

Office Order payable at the

which we should recommend to the perusal of
it is quite essential to those who contemplate
Record,

TRAGICAL AFFAIR IN VERMONT.—Danville, June 21, 1890.—A man who served his sentence for a murder, was the subject of a shocking affair which has occurred in our court-house, and has thrown our village into a state of great consternation and excitement. The felons Warburton, *alias* Bristol Bell and Meadows, were brought into court this forenoon at half-past ten o'clock, to receive sentence for the murder of a woman, which was committed and found guilty last week. Immediately after sentence was passed, to wit, ten years' imprisonment at hard labour, on each of the prisoners, Bristol Bell and Meadows, with the agility of a tiger, sprang upon Mr. B. N. Davis, state attorney, and plunged the hands of both into his face, and with their teeth fastened just back of the right ear, and on the neck bone, and flung backward instead of forward, to which fortunate circumstance of the backward direction the state attorney is no doubt indebted for his life. The first intimation that anyone present had of the prisoner's intention was the sharp tinkling of his chains, as he suddenly leaped forward and laid the hands of his victim upon the face of the attorney. But a faint cry was heard sticking in the wound. A bystander pulled out the reeking blade, while Bell stood erect, with a look of exaltation depicted upon his countenance. Indeed, while being doubly ironed, he repeatedly stated that he had but one anxiety, and that was the state that the work was but half done, and that he would not be satisfied until he had secured the same result as though nothing of any particular moment had occurred. The family of the state attorney were immediately sent for, and are anxiously attending by his bedside. Mr. Davis is in a very critical situation, though the doctor says he will not die.

"At a recent trial in Wisconsin," says an American paper, "the subject of controversy was demijohn of whisky, which was ordered to be brought into court. The defendant was tried, and so was the whisky—in other words the whisky was drunk, and so were the jury."

The Provinces.

could not find such a person at the address he had mentioned.—Several witnesses having been examined, the jury returned a verdict of guilty against ROBERTS BY A BARMY.—Henry Wright, 20, barman, and Caroline Davis were indicted for stealing from several sums of money from John Flouman. Mr. Robinson prosecuted. The prosecutor keeps the Three Compasses in the Wandsworth-road, and the male prisoner had been a servant there; but the great deficiency in his talking. Having set the police on the watch, they found out that the female was either his wife or lived with him, as she admitted the habit of coming and putting down a small coin as the payment for something. She was then sent to prison, in the present instance they took her at the bar of the house, having received 2s. 1d. in change for £1. The jury, thinking the female had acted under the guidance of the male prisoner, Acquitted her, and he was found "Guilty" and sentenced to twelve months imprisonment.

OBTAINING MONEY BY FRAUD.—Anna Maria Tolley, 33, married, was indicted for obtaining money by false pretences.—Mr. Huddleston prosecuted, and Mr. Ballantine defended.—William Henry Richardson, residing at 19, Sun-street, Bishopsgate-ward, was called in evidence, and proved that he was acquainted with the prisoner; having been introduced to her through his sister, who was acquainted with her. At that time witness had £50 in the hands of his attorney. The prisoner then informed him that she desired quarters, and asked him to obtain him a situation and he subsequently received a letter from her making an appointment at her lodgings in Coventry-street. He went there, and she again spoke of the influence she possessed, and mentioned a number of persons whom she knew, and said—she was acquainted, and amongst them that of Lord Ormsby Paget, and he added, that she should require witness to give her £50. Witness wished to know if it would be all right, and she said, "Yes, it would," as she was intimately known to his Lordship, witness then gave her the sum of £50, and after the conversation she asked him for some money, which he gave his sister, who paid it to prisoner. Shortly afterwards he had another letter from the prisoner, appointing another interview, and on his going she showed him a letter she said she had re-

her what situation it was to be. She said a messenger sent at the Home-office, and showed him a letterette which he thought was of an influential character, and from that and further statements made he believed what she stated to be true, and upon her asking him if he would give her a pass, he finally said he would, and she came home in October of that year. He then told her that he was to enter upon his situation on the Monday week following, and he then gave her £100, and another £20, after which he lost sight of her until the 21st of last May, when she was taken by James, the police-constable; and she then said she had not seen him since. She then said that she was not sure she was true, she had also told prosecutor that her husband's band was an officer in the army, who it turned out was only a private, and that he had deserted here some years ago. — Lord Alfred Paget, who was on the bench, was sworn, and said he had not seen her since she was sentenced to eighteen months' imprisonment. He said he had not seen her since the 21st of May, 1861, and that since then, by this system of fraud and perjury she had obtained some thousands of pounds. — She was sentenced to eighteen months' imprisonment. — The Grand Jury returned a verdict of guilty, and she was indicted for intermarrying with Emma Clark, otherwise Smith, his wife being then and now alive, and Mr. Charnock defended. — Mrs. Martha Page, the prisoner's mother, proved his first marriage on the 21st of May, 1861, to Emma Clark, the Evangelist's daughter, who was then living at No. 11, Waterloo-road, to one Ellen Ray, who was then married and had two children. He lived with her until about two years ago, when, in consequence of her deprecating his dissolute habits, he was compelled to be separated from her, and made her an allowance of six shillings weekly. Evidence was then given by several witnesses that she was not the same person as some one of the names of Henry Dickson was married at All Saints, Poplar, to one Emma Smith, and that he could not be proved that the prisoner was in the man, or that Emma Clark, who was then in the

George, near the common, was waiting for trial for a crime he had committed bigamy, and the wife was referred to in the register.—The man was then brought out of the dock into the witness box and having been sworn and cautioned not to say anything to criminate herself, unless she pleased, she said she knew the prisoner from his coming to her house, and that she had seen him always encouraged their acquaintances to do so.—Common Sergeant: Did anything ever occur between you and the prisoner at church? You need not answer unless you like.—Witness: No. Nothing ever occurred between you and the prisoner at church? The common Sergeant said to prove the end of the case, the evidence to prove the prisoner was the man married at Poplar Church. A verdict of acquittal was then taken.

Emma Clarke, 30, married, was then indicted for bigamy with Henry Page, alias Dickson, her husband being then alive. It was proved that she was married to Page, in 1842, to her husband (Clarke) who is now alive; and that she had since married Henry Page, alias Dickson, who was then alive. In proving her to be the party married at All Saints, Poplar.—The police officer said he saw the prisoner at the husband's house, on the 17th of June, as she was recovering from an illness. She told him she was married in 1843, at All Saints, Poplar, to the prisoner.—Common Sergeant: Smith, the clerk and the pew-opener, as witnesses to the marriage.—Mr. Charnock having briefly addressed the jury, dwelt on the fact that the only evidence against the statement made by her when on a bed of sickness, was the now denied oath.—The Common Sergeant having summed up the jury "Acquitted" her.

STABBING.—Benjamin Scott, 18, was indicted for feloniously cutting and wounding James Murray, a poor man, in the main and disable him, or to do him grievous bodily harm.—The thirteen prosecutors and Mr. Payne was for the defence. The prosecutor in this case is the potboy at the public-house at Granby public-house, Southwark, and on the 21st June, the prisoner, who has only one leg, was

standing outside the house abusing and threatening the prisoner. The prisoner was taken to the court where a sentence was ordered by the landlady, Mrs. Kierke. The prosecutor attempted to do so in a gentlemanly manner, but the prisoner was very violent, and Kierke himself, with his wooden leg, and he was thrown down by the jury. He got up and went in doors, and nothing more was said. The prisoner was taken out an hour afterwards, upon the procession being made out with some beer, the prisoner, who appeared to have been lying in wait for him, suddenly attacked him, and made a stab at him with an instrument resembling the sword of a chairmaker. The thrust was so violent that the prisoner put up his hands, and he was slain at his own door. The jury returned his left arm to ward off the blow. The prisoner received two somewhat severe cuts upon the right arm.—The jury found the prisoner "Guilty," and recommended him to mercy on account of his being a criminal. Justice Patteson sentenced him to be imprisoned for four years, and during that period to be kept to hard labour, as his state of body would enable him to perform.

ROBBERY OF A CHEQUE FROM THE GLOBE INSURANCE COMPANY.—Walter Watts, formerly lessee of the Olympic Theatre, and clerk in the Globe Insurance Office, who was convicted at a former assizes of robbing a piece of paper, the property of his employers, was this time the har to receive his judgment. It will be remembered that the law was reserved in this case which has since been argued before the Court of Criminal Appeal, and decided against the prisoner.—The Attorney-General, who appeared for the prosecution, said that before he proceeded to pass sentence, he begged to call the attention of the fact that there were three other indictments against the prisoner, and before sentence was pronounced he had to request that their lordships would read the depositions in these cases, in order that they might be apprised of the circumstances of the case before they delivered their judgment. He then read the depositions, and said that he was not in a position to save the public time if he could so, but in one case he should feel himself compelled to proceed with

the other cases.—Baron Alderson said he would look at the depositions, and in the meantime the prisoners would be kept in the cells. He probably pass sentence in the course of the present session.

"ALONG SHORE" DEPREDACTIONS—John Dwyer, twenty-six, hargeman, and Daniel Williams, sixty-three, labourer, two respectable looking men pleaded guilty to an indictment for stealing some goods from the property of Joseph James, of Alloway. Mr. Payne prosecuted, and Mr. Ballantyne and Mr. Payne defended. The prisoners, who it appeared were men of good character, pleaded guilty under the direction of their counsel. The proceedings were taken, not with a view to making the prisoners individually a severe example, but to make it publicly known that the offence which the prisoners had been given in, could not be regarded as permitted to be carried on with impunity. Mr. Barry said, that although the value of the goods stolen was trivial, still the frequent repetition of the offence, and the large class of property severe losers in the course of the year, and more especially, as the parties committing the depredations (mostly those engaged in the same trade) seemed to entertain an opinion that anything that fell from a barge they were liable to lose.

making it known that such was not the case and prosecuted these two men, whom they wished to be dealt leniently with. The prisoners were sentenced to fourteen days' imprisonment in New-

7

g in houses at a rental of not quite £50 a

RICHARDS AND ANOTHER V. GLADSTONES.
INSURANCE.

This was an action by Mr. John Richards and Sir James A. Gregor, as directors of the Eagle Assurance Company, against Edward Gladstone, Esq., Secretary of the Company. The amount of a policy of assurance effected on the 20th of May, 1845, by the plaintiffs on the life of Mr. William Capel Clayton, who was an officer in the Coldstream Guards, and died in the month of June of 1846, in the Queen's Bench prison, at the age of thirty-five, was the subject-matter of the action. Sir Wm. Clayton, who was son of Sir William Clayton, Bart., was, at the time the policy in question was made, and previously thereto, of drunken and intemperate habits; plaintiffs having stated in the usual declaration made by insurers, that he was of "sober and temperate habits," and that he was released by the defendants from custody on the ground that he was addicted to intemperance, and that it was alleged he ultimately died of delirium tremens. After much conflicting evidence on the subject the court was adjourned.—On Monday Mr. Peacock briefly addressed the jury for the defence, and called three witnesses.—John Warner examined: I am an engineer, and my employment of Mr. Clarke, optician, of the Strand. In 1845, I was in the habit of seeing Captain Clayton. He was mostly in his laboratory when I called, and he was always muddled. He spoke thick. I never saw him before twelve at noon. He was always drinking brandy and water. He was generally muddled from drinking and smoking. When I called upon him I found him in the laboratory. He generally was amusing himself with a cigar in his mouth. I assisted in setting up the scientific apparatus for him.—Cross-examined: He always appeared muddled, and sometimes drunk. I did not see him after the death of F. Thesiger. Should you consider a man muddled because he was irritable. (Laughter.) What do you mean by muddled?—Witness: Out of temper. (Great laughter).—Sir F. Thesiger: But that is being intemperate in one sense—(laughter)—but from what symptoms did you judge that he was muddled?—Witness: From his manner of speaking.—Sir F. Thesiger: How did he walk?—Witness: With the same as other men; upon his legs. (Loud laughter.) I considered him of drunken habits.—Margaret Carter: I live in Bath-street, Peckham. I lived with Miss Pitt one night while she was lying in a fit of intoxication. This occurred about five or six weeks ago, turned from Uxbridge, where he had been fishing. He brought two gentlemen with him, who thought she was Mrs. Clayton, his wife, and as there was in the laboratory a gentleman who was aware that she was not his wife, she refused to go in lest it might be discovered. She carried a pocket-handkerchief and a carving-knife out of the cupboard, and rushed upon her; I caught him by the arms, and prevented his hurting her. He was then under the influence of liquor. He was out very late every night, except when he had his supper at home on Saturday night. He was very noisy all day long, and on Sunday morning, and then he often used to make Miss Pitt come down stairs, and play him the music. He was very different when not under the influence of liquor. He drank, to very great excess, brandy and water, coloured liquors, and wine. When he got up in the morning he would get a glass of brandy and water, and spirits and soda water. I recollect another occasion on which at supper he fancied Miss Pitt had been too familiar with one of his guests. She was exasperated at the accusation, and struck him on the head, and knocked his hat, which is commonly known as the "cockade," off his head, and threw it over her bed-room. He followed her, and knocked her down. I with difficulty persuaded him to sleep on the couch in the sitting-room that night. After his supper he was always intoxicated. I have seen him knock the stems off the wine glasses. I have seen him throw tea and coffee overboard. I have seen the chairs here were—"drinking." (Laughter.)—Cross-examined: My nephew left before I did. I was mostly in the kitchen, but it was on a level with and facing the room they dined in. Nine or ten times while he was there he made Miss Pitt get up and dance with me. I was not present more than half the time, and several complaints were made to him about the noise of the music.—Sir F. Thesiger: Did he dance? (Laughter.)—Witness: I do not think it necessary to say whether a man dances to show he was an intemperate man. (Laughter.) I know nothing of this case.—(The judge) for I was only asked to attend to the facts. (Mr. Peacock) said: I never went to bed till he came home, though he had a latch-key. Sometimes he turned off the gas and sometimes I did.—Sir F. Thesiger: How did you know his intoxication?—Witness: Why, you have some notions in your head as to intoxication. (Laughter.) A man intoxicated, you say, is incoherently incoherent. (Laughter.)—Sir F. Thesiger: I perfectly agree to that;—(laughter)—but you say he was very different when drunk and sober; now how was he different?—Witness: When he was sober he spoke clearly, and was rational. He was usually one step at a time, but when he was drunk he would run up three or four steps at a time, hallooing and crying out "Let, let, let." In fact, a drunken man is a drunken man. I told you he was a drunken man, and I do not think I have any reason to say anything less. (Laughter.)—Sir F. Thesiger: Have you satisfied me? Witness: That is quite unnecessary. (Laughter.) He was very "obstipulous." I call any man "obstipulous" who strikes an innocent woman.—Thomas Lambert, the nephew of the preceding witness, gave evidence of a very similar character, and stated that Henry Bland fetched the captain from the Cider Cellars. He gave a very distinct account of the intemperate habits of Captain Clayton.—Henry Hembrey, head-waiter at the Cider Cellars for eleven or twelve years, examined: I knew the late Captain Clayton. I first became acquainted with him in 1837, when he first attended the Cider Cellars. I used to wait upon him at his lodgings in Castle-street. He was there every evening while in town. He would play a game or two of billiards. He used to come there at seven or eight in the evening. He used to leave at all hours, and come back again. He used to have brandy and water, cherry and water, hollaunders, sodas and brandy. He frequently had neat spirits in the bar. He used to come in the bar and have a glass or two of sherry when he first came in. He continued drinking and smoking till he left. I could not tell if he was ever so tipsy as to require another. (Laughter.) In the course of an evening he, on one occasion, was charged fourteen glasses. He objected, but the waiter, I think, was correct. He usually of a night took nine or ten tumblers. He mixed his spirits mostly. He was whole in the evening generally in fits of intoxication; he could walk till he had a couple of tumblers, play at twelve; but his general habit was smoking, leaving at billiards, and drinking. When I attended at his house he used to have friends with him; he used to drink a great deal more than they did, and used to leave before they retired; and his wife was never sober. He was not a regular drinker of temperate habits.—Cross-examined: Mr. Rhodes was landlord of the Cider Cellars. I am now speaking of the latter end of 1843 to May or June of 1844. He was absent during portions of that period. He played billiards with any one in the room. I could not tell if he was ever so tipsy as to require another. (Laughter.) He played a middling game. He was principally in the billiard room. I used also to drink. It was play and pay. (Laughter.) He paid for me. I was fond of brandy and water. I used to drink with some of the company. I used to be very tipsy, but I cannot say I was always steady. I do consider myself a person of drunken and intemperate habits. I generally go home pretty comfortably. (Laughter.)—The Lord Chief Baron: Shall I take that down, that you are of intemperate habits? (Laughter.)—Witness nodded assent amidst much laughter.—Cross-examined: You were not a regular drinker and friend at Julien's mask ball.—Mr. Peacock: In what state were they?—Sir F. Thesiger: Disguised of course. (Laughter.) Witness: Captain Clayton was certainly not a temperate man.—Major Brown examined: I reside at Uxbridge, and knew the late Captain Clayton. His last visit to my house was in the month of May, 1845. I did not know him. I could give no history of his life from May to August. He was certainly not of sober and temperate habits. I have frequently seen him drink to excess. We went out to fish at ten, and he would drink nearly a pint of brandy before dinner time. He was drunk before dinner, that is rather intoxicating. He ran out to the garden and commenced to drink spirits nearly in the morning.—Cross-examined: I am in the Militia. I volunteered in 1815 to the Second Provisional Battalion. I am a major in the Spanish service. I used to meet Sir F. Thesiger: He frequented the quartered upon him?—Witness: I did fortunate. (Laughter.)—The Lord Chief Baron: Is that sufficient? (Laughter.)—Sir F. Thesiger: Especially when it is at another's expense. (Laughter.)—Cross-examination continued: We went to play at quarts merely for the benefit of the pelpers, not for money. We were fishing.—Elizabeth Norton, servant, Miss Pitt called upon Mrs. Clayton engaged me in 1844. Lived with him for five years and four months. Gave the same evidence as to sobriety of his habits. I used to put up rum punches for him, two bottles of sherry, one of brandy and water, three of Madeira, and many of ale, and three or four bottles of soda water. He could not get to dinner without some cause he was so far gone in liquor. At dinner he used to drink dogs and brandy, and sometimes glass

[illegible][illegible]

DONWELL was decidedly in favour of the bill being made important. If the time allowed, he would have been glad to consider the question connected with it, but this not being the case, the only question was, whether the Bill should pass in the present session. The shipping interest had been at first opposed to the introduction of Mr. Labouchere's motion, but the Chamber of Commerce in the morning of the 1st, uttered, "denying the importance of the exclusion," he was bound to resist the demand by time.

The House having made a few remarks in support of the bill, Mr. Adolph withdrew his motion.

J. MANNERS then moved that the bill be referred to a select committee,

The motion was upon a division negatived by 120 yeas to 67 nays.

From some observations by Mr. Waxed, in opposition to the bill, the house went into committee, being three o'clock, the Chairman reported progress, obtaining leave to sit again this morning at five o'clock, and then suspended until five o'clock, the hour remaining.

F. O'CONNOR presented a petition from brewers, distillers, proprietors, factors, holders, dealers in excisable liquors, and others, residing in the city of Glasgow, against a resolution introduced into the House of Peers, which intimated that the Government intended the system of licensing spirit-dealers in Scotland, under the house resolving itself into committee on ecclesiastical Commission Bill.

HORSBURG rose to move his amendment to the clause relating to the appointment of Church Commissioners, and proposed that no member of commission should be limited to three paid responsible officers, and that the fifty-two pro-officio members of the board should be reduced to ten. The judges, cabinet ministers, and others, as it was composed, had, he observed, their own independent means of income, and were to be discharged of their functions by the exercise of the duty of their personal office. He thought that this was especially true of bishops. He quoted Scripture to prove the prevalence of ecclesiastical personages, being taken from the apostle's epistles, calling them to their own discharge, in order to take part in questions affecting the temporal interests of the Church.

The amendment was agreed to, and the clause was passed. He admitted that he had often heard churchmen speak against existing bishops, but that was only because he conceived them to be more than other persons to the religious instruction of the people.

JOHN RUSSELL preferred to adopt the suggestion of the committee, which was, that the most important questions should still be left to the board of management, but that a smaller body should be appointed to act as a check.

He then read a caution to the effect, from Sir ROBERT LALOR, against placing confidence in Mr. Horsman's amendment, and a report from that gentleman, in which BENJAMIN HALL said that he agreed in thinking that the bishops should form no part of the management, but that their conduct had proved how much they were unworthy of such an appointment, and themselves to the neglect of their pastoral duties. The bishops only attended the board when they wanted to borrow from the fund. Upon these grounds, he should support Mr. Horsman's amendment.

G. GREY observed that many of the charges against the bishops by the hon. baronet only revealed his ignorance of the duties really imposed on commissioners. For instance, they were required to deal with questions of pluralities, and he suggested that if the hon. baronet had been so ignorant, he should have abstained from speaking. G. STANLEY observed that the faults of the commission could hardly be charged against the bishops, unless it were shown that the lay members were in a minority against them.

Mr. RUSSELL then moved that the hon. baronet's amendment be rejected, and the committee be divided, when Mr. RUSSELL'S amendment was lost by a majority of 60 yeas to 92 nays.

E. DAVISON then proposed that three of the commissioners should be paid; but after a short discussion, it was decided that the clauses up to the seventh clause having been passed, after a preliminary conversation and a division, a prolonged discussion ensued upon the clause introduced by Mr. Russell, relative to the appointment of a series of suffragan bishops, who were to receive a reduced scale of income, and who were to perform the duties of the archbishop and auxiliary range of episcopal duties until the death of the archbishop.

J. J. RUSSELL moved an amendment, whereby the operation of this clause was considerably restricted. The amendment then divided, and the government amendment was carried by a majority of 163 to 111 yeas and 62 nays.

On the motion of Mr. Russell, the House resolved to sit on Friday next at eleven having been agreed to the chairman reported progress and the house recessed.

A Corporation of Boroughs Confirmation Bill was brought through committee.

MR. MACDONALD moved the addition of schedules containing a variety of minute statistical returns respecting agriculture, manufactures, productions, possessions, religious tenets of the dwellers in agricultural districts.

MR. CONNELL AND MR. S. G. GREY opposed the proposition, which would encompass the registration, and would delay the completion of the census. They also objected to the inclusion of statistics of agriculture, manufactures, and productions, as well as of religious tenets, as being unnecessary and unwarrantable. A similar bill for Ireland was afterwards withdrawn from committee.

It was the commitment of the Home Made Spirits in London having been put, the CHANCELLOR of the Exchequer without any further remark, moved that the bill be committed for three months.

The bill was divided.

For going into committee 120
Against 121

Majority —1

The house adjourned at a quarter to two o'clock.

TUESDAY, JULY 9.

HOUSE OF LORDS.—DEATH OF THE DUKE OF LANSOWNE.—The Marquis of Londonderry, after commemorating the virtues of the Duke of Devonshire, proposed that the house should show its respect for the illustrious deceased by an immediate adjournment.

MR. RUSSELL moved that the Duke of Devonshire should be entitled to all that extended fallen from the noble earl, still master of Lonsdowne, while he entirely disclaimed any claim to the title of Duke of Devonshire, partly because it was unusual, but more principally because it would deprive the house of an opportunity of condoling with her Majesty and the Duchess of Cambridge, by voting an address of sympathy to the bereaved family who had befallen the Royal Family.

After some discussion it was agreed that the Marquis of Londonderry should propose two addresses of condolence—one to her Majesty, the Duchess of Cambridge, and that the Marquis of Londonderry should withdraw his motion of adjournment.

The two addresses were accordingly voted *non est*, and the motion withdrawn.

The report on the Parliamentary Voters (Ireland) Bill was received, and the third reading fixed for Tuesday next.

The Metropolitan Interments Bill passed through committee, the Elections (Ireland) Bill was read a second time, a number of other bills were forwarded stage, and their Lordships adjourned.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.—This house was occupied with the consideration of the motion for an address to the Mercantile Marine Bill until nine o'clock, when the Chairman reported progress, and the house adjourned.

When the house resumed took place until five o'clock.

THE NATIONAL LAND COMPANY.—Mr. F. O'CONNOR presented a petition relative to the affairs of the company, and moved that it be read by the clerk of the House.

The Clerk had commenced reading the petition, when Mr. RUSSELL moved that the petition be referred to a select committee, consisting of the National Land Company, when

MR. RUSSELL asked if the hon. member was content to present a petition from himself?

MR. SPEAKER intimated that he was not, but that it might give it to some other member to present.

MR. F. O'CONNOR.—Thank you sir; then I'll deliver to the hon. member for Rochdale, to present it me.

MR. S. G. GREY subsequently presented the petition, which prayed the house to give leave to the National Land Company to bring in private bills, and to make a similar compliment to the Lord Chancellor, that the same should be done in relation to addresses of condolence to the Queen and the Duchess of Cambridge.

THE COUNTY FRANCHISE.—Mr. L. KINO then rose to move to bring in a bill to make the franchise in Great Britain and Wales the same as that in England, and to give the right of voting to all persons of tenements of sufficient value of £10. It was aware that many hon. gentlemen on that side the house were as anxious as he was for that considerable measure of Parliamentary reform; and the hon. member for Montrose had, year after year, urged the necessity of a most comprehensive measure of reform, which he had supported by illustrations and authorities, but which had been covered on the

[illegible][illegible]

