amidst the report of cannon, in a light carriage drawn by four handsome horses, driven at full trot by two elegant jockeys. My people followed in separate carriages, and couriers in my livery accompany the *cortège*. We dash through Canterbury, attracting the gaze of John Bull, and stared at by all the equipages we met. At Blackheath, a moor formerly infested with robbers, I find a village altogether new. In a short time I perceive the immense canopy of smoke which hovers over the city of London.

Plunging into the gulf of carbonised vapour, as into one of the jaws of Tartarus, and traversing the entire city, the streets of which I recognised, I drew up at the hotel of the embassy in Portland-place The *chargé d'affaires*, the Count George de Caraman, the secretaries of the embassy, the Viscount de Marcellus, the Baron E. Decazes, M. de Bourqueney, and the *attachés* of the embassy, received me with dignified politeness. All the officers, porters, valets-de-chambre, and footmen of the hotel are drawn up on the pathway. I am handed cards of the English Ministers, and the foreign ambassadors, who have already been informed of my approaching arrival.

On the 17th May, in the year of grace, 1793, I disembarked on my way to the same town of London, an humble and obscure traveller, at Southampton, coming from Jersey. No Lady Mayoress took notice of my appearance. The mayor of the town, William Smith, handed me, on the 18th, a road-map for London, to which was attached an extract from the *Alien Bill*. My description was as follows:—"Francois de Chateaubriand, a French officer in the emigrant army, five feet four inches in height, slender figure, brown hair and whiskers." I modestly shared the cheapest vehicle with some sailors on leave. I stopped at the meanest taverns on the way; I entered, poor, ailing, and unknown, an opulent and renowned city, in which Mr. Pitt reigned absolute. I took lodgings, at six shillings per month, in an attic, hired for me by a cousin from Brittany, at the extremity of a little street adjoining Tottenham-court-road,

"Ah! Monseigneur, how your life,
To-day with luxuries so rife,
Differs from those happy times!"

At the present day another sort of obscurity overshadows me in London. My political station throws into the shade my literary renown. There is not a fool in the three kingdoms who does not prefer the ambassador of Louis XVIII. to the author of "*The Genius of Christianity.*" I shall see what turn affairs will take after my decease, or when I shall have ceased to replace Monsieur the Duke Decazes at the court of George IV.—a succession as bizarre as the rest of my life.

When residing in London as French Minister, one of my greatest delights was to leave my carriage at the corner of a square, and to traverse on foot the little streets which I had formerly frequented; the cheap and popular suburbs where misfortune takes refuge under the protection of similar suffering; the obscure retreats which had been my haunts along with the companions of my distress, when I knew not if I should have sufficient bread for the morrow—I whose table is spread, at the present day, with three or four courses. At all those mean and narrow doors, which were formerly open to me, I met none but strange countenances. I no longer saw, wandering to and fro, numbers of my countrymen, easily recognised by their gestures, their manner of walking, the cut and antiquity of their clothes. I no longer perceived those martyr-priests, wearing the narrow collar, the large three-cornered hat, the long black riding-coat much worn, and who were saluted by the English in passing. Wide streets, lined with palaces, had been laid out, bridges built, and walks planted. Regent's-park occupies, in the neighbourhood of Portland-place, the site of the meadows which were formerly covered with groups of cattle. The cemetery, which could be seen from the dormer-windows of one of my attics, has disappeared within the boundary walls of a manufactory. When I called at Lord Liverpool's I could with difficulty recognise the empty space where the scaffold of Charles I. had stood. New buildings, hemming round the statue of Charles II. have advanced, carrying oblivion with them, over the site of these memorable events.

How I regret, *in the midst of my insipid pomp*, that world of tribulation and of tears, those times when I shared my suffering with those of a colony of unfortunates! It is true, then, that everything changes—that misfortune itself perishes like prosperity! What has become of my brothers in exile? Some are dead; others have undergone various vicissitudes. They have seen, like me, their relations and friends disappear from the scene. They are less happy in their native country than they were in a foreign land. Had we not in that land our meetings together, our amusements, our *fêtes*, and, above all, our youth. Mothers of families and young girls, who commenced life in adversity, brought the weekly proceeds of their labour to gladden their hearts with some dance of their native country. Attachments were formed in the conversations of the evening, after the day's work was done, on the velvet meadows of Hampstead and of Primrose-hill. At chapels, adorned with our hands amidst old ruins, we prayed on the 21st of January, on the anniversary of the death of the Queen, and were melted to tears by the funeral oration pronounced by the emigrant curate at our native village. We wandered along the banks of the Thames, sometimes to view the vessels, loaded with the riches of the world, entering the docks, sometimes to admire the country houses at Richmond—we so poor, we banished from our paternal abodes. All these things were real sources of happiness.

When I returned here in 1822, in place of being received by my friend, shivering with cold, who opens the door of our garret to me with a familiar salutation, and who reposes on his pallet beside me, covering himself with his thread-bare garments and having as his only lamp the moonlight, I passed, amidst the glare of torches, between two files of lackeys, whose ranks were closed by five or six respectful secretaries. Overwhelmed on my way with a torrent of words—"*Monseigneur*"—"*My Lord*"—"*Your Excellency*"—"*Monsieur the Ambassador*"—I reached a drawing-room carpeted with gold and silk.

"I beseech you, gentlemen, leave me! A truce to these 'My Lords.' What do you wish me to do for you? Go and amuse yourselves at the chancery as if I were not there. Do you imagine that you can make me look on this masquerade as serious? Do you think that I am stupid enough to think my nature changed because I have changed my dress?"

We repeat our earnest recommendation of this volume, with thanks to the publisher for placing it within the reach of all classes.

HOME COLONIES IN THE NETHERLANDS.

(Abridged from the *Commonwealth* for March.)

In the application of machinery to manufacturing processes this country took the lead; our exertions in this branch of national industry were both earlier in point of time, and more successful in point of effect, than those of other nations. This enabled us for some time to undersell all rivals, and by degrees to attract to our own market the great body of purchasers who had in former days been supplied with wrought goods from other European countries. The foreign consumer would not continue to give a quarter of corn for a piece of cotton cloth which we could give him for half a quarter. This extra demand to supply foreign markets obviated, for a time, the necessary effect of machinery in throwing workmen out of employment; the additional demand for wrought commodities to be exported absorbed the quantum of human labour which would otherwise have been displaced by machinery. The men merely changed their employment; instead of working with the hand, they worked with machines; from handicraftsmen they became mechanical craftsmen; one million of men, by the aid of machines, did the work that had formerly occupied two millions; and the goods wrought by the other million found their way into foreign markets. At that period, therefore, the effect of machinery, in abridging the employment of the working classes, was not felt in *this* country; it was, however, very sensibly felt in others. The manufacturing classes on the continent were reduced to great distress under the overwhelming influence of our rivalry; but, although we prospered, and that greatly for a time, from the circumstances of our having taken the lead in abridging labour by mechanical contrivances, it was unreasonable to expect that this advantage should last for ever; it was but natural that other nations, stimulated by our example, and burdened by a surplus population which our success had deprived of employment, should endeavour to follow in our steps. They, in turn, introduced machinery; gradually acquired skill in its application; and now some of them stand in that respect upon pretty nearly the same vantage ground as ourselves. Cotton goods, for example, are now fabricated as expeditiously, economically, and with as little real outlay of labour, on the banks of the Seine as on those of the Ribble.

* * *

But the period has at length arrived, when other nations have learnt to produce commodities with which we used to supply them—the foreign demand for our manufactured productions is no longer, considering the increase of population on both sides, what it was,—it has necessarily relaxed,—and it now remains that we put our shoulders heartily to the wheel, and endeavour to extricate the labouring classes from the severe pressure of the difficulties occasioned, as we conceive, principally, if not exclusively, by these national changes. In short, the operations of these causes which, in the long run, are nearly as irresistable as the laws of nature, has rendered it indispensable, both for the welfare of the state and the happiness of individuals, that the labour of a considerable portion of the population of this country should be transferred to some branch of national industry other than manufacturing operations.

That, under any conceivable change, either in our policy or in that of other nations, the demand for manufacturing industry should revive to an extent which would permanently absorb the vast surplus of that species of labour which now remains unoccupied in this country, is an expectation in which we dare not indulge. We feel, in short, a conviction, which no argument that readily presents itself to our minds can shake, that no measure can afford our labouring classes substantial relief which falls short of producing an entire change in the character of their industry—which does not transfer their labour from the manufactories in which they starve, to the soil of the country, on which we entertain no doubt, they might be made to subsist in comfort at least, if not in affluence. This proposition may appear paradoxical, as we have already admitted that even our agricultural population is super abundant: it may sound somewhat strangely that we should propose pouring more water into a vessel which, upon our own showing, already overflows. With regard, however, to the idle hands which now press upon the resources of country parishes, it may be observed that their want of employment arises from the faulty organisation of the district, and from the defective cultivation which the occupiers bestow upon the soil. Every intelligent person conversant with the state of agriculture in this country, will acknowledge that scarcely one farm can be met with on which a vast addition of manual labour might not be employed, to the great benefit not only of the labourer, but also of the occupier. But, leaving for the present out of our consideration the number of unemployed hands which a better system of tillage undoubtedly would absorb, we venture to reiterate what we have already more than once stated, that we possess in our numerous waste and uncultivated districts a source of employment which cannot speedily be exhausted.

The natural capability of our waste lands to yield a return for the labour which might be employed in cultivating them is vehemently denied by certain economists of the day; and we are well aware that to the task of bandying words with them there would be no end. The arguments and reasonings of a pure economist of the modern school, like a hydra's head, grow the more abundantly the more frequently you crop them. But, as it happens, we are in a condition to appeal to *facts* which leave no doubt that a soil, inferior in natural productiveness to most of our wastes and commons, can be made to yield the cultivator a produce exceeding the amount consumed by him while employed in tilling it.

The Payes-de-Waes is, at this time, the most thickly peopled district belonging to the generally well-cultivated kingdom of the Netherlands. Two hunered and fifty years ago it was nothing but a dismal tract of deep loose sand, scantily sprinkled with heath. About the middle of the sixteenth century, the Duke of Parma cut a canal through this desert, in order to facilitate his military operations against the Flemings. This canal attracted many of that industrious people to settle on its banks; they built huts and began to reclaim the moor in their vicinity: their numbers daily increased, and cultivation gradually extended until the whole surface was at length reclaimed and brought under the finest tillage. At the present moment, in this district, a field of two acres, or even one, suffices for the support of a whole family. Even now the traveller finds that the wheels of his carriage sink into the sand; but when he looks over the hedges, he sees the enclosures groaning under a weight of produce which has conferred upon the Payes-de-Waes no ordinary celebrity in the annals of successful agriculture.

Another striking instance of the effect of tillage upon the productive powers of land, which, in its original state, would have been pronounced by the philosopher hopeless and incurable, may be seen in the duchy of Cleves. There is a very interesting colony of agriculturists settled on the right hand of the road which leads from the little town of Goch to the city of Cleves. In the commencement of the last century, the land occupied by this thriving establishment was a barren heath: about the year 1707, one of the inspectors of the royal forests caused some pines to be sowed in the neighbourhood. This was the first attempt of the kind which had been made in that district; and the plantation sprung up and prospered. Judging by the thriving appearance of these trees, a Dutch agriculturist was induced to believe that the land might be made to yield corn; he resolved upon trying what could be done, and reclaimed one hundred and seventy acres of heath, which he divided into six farms, and let to so many tenants. The experiment was completely successful; and, in the year 1740, one hundred and forty-five persons were found subsisting, in much comfort, upon the produce of one hundred and seventy acres of land, which ten years previously, was nothing but a black moor.

* * *

But the most interesting, as well as successful experiment set on foot in any age, or in any country, to enable the indigent pauper to subsist independently of charity by the cultivation of the soil, is that which has been recently made in the Netherlands.

The inhabitants of the countries which now compose the kingdom of the Netherlands have been for ages remarkable for their manufacturing industry For a considerable period they supplied the less skilful, or less industrious, inhabitants of other parts of Europe, with a large proportion of the wrought commodities which they consumed. By degrees the English rivalled, and then out-stripped them. Borne down by our competition, the manufacturers of the Low Countries sustained a granual declension until they were somewhat revived by the operation of Buonaparte's prohibitory decrees. If these did not prove altogether successful in excluding our wrought goods, it cannot be denied that they threw such impediments in the way of their introduction as secured to the manufacturers of the Netherlands a considerable advantage in the continental markets: but with the peace of 1815 this partial monopoly disappeared; and ever since, the demand for manufacturing labour has been rapidly declining in the Netherlands. A large proportion of the population has been thrown out of employment, and forced to subsist upon alms. The misery suffered by these unemployed workmen, and the burden which their maintenance in a state of idleness imposed upon others, made a deep and general impression. Various plans for relieving them were unsuccessfully tried. Attempts were first made to give them employment in manufactories established for that purpose, by the communes to which they belonged; but, as might have been expected, these entirely failed; the market of the Netherlands was already overstocked with wrought commodities; and adding to this superabundant mass, was making bad worse. In a word, it was apparent that too large a proportion of the population had devoted themselves to manufactures, and that relief could only be obtained by diverting their industry to other objects; and it was proposed to transfer this surplus population from the districts in which their labour was no longer profitable, to agricultural colonies established on some of the wastes and heaths with which the country abounds.

The plan of establishing agricultural colonies was warmly taken up by the public; and, in 1818, a voluntary association was formed at the Hague for the purpose of carrying it into effect. The first step was of course to raise funds to commence their operations. This was speedily done by the donations of benevolent individuals, as well as by a small annual subscription (about five shillings English money) which each member contributed towards the resources placed at the disposal of the managing committee. As thirty thousand persons put down their names as subscribers the very first year, five thousand pounds were at once realised. Having thus laid a foundation, they determined to make in the first instance, an experiment upon a small scale, and purchased a tract of land called Westerbeck Sloot, situated near the little town of Steenwyk, on the confines of the provinces of Drenthe, Friesland, and Overyssel. It contained between twelve and thirteen hundred acres of land, covered with heath and turf—except about one hundred and forty acres, which had already been in some measure reclaimed. The whole cost the association four thousand six hundred and sixty pounds. The money for this purpose was raised by loan at six per cent., the association engaging to liquidate the principal by regular instalments, in the course of sixteen years.

The one hundred and forty acres in tillage were allowed to remain in the hands of the tenants by whom they were already occupied; and three hundred and fifty acres of the waste were marked out and enclosed for the foundation of the first colony. The King of the Netherlands' second son, who interested himself warmly in the success of the undertaking, readily consented that the new establishment should bear his own name: hence it was called "*Frederick's-Oord.*"

In order to facilitate the communication of the colony with the neighbouring districts, and to reduce the expense of carriage, a little river, called the Aa, was rendered navigable; a school-house, a warehouse, spinning-houses, and fifty-two dwellings, were then built. These works were begun in Sept. 1818, and finished by the first day of the following November, when they were taken possession of by fifty-two indigent families, collected from different parts of the country; and who, from that moment, ceased to be burdensome to the communities to which they belonged—the association taking upon itself exclusively the responsibility of their subsequent maintenance.

It is needless to observe that these fifty two families possessed no funds of their own on which they could subsist till the ensuing harvest, which was the earliest period at which they could expect to reap the fruits of the labour which they had bestowed upon the land. This difficulty had, of course, been foreseen and provided against: the association found them in clothing and food, and employed them in reclaiming and preparing the land for the first crop: for this labour, the colonists themselves, were paid, just as strangers would have been paid, in proportion to the quantity of work which they executed. It was calculated beforehand, that to settle one family, consisting of from six to eight persons, upon one of these seven acre allotments, would require, on the part of the society, an outlay of 1700 guilders, or £143 13s. But most of the houses which have been subsequently built have cost the society considerably less than the original estimate. All the labour of building is performed by the colonists themselves at the fixed rate of wages; and all the bricks are made of clay, and burnt with turf—both of these materials being found on the land."

For an account of the working of this system, we must refer the reader to the full article in the *Commonwealth*. The following extracts set forth the result:—

"I have visited," says the Baron de Keverberg, in his interesting account of this colony, "a great number of these family establishments. In every place the females were seen cheerfully occupied either in cleaning their dwellings or in preparing the family meal: the children, neatly clothed, and full of health and spirits, rivalled one another in the alacrity with which they turned their spinning-wheels. The mothers boasted of their comfortable condition, and the productive industry of their children: indeed, it is not by any means an unusual circumstance that these should, from the age of seven to eight, earn weekly ten, fifteen, or even twenty sols. The greater part of these earnings is carried to the account of each family; but a small proportion is distributed among the children, to encourage them in their industry. I have scarcely observed a single dwelling which did not exhibit some trace of extra labour, gratuitously performed by the colonists themselves, solely for the purpose of embellishing their modest habitations. Their little gardens, tastefully and carefully laid out, present models of well-regulated cultivation; they are nearly all ornamented with flowers, which gracefully surround the beds in which the nutritive vegetables are grown. These not only delight the eye of the spectator, but leave a pleasing impression on the mind of the man who traces these embellishments back to the causes to which they owe their origin."

Another traveller, who recently visited these colonies, speaks thus of their condition in 1826:—

"The crops were luxuriant, the people healthful, and the houses comfortable. Several of the colonists had acquired considerable property. Many gardens were planted with currant-bushes, pear and apple trees, and tastefully ornamented with flowers. Additional live stock, belonging to the colonists themselves, was frequently pointed out; and around not a few of the houses lay webs of linen bleaching, which had been woven, on their own account, by persons who only four years before were among the outcasts of society. The families found at dinner had quite the appearance of wealthy peasants; and from the quantity and quality of the food before them, they might have been considered as not inferior to the smaller tenantry of this country."

We pass over a mass of interesting information, to make way for the answer of the writer of the article to the objections of those who oppose the very idea of trying the experiment of such colonies in this country:—

"Where, the dampers will ask, is the land to be found on which our unemployed paupers may be made to raise for themselves a supply of food by their own industry? We do not apprehend, that, in this respect, much difficulty could be experienced in a country which contains a trifle of between twenty and thirty millions of acres of waste land, setting aside some ten or twelve additional millions of meadow and dry pasture land, which, as far as concerns the employment of our population, are little better than mere wastes.

* * *

It will, perhaps be said, that, upon our own showing, a considerable outlay of capital will be required in the first instance; it will be necessary to provide the means of maintaining the colonists while tilling the ground during at least one year: and it may be urged, probably, as an additional objection, that this amount of capital must be withdrawn from the general capital of the country; and that the gain of one spot will be counterbalanced by an equivalent loss in another district. * * *

The question is, not whether it may be expedient to transfer a certain capital from a branch of industry, in which it is now productive, into another department—but whether it be expedient to render productive, both to the owners and the public, a certain amount of capital which is now utterly wasted and yields no return to anybody. We speak of the enormous capital annually squandered upon the maintenance of able-bodied paupers. All that is repuired is, that those who now throw away their capital upon the unemployed labourer, should combine to lay it out in a manner which would enable the same man to raise food for himself by the sweat of his own brow."

Varieties.

A REPUBLICAN'S PRAYER.—"Strange that men, from age to age, should consent to hold their lives at the breath of another, merely that each in his turn may have the power of acting the tyrant according to law! Oh God! give me poverty! shower upon me all the imaginary hardships of human life! I will receive them all with thankfulness. Turn me a prey to the wild beasts of the desert, so I be never again the victim of man dressed in the gore-dripping robes of authority. Suffer me at least to call life, and the pursuits of life, my own! Let me hold it at the mercy of elements, of the hunger of beasts, or the revenge of barbarians, but not of the cold-blooded prudence of monopolists and kings."—*Godwin's Caleb Williams.*

A WIFE.—A wife, full of truth, innocence, and love, is the prettiest flower a man can wear next his heart.

FRIENDS.—If a man does not make new acquaintances as he advances through life, he will soon find himself left alone. A man should keep his friendships in constant repair.—*Johnson.*

A BACHELOR'S LIFE.—Miss Bremer tells us that the life of a rich old bachelor is a splendid breakfast, a tolerably flat dinner, and a most miserable supper.

VICTORIA THEATRE.

Boxes 1s., Half-price 6d. Pit 6d. Gallery 3d.

THE "HAND AND HEART" WIDOWS' AND ORPHANS' FUND will take a BENEFIT at the above splendid theatre, on

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 21ST, 1849.

The Entertainment will commence with an original and powerfully written

DRAMA!

Supported by the following Talented Artists:—Miss Richardson, Mrs. G. Lee, Miss Barrowcliffe, Mr. J. T. Johnson, Mr. Forman, Mr. Dale, Mr. T. H. Higgie, Mr. Bradshaw, Mr. J. Howard, Mr. Henderson, Miss VINCENT, and Mr. OSBALDISTON.

With a Variety of other Entertainments.

Tickets to be had of Mr. J. Grassby, 8, Noah's-ark-court, Stangate, Lambeth; Mr. J. Simpson, Elm Cottage, Waterloo-street, Camberwell; Mr. W. H. Nicholson, 3, Garden-row, Kennington-road; Mr. C. Keen, 7, Poplar-place, New Kent-road; Mr. Side, 5, Pepper-street, Union-street, Southwark; Mr. Edwards, jeweller, Weston-street, Bermondsey; Mr. Pearey, Church-street, Rotherhithe; Mr. Petterson, 58, Cardigan-street, Vauxhall; Mr. Collins, 44, Vine-street, Westminster; Mr. Milne, 1, Union-street, Berkeley-square; Mr. Stallwood, Hammersmith; Colliver's Coffee-house, 266, Strand; Mr. M'Veigh, Two Chairmen, Wardour-street, Soho; Mr. Murray, Coach and Horses, Silver-street Golden-square; Mr. Parkes, 32, Little Windmill-street Soho; Clark's Coffee-house, Edgware-road; Mr. Dudridge, Bricklayer's Arms, Tonbridge-street, New-road; Mr. Simms, 11, Tothill-street, Little Gray's-inn-lane; Mr. Allnutt, Deadman's Coffee-house, Clerkenwell-green; Parry's Coffee-house, 422, Church-street, Shoreditch; Mr. Newley, Crown and Anchor, Cheshire-street, Waterloo town; Mr. Knowles, Globe and Friends, Morgan-street, Commercial-road, East; and John Arnott, Middlesex-place, Somers-town.

In announcing the above Benefit to the Philanthropic public, the Committee beg to state that Thirty Widows, and nearly One Hundred Orphans are supported by the Fund, and they trust that those who have hearts to feel for suffering humanity, will rally around them on this occasion.

JOHN ARNOTT, Secretary.

TO THE DEMOCRATS OF GREAT BRITAIN.

THERE will be DISPOSED OF, by SUBSCRIPTION, on the principle of the Art-Unions, TWO BEAUTIFUL PLAIDS, OF O'CONNOR AND DUNCOMBE TARTANS.

They are of the finest quality, are suited for the wear of either Lady or Gentleman; and will lie, for inspection, at the shop of Mr. RICHARD BURKETT, stationer, 177, Fountain Bridge, Edinburgh. They will be forwarded to the successful subscriber by such conveyance as he may desire.

The Subscription Sale will take place in Ross's University Temperance Hotel, 59, South Bridge, on the 21st of March, at Seven o'clock in the Evening.

Proceeds to be given to the Victim Funds of England and Scotland.

SUBSCRIPTIONS:—SIXPENCE each, to be paid or remitted in Postage Stamps or Post-office Orders, to Mr. Burkett, as above.

N.B.—The Committee of the above beg leave to inform those who feel interested for those who are now enduring imprisonment for their advocacy of the rights of man, that we have postponed the giving away of the prizes till the 4th of April, knowing that means are much wanting to alleviate the distresses of the wives and families of the victims. Be not apathetic, but remember it is to lighten the sufferings of those who are now suffering for manfully advocating our principles.

On behalf of the Democrats of Georgie Mills,
RICHARD BURKITT.

O'CONNORVILLE.

A FOUR-ACRE ALLOTMENT TO BE SOLD CHEAP, cropped with Two Acres of Wheat, &c.

Apply (if by Letter, post-paid) to Y. Z., at W. KEEN's, 45, Cannon-street-road, Commercial-road-East.

O'CONNORVILLE.

TO BE SOLD A BARGAIN, a TWO-ACRE ALLOTMENT, situated, No. 7, in the centre of the estate, which has been much improved. A three-roomed cottage and large outhouse is attached, with a capital iron boiler, water butts, and a brick tank capable of holding some hundred gallons of water, a yard fenced round, together with pigsties, and manure tank; a beautiful verandah, with gates and railings, in front of the cottage; one acre of the land is in winter wheat, and the rest is ploughed up ready for spring operations, with a sufficient quantity of seed potatoes and manure; a number of fruit trees, &c., &c.

All persons wishing to avail themselves of this offer (as no reasonable sum will be refused) must apply, immediately, to Mr. JOHN HORNBY, No. 15, Northam's-buildings, Somers town, London. All letters pre-paid, with a stamp for reply.

TO BE SOLD,

THREE PAID-UP FOUR-ACRE SHARES in the National Land Company: also, £2 paid in part of FOUR ACRES. Price, £10. They may be had in one or separate lots at £3 each; the £2 for £1. Also, a THREE-ACRE SCRIP, drawn in the November ballot. Any reasonable offer accepted, as the parties are about to emigrate.

Apply (by letter prepaid), to Mr. R. D. Morgan, Malt Mill-square, Merthyr Tydvil.

FOR SALE,

TWO FOUR-ACRE SHARES in the National Land Company. Price, £4 each.

Apply (if by letter, prepaid), to Mr. James Heaton, Cawthorne, near Barnsley, Yorkshire.

FOR SALE,

ONE OR TWO PAID-UP FOUR-ACRE SHARES. Price, £3 10s each.

Apply to A. B., 25, Great Warren-street, Clerkenwell, London.

THE LATE GALES.—FALMOUTH, March 10.—Among the casualties to shipping, occasioned by the recent severe gales, we have to record the following:—The bark Isabella, of Dundee, Captain Small, bound from Alexandria to this port for orders, and which arrived here yesterday, reports, when in latitude 44.9 N., and longitude 11.12 W., having fallen in with the bark Lord Collingwood, of Newcastle, abandoned. The crew of the Isabella, being short of provisions, boarded the wreck, and discovered that the fore-sail and close-reefed maintopsail were set, the latter being aback, and the bark's head to the westward. The long boat and jolly boat were both stove, the former out of the chocks. The bulwarks were also carried away on either side, and the pumps hoisted up about three feet. The bark was lying in the trough of the sea; and, from a quantity of wheat being found on the cabin steps, it appeared as if the crew had been lightening her previous to their quitting, as is concluded and hoped must have been the case. Captain Small took from the bark a chronometer, barometer, quadrant telescope, box of charts, a ship's bell, medicine chest, four muskets, a belt of canvas, and a plaster of Paris figure, together with some beef and bread. The two latter articles were consumed, and the former were delivered, on arrival, into the custody of Messrs. Broad and sons the receivers of droits. A package, at first supposed to be a mail-bag, was also found on board, and brought on shore for delivery to the authorities, but, on being opened by the collector, it was discovered, instead of letters, to contain garments stained with blood. As a consular seal was on closer inspection, observed to be attached to the bag, it is concluded that a prisoner guilty of some criminal act, was a passenger on board the vessel. This supposition is strengthened from the fact of instructions having been sent to the civil authorities in this port, in reference to such an expected arrival; and the Lord Collingwood is surmissed to have been from the Mediterranean, and bound to this port for orders.

SNOW STORM IN THE HIGHLANDS.—Last week a considerable fall of snow took place in the Highlands, which interrupted travelling on the roads, and put the flocks in danger where exposed to the storm. It came on in the course of Tuesday with strong north-westerly gales—the quarter from which snow-storms are always severest in the Perthshire Highlands—and continued, with little interruption, for nearly two days. On Wednesday night the two Inverness and Perth mails were stopped—the one from Inverness about six miles to the north of Dalwhinnie, and the one from Perth at Dulnacardoch. The latter remained housed at the inn till daylight began to appear, about six o'clock next morning; and upon reaching the first toll-bar only the top of the toll-house was visible above a wreath of snow. The work of cutting commenced, and Drummachdair-hill was ultimately crossed in about six hours, with occasional clearing of deep wreaths all along the road. The other mail was met about three miles on this side Dalwhinnie, having made only nine miles since daybreak, and they reached their ultimate destinations respectively sixteen hours behind time. The guards, Stewart and Anderson, were very active in getting their charge forward; but, although additional horses were put on, the animals were frequently overpowered by the cold and drift. Next day snow-ploughs were at work where they were available, but the continuance of high winds, with occasional snow showers, rendered the operation very tedious and imperfect. Altogether, this has been one of the severest storms experienced for some winters in the Highlands, to which it has mainly been confined, as not above a couple of inches in depth fell in the low country, which one day's sunshine sufficed to dissolve.—*Perth Courier.*

A PLEASING MIRACLE.—The bitterest enemies of Christianity were the Druids, whose interest it was above all others to support the ancient belief of their forefathers; and many of these, who are described in the Christian narrative as magi, or magicians, were the objects of Patrick's miracles, and were sacrificed for their obstinate hostility. A Druid of Dicha's territory carried his insults so far as contemptuously to interrupt the holy service one day that St. Patrick was administering in the barn of Sabhul-Phadruig, on which the earth suddenly opened and swallowed up the sacrilegious offender. Dichu had a brother named Rias, an old man, as wicked as he was ugly, who, enraged at the conversion of Dichu and at the fate of the Druid, persecuted the saint by every means in his power. At last the aged blasphemer dared him to perform a miracle on his person as a condition of his believing in the Gospel; Patrick held up his hand, and the ugly old man was suddenly changed into a beautiful youth. A miracle like this was not to be resisted; Rius was immediately baptised, and the example was followed by many of those who had hitherto refused to listen to the words of salvation.—*Wright's Ireland.*

THE CHEAPEST EDITION EVER PUBLISHED.

Price 1s. 6d.,

A new and elegant edition, with Steel Plate of the Author, of

PAINE'S POLITICAL WORKS.

Now Ready, a New Edition of

MR. O'CONNOR'S WORK ON SMALL FARMS.

Just published, No. II. Price SIXPENCE,

OF

THE COMMONWEALTH:

A MONTHLY RECORD OF

DEMOCRATIC, SOCIAL & INDUSTRIAL PROGRESS

"THE COMMONWEALTH" will be the Representative of the Chartists, Socialists, and Trades' Unionists, in the Monthly Press.

CONTENTS:

1. The Crime of the Government against the People.
2. Home Colonies in the Netherlands.
3. The Law of Representation.
4. Louis Blanc.
5. Dream of Liberty.
6. Review of the Month:
   I. Foreign Affairs.
   II. Home Affairs.

Communications for the Editor, Books for Review, &c., to be forwarded to the Office, 16, Great Windmill-street, Haymarket, London.

Sold by J. Watson, Queen's Head Passage, Paternoster-row, London; A. Heywood, Oldham-street, Manchester; and Love and Co., 5, Nelson-street, Glasgow.

And by all Booksellers in Town and Country.

To Correspondents.

THE NOTTINGHAM ADDRESS.—"There appears in our address in the STAR, of Saturday last, a trifling error; it is in the second line of the second paragraph, where the word 'republic' should be 'America.' The error is of very small importance; the remarks are exactly what we intended in either case, but it might cause a multitude of useless words."—J. Barber, G. Rogers, J. Souter, A. Maltby, J. Proctor, W. Dexter.

NOTTINGHAM.—J. SWEET acknowledges the receipt of the following sums, sent herewith, for M'DOUALL'S Writ of Error:—Mr. Barrows, 6d.; Mr. Scott, 1d. For the VICTIM FUND:—From the Shoemakers' Association, 7s. 2d. For the DEFENCE FUND:—From Arnold, 3s. The sum of 18s. 11d. was acknowledged in the STAR of Feb. 10th, for M'DOUALL'S Writ of Error, and the following are the names of those who sent it:—From Lambley, 3s. 6d., Mr Chipindale, 3d., Mr. Frost, 2d., Mr. Liggett, 1d., from the Colonel Hutchinson, 8s., the Poplar Tree, 1s. 2d., the Seven Stars, 5s. 6d., and Mr. Deafman, 3d.

Mr. H. JACKSON, Rough Lee.—The charge will be four shillings and sixpence. You must send the advertisement to this office. You may write to the Directors.

Mr. J. GALE, St. Heliers, Jersey. — A view of Lowbands Estate has not been issued.

THE KIRKDALE PRISONERS. — Mr. Ormesher acknowledges the receipt of the following sums:—Rochdale, Mr Bake, 10s; Pilkington, per Heastwood, 14s 7d; per Robert Booth, of Galton, 1s; Bacup, per James Wilson, 6s. —— DR. M'DOUALL'S WRIT OF ERROR.—per Mr. John Chin, 1s.

DR. M'DOUALL'S WRIT OF ERROR. — Mr. Shute, Westminster, 1s.

BANBURY LAND MEMBERS.—Next week.

NEWCASTLE-ON-TYNE.—Mr. Jude's letter is through press of matter postponed. We understand that a delegate meeting will be held on Saturday next, at the Cock, head of the Side, Newcastle-on-Tyne.

Mr. T. STONE, Newbury.—To Mr. O'Connor.

Mr. J. PARE, Birmingham.—We have not got a copy.

CHARTIST TRACTS FOR THE TIMES.—We have received No. 2 of these tracts. We are requested to state that all applications respecting the said tracts, must be addressed to Mr. Joseph Barker, Wortley, near Leeds; or Mr. Watson, 3, Queen's Head-passage, Paternoster-row, London, No notice can be taken of applications addressed to the Kirkdale Chartists.

PORTRAIT OF T. F. MEAGHER.

The Specimens will be in the hands of our Agents during the ensuing week.

THE NORTHERN STAR.

SATURDAY, MARCH 17, 1849.

MR. O'CONNOR AND THE NOTTINGHAM ADDRESS.

In the second and third—that is the English provincial, and town—editions of last Saturday's "*Northern Star*," Mr. O'CONNOR made a complaint that the Address of the Nottingham Republicans was not sent to him in manuscript, or the contents communicated to him before publication. Mr. O'CONNOR has repeated that complaint in to-day's paper, and adds: "Now this comes strangely from a professed lover of justice!" We have only to say, that whenever we conceived that *justice* required that any communication sent to this office should be sent to Mr. O'CONNOR previous to publication, such communication has been always forwarded to that gentleman "in manuscript." We did not consider that *justice* demanded that the Nottingham Address, and the letter of "L'AMI DU PEUPLE," should be sent to Mr. O'CONNOR before appearing in the columns of the "*Star*." We considered both "Address" and "Letter" to be written in a spirit of friendly remonstrance—containing nothing unjust. Mr. O'CONNOR has thought fit to indulge in sundry criticisms on the irresponsibility of the author of the letters of "L'AMI DU PEUPLE," taking care to announce at the same time that the writer of those letters is the editor of the "*Star*." We beg to say that we are not ashamed of the identification, and that *unless the "Star" is forcibly closed against us next week*, we will reply to Mr. O'CONNOR, and answer all the complaints he has thought proper to level both against the "Editor," and the author of the letters of "L'AMI DU PEUPLE."

THE CHARTER.

Blessed are those who expect nothing, for verily they shall not be disappointed. The recent division in the House of Commons, on Mr. COBDEN'S Financial Reform Motion, verified the predictions of those who contend for Democratic Electoral Reform. The House of Commons, as at present constituted, will not lower taxes nor reduce the public expenditure. Of 656 Members, only seventy-two were found to affirm Mr. COBDEN'S resolutions—resolutions which were, in all conscience, moderate enough, and contemplated a reform of the public finances, only much too gradual. The question may be said to be disposed of for this Session, for even though Mr. COBDEN'S resolutions were re-introduced in a new shape, it is unreasonable to hope that a larger number of votes would be obtained under present circumstances. It is likely, on the contrary, that, on a second trial, the number would be less. The news from India has afforded the Government an admirable pretext for backing out of the military reductions so pompously announced at the commencement of the Session. Notice has been issued from the Horse Guards to suspend the recent orders for the discharge of men from the army; it being anticipated that the war in India will absorb the "contemplated" reduction of 7,000 rank and file. Under these circumstances, were the Financial Reformers to bring on another trial of strength, they would probably find their ranks thinned by the desertion of those patriots, one point of whose creed is the maintenance of "our supremacy in the East," and the defence, at any cost, of our "Indian Empire."

A glance at our second page, in which is contained a list of Members of the House of Commons, connected with the Army and Navy, who voted against Mr. COBDEN'S motion, will satisfy any rational being how utterly vain must be any attempt to induce the present House of Commons to sweep away ten, or half ten, millions of taxes. The Financial Reformers are far exceeded in number by the fighting folks and their relations, to say nothing of the landed and monied aristocrats, and the foul fry of party expectants, who, though not connected with either of the "services," are interested in maintaining a costly and profligate system of Government in all its branches. It would be the height of childishness to expect any good thing to come out of such a Nazareth.

"What shall we do next?" is now the question put by the discomfited Financial Reformers to each other. If they will put that question to parties beyond their own circle, they will get for an answer from the real Reformers:—"Go for the Charter." Whether or not they take that good advice, this, undoubtedly, is the time for the Chartists themselves to make a move for the obtainment of their favourite measure; the only really "comprehensive measure," because comprehending all classes, and doing justice to all.

In another column will be found a petition for the Charter, prepared by the Chartist Executive for general adoption and presentation to the House of Commons. We understand that it is considered not necessary to impose upon our friends the thankless toil of getting up a huge "National Petition," "one and indivisible." The Executive recommend the local adoption of the Petition; and that each locality send its own Petition to its own "representatives." It is desirable that as large a number of signatures as possible should be appended to each Petition, but care must be taken that the signatures are veritable. The sheets must be entrusted to none but competent and trustworthy persons, and when returned must be narrowly scrutinised by the local committees. All persons signing must append their address; and we recommend that if the signatures of women are taken that they be placed on lists distinct from the male signatures. If further instructions are needed, the Executive will supply the requisite information.

We know that our friends are weary of petitioning, but it is the only legal course through which they can address the Parliament. After public meetings, and organisation, petitioning is the next necessary step in any movement intended to tell upon the House of Commons. A veritable "movement" will include much more than petitioning, but petitioning cannot be dispensed with.

Those who desire a bolder policy than petitioning, will do well to bear in mind—that an Executive without funds must necessarily be powerless. Even autocrats at the head of armies know well that money is "the sinews of war;" wanting that, their physical force is weakness rather than strength. Both royal and democratic Executives are paralysed by the all-withering influence of an empty exchequer.

We must also direct attention to the Address of the Central Registration and Election Committee—an address which does great credit to its authors, and which, we trust, will call forth a worthy and deserved response from the Chartist electors and non-electors of the United Kingdom.

Were forty or fifty thorough Chartists in the House of Commons, the petitions of the people would be made to *tell*. Backed by the "pressure from without" such a band of true reformers would be soon able to render Whig and Tory rule impossible, and the rule of the people alone endurable.

The Central Registration and Election Committee is a body that has well done its work. At the last general election it well earned the thanks of the working classes. Once assured of popular support, it would *do far more than it has yet done*. Backed by public opinion and public financial aid, the Committee would do much—immensely much—to hasten the enactment of the Charter.

We have learned with much pleasure, that that old and useful body—the Metropolitan Chartist Council, is in course of re-organisation. This looks well. It gives promise of better days for Chartism. Liberty is to be won only by toil, energy, and perseverance; and those only who struggle for Freedom, deserve to be free.

PARLIAMENTARY REVIEW.

The division on the Navigation Laws may, we think, be taken as evidence of a decided re-action in public opinion, as to the Free Trade policy. In a House of nearly 500 Members—the largest which has yet voted this session—Ministers had only a majority of fifty-six. In favour of retaining protection to this branch of national industry 210 votes were given. The majority was a motley one, and is not likely to be depended upon in future stages of the Ministerial measure. Mr. GLADSTONE, who re-opened the debate on Monday, spoke against the plan of the Cabinet throughout, though he voted on its side. There was scarcely a single clause that he did not prove to be either defective or mischievous; and he developed, with great clearness, another plan, by which the Free Trade principle—if it is to be applied at all to the shipping interest of the country—may be practically applied, without involving the palpable injustice of the Government scheme. Mr. GLADSTONE'S premises and conclusions are in keeping with each other, which is more than can be said of the reasoning and the measure of Lord J. RUSSELL and Mr. LABOUCHERE. He says, in effect,—If the British shipowner is to be forced into open competition with the shipowner of other countries, let him have, at least, fair play, and start with equal chances. Remit the duty upon all Timber and other foreign materials he may use in the construction of his ships; abolish all restrictions upon the mode in which he shall man them, and do not allow any foreign rival to enter our ports freely, who has not first signified his readiness to allow the same privilege to the British shipowner, with regard to his ports. Legislate (says Mr. GLADSTONE), conditionally. Do not attempt either the reciprocity or the retaliatory system. In the one case you will be involved in all the meshes and embarrassments of diplomacy; in the other you will excite angry feelings. Take another and straightforward course; either by an order of the Queen in council or by an immediate and final enactment of Parliament, *throw open the British ports and coasting* trade to the ships of every country which will grant us the same freedom. Now, if the Free Trade policy is to be applied to the shipping interest, we repeat that this appears to be, at least, a fair way of doing so; and if the Peelites, generally, coincide in the opinions of Mr. GLADSTONE, one of the most distinguished of their party, and an authority on these subjects, there can be no doubt that, when the measure goes into committee, it will undergo such alterations that its authors will not know it again when it comes out. Ministers will either have to submit to this change or to a defeat. It is the interest of the Peelites, however, to have this question settled as soon as possible. It is the principal obstruction to a re-union of the severed Conservative party, and, if it was decided, there can be little doubt but that, soon after, a junction would take place, and the present Ministry be driven from a position which they only hold by sufferance. It is questionable, however, whether the measure can be carried in any shape this Session. The Protectionists, flushed with their virtual victory on Monday, will, no doubt, use redoubled efforts in the future stages of the measure, and, under any circumstances, the Lords will be justified in throwing it out, should it ever reach the Upper House. They will have a good reason in the fact, that the decision was carried by so small a majority, and they have a right to say that a trade which supplies not less than £16,000,000 for the support of British industry, shall not be lightly tampered with. The welfare of the sailors, shipwrights, carpenters, smiths, ropemakers, sailmakers, mast and blockmakers, and all the other trades—more or less dependent on this branch of industry—ought not to be sacrificed to mere abstract crotchets. As we have before said, it is but reasonable to ask for some more experience as to the effects of the Free Trade measures already agreed to, before proceeding further in the same direction. We are the more entitled to ask this, because, so far, the results are not of the most promising character. If Mr. MUNTZ is to be believed, the effects upon the trade of Birmingham have been anything but pleasant or satisfactory. The foreigner has come to the English market certainly, but it is to *sell*—not to *buy*. He has the power of selling *cheaper* than our own manufacturers can, and, hence, he is beating them in their own market. It does not matter to the factor or shopkeeper where the articles he sells are manufactured, if they are of the requisite *cheapness*, and it needs no ghost to come from the grave to tell us that a continuance of this system must give a deathblow to profits, wages, and employment at home.

Mr. DISRAELI is an admirable novelist, and brilliant rhetorician. The imaginative prevails over the ratiocinative in his mental composition. His parliamentary essays, in consequence, exhibit, very frequently, more of the inventive than the logical faculty. Facts seen through the magic prism of his genius, assume such strange shapes and hues, that those most familiar with them in their every-day guise, fail to recognise them. The latest transmutation of this kind which Mr. DISRAELI has attempted—apparently as a pleasant exercise for his own powers of mystification—was his elaborate attempt to make out that the landed interest and owners of real property have been so silly, good-natured, and short-sighted, as to lay more taxes on themselves than they ought to pay! The contrary opinion is so common and firm an article of the popular creed, that it required no small genius to conceive the opposite opinion, and when conceived—still more daring to gravely propound and advocate it. Yet this daring Mr. DISRAELI has evinced—and to his credit be it said, he backed up his opinions with a show of argument which carried a considerable portion of his hearers with him, and enlisted the "*Times*" on his side next morning. That variable authority has since seen reason to qualify its first ecstacies, and is at present in a state of muddle-headedness on the subject, not knowing which way to turn, but that is no fault of Mr. DISRAELI'S—it is merely the nature of the "*Times*" to turn round upon itself, and everybody else.

We heard a portion of Mr. DISRAELI'S speech, and read carefully the whole of it, in the hope of finding some solid ground for the extraordinary proposition to take off some six millions a year from landed property, and throw it upon the Consolidated Fund—in other words, for relieving the landlords to that extent, and fastening the burden upon the shoulders of the other classes of the community. We were disappointed. Anything more baseless in argument—more devoid of facts, figures, and distinctness, we never met with. The most effective, dramatic, and telling point of the oration was, that which had reference to an abuse of the county rate, which has since been remedied; and, really, if the hon. Member for Buckinghamshire means to win the place of leader of the Conservative party, he must be less imaginative, and more practical. The bare enumeration of the burdens he selected as falling peculiarly on Land, is sufficient to show the hollowness and insubstantiality of the whole of Mr. DISRAELI'S great move on behalf of the agricultural interest. Poor rates, county rates, highway rates, church rates, and the land tax—these are the peculiar and exclusive burdens which fall upon land, and real property! He reckons the total amount at £12,000,000 annually; the amount of income from land and real property at £67,000,000 a-year; the total income of the country at £249,000,000; and complains that so large a proportion of the annual taxation should be levied upon one-fourth of the whole annual income of the kingdom. Mr. DISRAELI, however, did not propose any definitive plan for remedying this disparity. He, in effect, said, "Give me a committee, and you shall see what you shall see. I will astonish you by some wonderful sleight of hand, then, if you will only give me a chance;" but well inclined as the landlords are to put the weight on anybody's shoulders but their own, we scarcely believe they would venture upon supporting so suicidal a proposition as that which has been made by their champion on this occasion.

It is not often we have occasion to praise Sir CHARLES WOOD. His constructive faculty is not more powerful than Mr. DISRAELI'S, and, in general intellectual capacity, he is not for an instant to be compared with the author of "Coningsby." But, in his speech of Wednesday, he showed a precision of idea, a power of arranging facts, and a cogency of argument, which completely demolished the sophistries by which Mr. DISRAELI attempted to make out his case. The structure tumbled like a house built of cards. By reference to facts patent to everybody, the CHANCELLOR of the EXCHEQUER showed that the annual income from land and real property was £105,000,000, instead of £67,000,000, and was, therefore, two-fifths, instead of one-fourth, of the whole. That of this, not more than £40,000,000 was derived directly from land alone, the other being railway, mining, house, and other property, none of which, it was alleged, had suffered by the changes which induced the agricultural community to call out for a diminution of burdens. With respect to the poor rate, it was shown that the proportion paid by the land alone was diminishing largely per cent., while the proportion paid by towns and manufacturing districts was increasing as largely. But the real object of the resolution was effectively exposed, by the statement that, after all, these rates did not fall upon the tenant farmer, but were, in fact, simply a deduction from rent. The only effect of their remission, therefore, would have been to enable the landlord to put the rates into his pocket, and to saddle the country with them in some other way. Every one knows that, in purchasing an estate, the rates and taxes to which it is liable are carefully calculated, and deducted from its real value, in order to ascertain the market price. With respect to the land tax, that was, in the first instance, a commutation in money for the feudal services required by the Sovereign in return for the grant of the lands. Among other services rendered under this feudal tenure, was that of supplying men-at-arms to the sovereign in time of war. There were no standing armies in those days. The aristocracy have got rid of that burden, but they keep their lands on the old tenure still. At a later period, when the Government wanted money, it borrowed on the security of the land tax, and gave all who paid that tax the option of redeeming the whole at ten years' purchase of the then value of the tax. Even now, notwithstanding the enormously increased value of land, the land tax can still be redeemed at the old valuation. In no country in Europe is that tax so small as it is in this country. In Prussia and other continental countries the proceeds of the land tax constitute by far the largest item of the national income. Whereas, here, Mr. DISRAELI himself only estimates the burden at £2,000,000 annually, a large portion of that estimate being composed of interest on the sums spent in redeeming the tax at its original low valuation. Altogether, we think Mr. DISRAELI has come badly out of this "move." He has achieved a position such as few men in this country ever attained, with his defects, among the jealous, exclusive, and haughty party with whom he acts. He has neither the blood, rank, nor fortune, they look for in their chosen leaders, and has had to fight his way up in the face of a decided Parliamentary failure at the commencement of his career. In order to maintain his position he must show good cause for so doing. It is the penalty attached to eminence. If he could practically carry out the principles enunciated in the brilliant peroration to his speech, he would stand a chance of being remembered in history as something better than a sayer of smart things. But, at all events, he must not trifle with his reputation and position by any more false moves like the present. At this time of day it is a "*leetle* too much of a good thing" to attempt to persuade us that the landlords have been such innocent, unsuspecting, and generous fools as to pay more than their fair quota towards the national income.

CHOLERA.

The following fresh cases were reported to the Board of Health on Saturday:—Glasgow, 2 fatal; Kilbirnie, 2, 1 fatal; Riccarton, 3 fatal; Greenock, 2; Island of Lewis, N.B., from 27th ult., 10, 5 fatal; Campsie, 3, 1 fatal; Kilmorey, Arran, 1 fatal; Kilbride, 8, 5 fatal.—Total, 31 new cases; 18 deaths.

The following fresh cases were reported to the Board of Health on Monday:—St. George's-in-East workhouse, 3 fatal; Shepherd's Bush, 1; Spital-fields, 1; Isle of Dogs, Poplar, 1; Sunderland, from 7th to 11th March, 44, 20 fatal; Glasgow, (10th), 3; Kilbirnie, 2 fatal; Stirling, 4 fatal; Paisley, 7, 6 fatal; Riccarton, 4.—Total, 70 new cases; 35 deaths.

The following fresh cases were reported to the Board of Health on Tuesday. It will be seen that there has, of late, been a considerable abatement of the disease. Whitechapel, 4, 1 fatal; Liverpool, 7, 3 fatal; Edinburgh, 1; Glasgow (11th), 6; ditto (12th), 2; Kilbirnie, 2; Riccarton, 5, 1 fatal; Greenock, 4 fatal.—Total, 31 new cases; 9 deaths.

On Wednesday there were 48 new cases, and 19 deaths.

On Thursday there were 17 new cases, and 2 deaths.

On Friday, 106 new cases and 43 death. [This includes cases at Clackmanan from the 5th ult.]

THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE TO THE CHARTISTS OF THE UNITED KINGDOM.

FELLOW COUNTRYMEN!

We again take upon ourselves the task of addressing you upon the necessity of renewed effort in furtherance of our political faith. To us nothing can be more distressing than to witness the indifference of the great body of the people to the degradation to which they must be subjected, so long as they are excluded from the rights of citizenship; and if there is any reason at all why the present order of things should be continued, it is, that those who suffer most from existing institutions, are least anxious about their alteration. This, of course, is no justification for the exclusive rule of the privileged classes, but it deprives us, and other persons like us, of the power which must be employed to ensure success to our cause. The masses in motion, and under wise, temperate, but energetic and determined direction, is what our rulers dread; and what we seek to accomplish, and what, with your aid, we feel *can* be accomplished. Will you, then, lend us such assistance as you can afford? If you are sincere, and would snap asunder the manacles that fetter your limbs—that degrade you—if the professions which you have so often repeated, have not been uttered thoughtlessly—if you value liberty, and hate bondage—if you feel the shame that marks the way of the slave, then will you join us, and help us to make right the foundation and justice—the practice of law. There is no power which can withstand the will of a people; but to make a demand successful, it must not only be made in the *name* of a people, but *by* a people themselves.

It is not the righteousness of the Charter that will ever ensure for it the attention of those who rule us, but the *power* to enforce its justice! To the creation of that power we have dedicated our humble abilities, and with your honest and energetic co-operation, we are sanguine of success. If circumstances have arisen to thin the ranks of the democratic army, should we be, therefore, daunted? If our numbers are fewer than they were, does that make our cause less sacred? or does it absolve us from the duty which we owe it? Say, are we not, for these very reasons, doubly bound to uphold it, and louder than ever to proclaim its truth? We, who for years have been in the foremost ranks, and who have been incessant in our labours to promote the interests, and elevate the character of our class, are still actuated by the same desire, and still urged forward by the same resolve. We, who have passed through all the phases of a popular movement—who have been buffetted by the storm, and have witnessed the calm, are still engaged in the active pursuit of the same great objects—the emancipation of Labour, and the freedom of our country. We make no demand upon you with which we have not already complied ourselves; and are, therefore, at least consistent in our appeal to your patriotism. We again put it to you, Chartists of the United Kingdom, to come forth in your numbers, and from the valley and the mountain top—as in times gone by—let there be heard once more in soul-enlivening notes, the cry,

"We *will*, we *shall* be free!"

It is with pleasure we observe that the men of Lancashire are again on the alert. On the 18th of the present month, it is intended that there shall be held at Todmorden, a meeting of delegates to devise means for supporting and propagating Chartism. A more fitting place could not have been selected for the meeting. Todmorden has done much for Chartism, and the Executive hail with pride the co-operation of the patriotic men of that noble valley. We hope that the example of Lancashire will be followed by the good men and true in all other districts, and that at all such meetings a primary consideration will be the condition of the Executive's exchequer. Without pecuniary means, it will be impossible to sustain a national movement, and the grand reason why our operations are at this moment so limited is, that sufficient funds are not placed at our disposal. Look, for example, at the receipts of the association for this week, and there will be found ample justification for these remarks.

In furtherance of the policy of the Association, a petition to Parliament—which accompanies this Address, has been prepared by us, and we urgently and earnestly recommend its adoption in the several districts throughout the country, and when signed to be sent for presentation to the House by the members representing the boroughs or counties in which they are adopted. We will address you again next week, pointing out our wishes as to the manner in which we think the preparation of the petition can be best proceeded with.

We have already given a pledge to the country that our proceedings shall be of such a character as to avoid the traps of spies and the malignity of the Crown prosecutor. There shall be no abatement of our energy and enthusiasm in the advocacy of our principles, but, if we can help it, faction shall not have the gratification of even impeding our course by verdicts of "Guilty," or sentences of expatriation; and having made up our minds to this method of procedure, we have determined to persevere, *until, with the assistance of the industrious classes*, our exertions shall have terminated in a great but peaceful victory.

"The People's Charter and No Surrender."

WILLIAM DIXON, THOMAS CLARK,
G. JULIAN HARNEY, PHILIP M'GRATH,
EDMUND STALLWOOD, SAMUEL KYDD,
JAMES GRASSBY.

PETITION FOR THE CHARTER.

TO THE HONOURABLE THE COMMONS OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND IN PARLIAMENT ASSEMBLED.

The Petition of the undersigned Inhabitants of ——

SHEWETH,—That your petitioners regard government as an institution designed for the protection of all the members of the community, wholly irrespective of class distinctions, or other social arrangements, and your petitioners are of opinion that where the interests of *all* are *equally* concerned, that the assumption by a minority of the management of the affairs of the whole body is a tyranny, the perpetuation of which can result only from the ignorance or indifference of the excluded and injured parties.

That your Honourable House from its designation, as well as from the theory of its constitution, and the functions which it performs, ought to be an emanation from, and a reflex of the will of the whole people, and not what it now is, the organ of an insignificant number of those who are subjected to its dominion, and whose lives and properties are to a great extent affected by its legislation.

That your Honourable House is at this moment legislating in the name of the people of the United Kingdom, upon all of whom your laws will take effect, notwithstanding the fact, that the authority of your Honourable House for the enactment of such laws, has originated from a constituency comprising not more than ONE out of every SEVEN of the male adult inhabitants of these islands.

That your petitioners are of opinion, that, in order to impress the decisions of your Honourable House, with the legitimate character and moral weight of law, with the SIX MILLIONS of male adults who have now *no legislative existence*, it will be imperatively necessary on the part of your Honourable House, to include them in the catalogue of persons who, by RIGHT, are entitled to the Electoral Franchise; and your petitioners accordingly urgently request your Honourable House to pass a law for their immediate enfranchisement—your petitioners being of opinion that such conduct, on the part of your Honourable House, would be nothing more than the most obvious justice to wronged and oppressed MILLIONS of your fellow subjects.

That your petitioners, in again appealing to your Honourable House to extend to the aforesaid SIX MILLIONS of men the immunities of citizenship, wish your Honourable House respectfully, but most emphatically and distinctly to understand, that they are not soliciting nor begging a privilege, but claiming a RIGHT, which, in the opinion of your petitioners, belongs as much to one man as to another.

That the age of twenty-one years being the period of life at which, by common consent, active manhood commences, and when men are considered competent to enter upon the performance of social duties, and independently to contract moral and legal obligations—and this will not apply exclusively to particular *classes*, nor to persons possessing a specific amount of wealth, no matter how acquired, but appertaining to all men alike—Your petitioners are of opinion, fixes the *datum* for the assumption of political power, by all who are required to act the part of men in the defence of their country, in sharing its pecuniary burthens, and obeying its laws: Your petitioners therefore pray your Honourable House, forthwith, to enact a law, extending to every MALE ADULT in the United Kingdom, who has attained his TWENTY-FIRST year (criminals undergoing the sentence of the law, and insane persons, alone excepted), the power of voting in the election of members to serve in your Honourable House.

That, in order the more effectually to enable electors to record their votes, free from interference or dictation, your petitioners pray your Honourable House to enact that at future elections for your Honourable House, voting shall proceed by BALLOT.

That your petitioners are of opinion that the present duration of Parliament is a great grievance, as affording to the corrupt opportunities too ample of sacrificing the interests of their constituents, to promote their own personal aggrandisement, and, also, as depriving the electoral body of that vigilant control, which is so essential in making your Honourable House the index of popular will. Your petitioners therefore pray your Honourable House to enact, that henceforth elections for members to serve in your Honourable House, shall occur ANNUALLY.

That as legislative talents and patriotism are not the peculiar attributes of any particular class of the community; and as wealth and station are not *always* allied to *genius* and the capacity to govern, your petitioners pray that what is now called "Property Qualification," for members to sit in your Honourable House shall be abolished, and that your Honourable House enact, that in future the only qualifications required, to constitute a British Senator

LETTERS TO THE WORKING CLASSES.

XXXVIII.

"Words are things, and a small drop of ink
Falling—like dew—upon a thought, produces
That which makes thousands, perhaps millions think."
BYRON.

"OUR INDIAN EMPIRE."

"The private soldiers fight and die, to advance the wealth and luxury of the great; and they are called masters of the world, while they have not a foot of ground in their possession."—TIBERIUS GRACCHUS.

BROTHER PROLETARIANS,

The three columns of "guns and drums," gore and glory, which occupied one half of the second page of last Saturday's *Northern Star*, was but an abridgment of the revolting particulars supplied by the writers of official despatches, the Indian newspapers, and the correspondents of the London daily journals. But although an abridgment, the *Northern Star's* account was probably quite sufficient to satisfy the curiosity of its readers—a curiosity which, of course, would be stimulated by the rumours noised abroad of the new dangers which threatened "*our* Indian Empire." I think I understand the anxiety my brother Proletarians must have felt when they heard that "*our* Indian Empire" was in danger!!!

"*Our* Indian Empire" is reported to contain upwards of *six hundred and thirty thousand* SQUARE MILES *of land*, and thereon a population of *ninety-five* millions! This includes the presidencies of Bengal and Agra, Madras, and Bombay; the province of Scinde; the provinces conquered from the Burmese Empire—including Assam, Arracan, &c.; Ceylon and other islands. When I say that "*our* Indian Empire" contains the above named quantity of land and population, I speak only of the British Paramount Possessions. I do not include the Tributary States containing land amounting to nearly *four hundred and ninety thousand square miles*, and a population of upwards of *thirty-two millions*. If I include these tributary states, "*Our* Indian Empire" contains about ONE MILLION ONE HUNDRED AND TWENTY THOUSAND SQUARE MILES, and a population (at least) of ONE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-SEVEN MILLIONS!!! Certainly this is rather a large bit of ground, and "our" subjects *do* make a pretty big figure. Mind, this is exclusive of the Punjaub, and those lion-like fellows, the Sikhs. Why we should meddle with them and their country is not easy to explain. Believe the *Times*, the fault is none of ours. We have, according to that veracious journal, been "the mildest, meekest men," in our intercourse with the Sikhs, who, according to the same authority, have repaid us with the blackest ingratitude. Ah! my friends, if the human devils who coin lies by the column in the *Times*, received their pay from SHERE SING or CHUTTUR SING, there would be another and a very different story told in the pages of that triply infamous journal.

As I have already said, exclusive of the Punjaub, and the tributary states, "*Our* Indian Empire" contains more than *six hundred and thirty thousand square miles of land*. You may form some idea of this extent of territory, by mentally comparing it with the United Kingdom, which (including the adjacent isles), contains about one hundred and sixteen thousand square miles. That is to say "*Our* Indian Empire," (exclusive of the tributary states, the Punjaub, and Hong Kong), considerably exceeds *five times* the extent of England, Scotland, Ireland, and the adjacent isles combined!

Methinks I hear some aristocrat, or aristocrat's lickspittle, asking if this Indian Empire is not a possession worth defending?—worth living for and dying for? It may be to those who directly or indirectly gorge the plunder of that empire. But to you, brother Proletarians, it is a matter of perfect indifference whether Briton or Hindoo, Russian or Sikh, rule the roast. So far as *you* are concerned, "*Our* Indian Empire" is an enormous lie. Granted that that empire has been won and preserved by the blood of your class; the winners and preservers have not enjoyed the fruits of their conquest. Disinterested conquerors! You have plundered nations only to lay your spoils at the feet of your masters! You have seized on hundreds of thousands of square miles of territory, yet you possess not a foot of soil either in England or India, that you can call your own! You have conquered millions upon millions of far distant tribes, only to extend the "glorious" yoke under which you sweat and starve, whilst melodiously chaunting "Britons never shall be slaves!"

It "were long to tell and sad to trace" the progress of "our" conquests in India. Some day I may narrate the hideous tale, too little known to your class. From the beginning even to the present hour, Fraud and Force have been the instruments of "our" progress to supremacy over the native peoples of India. In 1773 a Select Committee of the House of Commons having been appointed to enquire into the state of East Indian Affairs, and the conduct of the several Governors of Bengal, General BURGOYNE, on presenting the Committee's report to the House, observed "That the report contained accounts of crimes shocking to human nature; that *the most infamous designs had been carried into execution by perfidy and murder.*" He went on to show the horrible oppression which had been practised by Lord CLIVE and others; and charged his said lordship with taking bribes and extorting "donations" ("over and above the enormous sums he might, with some appearance of justice, lay claim to,") to the amount, in English money, of *two hundred and thirty-four thousand pounds*! General BURGOYNE showed the wretched situation of the East Indian princes, who held their dignities on the precarious condition of being the highest bribers. A bribe of five thousand pounds sterling was traced to a certain noble Duke, and one of double that amount was said to have been pocketed by that most pious of kings—George III. Between 1759 and 1763, CLIVE and his co-brigands gorged themselves with plunder to the amount of nearly SIX MILLIONS STERLING!

Public opinion forced even the Directors to make a clean breast of the villanous misdeeds of their "servants," although they took care to conceal their own. In a public document issued by that precious fraternity, they acknowledged the "corruption," "rapacity," and "universal depravity" of their agents; and added:—"We think the vast fortunes acquired in the inland trade have been obtained by the most tyrannic and oppressive conduct that was ever known in any age or country."

If the princes were oppressed beyond endurance, you may form some faint idea of the wrongs of the people. Under English rule almost every article of sustenance was monopolised by the Company. Rice, almost the sole food of the poor, at one time was raised six hundred per cent. The consequence was, that the unhappy natives perished by famine to the number of thousands! Such famines have repeatedly occurred since the foundations of "*our* Indian Empire" were laid. One occurred only ten years ago, in 1838-39.

The Company's salt monopoly, existing to the present day, is an atrocity which cannot be too severely denounced, but which I have not space to more than allude to. The grinding land tax is another frightful evil, and the principal cause of the retrogression of agriculture. Other monopolies and exactions combine to crush the natives to the dust, and make them curse the very name of Englishman.

India possesses immense, perhaps unequalled natural advantages: a soil of wondrous fertility, producing sometimes three, and even four crops in the year; mighty rivers; rich mines; a land producing almost every necessary and every luxury that could be named. Yet in such a country, under *British Christian* rule, the inhabitants have perished to the number of thousands, and tens of thousands, by famine, and pestilence engendered by famine. The English found India covered with temples, tanks, and aqueducts, and rich to overflowing in accumulated wealth, and the choicest manufactures in gold, steel, ivory, muslin, &c., &c. Under British rule one-third of the country, formerly cultivated, has become a jungle, the home of prowling tigers. The tanks and aqueducts are fallen to decay. If the temples still retain the shadow of their former magnificence, it is because the priests—like their "caste" nearer home—look sharp after *number one*. The manufacturing workmen of India have been ruined and starved to death by the competition of the manufacturing slaves of this country. How can an Englishman reply to the taunt of MICHELET:—"What have you done with India, one of the finest empires the sun has seen? It has withered in your hands. You remain exterior to it; *you are a parasite body that will be cast off to-morrow.* You found that *marvellous country* provided with commerce and agriculture. Yet what now remains to be exported, except opium?"

Brother Proletarians, what have you gained by the conquests, the plunderings, the famines, the massacres, which make up the history of "*Our* Indian Empire?" Alas, that I should have to write it—*nothing but Infamy!* You are more unfortunate than the helots of Sparta, the serfs of Poland, and the pariahs of (ancient) India. In all those countries, none but a free or nobler class was permitted to bear arms in defence of, or for the aggrandisement of the state. If helots, serfs, and pariahs, were not permitted to share the rewards of fighting, they were at any rate spared the hard knocks of war. But you, from your own ranks, man the armies and navies of the British Empire to gather spoil for others. In conquering and plundering other nations you share the infamy of your masters, but that is all your share. I beg pardon, I had almost forgot one *benefit* you derive from wars of aggression—increased taxation. You never win "laurels," but you have to pay dear for them. Take my advice, and for the future (unless you take up arms *for* instead of against the oppressed,) eschew laurels, and stick to the cultivation of cabbages!

The almost ceaseless wars carried on in India are got up to satisfy the ambitious and avaricious lusts of English aristocrats and adventurers. The war in Affghanistan was utterly unprovoked by the people of that country. An able and popular ruler was torn from his throne, and for some years kept a prisoner in the hands of the British, who imposed upon the Affghans a human lump of infamy under the pretext that he was "legitimate;" but the object really sought was the division and demoralisation of the Affghans, with the view of founding on their weakness a further extension of "*Our* Indian Empire." For a time SHAH SOOJAH was kept on his throne by British bayonets. His profligacy, his unpopularity, and the fact that he was kept on his throne only by British force, was confessed by that "good old" "Church and King" paper, the *Standard* of September 9th, 1840, as follows:—"The profligate old puppet who, by the mere force of British bayonets, now occupies the throne of Cabool, daily grows more unpopular." But this came to an end, British brutality and insolence put the finishing stroke to the patience of the Affghans. They rose against their oppressors. They slew the wretched tool who had been imposed upon them as ruler and tyrant of their country. They made as little ceremony with "Her Majesty's (most haughty) representative." They drove the British from their capital, and as the retreating army fled, the red right arm of vengeance followed on their track, sweeping them to destruction, until there was scarcely one left to tell the horrid tale.

The subsequent invasion of Affghanistan was undertaken to "avenge the insult inflicted on the flag of England." The British took their revenge not merely by combatting and slaying men in arms, but also by butchering the unarmed and defenceless, not excepting women and children. Blazing cities, and fertile fields turned to desolation, attested the triumphs of the British "avengers." The plunder they were unable to carry away they ruthlessly committed to the flames. Brother Proletarians, that is the kind of "glory" you share, as *supposed* participators in the ownership of "*Our* Indian Empire."

When the first war with the Sikhs took place our "best possible instructors," of course, threw all the blame upon "the enemy." But when were the weakest in the right? I will not recount the hideous tales of battle and slaughter which ended in the merciless destruction of the Sikhs by British artillery, when beaten and flying they were attempting to recross the Sutlej. It was formerly an English boast that "Britons only conquered to save;" and that the moment an enemy was beaten he was sure of the mercy of his magnanimous English victor. The waters of the Sutlej turned crimson with the blood, and choked in their course with the mangled bodies of the slaughtered Sikhs, told another sort of tale!

How the war which is now raging came about it is unnecessary for me to attempt to explain. Set down anything you may see in the *Times* or other daily papers respecting the "perfidy of the Sikhs" as so much *bosh*. The English have no right to be in the Punjaub; the natives naturally regard them as oppressors; and it has ever been understood that a nation contending against oppression is justified in employing craft (commonly called "policy") as well as force. The short and the long of the story of how and why the present war commenced is, that the Sikhs hate "us," and are determined to drive "us" back again over the Sutlej, if they can.

Hitherto the war has progressed doubtfully. It is true the city of Mooltan has been captured by "our victorious arms." Here are a few of the glorious items connected with the siege of that city:—

On the 30th of December the grandest occurrence of the siege took place—the blowing up of the principal magazine in Mooltan. The explosion was terrific. Extract from a letter written on New Year's Day, nine a.m.—Several beautiful shots have been fired. Eleven a.m. Our guns are telling splendidly upon the fort. Two p.m. The fire in the granaries is still raging; the mosques and tombs are falling beneath our fire. Five p.m. Our breach is fast increasing. The officers are working like horses. 300 men were killed by the explosion of the magazine. Jan. 3rd This morning the plunder is being collected.

A writer describing the state of Mooltan after the capture of the town, says:—

The frightful spectacles presented by the piles of dead scattered about through the town—the shivered limbs and mangled bodies which our shells had occasioned, and the ghastly wounds of some still surviving—were awful to behold.

"Glorious," is it not?

"Think how the joys of reading a gazette,
Are purchased by all agonies and crimes;
And if these do not move you, don't forget
Such doom may be your own in after times."

So much for "glory." On the other hand, there has been something like "monkey's allowance" gained by "our gallant troops" on the banks of the Jhelum—of course the British claimed the "victory." But, "it is the universal opinion," says the *Bombay Telegraph*, "that two more such victories would be virtual ruin."

And no wonder that such is the "universal opinion" when the facts of the fight are taken into account. The British confess to the loss of nearly a hundred officers and two thousand five hundred men killed and wounded; four guns, and six regimental colours. At the close of the battle the Sikhs fired a salute as though claiming the victory; and their claim appears to have been well-founded, seeing that the British fell back four miles from the scene of slaughter, leaving a number of their wounded on the field of battle, and the few Sikh guns which they had spiked but could not retain possession of. Worse still for "the honour of our arms"; in the midst of the fight a Bengal cavalry regiment, and two British corps of Dragoons, turned their backs and fled from "the enemy." Like the Russians at the siege of Ismail:—

"They ran away much rather than go through
Destruction's jaws into the devil's den."

Small blame to them. The English dragoons were probably not thinking of TIBERIUS GRACCHUS, when they turned tail, but it is not unlikely that at that moment the melancholy truth he enunciated, and which I have placed at the head of this letter, flashed upon their minds, and had something to do with inspiring their resolve to "advance backwards." The Bengal cavalry I suppose to be composed of natives of India. Four-fifths of the entire Anglo-Indian army consist of Sepoys, that is native troops, hired and trained to fight against their own countrymen, or neighbouring peoples who share, more or less, their ancient customs, institutions, &c. Just as in this country Englishmen are trained and paid

"That daily shilling which makes warriors tough,"

to kill, if ordered, their own parents, brothers, and friends, and the people of neighbouring states, who, separated merely by a big *ditch*, Nature proclaims our *brethren* (much more our brethren than many who are our countrymen). If the sepoys are not utterly devoid of common sense, they must sometimes ask themselves why they should cut the throats of Sikhs, Affghans, Burmese, &c., for the benefit only of their own conquerors—the English oppressors of India. That is not all. The sepoys are physically not a match for such hard-hitting fellows as the Sikhs, and, therefore, often come off "second best," a matter of no joke where those who fall seldom rise again, being usually "deaf to time." The matter for wonder is not that they sometimes retreat, but that they ever advance to fight for their *not* "very worthy and approved good masters." But if black and white horsemen fled, the infantry stood their ground, and, the newspapers say, won "*imperishable laurels.*" Of the 24th regiment (*Imperial English Infantry*) there were 11 European officers, 4 sergeants, 1 drummer, 188 rank and file, 2 horses killed; 10 European officers, 8 sergeants, 2 drummers, 256 rank and file, wounded; 38 rank and file, missing. Total, killed, wounded, and *missing*:—518. One regiment only! But the horribly slain (*to say nothing of the frighfully wounded*) have won "*imperishable laurels!*"

"Vain sophistry! In them behold the tools,—
The broken tools—that tyrants cast away!"

A few more words. Sir CHARLES NAPIER has been appointed Commander-in-Chief of the Indian forces; the Government, the Parliament, and the Press combining to represent him as the best-fitted of all "our" fighting men to *finish* the war. According to the *Times* the *terror* of his name (think of that!) is one of his chief qualifications. Yet these veritable "terrorists" cry "Down with the *bonnet rouge*; it it an emblem of terror!" I see. "Terror" is terrible if employed against the people's enemies; but "terror" is *glorious*, if employed by our *Christian* lords and masters to uphold and extend "*our* Indian Empire."

O, BRAMA! Why tarry the wheels of thy chariot? When will thy tenth "Avatar" come?

I could wish to write much more on this subject, but for the present I conclude. The foreign news of the week is very important, but want of space compels me to defer comment until next week. I will merely direct your special attention to the trial of the Republican chiefs at Bourges. BARBES and his brother-heroes are at this moment doing, daring, and suffering for mankind, that which entitles them to your gratitude, and commands the heart-homage of

L'AMI DU PEUPLE.

March 15th, 1849.

Chartist Intelligence.

NATIONAL CHARTER ASSOCIATION.—The Executive Committee met at 144, High Holborn, on Friday evening, March 9th. Mr. Dixon in the chair. Present—Messrs. Stallwood, Dixon, Clark, and M'Grath. Several letters were read, giving a pleasing account of Mr. Kydd's tour in the Manchester district.—Mr. James Grassby was, by a unanimous vote, added to the Executive Committee, and Mr. William Dixon, at the request of the men of Ashford, Kent, was deputed to go down to that town to deliver two lectures, in support of the Charter.

REVIVAL OF THE METROPOLITAN COUNCIL.—On the motion of Messrs. M'Grath and Clark, it was resolved:—"That the Executive Committee consider that the organisation of the Metropolitan Delegate Council would tend to the advancement of the Democratic cause, the committee therefore request the metropolitan localities forthwith to elect two delegates to form the council, and that the first meeting should take place at the Executive rooms, on Monday evening, March 19th, at eight o'clock precisely." Mr. Clark reported the petition for the "People's Charter," which was ordered to appear in the *Northern Star* of the 17th inst., and which it is hoped will be adopted by every parish, hamlet, township, borough, and county in the united kingdom. The Secretary stated that in an interview with Mr. George Thompson, the member for the Tower Hamlets, that gentleman had promised to present their petition, adopted at John-street for separation of Church and State, and to support its prayer. It was resolved to hold a series of meetings at the South London Hall, in furtherance of the Chartist cause, and the committee adjourned.

WESTMINSTER.—Mr. M'Grath delivered a very interesting lecture, illustrated by diagrams, on the science of astronomy, on Sunday evening last, at the room, 17, Ryder's-court, Leicester-square, which gave general satisfaction. At the conclusion it was announced that Mr. T. Clark would lecture on the 18th inst., on the Life of Mary Queen of Scots, and on the following Sunday on the Life and Times of Charles the First.

SHEFFIELD.—The members held their quarterly meeting in the Democratic Reading Room, 33, Queen-street, on Tuesday evening, when the quarterly accounts were read and passed, and the following officers nominated for the next three months: S. Jackson, Geo. Holmshaw, W. Cavill, W. Dyson, J. Tayler, J. Mitchel, P. Golden, C. Booker, W. Buckley, H. Tayler, Financial Secretary; G. Cavill, Corresponding Secretary. Persons wishing to correspond with the Sheffield Chartists, must direct to G. Cavill, as above. It was also resolved that Mr. Thomas Cooper be invited to visit Sheffield, and deliver a lecture on behalf of the victims.

LECTURE AT THE PEOPLE'S INSTITUTE.

(From the *Manchester Spectator*.)

On Tuesday week Mr. S. Kydd delivered a lecture at the People's Institute, Mr. Wheeler in the chair, on "Labour and Commerce, Supply and Demand, the Ten Hours Bill—its principle and results." The lecturer began by observing that the history and progress of the working classes of this country, during the last generation or two, was one of the most important in the annals of the world. We heard now a-days of countries being revolutionised hastily and unexpectedly; and many writers and speakers, as well as the press, seemed to suppose that England had remained stationary while these countries had changed. But a brief review of the history of this country during the last sixty years, would show that we also had been revolutionised, and not less immediately affected than any other people on the face of the globe. Seventy years ago England was chiefly dependant on agricultural resources. It is true her manufactures were considerable, and, perhaps, of as valuable a kind as those of 1849; but looking at England as it was then and as it is now, and remembering that seventy years ago she exported corn and imported foreign manufactures to a considerable extent, and now knowing that, as a nation, we pride and plume ourselves on the success of the arts and sciences, and on the high state of our manufacturing skill, we cannot help coming to the conclusion that we, as a people, have been effectually and materially revolutionised. At the first mentioned period the manufactures of England were spread over the length and breadth of the land. Evidence of this was seen in all the old agricultural towns; and the extent of the agricultural and manufacturing operations of each county bore some relation to their individual wants. Machinery has changed all that. The spinning and weaving frame, the self-acting mule, and the steam-engine have completely revolutionised the old system of domestic manufactures, which have become centralised in a number of towns and districts. Manchester being the most important of these towns, and Lancashire and Yorkshire of these districts. This aggregation of masses of individuals had called the attention of the legislature to these districts, the wealth of which had rapidly increased. The revolution in the manufacturing operations of the country having separated them from the agricultural districts, the former had increased in population rapidly, and this population had been concentrated within a comparatively limited space; while the agricultural districts continued thinly populated, and their population was scattered over a larger surface. The lecturer read the advertisement inserted in a Macclesfield paper in 1825, wanting 5,000 persons from seven to twenty years of age, to enable the silk manufacturers to conduct their operations. This letter was referred to by Mr. Huskisson in his speech in the House of Commons. This was one of those facts which were valuable; as affording us the means of understanding what we had to complain of, and what was sometimes called "surplus population." Between 1811 and 1841, the commercial and manufacturing population had increased 49½ per cent., while, during the same time, the number of men employed in agriculture had decreased 287,000. The statements in Mr. Huskisson's speech were indicative of the very year in which we now live. It shows that the regular system of the manufacturing system was to draft off the people from the agricultural districts. These same years have also changed the internal relationship as between the agricultural and manufacturing population, in nearly all the states of Europe, as well as in the North American states. English machinery goes into all those states, and English workmen with that machinery. That revolution had given an undue influence to capital over labour, while the competition of foreign markets had increased, the result of which was that the foreign manufacturers, like the English, were desirous of keeping the market by cheapening labour. This, of course, was the reason why they preferred long hours in factories, and also the labour of women and young persons to that of male adults. The struggles on the part of the manufacturing population for the Ten Hours Bill, were only a declaration on the part of the factory operatives, that they were slaves, bound body and soul; they called on the legislature to protect their wives and children from the growing tyranny of the capitalist. The employment of women and children in factories was a disturbance of the relation between father and child. The reports of the factory inspectors show that the whole theory and practice of the system of employing women and children was to reduce the value of adult labour, by bringing against it that cheaper labour. Mr. J. G. Marshall, manufacturer of Leeds, had admitted the fact before a committee of the House of Commons. The lecturer then showed the comparatively small number of adult males employed in mills, as compared with women and children in England and Scotland. The obvious tendency of the "cheapening" theory was to centralise all the work into the hands of a few large capitalists, out of the hands of the small capitalists. In 1837, the declared value of the cotton goods exported was only one-third of what it was in 1814; so that it took three times the quantity to bring the same amount of money. The difference of price between the two values was 36½ millions sterling; and we virtually made a present of that sum to foreign countries. It was this state of things which induced factory operatives to demand the Ten Hours Bill. Because, as they say, "We are worked to death in the good trade time, and then we are starved to death in the bad trade time." (Hear, hear.) And it was natural that some protection should be afforded to the children, if they were to have any comfort or happiness. The factory operatives did not expect to have wealth or even to make a competency, by shorter time; but he did expect to be able to realise somewhat more of the social influences, and to cultivate the domestic ties. And if the young ought to be protected, whynot the adults as well? (Hear.) Because, said the *Morning Chronicle*, the adults can protect themselves, while the children cannot. But a calm examination of the condition of the factory operative would show that he was in the same condition as the children. It was an admirable thing to tell the working classes, that they should be free and independent—free to work or to be idle, just as they pleased. But they all knew that a man could not live without work; and that, in an artificial state of society, a man had no alternative but to work for the supply of his and his family's wants. After descanting upon some other topics, Mr. Kydd concluded amidst the cheers of his audience. A vote of thanks was given to the lecturer, and shortly afterwards the meeting broke up.

PROMULGATION OF A NEW CONSTITUTION.—DISSOLUTION OF THE KREMSIER DIET.—The Austrian Emperor has imitated the King of Prussia. On the 7th inst, decrees were published at Vienna, announcing a new constitution, and the dissolution of the National Assembly at Kremsier. The new constitution, nominally 'liberal,' will be found to be 'a mockery, a delusion, and a snare.' Several members of the late Assembly have been arrested. Terror still reigns in Vienna.

TO THE CHARTISTS.

(Concluded from the First Page.)

When the "*Northern Star*" was a provincial paper, I had correspondents in nearly every large town in England, who were also agents for the sale of the "*Star*," and who received from fifteen to twenty-five shillings a-week for communicating libels and rubbish. The great majority—or nearly all—of those gentlemen ran in my debt from 5*l.* to 30*l.* each, and when the account was sent in, the answer was, that it was incurred to uphold my dignity, and to support the Chartist movement in its proper position.

So much for editorial magniloquence and irresponsibility—for agents' dignity and my responsibility. And now to a more important part of the subject. As you are perfectly aware, I have always set my face against mixing up any other question with that of the Charter, and from the letters that I publish—and especially from that of "L'Ami du Peuple"—you will at once discover that—gloss it over as they may—a most insidious attempt has been made to mix up the questions of Republicanism and Foreign Policy with that of the Charter, and, therefore, it is not an adopted principle of mine, but one that I have systematically persevered in to prevent either interested, rash, or enthusiastic parties from damaging THE QUESTION by encumbering it with other questions.

I know, and no man knows better, from dear bought experience, how difficult it is to keep a large political party together, unless the leader of that party is prepared with some temporary juggle to fascinate the otherwise flagging mind of the movement party, and that is the chief, the only, credit to which I lay claim. I have kept the one subject clearly and distinctly before you—unmixed, unmutilated, and without compromise.

Now, let me remind you of the position of other leaders of large and influential parties. There breathes not a more honest, a more zealous, devoted, or energetic advocate of his own principles than ROBERT OWEN. He is a man of whom posterity will write without prejudice or jealousy. He has bearded an amount of prejudice that few men would have had the courage to contend against; and yet when the idleness of some, the rapacity of others, and the hope of gain of others caused the failure of his social plan at Harmony, he was not, like Acteon, devoured by his own dogs, but, like many a good man, he was banished by the growling of bloodhounds, wishing to make merchandise of his system, from the land of his birth. But, thanks to sound English opinion, when the power of his tormentors perished, through their own iniquity, he returned to his native shores. Although a great admirer of the indomitable courage and persevering energy of this great and good man, I never would allow the Chartist party to blend the question of Socialism with Chartism, because the Socialists themselves had mixed the social with the religious question, and I feared that the adoption of the one might taint our cause with the prejudice of the other. My courage in advocating Chartist principles is as nothing compared with the courage of ROBERT OWEN. He was before his time; I was of my time, and HUNT and others had partially cleared the road for me: while he was his own pioneer and the herald, at least to the English mind, of his own repugnant doctrines.

I shall now turn for a moment to the past, and to a proud reminiscence and reconsideration of my association with the English labourers; and I ask them—not the poor gentlemen, but the veritable workers—to point out a sentence, line, or word, in my letter of the 3rd of March which is repugnant to or at variance with any sentiment I have ever expressed, or any opinion I have ever published. And I ask them to reflect upon the difficulties—nay, the dangers, against which I had to contend, from the Convention of 1839 to the present moment; and then to point out one single act of inconsistency, notwithstanding the manifold inducements operating upon public men. When I say from 1839, I would not confine criticism within that period, I would extend it to the whole of life, but as that embraces the period within all men's recollection I mention it.

I have often told you how easy it was to tickle the fervid imagination of brave and suffering millions with exciting appeals, which may drive the feeling, the enthusiastic, and brave to face death in any shape, while the exciter may shelter himself under the mantle of irresponsibility, and smile at the woe that he has created. What would you say of me, even you—you brave Republicans of Nottingham—if I appeared before an enthusiastic and excited audience in a garb descriptive of nationality and valour, and said, "When you see me next I will come to proclaim the Charter, or this national badge shall be saturated with the blood of the martyr." And what would you say if I did not make my appearance before the same audience, although the Charter was not proclaimed—although blood was not shed in the struggle to achieve it.

What would you say to me now, if, in 1839, I had appeared before you with the Cap of Liberty, and declared that I was ready to tuck up my sleeves and go at it, and if, when the struggle came, I was *non est inventus?*

What would you say, if, during the Lancaster trials, when rampant Toryism and Whiggism looked for a large Chartist sacrifice, I had turned a puling spooney, with my face bathed in tears, lest I should suffer the penalty consequent upon my struggle for freedom?

What would you say, if, upon the 9th of April—when I was assured by scores that I was to be shot upon the 10th,—I had called a secret meeting of delegates, and if I had proposed to that meeting that the meeting on Kennington Common should not take place? Oh, in such a case, how poor and pitiful are the strictures now written by enthusiastic Democrats, compared to what their denunciation, their just reviling, and reproach would then have been. The fact is, Chartists,

"A little learning is a dangerous thing;"

but a good understanding, with unshaken confidence, is a powerful auxiliary. I have never deceived you, I never will deceive you. The sufferings of my family are a guarantee for my honour, if seventeen years' experience, of close watching, and malicious and interested criticism, are not sufficient. And now, mark me, the mild man wedded to principle is like the lion when roused, while the exciting writer is like the timid hare when called into action, to which his own folly may drive an enthusiastic people.

There never lived a man who has suffered so much in the advocacy of a popular cause as I have. I have done so because it is my own cause. You consigned HENRY HUNT to a premature grave by your ingratitude; you never shall inflict the same punishment upon me; because though all should desert the standard of Chartism, I will steadfastly adhere to its principles.

My Nottingham friends threaten me with giving up the "*Star*" if so much foreign matter is excluded from it. My answer to this paltry threat is, GIVE UP THE "*STAR*," as I would rather that the "*Star*" published and proclaimed my own opinions with only one reader, than that its circulation should be a million, if it depended upon my sycophancy and their servility. It has been my pride that for some years the "*Star*" has been free from all squabbles; it is my determination that it shall remain so. In the House of Commons I voted that the prisoner, instead of the Crown, should have the last word. You have now had my accusers' indictments—not one, but three—you have had the prisoner's defence, and there the matter shall end, besecching of you not even to discuss any question which may lead to local irritation and national dissent.

In conclusion, I implore of you to read the one striking extract which I have selected from the Tower Hamlets' indictment, and also Mr. DUNCOMBE'S letter, and then read my notions of the proper form of Government, which follows this letter; and ask yourselves, without prejudice, whether I have been, and still am, a consistent advocate of your principles, or whether I am likely to be guilty of TRUCULENCY TO THE BRITISH MINISTER.

Veritable Chartists! Watch me—judge me—displace me—and appoint a leader more congenial to your feelings, if you are dissatisfied with me; but neither threat, insolence, nor ingratitude shall ever compel or induce me to surrender my own principles to the caprice of others.

I am, and while life continues will remain,
Your faithful, true, and uncompromising
Friend and Representative,
FEARGUS O'CONNOR.

P.S.—Considering the length that this letter has run to, and the amount of business that I have been obliged to perform this week, it must furnish a sufficient apology for the absence of Leaders in the present number. Next week I will make up for it.—F. O'C.

FORM OF GOVERNMENT.

REPRESENTATIVE SYSTEM.

Every man, of twenty-one years of age, of sane mind, and untainted with crime, to have a vote. The kingdom to be divided into not more than four hundred electoral districts; each district to elect one representative. Two representatives, returned by the same district, may even, with the protection of the ballot, cause an injurious coalition, while the election of one would represent the majority of the people. Voting to be by ballot. Elections to be annual. The representatives to sit by day. No canvass of any kind to be allowed previous to an election. The elections to be taken in one day in places sufficiently convenient for the voters to go to vote, and return, in two hours. The candidates to send their written intentions, of offering themselves for election to the electoral district returning officer, ten clear days, at the least, before the day of nomination, and no candidate to address the electrol except on the day of nomination, and anyproved canvass of the electors, to disqualify a candidate from offering himself. That all candidates must have attained the age of twenty-five years, which shall be their only qualification. That the members shall be paid for their services.

This, in our language, I will call the House of Commons, consisting of members of not less than twenty-five years of age, and elected by a majority of the voters in each district. The next branch of the Legislature is the Upper House, which I will call the

HOUSE OF ELDERS,

or the Senate, if you please. The Senate to consist of not more than one hundred and fifty members, and, in the first instance, to be elected by the House of Commons by delegation from their constituents, who, at the election for representatives to the House of Commons, should also vote in the first instance for Senators. The one hundred and fifty having the greatest number of votes to constitute that assembly. Every Senator to have attained his thirtieth year, and that to be his only qualification. One-third of the Senators—those who have the lowest number of votes—to retire each year, thus adding new blood to the Senate, no Senator being allowed to sit for more than three years, and the third being elected annually—the retiring Senators to be eligible to re-election.

THE EXECUTIVE.

The Executive to consist of a council of five. All persons of thirty years of age to be eligible. The Executive Council to be elected by the whole people. The President of the Council to be elected for life, subject to removal by the people. The Councillor having the greatest number of votes to be the President. The Vice-President to be elected for seven years, but removable by the people for cause. The Vice-president, in case of the death of the President, to hold the office of President until the next meeting of the Commons, when the members, by delegation from their constituents, shall elect a President. The other three Councillors to be elected for three years, but removable by the people for cauee. Those three members of the Executive Council to be eligible to be re-elected, and their election to be made by the House of Commons, by delegation from the voters. The appointment of judges and all officers of State to be left to the Executive Council, with responsibility to the people, and removable by the House of Commons. The magistrates to be appointed by the people in their several districts within the electoral districts, and, at the same time that the election for representatives takes place, and due notice of the intention to oppose the election of any magistrate, or to propose substitutes, must be made in writing to the district officer fourteen days, at least, before the election.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT.

Each Electoral District to appoint twelve Justices of the Peace who shall constitute a local board for the due performance of all local business, thus destroying that system of centralisation which has grown up in this and other countries, and leaving the assessment and levying of local taxation as well as the enforcement of education, of instruction, trade, and labour regulations, to be legislated upon by this local board of twelve magistrates. And one half of this tribunal, added to six persons annually appointed, to constitute the legal tribunal before which offenders charged with the following offences should be summarily tried:—Theft, willing idleness, drunkenness, and riotous conduct or fraud.

Now, such is a brief outline of my notion of a constitution; and there are two points which require some explanation,—the one is—the appointment of the President for life,—and the other is—the conferring upon the Executive Council the power of appointing Judges and State officers. My reason for appointing the President of the Executive Council for life is twofold.

Firstly. To avoid those sad demoralising and injurious contests which now lead to faction fights and popular disorders in America, where the President is elected for four years—two years of which are wasted in canvass, which leads to the formation of factions and parties merely bound together by some ignorant cry or foolish predilection, while the subsequent two years are spent in faction fights and party squabbles between the partisans of the successful and unsuccessful candidates, and thus do we find every day in the year devoted to these useless purposes. And, in my conscience, I believe that this injudicious method of electing an American President will in the end lead to a National Debt—a standing army—a moneyocracy—an oligarchy and class-legislation. I would, therefore, make the President free by electing him for life, but removable on cause; thus unfettering him from all party obligations and fears, and allowing him to develope his mind, his talent, and his feelings, unshackled by any party consideration, while the ambition of the Vice-President and Councillors to fill his place upon fair opportunity, would lead to honourable emulation and ambition in the discharge of their duties, while his tenancy for life would secure him against their intrigues, and cause perfect harmony to reign, as a shrewd people would never tolerate those party squabbles or allow them to affect the deliberations of their Executive Council.

The other point which you may suppose to require some explanation, is the appointment of Judges and State officers by the Executive Council. The very same reason operates upon my mind in this respect which induces me to oppose the present system of electing the American President.

The appointment of those officers by the Council may be looked upon as patronage, but it is more safe, as both the officers, and the party appointing them, are responsible to the people, and removable by the people, than if the people themselves were seduced into party squabbles upon subjects on which they could not possibly be as good or competent judges as those to whom I submit the choice.

Such is my notion of a perfect Constitution—of course, capable of improvement in the varied details of perfect local government—but I merely propound the system that would lead to it.

The Ministers of the people should be elected by the House of Commons. They should sit in the House and propound and advocate their measeres; but neither they, nor any official receiving other wages than the salary of a representative, should vote upon any question.

There should be no standing army but a National Militia; every man should be armed, and every district should have its arsenal; every man, from eighteen to thirty, should be drilled half a day in every week; and every man, from thirty to fifty, should be drilled half a day in every month; and there should be an Electoral District inspection upon one day in every year.

Religion should be free. There should be no State Church establishment; and no country should possess or hold dominion over any foreign country or in any colony separated from the territory by prescribed or natural boundary. Every three years I would have a Convocation of States, where the President of each Republic should meet in Convention, for the purpose of discussing international laws, of harmonising nations, and of reciprocally conferring mutual benefits the one upon the other, and I would have some one universal langvage which all people in all States should learn.

Trade should be free as the air. The Land should be subdivided to meet the wants of the people; the wages of the artificial labourer would be then regulated by the standard established in a free labour market; the manacles should be struck off the limbs of every slave; the liberty of the press, the liberty of speech, the freedom of opinion, and freedom of labour, should be proclaimed; every nation should govern itself; your fleets would be turned into carrying vessels, to convey the necessaries of one country, and to bring back the luxuries of another; those who discharged their public duties faithfully, should be paid honourably; gaols, and bastiles, and prisons, should be turned into schools, colleges, and hospitals; trades should be taught without apprenticeship; agriculture should be taught by practice; education should be received in schools and colleges upon the self-sustaining principle; the arts and sciences would flourish; the country would be a Paradise; society would be harmonised; happiness, contentment, and plenty would reign; the throne of supremacy would be based upon popular affection; the cottage would be a sentry-box; manufactures would flourish; trade would be prosperous; commerce would thrive; no National Debt should be contracted; the medium of exchange should be simple; plenty, comfort, and luxury would be within the reach of every industrious man, and the willing idler should be whipped as a criminal. No money bartering, no Stock Exchage, no profitmongering, except upon honourable competition, and recognised speculation; and then, if the tocsin sounded to arms, the freeman would fly to the cry of "My castle is in danger." The voice of Knowledge would silence the cannon's roar; bigotry and intolerance would flee the land; all the best qualities of man would be nurtured into virtuous habits, instead of, as now, being thwarted into vices. Such is a system worth living for, and worth dying for.

THE NATIONAL REGISTRATION AND ELECTION COMMITTEE, TO THE ELECTORS AND NON-ELECTORS OF THE UNITED KINGDOM.

FRIENDS,—When we take a retrospective glance at the startling and eventful scenes that have taken place since we last addressed you, we find, on looking abroad, that thrones, mitres, and crowns have crumbled and disappeared; that kings, tyrants, and despots have tottered and fallen; and that the rights of man have been recognised—as Universal, or rather Manhood, Suffrage is now the law in several of the continental states. But when we look at home we ask, "What has been done to advance the great cause of universal liberty and the happiness of the human family?" Certainly, during the Spring and Summer of last year, we had much frothy excitement; more talk than discretion; much noise, but no apparent progress: on the contrary, the results have been Gagging Bills—Whig prosecutions—good and brave patriots doomed by rampant t

The Metropolis.

HEALTH OF LONDON DURING THE WEEK.—By the Registrar-General's report, we learn that a decided improvement in the public health has occurred during the week ending March 10. The deaths registered in London, which in the three previous weeks were respectively 1,225, 1,191, 1,138, have declined to 1,947, or 122 less than the winter average. A remarkable improvement has occurred in the mortality from epidemics; whereas this class of diseases was fatal in the three previous weeks to 333, 318 and 319 persons respectively; in the last week the deaths were only 243, which is little above the average. Small-pox does not prevail much at present; measles is unusually low. Scarlatina and hooping cough show a decrease on the previous weeks; and now the mortality from the former does not much exceed the average. The deaths from hooping cough were 69, which is more than the average by 27. Typhus has fallen to the average, namely, 42 deaths. Fatal cases of diarrhœa and dysentery were 21, being 7 more than the average: of cholera, only 15, though in the three preceding weeks they were 49, 49, and 35. Of the 15, two occurred in Warburton's Lunatic Asylum, Bethnal-green; 5 in the workhouse of St. George in the East. The mortality from diseases of the organs of circulation is also unusually low. Three men died of delirium tremens; a man and a woman of intemperance (both cases attended with epilepsy); also a woman from falling in the street when drunk. A woman died in Mile-End, "eight days after childbirth, of typhoid fever, from previous poor living." A man of 34 years died of "intestinal disease—obstruction of colon through its whole length," *(post. mort)*. The obstruction had continued thirty-four days, but was removed by medical aid before death. The patient had taken opium medicinally for the last nine years, and latterly in doses of three and sometimes four half drachms daily. The mean height of the barometer was about 30 in. daily, except on Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday; the highest, which was on Thursday, was 30,385. The thermometer was highest on Sunday, when it was 60 deg.; the highest of each day fell almost continuously to 42 deg. on Friday. The mean temperature of the week was 43 deg. The mean temperature of each day continued above that of the same day on an average of seven years, till Friday. The wind was for the most part in the south-west, till Thursday, when it veered to north and north-west. The number of births during the week was 1,544.

THE ATTEMPT TO ASSASSINATE MR. SOUTHGATE.—Since the commission of this gross outrage, the police have been on the alert to discover the guilty party, and on Wednesday week Thomas Tipping, an active officer belonging to the P division, succeeded in apprehending a gipsy named Ayres, whom he suspected to be the person who had so seriously injured Mr. Southgate. His suspicion was directed to Ayres principally on two grounds—the one was, that in the morning on which the outrage had been perpetrated he had shifted from an encampment, where he had been located for some time before; and the other the reports in circulation that he entertained a feeling of hostility towards Mr. Southgate for some imaginary ill done or about to be done to one of his family, and he (Tipping) in consequence sought him out. On Thursday week Ayres was examined before the Baron De Tessier and a bench of magistrates at Epsom, when the circumstances above mentioned were stated to the bench, and a smock frock belonging to the prisoner was produced, on the front of which there was a large stain of blood. The prisoner on that occasion preserved a strict silence, and had not given the officer the slightest explanation of the stain of blood upon his frock. He was remanded to Horsemonger-lane Gaol until Mr. Southgate is considered fit to appear against him. It is the opinion of Tipping, the officer, and others, that the wound on the ear of Mr. Southgate was inflicted with the point of his own stick; and that his assailant, on finding him prostrate at his feet, inflicted the slanting wound supposed to be done by a pistol ball. This opinion is confirmed by the fact that when the stick was picked up and examined it was found that about two inches of the end, including the ferule, were deeply stained with blood, and that four inches above this part were spotted, leading to the presumption, therefore, that the lower part had been fixed in the wound, and that the blood spurting from the wound itself had caused the splashed appearance.

MELANCHOLY OCCURRENCE ON THE RIVER LEA.—TWO LIVES LOST.—On Saturday night last an extraordinary and painful sensation was created in Hackney, by a report that two medical gentlemen and a female had lost their lives on the river Lea. From inquiries made, the following particulars of the melancholy occurrence may be relied on:—It appears that a gentleman named Robertson, a student at King's College, and residing at 7, Upper-terrace, Islington, and a fellow student, whose name is unknown, induced a young female, Hannah Murray, living as domestic in Robertson's lodgings, to accompany them to the river Lea, which they reached about five o'clock. They hired a pleasure-boat at the Jolly Anglers, and had proceeded as far as the Horse-shoe Point, when Robertson's friend leaned over the boat to secure the rudder lines. The female, fearing his precipitation into the water, unfortunately suddenly left her seat, which caused the boat to turn keel uppermost, when all the three were immersed in the watery element. While in the act of sinking the unknown gentleman clung to Murray. The melancholy catastrophe was witnessed by a barge-man, who promptly used his hitcher, and brought up the body of the female, which was conveyed to a neighbouring house, where, after lengthened efforts, Mr. Jones, surgeon, succeeded in restoring animation. Half an hour elapsed before the bodies of Robertson and his friend were got out. The latter had the female's shawl bound tightly round his right arm. Every effort made to resuscitate the unfortunate gentleman proved fruitless. On Tuesday Mr. Baker held an inquest at the Robin Hood public-house, High-hill, Hackney, respecting the deaths of J. J. R. Robertson, aged 21, and T. W. C. Hairby, aged 24, medical students, who were drowned in the River Lea. Margaret Murray stated that on Saturday last she accompanied Hairby to the Jolly Anglers, adjoining the River Lea, Upper Clapton, where he hired a small boat which was only sufficient to hold two persons, and shortly after she had embarked with Hairby, Robertson came up and requested to be taken in. The boat was put back, and Robertson jumped in and sat down by the side of witness. Some persons who were standing on shore cautioned Hairby and Robertson not to proceed in the boat, as it was too small to hold three persons, and that it was dangerous to remain in her. Hairby took charge of the sculls, and Robertson held one of the steering-strings and witness the other. The boat had not proceeded far when Hairby said he was tired of rowing, and requested Robertson to take the sculls. They both stood upright, and Hairby attempted to pass Robertson, and in doing so they both leant on one side, which caused the boat to heel over and it began to fill. They became much alarmed, and the deceased immediately caught hold of witness, and the boat instantly capsized and turned keel upwards. W. Waller, a bargeman, said his attention was attracted by hearing violent screaming for assistance, and he saw three persons in the water. Witness was in a barge, and he quickly reached the spot and succeeded in rescuing Murray. The deceased, after swimming a short time, sank, and their bodies were not recovered until half an hour afterwards. The jury returned a verdict of "Accidental death."

WORKHOUSE ECONOMY.—An inquest was held on Saturday, before Mr. Wells, at the King's Arms, Short's-gardens, Drury-lane, on the body of M. Reynolds, late an inmate of St. Giles's workhouse, aged sixty-two. Elizabeth Worrall, another inmate of the workhouse stated that on Thursday night deceased returned with her to the workhouse about nine o'clock. She was perfectly sober. Just as they entered the hall the deceased missed her footing, there being no light, and fell head foremost down the kitchen-stairs. Witness fell after her and tumbled on deceased. She called for assistance; the nurse came and removed witness, but deceased was quite dead.—Coroner: "Was there no light?"—Witness: "No, sir, and the stairs are very dangerous. The least thing would throw any one down them."—Thomas, the summoning officer: "The lights are extinguished at eight o'clock."—Coroner:—"That's very ill-advised economy, by which human life has been sacrificed."—Verdict: "Accidental death," accompanied by a recommendation from the jury that the guardians should without delay erect a small door at the head of the kitchen-stairs. The coroner directed Thomas to forward the recommendation to the guardians.

NARROW ESCAPE OF FIVE PERSONS FROM SUFFOCATION.—On Tuesday evening, whilst Mr. W. Payne was holding an inquest at the Bull, in Tooley-street, the following extraordinary case, and narrow escape of five persons on board the Begownam Maid, was related to him by Mr. Mead, the summoning officer:—The vessel, which belonged to Wales, had a few days since arrived in the London pool, and had been moored off Topping's Wharf, where she remains. The night being excessively cold, the crew consisting of five men, made up a large fire, with Welsh coal, in the forecastle, and previous to retiring to rest they put down the forecastle hatch. In the morning the watchman was surprised at finding no one making his appearance from below. He knocked and called from above but without receiving any answer. This induced him to open the hatchway and go below, where he found the five persons lying in their berths, with blood issuing from their mouths and noses, and they appeared quite dead. They were taken on to the deck, and two medical gentlemen were sent for, and they declared that they men were labouring under the effects of some noxious vapour.—An examination having been made, it was clearly ascertained that the Welsh coal brought in the vessel, and which had been burned in the forecastle, contained a large quantity of sulphur, the vapour from which had so filled the cabin, as to overpower the men whilst they were asleep. The most prompt measures were resorted to by the medical men to restore the unfortunate men, and after the lapse of nearly twelve hours, they were pronounced out of danger.

The Provinces.

WARWICKSHIRE. — AWFUL DEATH. — On Friday week Mr. G. Greenway, coroner, held an inquest at the King's Arms, Kenilworth, on the body of Miss Ann Stewart, aged 16, a daughter of General Stewart. It appeared from the evidence of John Pugh, coachman to the General, that on Thursday afternoon, about three o'clock, he heard one of his master's horses making a strange noise in the stable, and on going to the spot he found Miss Stewart under the horse. The animal was standing close by the side of the stall, and the deceased was doubled up under it. The blood was issuing from deceased's head, and there was a large pool of blood in the stable. The deceased used to caress and feed the horse occasionally, and it was remarkably quiet and seemed sensible of her attention. In the opinion of the witness the deceased was feeding the horse, when he, in play, knocked her bonnet off, and it fell on the ground; that he then became frightened, and, knocking her down, kicked her on the head, as he found her bonnet on the floor of the stable, and the off hind heel of the horse was covered with blood. When he extricated deceased life was quite extinct. The jury returned a verdict of "Accidental death." The young lady was highly respected by the whole neighbourhood, and the melancholy event has thrown a gloom over the district.

LEICESTERSHIRE. — RIOT BY WORKMEN. — During the past five weeks the hands employed at the Leicester sock branch, and other parts of the frame-knitting trade, have been on strike for an advance of wages, and subscriptions have been opened for maintaining them until they could obtain the advance sought for. During this period a few persons have gone to work at Belgrave and also at Thurmaston. On the 2d inst a man named Dilely, who had partaken of the subscription raised, went to work, and said that he had got the advance demanded. His fellow-workmen did not believe him, and on the following Monday Jonah Dakin and Jesse Brewood went to his shop and commanded him to come out. The man, however, refused, when the two entered and commenced maltreating him, and he was obliged to defend himself with an iron rod. The parties having departed, a crowd of between 300 and 400 persons went to a house kept by a person named Oswins. An effigy was carried by the mob, and several shots were fired at it. The mob next fired into Oswin's window, but fortunately without striking their man. Various other acts of outrage were committed, and ultimately thirteen of the rioters were taken up and sent for trial.

HINCKLEY PETTY SESSIONS.—Thomas Coley, a poor day-labourer, was brought before the court by Mr. Henry Moore, farmer and overseer of the parish of Dradlington, to show cause why he refused to pay the sum of 1s. and 8d. for poor rates due to the said parish. The poor man said with much earnestness and feeling that he could not pay for the following reasons, or he would not object: "I work for 10s. per week wages. My house rent is 1s. 9d. per week. I have a wife that can earn scarcely anything at all, and three children, all under seven years of age. That is my case, gentlemen." Mr. *Heming* said to Mr. Moore: "You hear this poor man's case. Now do you think, as a conscientious man, that that family can be maintained for a less sum than 8s. 3d. per week, or that that man can pay rates for the relief of the poor? You must know that it cannot be done. Nevertheless, if you say—and say it officially—that you believe he can pay, the bench has no alternative but to enforce the payment. The consequence will be, that a warrant of distress will be issued upon his goods and chattles, and you will make the poor honest labourer a pauper at once." Mr. Moore said that the gentlemen at Dadlington had had a vestry meeting, and they had every one agreed that the defendant was able to pay the rate, for he was better off than some others of the parish who did pay, for their families were larger than his. Mr. Hemming said it was a shame that any of those men should be required to pay. Payment, however, must be ordered. Thomas Coley and some other poor labourers belong to Shenton and other parishes, but they are compelled to live at Dadlington, because there is not a single house in the parish where they belong, and where they work, for them to live in. The owners in that parish will not have any built; and those parishes where they do live, compel them to pay rates in order to get rid of them.

SUSSEX.—DEFALCATION AT A SAVING BANK.—The committee of management of the Brighton Savings Bank have been engaged in a very arduous inquiry, arising from the misconduct of their actuary, Mr. Buckoll. The first suspicion of anything wrong was raised soon after the late annual general meeting, when a discrepancy of £100 was discovered in what are called "extra profits," and which Buckoll, on being called upon, could not explain. Other discrepancies were also detected with the same result, and, at a meeting of the committee, a member was about to move a resolution declaring the incompetency of Mr. Buckoll (who had not attended) for his situation as actuary, when a letter was handed in from Mr. Buckoll, in which he admitted that there were defalcations in the accounts, but appealed to the committee, for merciful consideration on account of his innocent wife and family, and offered to make up any deficit from his private property. The case now assumed a more grave aspect, and a warrant was immediately issued to secure the attendance of Buckoll, but which, up to the present moment, has not been executed in consequence of his absence. The accounts were found to have been kept in a most confused manner, some accounts being closed which were still current, and entries made in the general ledger (upon which the returns are made to government) which did not agree with those of the class ledger and the depositors' books. Upon the examination hitherto made, there appears a deficit of about £850; and of course a large number of accounts remain to be examined. Under these circumstances, a sub-committee was appointed to proceed to London to consult with Mr. Tidd Pratt, and see the comptroller general of savings banks, and the advice of this latter gentleman was, that no further deposits should be received, or payments made, until the accounts had been thoroughly inspected. The committee, consequently, at a meeting held on Friday, passed a resolution recommending the managers to close the Bank for deposits and payments until this has been done, and to call in the books of all the depositors. The depositors, however, says the *Brighton Herald*, need be under no alarm on this account. The position of the bank is such as to secure them from loss. The amount of deposits is about £120,000: and the bank has the sum of £110,000 invested in government securities, and there is a further sum of £1,700 arising from the accumulation of "extra profits," and which will, of course, be applicable to any deficiency that may not be covered by the property or the sureties of the defaulter. The amount of security given by Mr. Buckoll is, we understand, £600, and his sureties are the London Guarantee Society. It cannot be denied that the managers of the bank have not shown that care and vigilance which were required of them, or this state of things could not have arisen.

THE MURDER AT BRISTOL.

BRISTOL, March 12.—The remains of the murdered lady, Miss Elizabeth Jefferies, were removed to their last resting place this morning, the spot selected being a vault in the Bristol Cemetery. The funeral was strictly a private and a plain one, every ostentation being, for obvious reasons, avoided by the relatives of the unfortunate deceased. The police are actively engaged in investigating the affair, and have hitherto proceeded with very great skill and caution. They have succeeded in discovering the flyman who drove the prisoner, with her boxes, to Horfield on the day of the murder. The deposition of the flyman is to the effect, that he took the prisoner up on St. Michael's hill, and that at the time when she engaged his fly she was standing on the pavement, and her boxes were by her side. At this time she had no person at all with her, and, after engaging his fly, and seeing that all her boxes were stowed away—in doing which she was very particular—she told him to wait a bit, and she then went to a greengrocer's shop, which was not very far off, and brought out a bandbox, which it seems she had left there some little time before, and which, in all probability, was the one which was found under the girl Sarah Thomas's bed, and in which was found concealed several articles of jewellery. After this box had been safely placed away with the rest the prisoner entered the fly, and desired the flyman to drive her to the "stop-gate," on the road to Gloucester. He did so, and put her down at a turning which passed down by the lane-way leading from Ashley Down, and where her father's house was situated. There was no one with her, or waiting for her, and she did not have any conversation with a single individual the whole way. As is customary in these cases, the most absurd, improbable, and sometimes contradictory reports have been afloat.

On Thursday, March 8th, the coroner, Mr. J. B. Grindon, commenced the inquest on the body of the deceased, Elizabeth Jefferies, at the Griffin Inn, and having detailed to the jury at considerable length the principal facts of the case, he observed that the gentlemen present were no doubt aware that in cases of suspected murder the first, as he was the most important witness, should always be the medical man. He should therefore propose, before he took any considerable amount of evidence, that they should adjourn their proceedings, and direct Mr. Bernard, surgeon to the Bridewell and to the police force, to make a *post mortem* examination of the body. Previous, however, to that, and to their going to view the body, he thought it might facilitate the investigation to take briefly some evidence from the brother of the deceased.

HENRY JEFFERIES was then called, and having also minutely detailed the circumstances of gaining admission to the house, and other facts which have already appeared, he proceeded to observe that when he entered the bedroom of his sister and saw her lying on the bed, from what he observed he was convinced that she died from violence, and being a surgeon he was sure that violence could not have been inflicted by herself. In addition to the blood on her face, the pillow and bolster were completely saturated with blood.

The jury then proceeded to view the body, but such was the excitement created, that it was only by the most strenuous exertions that they made their way through the crowd. The body presented a most frightful appearance, the head being completely beaten in. The deceased appears to have been a strong muscular woman. The right leg projected from the bed, and her left was drawn up as if she had been in the act of getting out of it, probably in order to grapple with her assailants. The jury having viewed the body returned to the inquest room, when

HENRY JEFFERIES was recalled, and stated, that by his directions the police had searched the house for property and he particularly mentioned to them a certain tin box in which his sister kept several valuables. It was found in a closet, without the padlock which she always kept on it. It was not empty, but was not nearly so full as it used to be. He also directed the sergeant to search for a nest of drawers, which he knew was generally full of valuable jewels. When found it was without some of the drawers, and it had been pillaged. There was likewise a peculiar silver cruet-stand made of filagre silver; one article of it, however, only was found. He had since seen a quantity of property at the station-house, and he recognised several articles of jewellery which he could identify.

MICHAEL CORP, police-sergeant, No. 2, sworn, said that on Wednesday afternoon, by direction of the superintendent, he, accompanied by police-constable 58, went to the house of the deceased. They managed, by going through the next door, No. 5, to get into the back premises. They found the back door fast, but by drawing the staple they gained admission to the kitchen. He could not judge what meal had last been taken there, but he saw a piece of liver on the board. There was no fire, but the fender looked as if it had been left in the act of being cleaned. The witness then gave the particulars of his search with Mr. Jefferies, and continued—that from information which he received he went in search of the prisoner, and found her at her father's house. Her father was a labourer, residing at Horfield. The door was opened by an elderly woman, who said—

Mr. DAY, solicitor, stated that he attended on behalf of the accused, and he objected to any conversation being received as evidence unless the girl Sarah Thomas was present at the time.

The CORONER observed, that he might recognise Mr. Day in the character of attending for the accused, but he could not allow him to interfere. He did not know that any one was charged; but Mr. Day must know that any one suspected of murder would be taken into custody. If he (the coroner) took down anything improper, he was responsible for it, but not to any one present.

The witness continued, that the mother denied all knowledge of her daughter being in the house, and said she had not seen her husband for a month. On searching the house, besides the articles already mentioned they found several articles of jewellery in a bandbox under the bed, in which a little girl was sleeping, and from which he believed the prisoner had gone when they entered the house, as they found her in the coal-hole only partly dressed. [The articles were here handed to Mr. Jefferies, who recognised them, and said he knew that his sister valued them as relics of other days, and she was not at all likely either to have given them away or to have sold them.] Witness, that morning, accompanied by police-constables 46 and 86, made a further search of the house, and hanging behind the back-kitchen door they found a corded petticoat stained with blood, which they were told belonged to Sarah Thomas.

ISABELLA FRY deposed, that she was the wife of Thomas Fry, turnkey at Bridewell. She resided at No. 5, Trenchard-street. She had lived there five years, and the deceased was her landlady, but she never saw her unless when she went to pay her her rent. She never saw her servant, but a tenant of hers knew her well. On Saturday morning last, about ten minutes past five o'clock, she was in bed with her husband, when she was awakened by a very great noise in Miss Jefferies' house, which apparently proceeded from the front bedroom. The noise was like a person crying or screaming; she did not hear any noise like blows. A tenant of hers, Mrs. Ham, came and asked her if she heard the noise, and she said she did, and she supposed that it was Miss Jefferies calling up the servant, and that they were quarrelling, adding, that from the noise the old woman must be killing her. Mrs. Ham asked if she should knock at the wall, and witness told her to do so. She knocked, and almost immediately the noise ceased. About seven o'clock the same morning there was a knock at her door, and being only partly dressed she asked Mrs. Ham to go down and answer it. She went down, and witness heard a female voice which she was afterwards told was Miss Jefferies' servant, say "that Miss Jefferies had sent her in to say she hoped Mrs. Fry was not alarmed at the noise, for it was a cat had got on the bed and had frightened her mistress and that her mistress was afraid that they were killing each other." Mrs. Ham said, "I thought it was you crying." The girl replied "No, it was the cat got on the bed." Mrs. Ham said, "Oh, it was no cat, for I have heard you cry before in the yard;" and the other then said "She is such a good-for-nothing woman, or wretch, that I cannot live with her." Witness did not observe that the house was closed that day, but her servant told her it was closed Saturday and Sunday, and she herself saw it closed Monday and Tuesday. On Tuesday some persons came and knocked, and no answer was returned. Witness said it was very strange, and her servant looked up at the window and said she believed Miss Jefferies was up, for she could see a looking-glass, a time-piece, and the corner of a bed-post. The next morning her servant went again and looked up, and then the green blind was down. She said, she thought Miss Jefferies was ill, but witness said, how could that be? and, besides, her back window was open.

Mrs. HAM confirmed the statement of this last witness as to the conversation that had taken place between her and the girl Sarah Thomas. She also said she heard the noise in Miss Jefferies' bedroom; it was about five minutes past five. It was a noise as of a person crying or screaming. She knocked at the door, and after that heard no more noise.

On Friday morning the investigation was resumed. The accused, Sarah Thomas, was furnished with a chair. She looked well, but her demeanour was by no means so callous as before, and at one part of the evidence she burst into tears and remained with her handkerchief to her eyes during the rest of the proceedings. The following is the evidence as to the *post mortem* examination:—

RALPH MONTAGUE BERNARD, having been sworn, deposed that he is a surgeon, and resides at 18, Richmond-terrace, Clifton. Yesterday afternoon he made a *post mortem* examination of the body of the deceased, in the presence of Dr. Farebrother, Mr. Evans, Dr. Bowly, and Mr. Bowly. After describing the external appearances of the body, and the clothes in which it was dressed, he proceeded to say that the head was covered with a nightcap, which was saturated with blood on the left side. The pillow and bolster, and also a part of the bed, were bloody, as was also a chair by the side of the bed; and a stream of blood, about an inch wide, extended from the bedside to the wall near the door, where it formed a pool. The face was livid and bloody; the chest and abdomen livid. On the left hand was a contused wound of the thumb and forefinger. There were three contused wounds on the left side of the forehead. On the top of the head, in the centre, extending from the coronal suture backward, was a contused wound, two inches long. A little to the right of this was a contused wound, like the letter Y, one and an eighth inch long. On the left of the central wound was also a contused wound of the same description. At the back of the head to the left of the occipital protruberance, was a contused wound, three-quarters of an inch in length. To the left of this, and below it, was an abrasion of the skin, one and a half inch long. The wounds appeared to be recent and death must have taken place soon after their infliction. They were such injuries as the deceased could not have inflicted on herself. [The girl, Sarah Thomas, here burst into tears.] On removing the scalp it was found that the occipital bone was minutely injected with florid blood. There was an extravasation of blood on the left temporal muscle, and also under the scalp, at the lower and front parts of the parietal corresponding to the external ecchymosis. On removing the dura mater a layer of blood was observed effused under the arachnoid membrane. The vessels of the right hemisphere were congested; the left was natural. In the chest and abdomen there was no mark of disease or injury sufficient to cause death. He concluded the cause of death to be concussion and compression of the brain, which the external appearances were sufficient to account for, and in his opinion did cause it. The injuries could not have been inflicted by a sharp instrument, but must have been caused by a blunt one. He had no doubt whatever that the deceased died immediately after receiving the injuries, and that her death was caused by those injuries.

The inquest at this stage of the proceedings was adjourned till Tuesday.

ADJOURNED INQUEST.

MARCH 13th.—The interest consequent on the horrible murder of Miss Jefferies at Bristol continues to increase, and at the resumption of the inquiry before the coroner this day the most intense anxiety was manifested. The inquest-room and all the approaches to it were so densely crowded that it was with the utmost difficulty the jurors or witnesses could fulfil their duties. The list of the jurors having been called over, Mr. Bernard, surgeon, was recalled in reference to the appearances presented by the room when he was first called in to see the body of the deceased. He stated that the floor was strewn with linen and papers, and leaning against the fireplace was a clothes-horse, having upon it a woollen counterpane; it was not, however, sufficient fully to conceal the fireplace. Witness and Inspector Bell, after looking at the body, made a search for a weapon, and when looking at the fire-place to see if the fire-irons were stained with blood, they observed a flat stone, like a piece of a paving-stone, in the fire-place. They did not examine it particularly at the time, thinking that it had been placed there for the purpose of making the fire-place smaller. There were no marks of blood on the poker or tongs. On Thursday, while witness was engaged in making the *post mortem* examination, Inspector Bell came to the room and took the stone from the fire-place and put it in witness's hands. He looked at it, and saw that there were marks of blood upon it, and also grey hairs. The hairs had been divided, and had not come from the head by the root. Dr. Fairbrother, at the suggestion of Inspector Bell, tried the corner of the stone to one of the wounds in the forehead, and found that it exactly corresponded. Witness had no doubt that the stone produced the wounds, or, at all events, that the injuries were caused by such a stone. (The stone was here produced. It was of an irregular square shape, about two inches thick, and bore upon it marks of blood and some fragments of grey hair. It was part of a paving-stone, and weighed nearly 4lb.)—Alfred Bell, inspector of police, corroborated the statement of Mr. Bernard as to the finding the stone with which the murder is supposed to have been committed. From information which he received the same night, accompanied by Sergeant Corp, Sergeant Somers, and police-constable Elmes, 46, he went to Horfield, to the house of a man named Thomas. After much trouble they entered the house, and found the young woman present, answering to the name of Sarah Thomas, in a coal-hole under the staircase. Elmes saw her in the act of closing the door, and said, "Come out of that; it won't do." She had on a night cap and a pair of slippers. In other respects she appeared to be in a day dress. She took off her night cap, and "threw it with great viciousness into the fire-place." He then took her into custody.—By a juror: They were detained at the door long enough for her to have put on these articles of clothing. On her being brought out of the coal-hole, he asked her "When she had left her mistress, at Trenchard-street?" She said, "On Friday last." He asked her "Who brought her boxes up?" and she said "She employed an Irishman, and gave him sixpence for the job." After having been duly cautioned, she said, "You may take me into custody; but it was not I that did it." This was after he had told her that he took her into custody on a charge of murdering her mistress. She seemed very uneasy in her mind whilst the house was being searched. This witness and policeman Somers and Elmes, and Mr. Cridland, housekeeper and searcher at the central police station, then deposed to the search of the prisoner's father's house, particulars of which have already been given, and produced the property found, viz.—four silver table-spoons, a gravy spoon, and a box, found in the coal-hole; a gold watch, chain, and seals, found in the bedroom; and twenty-seven sovereigns, four half-sovereigns, and some other monies, found in the prisoner's pocket. Mr. Cridland also produced five silver tea-spoons found in the prisoner's stocking at the time when she was searched at the station-house. The most important evidence of the day was that of Police Constable M'Clymont, under whose charge the prisoner, Sarah Thomas, had been since her apprehension, who deposed that the prisoner had several times spoken to him about the murder. Witness did not offer the prisoner any inducement to say anything, nor threatened her, but she freely and voluntarily spoke to him about it. The prisoner told witness that the servant girl who was with Miss Jefferies about two months before she went to live there, and whose place she had taken, came down to the house on the Saturday morning, when she was taking down the shutters, and told her that she had been several times for a character from the old woman, and she would not give her one, and that she could not get a situation unless she got a character, and that then this girl said she would go up stairs and murder the old woman—that the girl went up stairs and killed Miss Jefferies with a stone, and then got the keys and opened the cupboard, and took out a small box that was full of sovereigns. She opened the box and gave the prisoner part of them, and took the other part to herself, and that she told her that she would give her all the silver spoons and plate if she would not speak of it. She told her that it would be a long time before it would be found out, as there were not many persons who called at the house; that they then ransacked the house, came down stairs, put on a frying-pan, made pan-cakes, and had their tea, and that the stone that the girl killed the old woman with was laid upon the hob by the side of the fire. They did not leave the house until about dinner time, and that she (prisoner) then went to Horfield. She said the girl's name was Maria Lewis, or Williams, and witness was not sure whether she said she lived in Bedminster or St. Philip's—witness forgot which—that when they came out of the house, the other girl locked the door, and took the keys with her. A day or two afterwards, witness was sent up on duty to the house of the deceased, to relieve another policeman in charge of the house; on witness's return he was placed in charge of Sarah Thomas in her cell; she asked him if he had seen the old duchess? Witness said he had not, for the door was made fast. She said that the other girl had killed the dog, and put it down the privy.—Susan Miller, who had been in the habit of going errands for Miss Jefferies, proved that she saw her alive and well on the Friday before she was discovered murdered, and that on the following afternoon she went to the house and rang the bell, but could get no answer. This witness stated that Miss Jefferies kept a very sharp dog, which used to bark at strangers, and that, in order to let the dog in and out, the kitchen door was usually kept open. It was fastened back with a stone (the stone stained with blood was here shown to the witness, and she identified it as that usually employed to keep the door open.) A girl named Chad, who had lived as servant with the deceased till about six or seven weeks before the prisoner went to live there, was called, as were also her friends, to prove that at the time of the murder she was in Bath. This witness also spoke to its being the habit of deceased to have her dog sleep in her bedroom, and to see the doors safely locked, and carry up the keys in her pocket.—Police-sergeant Somers proved that in consequence of a statement made by the accused to the effect, that the girl who committed the murder killed the dog and threw it down the privy, he went and searched that place, and found the carcase of a dog lying head downwards, embedded in the soil.—A man named Vickery also deposed, that on Wednesday night, when engaged in putting up the shutters of the Flitch of Bacon Tavern, Host-street, he found in the groove in which the shutters worked the latch and street-door key of a house, which he handed over to the police.—The Coroner said there were other witnesses to be examined, and as the inquiry had now been protracted for a great number of hours, he thought it would be more convenient to at once adjourn. The inquiry was then postponed.

At the close of the proceedings the crowd congregated outside could not have fallen short of 5,000 or 6,000 persons, all patiently waiting to see the prisoner brought out, which, however, Inspector Bell would not permit until, in some measure, a clearance had been effected. The prisoner was then reconducted to gaol. She had by this time regained her confidence, and left the room with a firm step.

WEDNESDAY, March 14.—The proceedings of the inquest were again resumed this morning. In addition to the prisoner, Sarah Thomas, her mother was also brought up in custody, charged with being an accessary after the fact. The new evidence of importance was that given by the mother, Anne Thomas, who was ordered by the coroner to be sworn, and deposed that her daughter returned home to witness, at Horfield, on last Saturday week, between three and four o'clock in the afternoon. She left her boxes out of doors, and requested witness to fetch them in. They were a trunk covered with paper, and a bonnet-box—nothing more. After she had brought home these two boxes in the afternoon of Saturday, she went again into Bristol in the evening; she went alone, and returned about half-past nine o'clock. She then brought home with her a little brown box, about the size of a small bonnet-box, and a band-box, and she also had a bundle. On Monday evening she again went into Bristol, leaving Horfield at about seven o'clock, and returned at about half-past eight. She then brought home a few biscuits and oranges, but no clothes. She went into Bristol on Tuesday night, and again on Wednesday; it was before dark, about half-past six in the evening. She brought nothing back. She said she was going to buy some tape for a new apron. Did not see that she brought home any scissors or a book. She always returned alone, as far as witness knows.—Thomas Rowley, a fly driver, identified the prisoner Sarah Thomas. On going up St. Michael's-hill on Saturday week last, at between eight or nine in the evening, she was standing on the pavement; she hired his fly at 2s., to take her to Horfield; she was alone; she had with her a little mahogany box, and another box with a loose cover, and a black bag; then accompanied her to a confectioner's shop in Lower Maudlin-lane, where she received a bundle; he then drove her to Horfield, and put her down at the stop-gate leading to Ashley-down, and carried the luggage to the gate leading to the cottage she was going to, and left her. Mary Sullivan, a little girl who led about a blind fiddler, and told an incoherent story about following two of the Rifles into Miss Jefferies' house, and seeing the murder committed by one of them; but it was proved that the child was subject to epileptic fits, and not of right mind; the jury, therefore, desired that her statement should be stopped.—George Webb residing at No. 11, Trenchard-street: On Saturday week last, between eleven and twelve o'clock in the day, he had just got to the top of Steep-street steps, when he saw a man come backwards out of the front door of Miss Jefferies', carrying a red box before him. There was a young woman following him out, carrying the other end of the box, and she lifted it on his shoulder. Did not notice either of their faces, but the young woman returned into the passage, and again came out with a bundle and something else in her hand, and then slammed the door after her. They walked towards Steep-street, St. Michael's-hill. The shutters of the house were then open. It was like a bundle of clothes; a light-coloured bundle. The man had on a fustian jacket and fustian trowsers, like one who tended on masons.—Police-sergeant Philips: On Wednesday night he went to the Flitch of Bacon, at about half-past nine o'clock at night, and had some conversation with Mrs. Price, respecting Mrs. Jefferies, who then lay dead at that time, not knowing that she had been murdered. At between eleven and twelve o'clock the same night, he was informed that police-constable No. 110 had some keys which had been found at the Flitch of Bacon. At about three o'clock the next morning, having learnt that Mrs. Jefferies had been murdered, and the house robbed, he was induced to try the keys to the street door of Miss Jefferies' house, and found that they fitted exactly both the key of the lock and the latch.—Mrs. Mary Price, landlady of the Flitch of Bacon, deposed to the witness William Vickery having on Wednesday night last delivered her two keys, which he had found. Finding they did not belong to her, she delivered them to the policeman. During that evening there was a man of the name of Sweet, and a man of the name of Angel, and a washerwoman at her house. No one else. Has seen the little girl who leads about the blind man. Has heard she is not in her right senses. Had not seen a Rifleman in the house for six weeks. One of them came in with a young woman, and asked if she had a room to let. The Riflemen do not use her house. Had seen the blind man there twice, and the little girl was with him. There was no Rifleman there at that time.—At this period the proceedings were further adjourned.

Ireland.

DUBLIN, SATURDAY.—RESISTANCE TO THE RATE IN AID.—The vote of the House of Commons in favour of the rate in aid has not in the least degree diminished the hostility to that obnoxious impost in the northern province. On the contrary, the movement proceeds with still greater vigour—men of the highest position are entering the arena, and there appears to be a settled and resolute spirit of passive resistance, which, if carried into practice, may lead to very serious if not disastrous results. The northern journals received this morning contain accounts of further meetings in various parts of Ulster.

The *Banner of Ulster* has a long report of the meeting of the county of Antrim, held at Ballymena, on Thursday last, at which the High Sheriff, J. S. Moore, Esq., presided. The proceedings were opened by a startling speech, of Lord Massareene, who urged an organised opposition to the collection of the rate in language almost as unqualified as any uttered by the Young Irelanders in the hottest period of their agitation. The following is an extract from his lordship's speech:—"Let men of all parties and creeds unite, and if they cannot prevent the passing of the present measure, or the levying of the tax, let them take care that the intruder shall never go back with the supply. (Hear, hear, and cheers.) There is at present in Ireland a society which seeks to have an occasional sitting of the Imperial Parliament in Dublin for the transaction of Irish business. He (Lord Massareene) was a member of that society, and he believed that if its object had been adopted some years ago, the distress which now exists would not be so extensive, nor would the proposition of a rate in aid have been submitted. At a meeting in December last of the society to which he had alluded, he (Lord Massareene) observed that England had shown herself very generous in placing in this country some 50,000 soldiers to prevent us from shooting each other, but that it would take 50 000 more to prevent the north from speaking out, if once it felt itself to be unjustly taxed. England was now about to tax her unjustly; and the demonstrations which had lately taken place had verified his prediction so far, for he believed that twice or three times 50,000 soldiers would not, in the north be able to collect this most unjust rate in aid. (Loud Cheers.) He (Lord Massareene) would dare the government to collect it. (Cheering.) If they would not repudiate the connexion between this country and Great Britain, or if they had the shadow of a shade of justice, let them tax the absentee landlords for whatever they want; but let them not add to the already over-burthened but industrious people by additional and unjust taxation."

Messrs. Leslie, Edmund M'Donnell, and M'Naghten, subsequently addressed the meeting, in proposing resolutions, denounced the injustice of the rate in aid. Mr. George Macartney and the Hon. G. Handcock also addressed a meeting of tenantry of the Marquis of Downshire, which was held in the Court-house of Hillsborough, on Thursday last, at which Mr. Watson, of Brook-hall, and several of the neighbouring gentry, attended. Several respectable farmers expressed the most rooted opposition to the rate in aid; and resolutions and a petition were adopted. A letter from Lord Downshire was read to the meeting, by Mr. R. S. Kennedy, J. P., which contained the following paragraphs:—"We must raise a bold and determined resistance in Ulster, and show the minister that, while we are determined and resolute in maintaining a real union between the two countries, as we did last year, and are the advocates of peace and order, we will not quietly submit to have the profits of our industry, which that peace and good order have secured to us (and which this very government has so often done their best to destroy), taken from us. The edge of the wedge once introduced, every year will drive it in more firmly; and we shall have the satisfaction (!) of paying for the districts of the country which this government has demoralised, after it had tried, but failed, to demoralise us.

"Besides this; remember that is one thing to strike a rate and another to collect it; and all that is necessary to bring us in for the 'rate in aid' is that the other districts should strike a rate: not a word is said about its being collected.

"Lord John Russell may call us in this province 'The Whisper of a Faction,' but we will show him that we can speak in a voice louder than a 'whisper,' and stronger than a 'faction,' when injustice and wrong are attempted against us."

The Cavan grand jury have adopted resolutions and a petition against the rate.

The county of of Wexford met on Thursday last, and adopted a petition against the rate in aid.

TUESDAY.—OPPOSITION TO THE RATE IN AID.—The meetings continue in Ulster and Leinster, and even in the south and west there are meetings to protest against the rate in aid

Imperial Parliament.

MONDAY, MARCH 12.

HOUSE OF LORDS.—The Petty Sessions Bill was read a second, and the Larceny Acts Amendment Bill a third time and passed.

LORD BEAUMONT, after detailing the circumstances under which Mr. Cotter had been arrested at Madrid, in September last, and subsequently transported by the Spanish authorities to Manilla, begged to ask whether government had taken any steps to ascertain if Mr. Cotter was a British subject, and, if so, whether any means had been taken to obtain satisfaction for the injury which had been done him.

LORD EDDISBURY, in reply, stated that Mr. Cotter had been arrested in March, 1848, charged with being concerned in a conspiracy, and subsequently a second time, on suspicion of having been concerned in a conspiracy against Narvaez. It appeared that Mr. Cotter had originally served in the British Legion, then became a captain in the regular Spanish army, and was appointed aide-de-camp to Gen. Concha, and was afterwards appointed comptroller of customs in a Spanish port. Mr. Cotter was not, therefore, a British subject, owing allegiance to the Queen of England, nor had he claimed to be so either on his first or second imprisonment.

On the motion of Earl WALDEGRAVE, an address was agreed to for a copy of the instructions given to the captain of the Scourge, as to the treatment of the convict Mitchel on his voyage to Bermuda.

Their lordships then adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.—The adjourned debate on the second reading of the Navigation Bill was resumed by

Mr. GLADSTONE, who sustained an elaborate argument in favour of a departure from our present system by a series of comparisons which went to show that our tonnage, both foreign and colonial, had increased at a far more rapid ratio since we embarked on a system of relaxation, so far as the Navigation Laws were concerned, than previously to our so doing. This was, of itself, a complete answer to those who held that further progress in the cause of relaxation would be destructive to the shipping interests of this country. He would not then enter into the question of time, his conviction being that, on commercial and other grounds, this was a fitting season for effecting a large change in our navigation system. If this were a proper time for making such a change, the question was in what manner it could be best effected. Here he must say that he differed from many who supported the present measure. His doctrine was, that they should not abandon the path of experience. In his opinion, it was only on principles analogous to those acted on by Mr. Huskisson and others, that we could safely depart from the system of navigation which we had so long pursued, and which had been for centuries interwoven with our national policy. There were several demands which the shipowner might fairly make upon the Legislature, when it was about to deprive him of protection. In the first place, he was entitled to the removal of every peculiar burden by which he was now hampered. If we exposed him to unrestricted competition with foreigners, we should give him a drawback, or a remission of the duties upon the timber which he used in the construction of his ships. He should also, in the next place, be relieved from the restraint under which he laboured with respect to the manning of his ships. There was still another compensation to which the shipowner was entitled. By the repeal of the Navigation Laws he would have to undergo a competition from the Baltic, sharp, as far as it went, and from the United States, all over the world. He was, therefore, entitled to ask that we should secure for him, if possible, an entrance into those fields of employment from which he was now excluded, as a compensation for the entrance permitted to the foreigner to those fields of employment of which he had now a monopoly. The policy pointed out to them by experience was that of conditional relaxation. He had never entertained the notion that we should proceed by treaties of reciprocity with foreign powers. There were difficulties in the way of so doing, which it became a prudent Legislature to avoid. The American system, so far as it went, was that to which he would look as a model. By adopting that of conditional relaxation, they would avoid the difficulties inseparable from the system of reciprocity treaties. The immediate effect of conditional relaxation would be to give to the vessels of such states as conferred privileges upon our shipping corresponding advantages in our ports. Such a course would be in accordance with precedent and experience, whilst it was that which was demanded by justice, and which would be found much more easy of execution than the plan proposed by her Majesty's government. There was one feature of that plan to which he had an insuperable objection. Every word said by Mr. Wilson, on Friday night, against the system of reciprocity, told with augmented force against those of retaliation. He would join readily with those who might endeavour to get rid of that feature, regarding it, as he did, as a material defect in the government plan. If the government would not consent to legislate on the subject conditionally, he would advise it to do so directly, without the accompaniment of retaliation. Indeed, the conditional system was that upon which we now practically acted with regard to many of the maritime nations of the world. The plan which he thus proposed would do more for the general liberty of commerce than that which had emanated from the Treasury bench. There was another feature in the government proposition which he regarded as defective. He was of opinion that the mode in which it proposed to deal with the coasting trade would be found ineffectual for the purpose in view. Before we could expect to get the boon of the American coasting trade, we must throw our coasting trade unreservedly open to that country. He did not believe that we would secure the coasting trade of America by proceeding on the principle of unconditional legislation. On the other hand, by proceeding on the conditional principle, they had every reason to believe that they would secure that trade. If his plan wanted another recommendation to entitle it to the favourable consideration of the House, it would be found in this, that by proceeding conditionally, they might at once effect a final parliamentary settlement of this great question. He was aware that there was one fact which might be adduced in the form of an argument against the plan which he ventured to suggest. It might be urged that it would not suit the views or meet the wishes of the colonies. What they wanted was supposed to be an unconditional repeal of the Navigation Laws. But he begged to remind the House that what they wanted was not such a repeal with a reserved power of retaliation. Having once tasted the sweets of unrestrained commercial intercourse with the whole world, the colonies would not be very ready to return to the system of restriction, either wholly or partially, should that system be reverted to by the mother country, either in whole or in part, by the exercise of the power of retaliation. So far as regarded the colonies, the exercise of the power in question would be unwise and impolitic. On this and on the other grounds, he would submit, in all earnestness, to the government, the propriety of erasing this feature from its plan, if it was resolved to proceed upon the principle of unconditional legislation. The right hon. gentleman then proceeded to detail his reasons for thinking that the inter-colonial trade and the direct trade between the colonies and foreign states should not be removed from beyond the jurisdiction of parliament. The government bill contemplated such removal, which he regarded as another flaw in its construction. Imperfect, however, as the measure was, he could not refuse his assent to the proposition for its second reading, as in committee opportunities might be offered of correcting what he conceived to be material defects in it.

Mr. *G. ROBINSON contended that one effect of the* abrogation of the Navigation Laws would be to increase the shipping of America, and to decrease that of Great Britain; and what security would there be that when the change was effected, that the British shipowner would be released from the disabilities under which he at present laboured in foreign countries. The project doubtless was put forward by the government because they had entered on the path of free trade, but notwithstanding all the advantages which had been promised to result from that system, it had not been successful, all its results proving that directly the contrary was the case. He entreated the noble lord at the head of the government to pause before he exposed both the commercial interest and the British navy to the danger with which they were threatened by this measure.

Mr. CLAY, Mr. J. HORNBY, Mr. W. WAWN, Mr. C. BRUCE, Mr. WILCOX, Mr. R. C. HILDYARD, and Admiral BOWLES, spoke against the measure; which was supported by Mr. MITCHELL and Mr. RICARDO.

Mr. DRUMMOND made a speech which excited considerable amusement, and from which we take a few passages:—He must agree that much of the debate on this occasion had been not so much on the principle as on the details of the bill; but at the same time he must say there was this excuse for hon. members—that the principle of the bill was nowhere to be found in it. (Laughter.) The bill in its first words said that it was a bill to amend certain things; and the way in which it proposed to amend them was by abrogating them. Now, he must say that was the most extraordinary way of mending he had ever heard of. (Hear, hear.) It might be all very right and proper to alter eighteen statutes of Parliament, but he could not consider that question in the present stage of the bill. To find out what was the principle of the bill they must look to the speeches which had been delivered, not only in that legislative assembly, but in many assemblies of an illegitimate character. In all past times the object of every statesman, whatever his political opinions might have been, was to prevent capital going out of this country, because if it did our labourers could not be employed. Now, the object of this bill—and most ingeniously contrived it had been—was to keep capital in the country, but still not to employ our labourers. ("Hear," and a laugh.) The promoters of it did not send capital away, but they kept it here for the purpose of employing foreign labourers. They had all heard of the Satanic school of poetry in literature. If there was such a thing as a Satanic school in politics, the authors of this bill certainly belonged to it. ("Hear, hear," and a laugh.) It was a very remarkable phenomenon that at the present day it seemed to be the fate of every statesman, no matter to what party he belonged, or on what side of the House he sat, to be doomed to eat every word he had ever uttered on any one occasion—(a laugh—and to go against every principle which he had ever endeavoured to establish. If, therefore, any hon. gentlemen were at a loss to meet the arguments of the government and its supporters, they had only to go back to the speeches of those very gentlemen, and to appeal from the drunken Philips of the day to the sober Philips of ten years ago. (Hear, hear.) In fact, the best speech against the measure of Earl Grey was the speech delivered not long ago by Lord Howick. (A laugh.) For years past the country had been under an evil genius. It had been well described by the hon. member for Buckingham (Mr. Disraeli), as a fate from which no Minister could liberate himself—it seemed, as it were, a sort of myth of a force which bound them down, while Chancellors of the Exchequer pecked at their livers *ad libitum*. (Cheers and laughter.) The alterations in our system had not been carried to any dangerous extent. The changes introduced by Lord Wallace and Mr. Huskinson had been wise and prudent. Not so the conduct of Ministers now. He spoke not of any particular government, but of all those who had sat on the Treasury benches for many years back. It might be apparent presumption in him to say so, but one expression in the right hon. member's (Mr. Gladstone's) speech had been worth attending to—that in which the right hon. member said the evil of our school was that we did not attend to the lessons of experience, but dashed boldly into ways unknown on the faith of theories untried. (Hear, hear.) He called on them not altogether to disregard the teaching of the past, and the lessons of experience. The most celebrated statesmen of antiquity declared that "there is in maritime states a corruption and instability of morals, for they import not only merchandise, but morals—so that nothing can remain entire in the institutions of their country—(hear, hear)—for they who inhabit those states do not remain quiet in their places, but are hurried away from their homes by an overwinged hope of thought, and, even if they remain bodily, they still run about and wander in spirit; nor did anything tend more to the destruction of Corinth and Carthage, long in a declining state—than the vagrancy and dissipation of their citizens, who through their greediness of trade and navigation relinquished the culture of their lands and their training to arms." (Hear, hear.) He might quote the opinions of Lord Chatham and of Mr. Canning to a similar effect, and of late days they had an eminent writer, who, in his work on Germany, speaking of Frankfort, said, "in consequence of her commercial relations, she was so thoroughly under foreign influence, and so polluted by a mixture of all foreign manners, that her population could be hardly said to have a character of their own." What had fitted them to be citizens of the world had unfitted them to be citizens of the country to which they belonged, for "they judged of the happiness of mankind by the rate of exchange." (Cheers and laughter.) Now, all that was applicable to the Manchester school. The grand fault of these gentlemen was, that they could not form a conception how anything which was not good for cotton spinning could be good for anything else. (Renewed laughter.) "But," said the same writer, "let no one blame them for forgetting, in the pursuit of the money speculator and merchant, the interest of their country, or at least before doing so let him visit the ports of London, Liverpool, or Bristol, and discover—if he can—a purer foundation for English patriotism." (Hear, hear.) But he had one more authority for hon. gentlemen opposite — their darling Adam Smith. The only quarrel he (Mr. Drummond) had with hon. gentlemen with respect to Adam Smith was that they never would read beyond one page of him. (A laugh.) Let them attend to this:—"As their (the manufacturers') thoughts, however, are commonly exercised rather about the interests of their particular branch of business than about that of society, their judgment, even when given with the greatest candour (which it has not been on every occasion), is much more to be depended upon on the former than on the latter. The interest of the dealers in any particular branch of trade or manufacture is always in some respects different from or even opposite to that of the public." (Hear, hear.) Yet it was for such men as these that the Legislature had acted for many years back, and acted still. The manufacturer sent to America for his cotton, grown by the American labourer; having employed the American labourer and shipowner, he would take it home and spin it into cotton; then it was put on board a French vessel and exchanged for French silks or wines, so that from beginning to end not one English labourer would be employed. (Ironical cheers from the Ministerial benches.) When the poet, glowing with a fine enthusiasm, exclaims:—

"Breathes there a man with soul so dead,
Who never to himself hath said,——
* * *
This is my own, my native land?"

"Oh, yes," says the hon. gentleman opposite, "at Manchester there are a thousand of them." (Cheers and laughter.) Not content (continued the hon. gentleman) with resorting to bribery to get up accusations against your sailors—not satisfied with assailing them and your naval officers with taunts, you now say we have a superstitious reverence" for the navy. It may be true we have a superstitious reverence for that gallant service. It may remain among us yet. Time was when we had a veneration for it. There was indeed a time when we had a national faith—when we venerated, ay, worshipped, if you like, the statesmen who guided the destinies of this country—when we respected the magistrates who administered her laws, and admired the seamen and soldiers who devoted their lives to her service—a time when our national creed was "Rule Britannia," and the finest anthem in our ritual was "God save the Queen." (Cheers.)

Mr LABOUCHERE in reply proceeded to repel the accusation that he was disposed to base his support of the present measure upon the principle of cosmopolitan patriotism, as, on the contrary, if he were not fully persuaded that it was advantageous on strictly British grounds, he should never have taken a part in its introduction. After referring to the policy of Mr. Huskisson, and to the objections raised to the details of the measure, the right hon. gentleman implored the House to agree to the second reading of the bill, confessing that he should be greatly disappointed if it were not carried by a large majority.

Mr. MUNTZ thought that hardly any one who had heard the right hon. gentleman could fail to perceive that he was doubtful of the policy of the measure which he recommended the House to adopt. (Hear.) He (Mr. Muntz) was about to do what he supposed would be called speaking on one side and voting on the other. (A laugh.) The object of the present measure was to reduce the freights and profits of the English shipowner, and give them to the foreigner. (*Cheers from the Opposition.*) He had yet to learn that any of these changes were productive of national advantage. (Renewed cheers.) He had voted for the repeal of all protection. (A laugh) When he heard that laughter he always thought of Goldsmith's line in which he connected the "loud laugh" with the "vacant mind." Since other classes had been deprived of protection, he thought it ought not to be enjoyed exclusively by the shipowner. Besides, this advantage would result from the repeal of the Navigation Laws, that the standing excuse for the failure of all the free trade measures of the last two years would be removed. (Laughter.) The hon. member for Liverpool said we could compete with all the countries in the world, because we had the largest capital. He (Mr. Muntz) believed that that capital consisted in our land, houses, and ships—(hear)—but if we reduced the value of them, he was not sure we should have the largest capital in the world. (Hear and laughter.) They ought to consider what had been the success of the measures they had taken. He would mention the effect of them on the article of zinc, in which he had been a large dealer. No zinc was now made in this country. Why? Because the price of foreign zinc was only £13 or £14 a ton, while in this country it could not be made under £18. But what had been the effect of free trade on the town he represented? A few days ago a person handed to him a newspaper published there, called the *Midland and Birmingham Advertiser*, and pointed out an advertisement in it from a respectable ironmonger in Birmingham. It was headed "The Effects of Free Trade," and stated that the advertiser had just imported from Germany a stock of superior tools, which, although the duty was ten per cent., he could sell at from thirty to sixty per cent. under the price at which they could be made in Birmingham. (Hear, hear.) It struck him that every day they were getting out of the fryingpan into the fire. (Laughter.) For the last twenty-five years he had been competing in the foreign market with the merchants of his own town. By care, industry, and economy, the whole of them had ceased to compete with him; but although he had the whole trade, he found himself so reduced by competition with the foreigner that it was not worth keeping, and he was going to give it up. (Hear, hear.) It was said that they should buy in the cheapest market and sell in the dearest. That did not consist in the abstract price. (Hear, hear.) They might get an article that was manufactured in England ten per cent. cheaper on the continent. It did not follow that that was the cheapest market. Take iron. It might be £10 a ton here, and only £8 on the continent; but if it were bought there the labour here would be unemployed, and instead of buying it in the cheapest market it might in the end prove the dearest. (Hear, hear.) He expected to see the produce of this country as low as foreign produce—hear, hear)—and he knew that that price could not pay the taxes and liabilities of the country. (Hear, hear.) If they had a fixed amount of revenue to make up, and they lowered the price of produce, they increased the pressure of that taxation on the industrious classes—(hear, hear)—and by so doing prevented the possibility of their competing with foreign labour. They were told that they must buy in the cheapest market and sell in the dearest; but he did not call it a good bargain, although they got an article at a lower price from a foreign country, when at the same time all the different trades dependent upon the manufacture of the same article at home were injured and depressed by their employment being given over to the foreigner. (Protectionist cheers.) Let the Government only continue its present policy, and they would soon find, when they had thrown the lands out of cultivation, rendered trade profitless, and destroyed the sources of their revenue, that there was something else wanting besides experiments upon mere abstract theories. (Protectionist cheers.)

Mr. SCHOLEFIELD, in opposition to his hon. colleague, contended that the inhabitants of Birmingham, who had long carried on a flourishing colonial trade, which was now declining, were very much interested in the repeal of the Navigation Laws, by which there was no doubt they would be considerably benefitted.

The House divided—

For Mr. Herries' amendment..... 210
Against it 266
Majority in favour of the bill...——56

The announcement of the numbers was received with great opposition cheering.

The bill was then read a second time without further division.

The House then adjourned at a quarter to one o'clock.

TUESDAY, MARCH 13.

HOUSE OF LORDS.—This House sat only a few minutes, and the business was confined to the presentation of petitions.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.—After disposing of some private bills,

Lord PALMERSTON, in answer to Mr. G. SANDARS, stated, with reference to the affairs of Schleswig-Holstein, that it was true the Danish government had given notice of the fact of the termination of the armistice on the 26th inst., but, in so doing, had announced that it was not done with the intention of recommencing hostilities, but with a view to some provisional arrangement. No effort would be wanting on the part of the British government to bring the two parties to an understanding, looking to the vast magnitude of the interests concerned, with a view to a final arrangement for a permanent peace.

IRISH PAUPERS.—Mr. H. HERBERT asked the Home Secretary whether a deputation had waited on him representing that 12,000 Irish paupers had been landed at Belfast from this country, and whether the governmennt contemplated an alteration of the law in this respect?

Sir G. GREY replied that such a statement had been made to him. He thought, however, the number exaggerated; but whatever the number really was, they were paupers removed from Glasgow, having no legal settlement there, but in Ireland. The deputation had been told that the government would be happy to hear any proposal for altering the law, but none had been made to which they could give their support. Since then a deputation from Scotland had arrived, and represented that there was a society in Belfast supported by voluntary contributions, by whose instrumentality paupers who had been legally removed to Ireland were illegally removed back again to Scotland, their fares being paid with that object.

ABOLITION OF CHURCH RATES.—Mr. TRELAWNY, pursuant to notice, moved a resolution, "that effectual measures should be immediately taken for the abolition of Church Rates. After noticing the opinions expressed by Lord John Russell, Sir C. Wood, and others upon this subject, and expressing surprise that nothing had yet been done to settle this question, he adverted to the law, and to the authority under which the payment of these rates was held to be of universal obligation. He then stated the abuses to which litigation upon this matter had led; the hardship and oppression which flowed from this source; and he argued that the present moment, when there existed little angry agitation upon this subject, was the fittest time to deal with it. If a tax produced more private mischief than public good, it should be repealed; and when a law became impracticable, it ought to be abolished.

Mr. WOOD gave full credit to those who opposed these rates on conscientious grounds for really entertaining such scruples; though, if he had held property charged with a rate to a Roman Catholic chapel, he should not think that his conscience stood in the way of paying such rate. But although the law imposed these rates upon all property, there were many ways of evading it; and this and other considerations, connected with the altered condition of the country, induced him to think that some measure—not the abolition of church-rates, as proposed by Mr. Trelawny—for placing this question on a more satisfactory footing was absolutely necessary. The hon. member then proceeded to say that he had embodied his views in the shape of an amendment, which was to the following effect:—"That it is the opinion of the House that effectual measures should be taken for discharging persons dissenting from the church as by law established from contributing to church rates, and from taking any part in the levying, assessing, or administering, of the same."

The motion and amendment led to a lengthened debate.

Mr. HEADLAM, Mr. RICE, Mr. HUME, and Mr. COBDEN, supported Mr. WOOD's amendment. Col. THOMPSON, Lord D. STUART, Mr. MARTIN, Sir W. CLAY, Mr. BRIGHT, Mr. OSBORNE, and Mr. G. THOMPSON, spoke in support of the original resolution. Mr. GOULBURN, Sir R. PEEL, and Mr. GLADSTONE, opposed both resolution and amendment.

Lord J. RUSSELL said, unless the House had made up its mind that there should be a total abolition of church-rates without providing any substitute for the building and repair of churches, he should not agree to the proposition of Mr. Trelawny. He believed that the House had not come to such a conclusion. He agreed that there were evils in the collection of church-rates: but he could not agree with Sir William Clay that the Church should be ashamed to collect those rates from Dissenters; there could be no shame in collecting a charge originally laid upon the land, or allowed as reduction in rent. Neither did he think that the Established Church was to be regarded as a benefit solely for those who belonged to it. The general ground upon which church-rates stood was that it was a great tribute and homage to religion. The same argument against church-rates would be good against tithes. If any member would propose, in the form of a bill, a fair substitute for church-rates, he should not oppose the introduction of it, but he thought this resolution dangerous in principle and pregnant with mischievous consequences.

Mr. G. THOMPSON told the noble lord, after the discouraging speech which he had delivered, that the dissenters would bide their time, and watch for the opportunity which the government could not, or would not make for relieving the Church of England from the reproach of perpetuating so great a scandal, as exacting rates from persons not belonging to that establishment.

Mr. HENLEY thanked the noble lord for his noble speech, and said that the scruple of conscience as to the payment of church rates, was more an allegation than a reality.

Mr. COBDEN, after replying to the observations of the previous speaker, and referring to the Rochdale case, said, all the dissenters wanted was that they should not be compelled to pay two rates. The great difficulty in the matter had been to find a substitute for this impost, but that problem had been solved by the hon. member for Oxford, whose plan was not only consistent but just. The noble lord had said if a substitute were proposed, he would give it his consideration, but that had already been done, because the hon. member for Oxford proposed to exempt dissenters from the payment of church rates, leaving their payment to members of the church. After repudiating the charge that persons would pass themselves off as dissenters in order to escape the payment of church rates, the hon. gentleman concluded by expressing his intention as a churchman, anxious to show his desire to prevent dissenters paying the rates of the church to which he belonged, of giving his cordial support to the amendment.

The House then divided on the original motion, which was negatived by a majority of 166—the numbers being, 20 to 183. A second division followed on the amendment, which was negatived by a majority of 35—the numbers being 84 to 119.

Mr. ANSTEY rose to submit a motion on the subject of Van Diemen's Land, when the House was counted out at twenty-five minutes past ten o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 14.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.—THE "COUNT-OUT" OF TUESDAY.—Mr. ANSTEY complained with reference to the count-out of the previous night, that the officers of the House had not rung the bells which communicated with the smoking-room and library, or else a sufficient number of members would have been in attendance to keep a House, but entirely acquitted the government, inasmuch as they had exerted themselves to keep forty members present. As his motion was now a dropped order, he should move it as an amendment on the question of going into committee of supply on Friday.

LANDLORD AND TENANTS BILL.—The second reading of this bill was moved by

Mr. PUSEY, who said it was strictly in conformity with the report of the committee of last year.

Colonel SIBTHORP moved the postponement of the second reading for six months, considering that the bill would create dissatisfaction and disputes between landlord and tenant; and this amendment was seconded by

Sir HARRY VERNEY, who observed that if tenant farmers had leases, which it ought to be the object of all friends of the agricultural interest to procure them, they would provide a better remedy for the grievances against which this bill was directed.

A debate of some length ensued, in which Mr. ROBERT PALMER, Mr. PACKE, Mr. HENLEY, Mr. SIDNEY HERBERT, and Mr. NEWDEGATE spoke in favour of the principle of the measure, and Mr. CHRISTOPHER and Mr. MULLINGS against it; the latter suggesting some practical difficulties and injurious effects in the working of the bill.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL saw the force of most of the objections suggested by Mr. MULLINGS, but as they went to the details they were no ground for rejecting the bill.

Upon a division, the second reading of the bill was carried by 147 to 11.

CLERGY RELIEF BILL.—Mr. LACY moved that the second reading of this bill be postponed for six months, contending that the bill afforded facilities for clergymen to escape improperly from their vows, and that it would offer a premium upon insincerity.

Mr. BOUVERIE said, under the existing law a clergyman could not get rid of his orders at all.

Mr. HUME thought that nothing could be more tyrannical than to prevent a person from leaving the church who conscientiously differed from it and desired to do so.

Mr. STAFFORD objected that, by this bill, any clergyman who offended against the discipline of the church, and became liable to penalties, might go before a magistrate, call himself a dissenter, and escape them.

Mr. SPOONER viewed this as an objection to the details of the bill, the second reading of which he supported; as did Mr. WAWN.

Mr. DRUMMOND considered this bill was an act separating the Church from the State, which would be the only party prejudiced; the church would be the gainer.

Sir G. GREY said, it appeared him that the bill was calculated to remedy a great practical grievance, inasmuch as, by the existing law, a clergyman once ordained could not release himself, but continued subject to the jurisdiction of the church during his whole life, though he might become a professed member of another religious denomination. Was there anything unreasonable in exempting, under due limitations, from a process which might be instituted against them at any time, individuals once in holy orders, who were honestly exercising their talents elsewhere than in the church.

After some further discussion, Mr. LACY withdrew his amendment, and the bill was read a second time.

BURDENS ON LAND AND REAL PROPERTY.—The adjourned debate on Mr. DISRAELI's resolutions, and Mr. HUME's amendment was then resumed by

The CHANCELLOR OF THE EXCHEQUER, who rose to state the course which the government recommended the House to adopt with reference to the two propositions before it. He dealt first with the amendment of Mr. Hume, which was connected with the proposition for reducing ten-elevenths of the expenditure necessary for the defence of the country, and which proposition had been fairly discussed on the motion of Mr. Cobden a fortnight ago; and he called upon the House to negative Mr. Hume's amendment, and to affirm its recent decision. With respect to the other proposition, he agreed in much that had fallen from Mr. Disraeli. He joined him in the tribute he had paid to the gentry and farmers of the country; he agreed with him that the local taxation to which he had referred was a burden more especially pressing upon real property, and that the amount of that taxation came near £12,000,000. But here his acquiescence ended. Mr. Disraeli had calculated that this local taxation pressed upon one-fourth only of the property of the country, having taken the income derived from real property at £67,900,000 and the aggregate income of the country at £249,000,000. But he would find that the annual income of property rateable to the poor was not £67,000,000, but £105,000,000; so that the burden fell not upon one-fourth, but upon two-fifths, of the annual income of the country. Then the effect of the change proposed by Mr. Disraeli would not make a fair and equal distribution of benefit. Of the property subject to the exclusive burden of local taxation, not one half consisted of land, the rest being railways and other descriptions of rateable property; so that he would throw a heavy burden upon one class to confer a boon upon another that did not ask it. Mr. Disraeli had sometimes spoken of this burden as pressing upon the occupiers of land; but they had no interest, or next to none, in his proposition, the rates being always calculated by a tenant before he took a farm, and deducted from its value. There was another point he had lost sight of—namely, the diminishing proportion of the expense of maintaining the poor, paid by landed property, as distinguished from other property. He showed by statistics that the poor rate was diminishing in its proportion upon land, and increasing upon other property. He then touched upon the items of local taxation, and, with reference to Mr. Disraeli's complaint of the misery inflicted by manufactures upon agricultural counties, he asserted that, even in the county he represented (Bucks), the introduction of manufactures had relieved the surplus population and diminished poor rates. In dwelling upon the special burdens upon land, Mr. Disraeli had overlooked its special exemptions; and in asserting that nothing had been done for the landed and agricultural interest, he had forgotten that since 1815 Excise duties affecting agriculture had been repealed to the amount of £6,835,000. The burdens of the landowners of this country had been described in pathetic terms by Mr. Disraeli; whereas there was scarcely a country in Europe in which a heavier portion of the national taxation did not fall upon land and real property. To the local taxation referred to by the hon. member for Buckingham (Mr. Disraeli), must be added £2,000,000 for municipal taxation; this would make £14,000,000, half of which was to be transferred to the Consolidated Fund; and, assessing it in the proportion of the income tax, £8,233,000 would fall upon those in schedule A, and a heavy share upon the tenant farmers. He then proceeded at great length to show that the proposal before the House, if successful, would be of no benefit whatever to the tenant farmers, the proprietors being the only class who would benefit by it; and they had no right to look for such a boon at the expense of every other interest in the country. The proportion of poor rates now paid by the owners of real property was not so great as formerly. In 1833 they paid no less than sixty-nine per cent. of that rate, whereas now their proportion did not exceed forty per cent. Complaint was made that the whole cost of the roads fell upon the owners of real property. But this complaint was not very well founded, seeing that it was land that was chiefly benefitted by the great majority of the roads sustained. But the whole cost did not fall upon the landlords, many of the roads being supported by tolls, from the payment of which, manure, so extensively used in husbandry, was exempted. Nor did the burden of church rates fall exclusively upon the land, inasmuch as all the householders of the parish were rateable for the maintenance of the fabric of the church. Nor could they, in considering this whole question, leave out of sight the fact that there were some burdens, from which the land was exempted, such as the probate and legacy duties. He agreed with Mr. Disraeli, that as regarded the latter, the land was but partially exempted. As to the malt tax, he could not consent to its repeal, unless an equivalent were offered him. But, as he had already said, the burden proposed to be dealt with by the honourable member for Buckinghamshire was one by the removal of which the landlords alone would be benefitted. He objected, as a landlord, to take the burden from off his own shoulders, to transfer it to those of the tenant-farmers and others. He had serious objections also to saddling the consolidated fund with the millions proposed to be spared to the landlords. How could the sum be raised from the community generally without resorting to an increase of the income tax? Were the House and country prepared for such an increase? Were the tenant-farmers prepared for it? Or were they really the friends of the tenant-farmers who would make such a proposition? What Mr. Disraeli proposed would not simply be a transfer of a burden, but, to a considerable extent, a clear addition to the general burdens of the country. If the principle of local taxation, accompanied as it was by local administration, was an unjust one, it would be unjust if retained in part, as well as if retained in its present extent. He himself was not prepared to give up the principle of local taxation, because he would not abandon that of local administration, which had so greatly contributed to the safety and stability of the country. The two were inseparably connected, and if they abandoned the one, they could not with justice insist on the retention of the other. He admitted the existence of agricultural distress, but he did not admit its existence to the extent alleged by Mr. Disraeli. The distress was chiefly confined to the southern counties, and there was no good ground for saying that it had generally prevailed amongst the agricultural population. He deprecated the ill-advised language, on this subject, which had been used, as tending to lower the price of produce, and to spread, instead of alleviating, the distress complained of. The Chancellor concluded his speech by expressing his belief that the well-being of the masses was essential to that of the higher classes, and that if that well-being could be secured by the sacrifice of some of the luxuries to which hitherto the higher classes had been accustomed, the sacrifice should be freely and fully made. There was no class so strongly and immediately interested in the well-doing of the great body of the people, as that which enjoyed the permanent and inalienable interest of being the owners of the soil. The right hon. baronet was immensely cheered on resuming his seat.

Mr. CHRISTOPHER supported the motion of Mr. Disraeli, contending that Sir Charles Wood had not dealt fairly with that proposition, which was offered as one of conciliation and policy. The land, it was admitted, was unequally burdened; by the law of England every person should be rated to the poor according to his ability, and the fundholder having lent his money subject to this law, could not complain of being called upon to pay his proportion. Agriculture alone was subjected to the unlimited operation of free trade; manufacturers were protected by import duties; the landed interest, therefore, had a right to look to other remedies; and unless some remedy were given, the Ministers would find all the leading interests against them, and it would be impossible to carry on the government of the country.

Col. THOMPSON said, it was but a very short time ago since there existed in this country a tax which pressed very hard on the interests of many hon. gentlemen on that (the Ministerial) side of the House, and which was supposed to operate in favour of the hon. gentlemen opposite. It was now only six weeks since that tax was taken off, and yet hon. gentlemen opposite, under these circumstances, came forward and complained of suffering interests. Now, he wanted to know what compensation those hon. gentlemen intended to give in return for the advantage they had so long enjoyed? Did they mean to propose as a compensation that there should be a duty for twenty years on home-grown corn, in order to increase the quantity of corn brought from abroad? ("Hear, hear," and laughter.) If it should be said that that would be an injury to the country, he would commute the tax willingly for an equivalent charge on rent—(laughter,—and then he should be prepared fully to consider any allegation of theirs, that they were excessively taxed in respect to certain items, and to remove the grievance whenever found to exist. (Hear, hear.)

The Earl of MARCH said, he was surprised to hear the Chancellor of the Exchequer state that the distress in the agricultural districts was of a partial nature. He, on the contrary, believed that throughout the agricultural districts there existed the greatest and deepest distress. (Hear, hear.) They were told when the corn laws were repealed—a measure which no one regretted more than himself—that with low prices the labourers would be as well off as with high prices; but, by a paper before the House, he would prove that a greater amount was levied for the poor rates when corn was low than when it was high. From the appendix of the report of the Poor Law Commissioners, it appeared that there were expended for the relief of the poor, in the seven years when the price of wheat was lowest, £34,466,816, and in the seven years when the price of wheat was highest, only £34,259,454, being a difference of £207,362. But the difference in the value of corn during the two periods, he believed, might be correctly estimated at thirty per cent., and if, consequently, the amount of pauperism at the time when wheat was lowest was thirty per cent. greater than at the other period, no less a sum than £10,000,000 ought to be added to the difference of £207,362, in order to show the real comparison between the two periods. The Chancellor of the Exchequer had stated that the experiment of feeding cattle with malt was an entire failure. (The Chancellor of the Exchequer.—I said I thought there was no great advantage in it.) Nevertheless agricultural witnesses, examined before the Burdens on Land Committee, complained of their being restricted from using malt for that purpose, and the committee reported that the malt duty was a restriction on cultivation, and an impediment to the improvement of land. (Hear, hear.) With reference to what had fallen from the Chancellor of the Exchequer in reference to roads, he could say that in the Isle of Wight, where there were no turnpikes, or but very few, the highway rates were 1s. in the pound for the repair of roads, not required only for agricultural purposes, but for the benefit, too, of those who, in great numbers, visit that district. He, therefore, thought that that should not fall on the agricultural interest. Land had burdens to bear not borne by other interests, and what he wanted was that all classes should be put upon the same footing. He knew the case of a man with an entailed estate of £5,000 a-year paying for poor rates, land tax, income tax, assessed rates on his house in London, &c., about £1,123 a-year, while an individual with a similar income from the funds or annuities, and living in a similar house in London, would only have to pay for income tax and assessed rates on his house £210. As a proof of the existing distress, he could state that, since the present poor law had been in existence, the union of West Hampnet never was so full as at present, and it was necessary to give out-door relief. The farmers of Sussex, when they took their wheat to market, could now get scarcely any price for it at all. He was surprised that the Chancellor of the Exchequer, in reply to the statement of the hon. member for Buckinghamshire, that the farmers had not been fairly dealt with, inasmuch as the removal of the burdens on agriculture, which ought to have accompanied the withdrawal of protection, had not been effected, should have referred to the repeal of the duties on hides and skins, as if the occupier of land was the better by that repeal. (Hear, hear.) With respect to the malt tax, he thought it unjust, and the greatest possible feeling existed for its repeal; but, although he was prepared to vote for its removal, he was not prepared to vote for the proposition of Mr. Hume, because the hon. member, in his amendment, implied a doubt whether there were any burdens pressing unduly on land. The occupiers of land did not require any unfair exemption from taxation, but objected to have more than a fair share of taxation placed on them. In consequence of the withdrawal of protection, their burdens had now become intolerable; and he trusted the House was not prepared to leave them the victims of mischievous and reckless legislation. (Hear.)

On the motion of Mr. M. GIBSON the debate was then adjourned till Thursday.

The House adjourned at a few minutes before six o'clock.

INTERESTING DISCOVERY.—The picturesque valley of the river Mann, so long celebrated as the scene of some of the most jovial exploits of "Robin Hood and his merrie men," and also of the humorous interview between "the King and the miller of Mansfield," has this week contributed largely to the antiquarian celebrity of the neighbourhood by the discovery of an urn filled with Roman silver coin, in a beautiful state of preservation. Our readers are aware, from previous announcements, that the Mansfield and Pinxton Railway is being altered so as to adapt it to steam-power; in doing so it has been found necessary to alter the course near to the King's Mill, by cutting through several grass fields belonging to his Grace the Duke of Portland, and in the occupation of Mr. Adlington, the worthy modern representative of the redoubted "miller of Mansfield," and Sir John Cockle. During the process of levelling one of these fields on Saturday morning last, one of the workmen struck his axe against a hard globular shaped substance, about two feet beneath the surface, which he at first supposed to be a piece of lead. A council of navvies being instantly held, the stranger was submitted to a severe and searching cross-examination; a few gentle blows against a neighbouring block of stone very soon annihilated what proved to be a beautiful Roman urn, and presented to their astonished eyes from 300 to 400 silver coins of the Roman empire, which, after reposing for probably 1,000 years, were thus summarily ejected from their resting place by the rude hands of a trio of Irish labourers. These interesting relics of the greatness and glory of the "Eternal City," although at first encrusted with a strong coating of acetate of copper, proved, on being cleaned, to be in a most beautiful state of preservation, some, indeed, of the Emperor Severus as much so, to all appearance, as the day they were first issued from the imperial mint. The majority of them are about three-quarters of an inch in diameter, and somewhat thicker than a sixpence, and include fine specimens of the following reigns, viz.:—Octavius Augustus Cæsar, Vespasian, Ælius Hadrianus, Antoninus Pius, Aurelius, Commodus, Septimus Severus, Septimus Geta, Julia Augusta, and several others. It is impossible accurately to describe the amount of interest excited by this discovery; suffice it to say, that many anxious purchasers were found, from whom the navvies reaped a rich, although, probably, a very wet harvest. The whole of the coins were eagerly bought up, and it has been almost an impossibility to obtain one since Saturday for either love or money.—*Notts Guardian.*

A NAVAL ENGAGEMENT.—On Wednesday last a sanguinary conflict took place at Marseilles on board a Spanish vessel called the Léon. Some English sailors of the Ann Ingat went into the Spanish vessel and insisted on tasting some wine which the Spaniards had on deck. The Spaniards ousted the English, but the latter returned to the attack, whereupon the Spaniards assailed them with knives and hatchets, and a struggle ensued which lasted a

Murder of a Child by its Father.—G. Howe, 32, was indicted for putting a quantity of oxalic acid into some bread and milk, which was administered to his infant child. On Thursday evening, the 25th of January last, the prisoner was in the house of a person of the name of Bray, at Yarm, and there was also there a female named Wood, who had the care of the child. Mrs. Wood was feeding the child with bread and milk, and being called away, she took the child with her, and left the bread and milk upon a table near to the prisoner; and the prisoner, it is supposed, then poured some oxalic acid into the bread and milk. Mrs. Wood returned, and, ignorant of what had been done by the prisoner, proceeded to feed the child with the bread and milk, of which she took two teaspoonfuls, and died in consequence four days after. The prisoner was a widower, and was formerly a gentleman's servant, but had latterly been a railway labourer. He had stated he was about to marry again to a woman who had money, but who knew nothing of the existence of the infant. From that time he treated the child with unkindness, and expressed a wish that he was rid of it. On one occasion he had the child in his arms, and struck its head against a chair with such violence that the child screamed out, and a person interfered and threatened to thrash the prisoner if he did not desist. After the prisoner's apprehension a shawl belonging to him was found, in which a phial was wrapped that appeared to have contained some sort of crystalline matter. On the shawl, on the wall, and on the table where the food was, marks corresponding with those on the prisoner's trowsers were found. They would find that this phial was seen empty a day or two before the alleged murder—the eye medicine was gone; but on the day after it was found to contain oxalic acid. Thus far it was clear that there was oxalic acid in the child's bread and milk, and that there was oxalic acid in the prisoner's possession. Was he aware it was a deadly poison. The prisoner, after the case for the prosecution had been closed, addressed the jury. As to the phial found in the shawl in his box, he suggested that it had been put there by some one else. For the stains upon his trowsers he could not at all account, and therefore left his case to the judgment of the court and jury. The judge summed up, and the jury, after an absence of ten minutes, returned a verdict of "Guilty," and the prisoner received sentence of death.

Salisbury, March 12.

Murder.—*J. Smith*, aged 23, a wretched-looking object, was indicted for the wilful murder of Eleanor Lawrence at Collingbourn-Ducis, on the 9th of August last.—Mary Annett deposed: Eleanor Lawrence lived with me. On Wednesday, August 9, at twelve o'clock, she came to me in Mr. Pike's reaping-field, with my dinner. She stayed with me *twenty minutes*. She then returned towards Collingbourn. In about an hour and a half I was called. I went along the field towards the turnpike road, where I saw Lawrence lying on the road with the blood running from her head. Her bonnet was off, and she was insensible. She was conveyed home. I saw her until her death, which took place on Friday morning at ten o'clock. She was thirty-four years of age.—The Rev. G. Hadow, curate of Everleigh, deposed: I live about half a mile from the Crown Inn, at a lone house. About two o'clock that day the prisoner called at my house and asked for work. He appeared much excited, and was breathing hard. I asked what was the matter, but he made no answer. He had been running very hard. He immediately hurled two stones at me, and wounded me in two places. I rushed into my study, as I *thought* I was going to be murdered. I went out again, but he was gone. I ordered a man to go in pursuit of him. I took my horse and rode into the Devizes road. I soon came up with the *prisoner, who was coming* back. He said, "I suppose you want me?" and pulled a stone out of his pocket, and threw at me. He hit me three times, and then ran away. Woodruffe and my servant Mortimer came up, and we pursued him, and secured him. I asked him if he had intended to murder me? and he said, "Yes, I did not care what I did." Woodruffe asked him if he was not ashamed of himself? He said "No, for I have committed a murder already to-day." I asked him where? and he said "You will soon hear of it."—John Stagg deposed: I had the prisoner in custody on the 10th of August for the assault on Mr. Hadow. Barry came up, and desired to have the prisoner taken back on a charge relative to a woman who was found beaten near Collingbourn. The prisoner said, "I knocked her down, I did not ravish her. I met the woman on the road, and threw a stone at her and knocked her down. I then kicked her about the head and ran away. If I had not gone to the parson's house I *might* have been some miles away. If you had asked me I should have said the woman was dead." I asked what woman, but to that he made no answer. He subsequently said, "It was my own tongue that done me."—A jacket, which was found near the scene of the murder, was proved to be one similar to that worn by the prisoner, who acknowledged it to be his.—George Andrews deposed: I am surgeon of the county gaol where the prisoner has been since last August. He has been in a sane state of mind, and has a perfect knowledge of right and wrong. Cross-examined: I have seen the prisoner about twice or thrice a week. A person may be in a sane state at one time and mad at another. This is called monomania. It is only discovered when *the particular subject upon which* there is a delusion is acted upon. A person may be perfectly collected until the delusion is brought forward. At the time the delusion exists, a party cannot distinguish between right and wrong. There is a disease *called insane impulse, the predominant* character of which is to commit acts of violence—a sudden irresistible desire to destroy human life, or to commit a theft in the higher ranks of life—By Lord Denman: It is never thought so in the humbler class of life, is it? Witness: It is not, my lord; but in the higher classes there can be no reason for committing theft—Lord Denman: No desire to possess that which does not belong to them?—Crime is committed without any discoverable motive. Their will is not under control.—Re-examined: I have not seen anything in the prisoner's conduct to induce me to believe that he has had monomania or instinctive madness. I have not had any personal experience of such matters, but I have read it in books.—Mr. Challoner Smith addressed the jury on behalf of the prisoner.—Lord Denman, in summing up, observed that it was with great rashness that persons made doctrines as excuses for the worst passions, and persevered in contending that influences were irresistible. He was not aware that medical men were more capable of accounting for the state of the mind than other persons. To say that a man was irresponsible without positive proof of any act to show he was labouring under some delusion, seemed to him to be an assumption of knowledge which none but the great Creator himself could possess. He did not see anything to prove a diseased state of mind, except the violence of the act itself; and he could not help observing that the surgeon of the gaol had not found any symptoms of mental disease.—The jury consulted together for a few minutes, and then returned a verdict of "Guilty."—On being asked why sentence of death should not be passed on him, the prisoner replied that he was innocent of the murder.—Lord Denman then passed sentence of death.

Maidstone, March 13.

Alleged Incendiarism.—Charles Ableton, a boy 12 years old, was indicted for feloniously and maliciously setting fire to a stack of straw, the property of James Russell, with intent to injure him. Mr. Deedes prosecuted; Mr. Addison defended the prisoner. The prosecutor in this case is a farmer at Horton Kirby, and it appeared that the fire in question occurred on the 6th of November in last year, the day when it will be remembered, owing to the 5th falling on a Sunday, the commemoration of the gunpowder plot was celebrated. The only actual evidence against the prisoner was that he was seen near the place about the time the fire broke out. The jury, after a short deliberation, returned a verdict of Not Guilty, and the learned judge gave directions that the prisoner should be at once placed in the charge of his father, who was in waiting to receive him.

Burning Farm Produce.—A. Humphrey, eighteen, and I. Ellis, eighteen, were indicted for feloniously setting fire to a barn, containing a large quantity of wheat, oats, and barley, amounting in value to more than £500, the property of Edward Monckton.—Mr. *Bodkin* prosecuted; and Mr. Horne defended the prisoners.—Mr. Edward Monckton, the prosecutor, deposed that he occupied the Parsonage Farm, at Brenchley. On the 21st of October, he had a large double barn in one of his fields filled with grain. It contained 120 quarters of wheat, 100 quarters of oats, 44 quarters of barley, and 40 tons of hay. The family went to bed at half-past ten o'clock on that night, and the next morning there was an alarm of fire; and on getting up he saw the barn in flames, and it was consumed with all the property it contained. He saw both the prisoners at the fire, and they assisted to try to put it out. About a month or six weeks before this, he had warned the prisoner Humphrey off his farm, and had threatened, if he came there again, that he would pull him up for trespass. After the examination of several witnesses, who clearly proved the guilt of the prisoners, the learned judge summed up, and the jury after deliberating a short time, found the prisoners "Guilty," and they were sentenced to be transported for fifteen years.

Derbyshire.—The Vacant Seat.—On Saturday Mr. Munday addressed the electors at Ashbourne, and in the course of his speech declared himself opposed to Free Trade, to the Endowment of the Irish Roman Catholic priesthood, and to the Repeal of the Navigation Laws. It is expected that the nomination will take place on the 23rd.

IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT.

THURSDAY, March 15.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.—Rate in Aid Bill.—The Chancellor of the Exchequer answered Sir Robert Peel by stating that the second reading of the Rate in Aid Bill would certainly be proceeded with before Easter.

Agricultural Burdens.—The adjourned debate on the burdens on agriculture was opened by Mr. M. Gibson, who drew the attention of the House to the distinction existing between the two motions before them, involving, as they did, entirely different principles—the one being founded upon leaving the whole amount of the public burden and taxation as it now stood, merely transferring a portion from one class to another, by adding a charge of six millions on the consolidated fund; and the other, founded on the principle of giving relief to all classes—agricultural as well as commercial—first by a reduction of expenditure, in order that the claims of the national creditor might be duly satisfied, and next, by applying the surplus to the repeal of those taxes which pressed upon the agricultural and commercial industry of the country. The right hon. gentleman then proceeded to review the state of the local taxation of the country, and urged that, even if the transfer of the charge of six millions to the consolidated fund took place, still there would be the same machinery necessary for the collection of the rates; and, therefore, if the proposition was sound in principle, it would be better to transfer the whole charge to that source. He had never agitated for the repeal of the malt tax, because he had thought there were good economical arguments against it, but looking to the fiscal reforms that had taken place, and the principle upon which they had been carried out, he thought the like arguments applied to the malt tax, and that its repeal might be justified on the same grounds; therefore he was now prepared to advocate its repeal, which would be in perfect consistency with the policy parliament had hitherto pursued. If, however, hon. gentlemen turned their backs on reduction of expenditure, and pursued the phantom now leading them astray, they would run the risk of letting the repeal of the malt tax slip through their fingers, and the opportunity might not offer itself for some time of conferring this great boon on the agricultural interest, on the labouring classes, and on the general industry of the country.

Mr. Ker Seymer defended the landlords from the attacks which had been made upon them. He should vote for the motion of his hon. friend the member for Buckinghamshire.

Lord Norreys could not vote for the original resolution, because if such a plan were carried it would necessarily lead to an increase of the income tax; neither could he vote for the amendment of the hon. member for Montrose, because it would be in opposition to the vote he had given on the motion of the hon. member for the West Riding, which involved the keeping faith with the public creditor.

Mr. C. Lewis entered at some length into the principle involved in local taxation, particularly with regard to the poor laws, and expressed his conviction that the only means of keeping the relief of the poor within bounds consistent with the safety of property, was a strict adherence to the principle of local taxation and administration. The adoption of the plan proposed by the honourable member for Buckinghamshire would not afford any relief to the landowners and agriculturists.

Sir M. J. Cholmley expressed his intention of voting for the motion of the hon. member for Buckinghamshire, but would suggest that, instead of an increase in the income tax, as contemplated by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, there should be a moderate fixed duty on foreign corn.

Mr. P. W. Miles contended that, for the purposes of nationality, real property was too highly taxed, and that what was required was that a mode should be devised in which the unfair pressure could be best removed from the shoulders of those who now bore it, and that it should be redistributed more justly. It was because he believed the proposition of his hon. friend would have this effect that he felt he had no choice, but must vote for it.

Mr. Bright, in reference to a quotation from a speech of his read by the hon. member for Buckinghamshire, in which he was represented to have admitted that great distress prevailed among the agricultural classes, denied that he had ever expressed himself to that effect: what he had said was that although there might have been something of the sort said at meetings here and there in Cambridge, or in Suffolk perhaps, yet in the south of England the cry of agricultural distress had scarcely been heard. The hon. gentleman then proceeded to refer to the price of wheat, stating that inasmuch as at Dantzic wheat was now 53s. a quarter, and other wheat of fair quality 48s., English wheat of the same quality as the latter would fetch the same price. Therefore if that were so, the pretence on which the motion had been brought forward had signally failed, that no ground had been laid for any change in the existing burdens on the land which could be justified either by the present condition of the tenant farmer, or by the price of agricultural produce in the home markets. The hon. member concluded his address by paying a tribute to the character of Mr. Cobden, warning the house that the measures his hon. friend proposed had the sympathy of millions, and many sessions would not pass before the house would vote for the measure which he recommended.

Mr. S. Herbert concluded a speech of some length by expressing the opinion that he thought the house had some right to complain, when a plan of this magnitude was proposed, that there was no mention how the expenses were to be met; and not believing that any explanation which could be given would render the plan more feasible, and not wishing to raise false hopes, he should oppose the motion.

The Marquis of Granby followed in support of the motion for going into committee, and Mr. Goulburn and Lord J. Russell against.

Mr. Cobden, in an address of some length, supported Mr. Hume's amendment, after which Mr. Disraeli spoke in reply, and the House divided, first on Mr. Hume's amendment, which was negatived by a majority of 324—the numbers 70 to 394; and secondly, on the original motion, which was rejected by a majority of 91—the numbers 189 to 280. The result of the latter division was hailed with loud Protectionist cheers, and the House adjourned at two o'clock.

FRIDAY, March 16.

HOUSE OF LORDS.—The business was limited to the presentation of petitions and reading the Overseers (Cities and Boroughs) Bill a second time.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.—Committee of Supply.—On the question of going into committee of supply.

Mr. Hume moved the following amendment:—"That in the state of the finances of the country, her Majesty's ministers, before calling on this House to vote the estimates for the public service, should submit a general financial statement of the whole or expected revenues, and the total intended expenditure for the ensuing financial year." The hon. member, in answer to an anticipated objection of throwing any difficulty in the way of the government, said there could be no objection to voting a reasonable sum on account, until the required statement was before the House.

Sir H. Willoughby seconded the motion.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer combatted the proposition, which was supported by Mr. Cobden.

On a division the motion was rejected, by a majority of 49; the numbers, 48 to 97.

Navy Estimates.—Mr. Ward concluded a speech of details as regards the past and present condition of the navy, by moving that the number of seamen, marines, and boys for the ensuing year be 40,000, the number for the past year having been 43,000.

Mr. Hume replied at some length to the observations of the preceding speaker, and after some general observations on financial matters, moved that the number of seamen, marines and boys, be reduced to 35,000.

The amendment was opposed, on the part of the government, by Sir F. T. Baring and Lord John Russell, and was supported by Sir W. Molesworth and Mr. Cobden, the latter of whom proceeded to call the attention of the House to the gross mismanagement which existed not only in the naval department, but also in all the government establishments—indeed, the larger the establishment the greater the waste. The only way by which a reasonable reduction in the cost of the navy could be effected must be by changing the system, and having smaller establishments.

The committee then divided, when the amendment was negatived by a majority of 85, the numbers being 144 to 59, and the vote, as also the second on the head of wages, was agreed to.

Colonel Anson moved several votes, on account, in the Ordnance estimates, which were agreed to, and the House adjourned.

The Stanfield Hall Murders.—Wymondham, *Wednesday.—It will be recollected that Mrs. Jermy* was wounded by the assassin in the elbow joint of her right arm, and that owing to the judicious medical treatment she received, there appeared to be no reason to fear that unfavourable results would ensue. On Monday morning, however, the symptoms took an adverse turn, and the limb has now been amputated. Although the operation was skilfully performed, under the direction of Mr. Nicholls, of Norwich, and Mr. Tunneley, of Wymondham, the shock which has been sustained by the unfortunate lady is so severe that there is not the slightest hope that she will live twenty-four hours longer. The life of Eliza Chestney, Mrs. Jermy's servant maid, and one of the principal witnesses at the forthcoming trial, is also despaired of.

LATEST NEWS.

The Murder at Bristol.—Committal of Sarah Thomas.—The inquiry into the murder of Miss Jefferies was resumed on Thursday, but the evidence given unimportant. The coroner summed up at considerable length with ability, and the jury, after about ten minutes' deliberation, returned a verdict of "Wilful murder against Sarah Harriet Thomas."—The accused, who had maintained a firm and even impudent bearing, was much affected upon hearing the verdict, and when she was removed from the inquest-room, sobbed bitterly. The mother still remains in custody, and will be charged before the magistrates as an accessory.

Suicide in the Regent's-park. — At the early hour of seven o'clock on Thursday morning, James George, one of the park constables, and Sergeant Hockaday, of the S division, observed a gentleman upon one of the seats in the park, near Hanover-gate, and he was in such a position as to induce them to imagine that something of a serious nature had taken place. They hastened to the spot, and there beheld a man respectably attired, and between thirty and forty years of age, quite dead and cold, his brains having been blown out by the discharge of a pistol, which had beyond all doubt been fired off in his mouth, so that his head was literally shattered to pieces, and the seat on which he reclined was in a complete pool of blood. The body, which has not yet been identified, was without loss of time conveyed to Marylebone workhouse, where it awaits a coroner's inquest.

Shocking Discovery.—Yesterday (Friday) morning about ten o'clock, the workmen employed pulling down the houses for the formation of the new street from Walbrook to Queen-street, Southwark-bridge, on entering the house No. 1, Castle-court, for that purpose, to their horror, found in one of the upper rooms the corpse of a woman, with three children crouched around it, the eldest apparently not ten years, all seeming on the point of death; the fetid odour that issued from the apartment for the moment compelled the men to retire; on returning they questioned the children, but all they could glean from them was, that they were starving. Information was instantly forwarded to the police-station in Bow-lane, and the children who had scarcely a vestige of clothing, and were literally covered with vermin, were removed to the City workhouse in Cannon-street, where they received every attention, but from the deadful state of exhaustion of the two youngest they are not expected to survive. The corpse of the unfortunate woman is merely covered with a ragged gown, no clothing, furniture, nor bedding was in the room, and it is supposed, that finding the house empty, she, with her children, crept in for shelter, and they are believed to have been there for some days, totally without food.

The Attempted Murder of Mr. Southgate.—Epsom, Friday.—Alfred Ayres, a gipsy of desperate character, and well known to the local police, was brought up in custody from Horsemonger-lane Gaol, to Epsom, before the sitting magistrates. After the examination of the son of Mr. Southgate, and several policemen, the prisoner was discharged.

The Hutton Conyers Murder. — At York, on Thursday, before Mr. Justice Coleridge, Edward Mathers, aged forty-one, was charged with the wilful murder of John Harrison, a gamekeeper, in the employment of Lord Ripon, at Hutton Conyers, near Ripon, in the North Riding of the county of York, on the 25th of January last. The jury acquitted the prisoner.

The Strood Murder.—At Maidstone on Wednesday, before Mr. Justice Wightman, Thomas M'Gill, 42, fisherman, Maria M'Gill, 42, his wife, and James M'Gill, 22, his son, also described as a fisherman, were indicted for the wilful murder of Mary Abbott, by suffocating her by means of a piece of carpet, which it was alleged they forcibly pressed and held over her mouth and nose. In another count the cause of death was alleged to be drowning. The case occupied the court thirteen hours, and the jury returned a verdict of "Not Guilty."

Murder.—At Maidstone, on Thursday, George Millen, 57, and Henry Sheepwash, 16, were indicted for the wilful murder of William Law, by beating him on the head with an iron bar. After a lengthy investigation, the jury returned a verdict of "Guilty," and his lordship passed sentence of death upon the prisoners.

Charge of Wilful Murder.—At Stafford, on Thursday, before Mr. Baron Platt, Martha Jones, aged twenty-three, was arraigned on an indictment charging her with the wilful murder of Edwin Jones and Mary Spencer, on the 13th of September last, at Lane Head, near Wolverhampton. The prisoner, who is a married woman, aged twenty-three, lived with her husband at Lane Head, near Willenhall. A child, aged (at the time of the horrid transaction) about eighteen months, was the fruit of their marriage; and, in addition to this, she had had confided to her care a niece, aged twelve, the other victim to her murderous hand. The strongest maternal affection was evident in the prisoner towards her offspring; but for some time previous to the perpetration of the crime the unfortunate woman's mind showed undoubted symptoms of aberration attended with lengthened lucid intervals. These symptoms were strengthened by a religious phrenzy. The jury returned a verdict of "Not Guilty" on the ground of insanity; and she was ordered to be confined in the gaol during her Majesty's pleasure.

Ireland.—Conviction for Murder.—At Clonmel assizes on Wednesday, two men, named William Quinlan (nicknamed the "Cud") and Hugh Kennedy, were indicted for the wilful murder of John Walsh, on the 8th of October last; and in other counts Kennedy was indicted for inciting the other to commit the murder. Quinlan was once in the army, but discharged. A great number of witnesses having been examined, the jury returned a verdict of "Guilty" against William Quinlan, and acquitted Kennedy. Judge Jackson said he would not pass sentence at that late hour. Kennedy was greatly agitated, but Quinlan not apparently so. He was smiling during the day, and his manner was very strange.

France.—At the conclusion of the sitting of the National Assembly the results of the second ballot for the office of President of the Assembly was announced as follows:—M. A. Marrast, 378; M. Dufour, 256; M. Grevy, thirty-one; M. Billault, six. M. Marrast was then declared to be duly elected President of the Assembly.

M. Duchesne, editor of *Le Peuple*, and M. Louis Mercard, author of a *feuilleton* published in the journal, were sentenced by default on Wednesday by the Court of Assize of Paris to imprisonment for four years and to pay a fine of 5,000f.

On Thursday evening the electoral law was finally adopted. The elections will take place on May 13th, and the Legislative Assembly will meet on the 28th of May. At Bourges, on Thursday, M. Lamartine was examined for the prosecution. He gave his evidence against the prisoners with all that bitterness which so well becomes him as a traitor to the Republican cause. On the day previous, Degre, one of the prisoners and a painter, amused himself the whole day sketching portraits of the judge, jury, and counsel.

Glorious Victories of the Hungarians.—A bloody battle which terminated in the utter defeat of the Austrians has been fought at Kopolna. The Austrians lost at least 3,000 men. On the 5th, a corps of the Hungarian army marched from Czibakaza towards Zolnok, where an engagement took place between it and the Austrians, in which the Austrian brigade, Grammont, was completely defeated, and lost great numbers of men, especially the battalion of Chasseurs. Bem has beaten Puchner twice in Transylvania, and has again laid siege to Hermanstadt. Comorn and Peterwaradein still hold firm for the Hungarians.

War in Lombardy.—The news of the resumption of hostilities between Charles Albert and the Austrians, turns out to be substantially correct, war having in fact recommenced. The declaration of war was to be published at Turin last Tuesday. Charles Albert was to have been at Alessandria, at the head of the army, on the 14th inst.

The Franklin Expedition.—The following are extracts from a letter received at Plymouth from an officer on board her Majesty's ship Plover, lying at the Sandwich Islands, Commander Thomas E. L. Moore. The letter bears date August 23rd, and the writer says:—"We left Calio on the morning of the 8th of last month, intending to have gone to Behring's Straits direct, without touching anywhere; but, knowing there were despatches at this place waiting our arrival, Captain Moore thought it just as well to peep in here, in hopes that a few stray letters might have been left here as well. Nothing of any importance has occurred since leaving Calio—just the every-day business of a sea-life. You shall hear from me again on her return from the ice to Panama; that will be the last opportunity we shall have till next year. I am delighted to say that I have obtained permission to go with Captain Moore in his boat when she leaves the ship, to proceed along the northern coast of America, towards the Mackenzie River; to which river Sir John Richardson, with his party, are proceeding, they having landed at New York some two or three months since. He will proceed further to the eastward, as far as Copper-mine River. Sir James Ross and his ships, which have left England, will commence their search from Davis's Straits; so that if Sir John Franklin and his expedition are in existence, we shall, in all probability, find them very shortly. Should any unforeseen accident occur to prevent our getting through Behring's Straits to the ice this year, which might be, should the winter set in earlier than usual, we shall winter at Petropauowski, in Kamschatka, or at Norton Sound, at the entrance of Behring's Straits, on the North American side."

A son of the lamented artist, Mr. Haydon, whose untimely fate excited so much public sympathy, has been appointed by Lord John Russell to a junior clerkship on the first vacancy that has been filled up by the Treasury for some months past, in consequence of the reductions in the several departments.

Police.

WORSHIP-STREET. — A "Presentiment" of Robbery.—Ellen Thoroughgood, in the service of Mr. A. L. Flint, was charged with having stolen a purse, containing seven sovereigns and other monies, belonging to her mistress, under the following artful circumstances:— The prisoner and another servant had been left in charge of the house during the temporary absence of the family on the preceding afternoon, when the prisoner, in a state of great apparent trepidation, began conversing on the subject of a robbery recently committed in the neighbourhood, and intimated that she felt a painful presentiment that the place would be broken into and plundered by thieves before her master returned. Her fellow-domestic endeavoured to allay her apprehensions, and thought no more of the matter until about half a hour afterwards, when the prisoner entered the kitchen in breathless haste, and said that her fears had been but too soon realised, as she had just discovered that her mistress's work-box had been broken open, and that the contents of various drawers in one of the upper rooms had been ransacked and scattered about the place. Before the girl had recovered from her surprise at this announcement, the prisoner called her into the back kitchen and directed her attention to the window, which was partly open, and through which she expressed her conviction that the thieves had obtained access to the premises. The prosecutor's wife returned home soon after, and feeling satisfied, as a quantity of plate and other valuable property had been left untouched, and only her purse and money stolen from her work-box, which had been forced open, that the place had not been entered by regular housebreakers, she sent for the police, the result of whose examination was to confirm her suspicions, and the prisoner was given into custody. The prisoner in the first instance denied all knowledge of the robbery, but on her way to the court she confessed her guilt, and told an officer where she had concealed the proceeds of the robbery. — She was committed for trial.

GUILDHALL.—Materials for "The Mysteries of London." — C. Stanmore and Caroline Jane Worsley, were charged, the former with using threatening language towards Mr. Bruils, and presenting pistols at him, and the latter with aiding and abetting Stanmore, and also with accusing the complainant of having committed an infamous crime. — Mr. Bruils said: For a long while the female, and latterly the male prisoner, had been calling upon him, in order to impress upon his mind that they had the means of bringing an action against him for an infamous act; and in consequence of information he received from his landlady, he became alarmed lest his name should appear in the papers, and wrote to the female to meet him at the *Hotel de L'Univers*, in the Blackfriars-road. She came, accompanied by the male prisoner, and having been shown into a sitting-room, Stanmore then said to him, "You know you are guilty of an infamous crime, and this woman (pointing to Worsley) was witness of it." He replied that he could not listen for a moment to such an accusation, and desired to leave the room; but before he could do so, they both rushed towards the door and tried to force him back to a chair. He resisted, when the male prisoner suddenly pulled out a pair of double-barrelled pistols and presented them at his breast, at the same time saying, "You are in my hands." He sat down and asked what they wanted; upon which Worsley said, "You must write to the father of my children, as you have influence with him, to bring them here to see you, and when they arrive you must give them to me." Finding the male prisoner had locked the door, he consented to do so, and asked them, as a means of procuring assistance, if they would take a glass of wine. The male prisoner said, "you must make compensation to this woman, as you have plenty of money." He refused to do so, and Stanmore threatened to have bills printed in this and other countries, exposing him, and also that he would bring the charge against him which the female could prove. They consented to take a glass of wine, and the male prisoner went to the door. He was following in the hope of effecting his escape when the female called out "he will escape," upon which Stanmore pulled a pistol out, and said he should not leave the place, but he might call to the waiter. A bottle of wine was brought and placed on the table by the waiter who laid a knife down on the table, upon seeing which he snatched it up, and the prisoner at the same time drew the pistol out of his pocket. He said to Stanmore that he did not care for him, and was about leaving when the male prisoner cocked the deadly weapon, but was immediately seized by the waiter, and the police were sent for. On their arrival he gave them into custody, when the female in the presence of the officers repeated her charge. —The female, in defence, said she was a married woman with two children, and left her husband to live with the prosecutor, her principal reason for which was, that the former being out of employment could not support her. An arrangement was entered into between her husband and Mr. Bruils that the former should give up all control over the children. On Tuesday last she was walking with her two children, in the York-road, Lambeth, where she met the prosecutor, who seized her children, at the same time calling out police. A cab drove up, when her husband jumped out, the children were placed in it, and on her attempting to follow, she was pulled back by two women. The cabman called to her that he should drive to the station-house, but he did not do so, and she had not seen her children since. She could vouch that Stanmore intended no harm to the prosecutor.—In answer to questions put by the Alderman, Mrs. Worsley said that her husband was living with another woman, at Greenwich, and she was now living with the prisoner Stanmore.—The male prisoner acknowledged living with Worsley, and said his reason for carrying the pistols (which were only loaded with gunpowder in order to frighten the prosecutor) was that he had several times threatened to use the knife. He did not draw his pistols out until he saw the knife in Bruil's hand.—The prosecutor was recalled, and did not deny anything stated by the prisoners beyond the fact of the pistols only being presented, after the waiter was in the room. — The officers proved that the pistols were only loaded with powder and some paper.—As to being instrumental in having her children taken away, prosecutor said, as they were interesting children, he advised the father to send them to France to be educated, and the mother consented.—Alderman Lawrence said he felt inclined to believe the statements of the prisoners to a certain extent. The fact of threats to use the knife accounted for the male prisoner arming himself, but then there was only a little powder in the pistols to frighten complainant if he attempted violence. The prisoners were discharged. — Mr. Bruils asked if he could not take the case to the sessions? — Alderman Lawrence would give no advice, and said the less the prosecutor moved in the matter the better it would be for him.

Trade Combinations.—J. Faulkner, a journeyman cigar maker, was charged with inciting an apprentice, partly by threats and partly by promises, to leave his employers.—H. Vonderboerlin said he was apprenticed to Messrs. Newton, of Friday-street, cigar manufacturers, and had about a year and a half to serve. He knew the defendant, who left about three weeks ago. Last Wednesday fortnight a person named Coglin met him at the dinner hour and asked him to go as far as the White Horse archway, close at hand, to see Faulkner. On the way Coglin asked him if he wished to leave his place. He said, "He'll give you 10s. per week from Saturday;" and Faulkner remarked "that if he did not leave he would not get work when out of his time," and also offered him 10s. from the Wednesday until Saturday. Witness did not consent.—In reply to Alderman Lawrence, witness said he first informed Mr. Newton of the attempt to induce him to leave on a Saturday night.—Mr. Wontner, for the prisoner, cross-examined witness, and elicited that he did not inform any one of the affair until the foreman threatened to discharge him for some slight misconduct.—Alderman Lawrence said the case was very weak, and the boy had not left Mr. Newton's service. If he had, the charge would have assumed a different aspect. At present it fell a little short of the offence, therefore he must dismiss the summons.

Clerkenwell.—An Artful Dodge Defeated. —A well dressed, portly-looking woman, who refused to give her name and address, was put at the bar before Mr. Combe, charged with stealing a banker's parcel, containing upwards of £300 in gold and silver money.—Inspector Julian, of the G division, informed the magistrate that two persons, who represented that they had been retained to watch the proceedings on the part of the prisoner, had called at the station-house, and informed him that the name of the accused was Mary Watt.—Mr. Combe asked the prisoner if she answered to that name, and whether she had employed any one to defend her?—She replied that she had not instructed a professional adviser, and that her name was not Watt. The magistrate, however, might describe her as Mary Watt, if he thought proper,—Mr. Combe:—Well, to accomodate you, let that be so.—Mr. Bush, the solicitor to the Banker's Protection Society, who appeared for the prosecution, said he should, no doubt be able to ascertain her real name before many days had elapsed, and also show that she was connected with a well-organised gang of thieves. He then called into the witness box—Augustus Brime, porter of the London Joint-Stock Banking Company, in Lombard-street, who proved that on Monday afternoon he received from that bank a brown-paper parcel to convey to the Cross Keys in St. John-street, for delivery at a banker's at Luton, in Bedfordshire, and, on arriving there, he handed the same to the coachman of the vehicle running to that town.—The coachman having given evidence of its receipt, and the deposit of it by him in the bar of the Cross Keys,—Mrs. Mary Anne Griffin, the landlady, was next sworn:—She said, that on Monday afternoon she first saw the prisoner, who applied to be accommodated with the seat until departure of the Luton coach, as she had a young friend who was coming to proceed with that conveyance as far as St. Alban's. She invited her to take a seat in the coffee-room, to which she objected on the ground of gentlemen being there, and, on being offered a private sitting-room upstairs, she urged that it would be too lonely, and went away. In about five minutes afterwards she again presented herself at the bar, when, as a matter of courtesy, she was asked to take a seat in the bar parlour,—an offer she readily accepted, and in a very short time the last witness left the banker's parcel in the same apartment on a desk, two yards from the spot where the prisoner was sitting. Not long after this a "gentleman," who had for several weeks past been in the habit of visiting her establishment, and leaving in her care his great-coat, presented himself in a hurried manner, and, after saying, "Oh, you have a lady here waiting for me," pushed rudely by her, notwithstanding she objected, and entered the bar parlour to the prisoner, who instantly recognised him, and said something about his wife; at the same time the man called out for a glass of sherry, with which she served him, and received a shilling in payment. She retreated towards the bar to procure him change, when seeing from the reflection on the glass door, the prisoner receive from his friend a paper parcel (produced) with red seals, and exchange it for that of the banker's, she ran up to the desk where the first one was placed, and, at once perceiving that the change had been effected, she challenged them with so doing, whereupon the "gentleman" seized her by the arms, endeavouring to throw her down, and to take the packet that had been substituted for the banker's from her, but failing to do so he escaped from the house. While this struggling was going on, the prisoner kept on exclaiming, "For God's sake what is this about? what is the matter?" and seemed anxious to get away, but she was prevented by witness, who obtained the assistance of the Rev. Mr. Elwyn, of East Barnet, a gentleman then in the coffee-room, waiting for the coach in question, and the prisoner, finding that she was detained, was observed to drop the banker's parcel from under her shawl, which was partly drawn off her shoulders by the weight as it fell. Sergeant Archer, of the G division, was then sent for, and received charge of the prisoner, and removed her, at her desire, in a cab to the station-house. At the conclusion of this evidence the parcel brought by the "gentleman" to the prisoner was opened; it bore a similar appearance to the banker's, being tied and waxed in a like manner, but it was found to contain a small bag filled with sand. When it was exposed to view the prisoner laughed heartily. Mr. Combe told her she could ask Mrs. Griffin any question she thought fit.—Prisoner (firmly): Will you swear you saw me drop the banker's parcel?—Mrs. Griffin: Certainly I do.—Mr. Combe (to the prisoner): Is there anything else you wish to ask the witness?—Prisoner (smiling): Why, no, sir. However, is she not more likely, as she uses sand, to have made up that parcel (pointing to the dummy) to play some trick? (Much laughter.)—Mr. Combe: Why, really I don't think she is. After some further observations Mr. Bush applied to have the prisoner remanded for the attendance of the clerk who made up the parcel, and also to obtain the evidence of the Rev. Mr. Elwyn. Mr. Combe said that such a course of proceeding was necessary for the ends of justice, and told the prisoner she would be brought up for a further examination in a week. The prisoner applied for the restoration of six sovereigns and some silver money which had been taken from her. Mr. Combe: Will you tell me your name, and where you live?—Prisoner (good humouredly): Will you let me have my money?—Mr. Combe: Will you tell me your name? —Prisoner: Oh, you have got name enough. One is as good as another. But do be kind enough to give me up my money.—Mr. Combe: Not at present. I must know more of you first.—Prisoner: Then I wish you good morning, and, turning to the gaoler, she tripped gaily to the cell.

TO THE TAX-PAYERS OF GREAT BRITAIN.

Address of the Council of the Liverpool Financial Reform Association to the Tax-payers of the United Kingdom.

On the 26th of February, the following resolutions were submitted to the House of Commons for its consideration:—

"That the net expenditure of the Government for the year 1835 (Parliamentary Paper, No. 260, 1847), amounted to £44,422,000; that the net expenditure for the year ending the 5th of January, 1849, (Parliamentary Paper, No. 1, 1849,) amounted to £54,185,000; the increase of nearly £10,000,000 having been caused principally by successive augmentations of our warlike establishments, and outlays for defensive armaments; that no foreign danger, nor necessary cost of the civil government, nor indispensable disbursements for the services in our dependencies abroad, warrant the continuance of this increase of expenditure; that the taxes required to meet the present expenditure impede the operations of agriculture and manufacture, and diminish the funds for the employment of labour in all branches of productive industry, thereby increasing pauperism and crime, and adding grievously to the local and general burdens of the people; that to diminish those evils it is expedient that this House should take steps to reduce the annual expenditure, with all practicable speed, to an amount not exceeding the sum which, within the last fourteen years, has been proved to be sufficient for the maintenance of the security, honour, and dignity, of the nation."

This resolution the House refused to adopt by 275 to 78 votes.

The question of a reduction in the national expenditure adequate to afford relief to the people by a material lessening of taxation, is thus, for the present, decided—it is refused.

The Chancellor of the Exchequer, is reported, in the course of the debate, to have made the following observations:—"When he found that in the last twenty years the people of this country had been relieved from taxes to a most enormous extent, and that those taxes were on articles of consumption or the raw materials of manufacture, he was at a loss to understand on what ground it was now, for the first time, asserted in these associations throughout the country, and in a public manner, that taxation pressed in so grievous a manner. In the last twenty years there has been repealed or reduced taxes to nearly £20,000,000. There had been imposed taxes to about £9,800,000, the country being relieved to the extent of £9,899,000, or nearly £10,000,000, of one description of taxes or another, taken from articles of consumption and raw materials."

To these remarks the Association oppose the following comparison of taxation in 1801, and the three years ending the 5th of January, 1846-7, and 8:—

	1801	1846	1847	1848
	£	£	£	£
Customs and Excise	19,330,867	36,339,150	37,299,461	35,575,314
Stamps	3,049,344	7,871,968	7,675,921	7,671,325
Taxes (including Property and Income)	9,857,134	9,624,394	10,018,144	10,165,516
	21,369,927	23,300,180	26,814,708	
Amount received from Customs and Excise		36,339,150 ..	37,290,461 ..	35,575,314
Balance over and above all expenses of the State, and which goes towards payment of the interest on the national debt		14,969,223 ..	13,990,281 ..	8,760,606

Thus taxes, strictly so called, and paid *altogether* by the wealthier classes (including the property and income tax), have increased since 1801, on the average of the three years ending the 5th of January, 1846-7