

Thompson Leigh Hunt, 10 Wellington Street, Strand.

# The Leader.

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

## Contents:

### NEWS OF THE WEEK—

|  | PAGE |
|--|------|
| Opening of Parliament .....                                | 1054 |
| Mr. Macaulay's Great Speech at Edinburgh .....             | 1054 |
| The Manchester Free-trade Gathering .....                  | 1056 |
| Letters from Paris .....                                   | 1057 |
| Continental Notes .....                                    | 1057 |
| The Electric Telegraph Complete from London to Paris ..... | 1058 |
| The Launch of the Bengal .....                             | 1058 |
| The State of Trade .....                                   | 1059 |
| Emigration and Colonization .....                          | 1059 |

|  |      |
|--|------|
| Railway Smashing .....                 | 1059 |
| Progress of Association .....          | 1059 |
| Miscellaneous .....                    | 1060 |
| Militia Prosecutions .....             | 1060 |
| Health of London during the Week ..... | 1061 |
| Births, Marriages, and Deaths .....    | 1061 |

### POSTSCRIPT .....

### PUBLIC AFFAIRS—

|  |      |
|--|------|
| What will Come out of it All? .....                  | 1062 |
| European League against America .....                | 1062 |
| The Profanity of Present "Sabbath Observances" ..... | 1063 |

|  |      |
|--|------|
| The Crisis in Turkey .....                     | 1064 |
| A Check for Railway Destruction .....          | 1064 |
| A Clerical Witness to Church Anarchy .....     | 1064 |
| Sanitary Government .....                      | 1065 |
| A Screw for Public Health Officers .....       | 1065 |
| Hints to New M.P.'s. ....                      | 1066 |
| Fallacies of Macaulay .....                    | 1067 |
| Taxation Reduced to Unity and Simplicity ..... | 1067 |
| Dessert Banquets for Public Meetings .....     | 1069 |
| The Accuser .....                              | 1069 |
| The Clock à la Française .....                 | 1069 |

Abd-el-Kader and Archdeacon Hale 1069

### LITERATURE—

|  |      |
|--|------|
| Thackeray's New Novel .....                          | 1071 |
| Butler's Analogy <i>versus</i> Modern Unbelief ..... | 1072 |
| Books on our Table .....                             | 1073 |

### THE ARTS—

|                            |      |
|----------------------------|------|
| Two Comedies .....         | 1074 |
| King Henry the Fifth ..... | 1074 |

### COMMERCIAL AFFAIRS—

Markets, Advertisements, &c. 1074—1076

VOL. III. No. 137.]

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 1852.

[PRICE SIXPENCE.]

## News of the Week.

THE new Parliament opened on Thursday, and the Commons proceeded at once to the election of Speaker. The forms of that proceeding, and the administration of the oaths to Peers and Members, offer no subject for remark; except a pleasant reflection at the display of English character in the reelection of the Speaker. The universal recognition of Mr. Shaw Lefevre's fairness, and the right recognized in him to his post on the score of that quality, agreeably illustrate that the power of the boasted staple in English character survives in full force. Broadly considered, the speeches and the act are a great political event, and highly calculated to revive the popular reverence for the elective chamber. The whole tone of the proceedings marks national respect and conscious power.

The opening of Parliament was harbingered by a great demonstration of the Free-traders in Manchester, intended to be an imposing review of their forces, and to define their position. It appears that they intend to take up a perfectly separate position; that without consulting the convenience of any political parties, they intend to force on an immediate decision upon the question of Free-trade or Protection, unless they be anticipated by a Free-trade declaration in the Queen's speech. Mr. Cobden also seized the occasion to repeat his announcement, that he is as well qualified for office as many gentlemen that obtain it; and to express doubts as to the possibility of forming any new party in the House of Commons. The representations are both true; but the tone in which they were uttered implies a considerable coldness of feeling on the part of Mr. Cobden towards the more political order of Liberals. The muster, both of Members of Parliament and of the representatives of towns was great.

Mr. Macaulay's appearance at Edinburgh is less a political than a personal and local fact. He spoke an *Edinburgh Review* article, of a reserved Liberalism which astonishes his younger admirers, but reminds his older friends of the pre-Reform days. A model Whig of 1688, his own peculiar traits have been strengthened by the irresponsibilities of years, of an invalided health, an unsolicited seat, and absolute renunciation of office. To him the revolt of 1848 was anarchy and terrorism, Socialism is "robbery," universal suffrage

[COUNTRY EDITION.]

is alarming; and in short, the questions of 1853 are terrible to the politician of 1831. But the oral essay was a finished and brilliant composition, and was most alluring even to those critics of modern Athens who could not have shared its timidities. The declaration of the ex-Minister that he would never again be tempted to exchange a polished ease for the doubtful honours of Downing-street, lends to the position of our national historian in Parliament a peculiar dignity and independence, as his genius sheds a lustre and a grace on any assembly that his name adorns. The pale thin face, the failing energy, and the unflinching courage of the orator, saddened this remarkable occasion; the suddenness of his peroration had almost the accent of a parting, and the solemnity of a last farewell.

On Irish ground we find our Ministers taking up a position of aggression. The Attorney-General has filed an information against the *Anglo-Celt* for a libel on the Thirty-first Regiment respecting the transactions at Six-mile Bridge, and has moved for a rule to show cause why the proceedings before the Coroner's inquest, in which the Jury found a verdict of "Wilful Murder" against the soldiers, should not be quashed. Few English politicians will blame this decided course, especially when it is coupled with the generally liberal character of Lord Eglinton's career; but it contrasts ominously with the vacillating conduct of Ministers in the matter of Protection, and in English politics at large.

Elsewhere, indeed, our Ministers adhere, if we may trust all present appearances, to their plan of always taking exactly the position which they should not. The *Morning Post* has announced that the Allied Powers have required King Leopold of Belgium to exact from any new Ministry laws restraining the press, "England," *alias* Lord Malmesbury, joining in that "recommendation;" and this assertion has not received the expected contradiction from the avowedly Ministerial papers; a silence which proclaims eloquently that there must have been something in it. We must indeed doubt whether King Leopold would submit to a dictation so grossly violating the national independence of his kingdom; since not only his character, but his declaration that he would only retain his throne so long as it should be with the concurrence of his subjects, forbids the idea that he could sacrifice the dignity of the state to retain a degraded occupancy of the throne.

The notion is also forbidden by the character of M. de Brouckère, moderate Liberal as he is, who has once more formed a Ministry; and the disbelief is corroborated by the character of M. Piercot, the Prime Minister's Radical colleague. Meanwhile the popular party, the free-tariff, and the free press, are safe against the priest party of Belgium and the intrigues of Paris. If England, therefore, has joined the Allied Powers in coercing Belgium, it is probable that she has been rebuked by the firmness of Queen Victoria's uncle. But what says the English public on this uncontradicted prostitution of "England" to the purposes of Lord Malmesbury's continental friends?

The position of England in Sardinia is a problem more important than clear. Count Cavour has been beaten, and Count Cesare Balbo has undertaken the attempt to form a Ministry. The Count's antecedents mark him as an uncertain Liberal, with a leaning to the priest party; but his actual position is doubtful. Does England continue her moral support to Sardinia, or has England joined her enemies? Hail to the manly and truly *English* declaration of the *Times* on the subject of Belgium and Sardinia!

But a much more ugly question is suggested by the letter of our Paris correspondent: what reception is "England" giving to the project which Louis Napoleon is said to have put forward for an European League against America? The story is, that in order to obtain permission to found the Empire, Louis Napoleon has represented how desirable it is to establish in Paris a great power for keeping down France; that he proposes to revise the treaties of 1815, to yield various little pickings for the great power in exchange for the Rhine as a French boundary, and to purchase the alliance of England by securing to her the fixity of her American boundaries, on the guarantee of the great European powers, allied for that purpose against the United States of America. It would be quite right, in the coming "war of principles," to regard the United States as the natural leader of the anti-despotic powers, and to array against the American republic England, her natural ally; but will the people of England be content to accept a position thus chosen in their name by Lord Malmesbury? The Paris rumour may turn out to be a mistake: or if true, the alliance of the Northern powers against Louis Napoleon's assumption of the imperial title, as "Napoleon the Third," may break off the negotiation; but, at any rate,

the people of England ought to know what is done in its name.

On our own side of the water, an official proceeding that looks incompatible with the supposed diplomatic amity, is the appointment of General Sir Charles James Napier to the Kent militia division; Sir Charles, it will be remembered, being the strenuous advocate of a militia as a means of national defence against invasion, and also being the most distinguished of our living Generals. But we have always regarded the present Commander-in-Chief, Lord Hardinge, as a man of truly national spirit. He avouches the natural capabilities of the young Militia men who have come forward; and in appointing Sir Charles Napier to head the men of Kent, Lord Hardinge shows that he means to perform the duty of national defence in a workmanlike manner.

Although, therefore, Lord Malmesbury may be dallying with unnatural French alliances against the popular party of Europe and the United States of America; although the Electric Telegraph Company has been recognising the Empire, the honour of a soldier proves too strong for concurrence in such intrigues.

Commerce is moving its great engines with chequered success. In the endeavour to make the most of narrow space and time, the Directors of the Brighton Railway Company permit the repetition of acts which may, at any day, induce desperate accidents; and one has happened. It is so desperate, indeed, that the people injured and affrighted are likely to take steps which may draw upon the managers some species of coercion.

The steam ship, *Melbourne*, is dismasted at sea; and there is a new burst of complaint from the passengers, of hardship and danger through the meanness of the management. This unpleasant example of sharp practice in commerce, is compensated by the launch of the *Bengal*, the forty-first steamer of the Oriental and Peninsular Company, which is extending its network of communication from London to the most distant parts of the world. Three hundred and ten feet long, exclusively of outworks, fitted up in a style of the highest magnificence, the *Bengal* is a fine specimen of naval architecture; and her addition to the steam fleet is a public event.

#### OPENING OF PARLIAMENT.

PARLIAMENT opened on Thursday, in a very humble, quiet, and respectable way. There was very little speechmaking indeed, and still less was there that is worth repeating in our columns. But there attaches to our Legislature, at this juncture of European politics, a degree of importance not easily equalled, as ours is perhaps the only unmenaced assembly in this quarter of the globe. Somehow, no matter how trivial may be the matter discussed, one feels in the presence of a venerable institution which seems to have a personality of its own, as it were, independently of the speakers, and which, at the opening of a session at least, commands respect and wins affection. The British man loves his Parliament and he loves his home; and not until he loves neither will the freedom of these islands be seriously endangered.

As far as the HOUSE OF LORDS was concerned, it met, those members of it who did meet, and they were few, merely to open the session by Royal Commission. Sitting on the woolsack, the Lord Chancellor called up the Commons, and the writ having been read to them, they were requested to return and elect a Speaker. The Lords, among whom Lord Brougham, the Duke of Leinster, Lord Eglinton, Lord Malmesbury, the Duke of Northumberland, were noticed, then adjourned.

The interest of the opening, what there was of it, lay in the Commons. The members mustered in great strength. Among the earliest was Sir Robert Inglis, who took up a Ministerial sitting at once; then Mr. Christopher, first of the Ministers to arrive; Mr. Disraeli, Sir John Pakington, and Mr. Walpole, came in nearly together; and Mr. Disraeli, having shaken hands with Mr. Hume, entered into lively chat with Mr. Duncombe. Lord John Russell and Mr. Disraeli are described as looking unwell. Mr. Gladstone and Lord John sat together. Baron Rothschild appeared, sitting on the Treasury benches, and came to vote for Speaker. Among the leading members whose absence were remarked were, Lord Palmerston, Sir James Graham,

Sir William Molesworth, Mr. Goulburn, Mr. Roebuck, Mr. Cobden, and Mr. Bright.

Having, as above narrated, attended the House of Lords, the members proceeded to elect a Speaker. This business was shortly disposed of.

Mr. ROBERT PALMER, in a speech of no pretensions, but straight to the point, proposed that Mr. Shaw Lefevre, who has filled the chair of the House for the last thirteen years, with so much advantage to the country, and honour to himself, take the chair of the House.

Lord ROBERT GROSVENOR, from the Opposition side, seconded the nomination. They were proud of Mr. Lefevre as a Whig in former times; but having laid aside party feeling, they were more proud of him as a member of the House. Beside this, Lord Robert delivered a homily, not uncalled for, reminding the House that more than ever, when the liberties of Europe, when the rights of free, full and open discussion—the rights of public opinion—hung upon a thread, did it become the House to act with unusual prudence, calmness, and wisdom.

Sir ROBERT INGLIS spoke of the increased work of the Speakers in modern times. Mr. Lefevre had sat not less than 13,000 hours in the discharge of his duty, and he had done more work in thirteen years than Speakers a hundred years ago did in a whole reign.

There being no opposition, the election would have passed by acclamation; but some members calling "Question," the Chief Clerk put the question, which was carried in the affirmative. Mr. LEFEVRE bowed to the decision of the House, made a short speech of thanks, and was conducted to the chair by Mr. Palmer and Lord Robert Grosvenor. There he was respectfully addressed in brief and commonplace remarks by Mr. DISRAELI and Lord JOHN RUSSELL. The former congratulated the Speaker upon having again conferred upon him by the Commons of England the highest honour they could confer on one of themselves; and the latter expressed his satisfaction at the election to preside over the debates of a new House of Commons of a gentleman who could enforce with judgment its rules and orders.

Mr. HUME offered some suggestions as to the costume in which members should appear at the Speaker's levees; and the House adjourned until Friday, when the Speaker elect would be presented for her Majesty's approval in the House of Lords.

The following circular has been addressed to the supporters of the Ministry in the House of Commons:—

"Treasury, Oct. 25.

"SIR,—The re-election of the Speaker, to which I anticipate no opposition, will take place on the 4th of November.

"The Address will be moved on the 11th, and I earnestly request that you will take the oaths and your seat not later than Tuesday, the 9th, or Wednesday, the 10th. The oaths must be taken before 4 o'clock.

"I have the honour to be, Sir,

"Your obedient servant,

"W. FORBES MACKENZIE."

#### MR. MACAULAY'S GREAT SPEECH AT EDINBURGH.

ELECTED, without solicitation, to fill the distinguished post of representative of the modern Athens, and disabled, for a long time, by a painful illness, from even visiting his constituents, Mr. Macaulay has happily, at length, been able to fulfil a long-standing promise, and to address a most willing auditory. Few political scenes could be more affecting to both parties. Religious bigotry, five years ago, ousted the orator of the Whigs, and one of its brightest ornaments from the House of Commons; and he, taking counsel of a manly pride, resolved never to sit again in that House, unless he sat as representative of Edinburgh. Five years have passed, Edinburgh has repented of its folly, and returned the rhetorician of the Whigs at the head of the poll. And, after that long and bitter parting, forgiving and forgetting, they met again, face to face, on Tuesday. It is not easy to imagine the scene in the Music Hall, whose vast area was crowded in every part, whose orchestra was filled with hundreds of ladies, and on whose platform, moved deeply by the affectionate cheers of the assembly, stood the pain-stricken and worn figure of the great orator, surrounded by his friends.

As soon as the burst of cheering was over, Mr. Adam Black was appointed to the chair, and disposed around him were Mr. Tufnell, Mr. Fergus, Mr. Moncrieff, Mr. Hastie, of Paisley, Sir W. Gibson Craig, well-known Whig Parliamentarians, Mr. Cowan, the semi-Radical, Mr. Horsman, the rejected of Cockermouth, and a host of the best which Whig Edinburgh can produce on a political gala day.

Mr. Black's judiciously short introductory speech was greeted with delight, and when turning to Mr. Macaulay, he asked him "to address his constituents," the

whole audience, carried away by their enthusiasm, rose instantaneously to their feet, and cheered in their most "emphatic" fashion.

For some moments after he stood up before the people, Mr. Macaulay could not master his emotion, and was unable to proceed.

Their opinion, he said, was more valuable than any vulgar object of ambition, than any office, however lucrative or dignified; indeed, no office could have tempted him to leave again "the happiest and most tranquil of all retreats for the bustle of political." The honour now conferred upon him, of which the greatest man might well be proud, was such as "only a free people could bestow;" and it would have shown ingratitude and pusillanimity not to make one effort to serve them. And, he continued, affecting, here we meet again in kindness after a long separation.

"It is now more than five years since I stood in this very place. A large part of human life! There are few of us on whom five years have not set their mark; there are few circles from which five years have not taken away what can never be replaced. Even in this multitude of friendly faces I look in vain for some which would this day have been lighted up with joy and kindness. I miss especially one venerable man, who before I was born, in evil times, in times of oppression and corruption, adhered with almost solitary fidelity to the cause of freedom. And I knew him in advanced age, but still in the full vigour of mind and body, enjoying the respect and gratitude of his fellow-citizens. I should, indeed, be most ungrateful, if I could this day forget Sir James Craig, his public spirit, his judicious counsel, his fatherly kindness to myself. (Cheers.) And Lord Jeffrey, too (renewed cries of 'hear, hear')—with what an effusion of generous affection he would this day have welcomed me back to Edinburgh! He, too, is gone; but the remembrance of him is one of the many ties which bind me to the city he loved, and with which his fame is imperishably associated. (Cheers.) But, gentlemen, it is not only here, on entering again, at your call, upon a course of life which I believed that I had quitted for ever, that I shall be painfully reminded of the changes which the last five years have produced. In Parliament I shall look in vain for virtues which I loved and for abilities which I admired. Often in debate—and never more than when we come to discuss those great questions of colonial policy which are every day now acquiring a new interest—I shall remember with regret how much eloquence, and wit, and acuteness, and knowledge—how many engaging qualities and how many fair hopes lie buried in the grave of poor Charles Buller. (Loud cries of 'hear, hear, hear.') Other men, too—men with whom I had no party and little personal connection—men to whom I was for the greater part of my public life honestly opposed—I cannot now think of without grieving that their wisdom, their experience, and the weight of their great names will never more in the hour of need bring help to the nation or to the throne. Such were two eminent men whom I left at the height, the one of civil, the other of military fame (cheers)—one the oracle of the House of Commons, the other the oracle of the House of Lords. There were, no doubt, parts in their long public life which they themselves, would, on a calm retrospect, allow to be censurable. But it is impossible to deny that each in his several department served the State—that the one brought to a triumphant close the most formidable conflict in which this country had ever been engaged with its foreign enemies; that the other, at a sacrifice—an immense sacrifice—of personal feeling and ambition, freed us from an odious monopoly, which could not have existed many years longer without producing most fearful intestine discord. (Loud cheers.) I regret both, but I peculiarly regret him who is inseparably associated in my mind with that place to which you have sent me. I shall hardly know the House of Commons without Sir Robert Peel. (Loud cheers.) On the first evening on which I took my seat in the House of Commons, in 1830, he was then at the head of the Government in that house, and during all the years of Parliamentary service which followed, I scarcely remember one important discussion in which he did not take a part with conspicuous ability. His figure is now before me—all the tones of his voice are now sounding in my ears; and the pain with which I think I shall never hear them again would be embittered by the recollection of some sharp encounters which took place between us, were it not that at last an entire and cordial reconciliation took place, and that a few days only before his death I had the pleasure of receiving from him marks of his kindness and esteem of which I shall always cherish the recollection. (Cheers.)"

Not only the changes which the natural law of mortality produces have happened. During that five years we have lived many lives. The revolutions of ages have been compressed into a few months. France, Germany, Italy, Hungary—what a history has been theirs. When he and they last met, few even among the wisest knew "what wild passions, what wilder theories," were fermenting under "the outward show of tranquillity." An obstinate resistance to reasonable reforms gave the signal for the explosion, and in an instant, from the borders of Russia to the Atlantic Ocean everything was in confusion and terror. The most honest friends of reform began to doubt and despair of the progress of mankind. All kinds of animosity burst forth together.

"For myself, I confess I stood aghast; and naturally sanguine as I am, and disposed to look with hope on the progress of mankind, I did doubt for a moment whether the progress of mankind would not be forced backward, and whether we were not doomed to pass in one generation from the civilization of the nineteenth century to the barbarism of the fifth. I remembered that Adam Smith and Gibbon had told us that there would never again be a destruction of civilization by barbarians—that that flood would never again return to cover the earth. And they seemed to reason justly, for they compared the immense strength of the combined races with the weakness of those who remained barbarous, and they asked whence were the



Huns and the Vandals to come that should again destroy civilization? Alas, it had not occurred to them that civilization itself might engender the barbarism that would destroy it. It had not occurred to them that in the heart of our great capitals, in the neighbourhood of our splendid palaces, and churches, and theatres, and libraries, and museums, vice, ignorance, and misery might produce a race of Huns fiercer than those that marched under Attila—of Vandals more bent on destruction than those that followed Genseric (loud cheers). Such was the danger. It passed by; civilization was saved, but at what a price. The tide of popular feeling turned—it ebbed almost as fast as it had risen. Imprudent and obstinate opposition to reasonable demands had brought on anarchy—and as soon as men saw the evils of anarchy they fled in terror, to crouch under despotism. To the dominion of mobs armed with pikes, succeeded the sterner and more lasting dominion of disciplined armies. The Papacy rose from its debasement—rose more intolerant and insolent than ever—as intolerant and insolent as it had been in the days of Hildebrand—intolerant and insolent to a degree which dismayed and disappointed those who had fondly cherished the hope that its spirit had been modified—mitigated by the lapse of years and the progress of knowledge (cheers.) Through the whole of that vast region where little more than four years ago we looked in vain for stable authority, we now look equally in vain for any trace of constitutional freedom.

We were exempt; madness did not subvert our throne, nor reaction our liberties. And why was our country a land of Goshen? Everywhere else thunder fire running along the ground—a storm such as there was none like it since man was on earth—yet everything was tranquil here. We owe this to our noble constitution. Let us profit by the lesson,—prize that constitution; purify it—amend it—but not destroy it.

“If we love civil and religious freedom, let us in every day of danger uphold law and order; if we are zealous for law and order, let us prize, as the best security of that law and order, civil and religious freedom. (Cheers.) Yes, gentlemen, the reason why our liberties remain in the midst of the general servitude—the reason why the Habeas Corpus Act has never in this island been suspended—why we have still the liberty of association—why our representative system stands yet in its full strength—is this, that in the year of revolution we stood firmly by the Government in its peril; and, if you ask me why we stood by the Government in its peril—when men around us were engaged in pulling their Governments down—I answer, it was because we knew that our Government, though not a perfect, was a good Government—that its faults admitted of peaceable and legal remedies—that it was never inflexible to just demands—that we had obtained concessions of inestimable value—not by beating the drum, by sounding the tocsin, by tearing up the pavements of the streets, or by running to the gunsmiths’ shops for arms—but by the mere force of reason and public opinion. (Loud cheers.) And, gentlemen, pre-eminent among those peaceful victories of reason and public opinion, the recollection of the year of revolution, and then the year of counter-revolution, I would place two great reforms which are inseparably associated—the one with the memory of an illustrious man who is now beyond the reach of envy, the other as closely associated with the name of another illustrious man, who is still, and I hope long will be living, to be the mark for detraction. I speak of the great commercial reform of 1846, the work of Sir Robert Peel, and of the Reform Bill of 1832, brought in by Lord John Russell. (Cheers.) I particularly call your attention to these two great reforms, because, in my opinion, it will be the special duty of the House of Commons, in which, by your distinguished favour, I have a seat, to defend the commercial reform of Sir Robert Peel—to perfect and amend the parliamentary reform of Lord John Russell.” (Cheers.)

As to commercial reform, he doubted whether any direct attack need be apprehended. From the Ministerial speeches it was impossible to draw any inference whatever; because they furnished passages proving the speakers to be Protectionists, and passages proving them to be Free-traders.

“I left London in the heat of the elections. I was forced to leave for Bristol. I left the Tory candidate for Westminster and the Tory candidate for Middlesex proclaiming themselves Free-traders. All along my journey through Berkshire and Wiltshire I heard nothing but the cry of Derby and Protection; but so soon as I got to Bristol, I heard the cry of Derby and Free-trade again. (Great laughter and cheering.) Then, again, on the one side of the Wash you had Lord Stanley, Under-secretary for Foreign Affairs—a young nobleman of great promise—a young nobleman who appears to me to have inherited a large portion of his father’s ability and energy: he held language which was universally understood to intimate that the Government of his father had altogether abandoned Protection. He addressed a town population; but then, on the other side of the Wash, there was the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster, who addressed the agricultural constituency of Lincolnshire. Some one puts to him the question, ‘What will you do if Lord Derby abandons Protection?’ The hypothesis was monstrous and insulting. He said, ‘I will not answer a question that is so derogatory to Lord Derby. I stand by Lord Derby, because I am certain he will not abandon Protection.’ These two speeches, delivered by two eminent persons, both of them believed to know the mind of the Government, went forth, and they were taken up by less distinguished candidates. There was, for instance, the Tory candidate for Leicestershire, who says, ‘I stand by Mr. Christopher. I believe in him—so long as you see him in the Government, Protection is safe.’ But when I go to East Surrey—which is in fact a town population, a mere suburb of London—I find the Tory candidate saying, ‘Never mind Mr. Christopher, he is not in the Cabinet, and can know nothing about the matter; I swear by Lord Stanley.’ (Laughter and cheers.) Nay, to such a degree

has this been carried, that we find different men, who have changed their own former notes and opinions if they happen to have passed from one class of the constituency to the other. Take, for instance, Lord Maidstone. He used to be one of the most vehement Protectionists in England. He published a small volume—I do not know if any of you have seen it, but as I am an elector for Westminster, and as Lord Maidstone stood as candidate for Westminster, I thought it my duty to buy the book, that I might know his opinions. The book is entitled *Free-trade Hexameters*. Of its poetical merits I shall not presume to pronounce an opinion. Indeed, you may form an opinion by ordering copies for yourselves, for I found, on ordering a copy of the publisher, in Bond-street, that the supply on hand was still very considerable. (Great laughter.) But of the political merits of Lord Maidstone’s hexameters I can speak with confidence, for it is impossible to conceive anything fiercer or more bitter than the attack—according to the measure of the power of the assailant—(laughter)—which he there makes on the policy of Sir Robert Peel. Well, and on the other hand, there is Sir Fitzroy Kelly, the Solicitor-General to the present Ministry—who was Solicitor-General under Sir Robert Peel—who voted for all Sir Robert Peel’s Free-trade measures, and who (doubtless from regard to the public interests, which would suffer greatly by the retirement of so able a lawyer from the service of the Crown) did not think it necessary to lay down his office when Sir Robert Peel brought in his measure for the repeal of the Corn-laws. (Great cheering and laughter.) But unfortunately Lord Maidstone became candidate for Westminster, and Sir Fitzroy Kelly for an agricultural county. So Lord Maidstone forgets his verses, and Sir Fitzroy Kelly his votes. (Loud cheers.) Lord Maidstone becomes a convert to Sir R. Peel’s measure; and Sir R. Peel’s Solicitor-General stands up and makes a speech, apparently compounded out of Lord Maidstone’s hexameters, against it. (Vehement cheering.) It is, therefore, gentlemen, impossible for me to pretend to foresee, from the language used by the Government and their adherents, what their conduct will be on the subject of Protection. Nevertheless, I think I may confidently say, that the great reform effected by Sir Robert Peel is perfectly safe.” (Great cheering.)

The Free-traders are stronger than they were when the reform was effected; in reason, because what was prophecy is now history, and in numbers, because they have the support of the labouring classes, who before were led away by “demagogues” to believe that it was purely a capitalists’ question.

With respect to Parliamentary reform—[and here Mr. Macaulay seemed exhausted, but his courage kept him going]—with respect to that question, he thought the time was near when the Reform Bill of 1832 would require to be amended, cautiously and temperately, but in a large and liberal spirit. That could only be done by a Government; but could they expect it from the present Ministry? There was the greatest reason for an apprehension that they would resist just demands at one time, and at another propose the wildest innovations. He would tell them why.

[Here Mr. Macaulay prefaced an exposure of Mr. Walpole’s famous militia franchise by professions of personal respect, and the declaration that he spoke on the “defensive.”]

“Mr. Walpole addressed his constituents at Midhurst, and in doing so he spoke personally of Lord John Russell, as one honest and good man should speak of another, and as I wish to speak of Mr. Walpole; but of Lord John Russell’s public conduct he spoke with considerable severity. And chief among the faults which he objected to his lordship was this, that he had re-opened the question of reform. Mr. Walpole declared himself opposed on principle to organic changes. He justly said, that if organic changes are to be introduced, they ought first to be deeply meditated and well matured—that nothing ought to be done without much thought and care; and he charged Lord John Russell with having neglected those precepts of prudence. I must confess I was thunderstruck when I read that speech; for I recollected that the most violent and democratic change in our representative system which had been proposed within the memory of the oldest man had been proposed a very few weeks before by this same Mr. Walpole. Do you remember the history of his Militia Bill? (Great laughter.) In general, when a great measure for the reform of Parliament is brought in, the Minister announces it weeks before—he gives notice that he is about to make a change in our representative system. There is, when the time comes, a great attendance, and a painful anxiety to know what he is going to produce. I remember—for I was present—the breathless suspense with which 600 gentlemen waited, on the 1st of March, 1832, to hear Lord John Russell announce his Reform Bill. But what was his Reform Bill to the Militia Bill of Mr. Secretary Walpole, of the Derby Administration? Proposed at the end of a sitting, in the easiest possible manner, as a mere clause at the tail of a Militia Bill, it was proposed that every man who served two years in the militia should have a vote for the county. What would be the number of these votes? The militia is to consist of 80,000 men; the term of their service is to be five years. In ten years we should have 160,000 voters, in twenty years 320,000, in twenty-five years 400,000. Some, no doubt, would by that time have died off, though the lives are all picked lives, remarkably good lives—still some would have died off. How many there may be I have not calculated. Any actuary would give you the actual numbers; but I have no doubt that when the system came into full operation you would have some 300,000 added from the militia to the county constituency, which, on an average, would be 6000 added to every county in England and Wales. This would be an immense addition to the county constituency. What are to be their qualifications? The first is youth, for they are not to be above a certain age; the nearer 18 the better. The second is poverty—

all persons to whom a shilling a day is an object. The third is ignorance—for if you ever take the trouble to observe in your streets what is the appearance of the young fellows who follow the recruiting sergeant, you will say that, at least, they are not the most educated of the labouring classes. Brave, stout young fellows no doubt they are. Lord Hardinge tells me that he never saw a finer set of young men, and I have no doubt that after a few years’ training they will be ready to stand up for our fire-sides against the best disciplined soldiers that the Continent can produce. But these men, taken for the most part from the plough-tail, are not the class best qualified to choose our legislators—there is rather in the habits of the young men that enter the army a disposition to idleness. Oh, but there is another qualification which I had almost forgot—they must be five feet two. (Laughter.) There is a qualification for a county voter! Only think of measuring a man for the franchise! (Continued laughter.) And this comes from a Conservative Government—a measure that would swamp all the county constituencies in England with people possessed of the Derby-Walpole qualifications—that is to say, youth, poverty, ignorance, a roving disposition, and five feet two. (Prolonged laughter and cheering.) Why, gentlemen, what have the people who brought in such a measure—what have they to say, I do not say against Lord John Russell’s imprudence—but what right have they to talk of the imprudence of Ernest Jones? (Loud cheers.) The people who advocate universal suffrage at all events gave us wealth along with poverty, knowledge along with ignorance, and mature age along with youth; but a qualification compounded of all disqualifications is a thing that was never heard of except in the case of this Conservative reform. It is the most ridiculous proposition that was ever made. It was made, I believe, at first in a thin house; but the next house was full enough, for people came down with all sorts of questions. Are the regular troops to have a vote? Are the police—are the sailors? indeed who should not, for if you take lads of one and twenty from the plough-tail and give them votes, what possible class can you exclude—what possible class of honest Englishmen and Scotchmen can you exclude if they are admitted? But before these questions could be asked, up gets the Home Secretary, and tells us that the thing has not been sufficiently considered—that some of his colleagues do not approve of it—that the thing is withdrawn—he will not press it. I must say if it had happened to me to propose such a Reform Bill on one night, and on the next sitting of the house to withdraw it, because it had not been sufficiently considered, I think that to the end of my life I should never have talked of the exceeding evil of re-opening the question of reform—to the end of my life I should never have read any man a lecture on the extreme prudence and caution with which he should approach questions of organic change.” (Cheers.)

Parliamentary Reform must be soon taken up, and there is hope that before long we shall in place a Ministry that will take it up as it ought to be.

“I dare say you will not suspect me, in saying this, of any interested feeling. The truth is, that in no case shall I again be a member of any Ministry. (Loud cheers.) During what remains to me of public life, I shall be the servant of none but you. (Continued cheering.)”

The new Minister must “revise the distribution of power,” consider whether small corrupt constituencies should have votes in the House equal to large ones; extend the franchise without endangering peace, law, and order; but keep clear of Universal Suffrage, as “we have seen by the clearest of all proofs, even when united with secret voting, that there is no security against the establishment of arbitrary power.” But there would be at no remote period an extension of the franchise to a larger class than the speaker once thought either safe or practicable. Turning to another subject he thus expressed himself.

“Perhaps I am too sanguine, but I think that good times are coming for the labouring classes in this country. (Cheers.) I do not entertain that hope because I expect that Fourierism, or St. Simonianism, or Socialism, or Communism, or any of the other isms, for which the plain English word is robbery (loud cheers), will ever prevail. I know that these schemes only aggravate the misery which they pretend to relieve. I know that it is possible by such legislation to make the rich poor; but I know that it is impossible to make the poor rich. But I do believe and hope that the progress of experimental science—the free intercourse of nation with nation—the unrestricted influx of commodities from communities where they are cheap, and the unrestricted efflux of labour to communities where it is dear—will soon produce—are, indeed, already beginning to produce—a great and blessed social revolution.” It is not a republican form of government that keeps America prosperous: but the freedom of labour.

“Why are not our labourers equally fortunate? Simply on account of the distance which separates this country from the new and unoccupied territories, and from the expense of traversing that distance. But science has abridged and is abridging that distance—it has diminished and is diminishing the expense. Already, for all practical purposes, New Zealand is nearer to England than New England was to those Puritans who fled from the tyranny of Laud. Already, Halifax, Boston, and New York are nearer England than, within the memory of persons now alive, the island of Skye or the county of Donegal were to London. Already the emigration is beginning if I understand aright the signs of these times—to produce the same effects here as in New England. Now, don’t imagine that one emigrating countryman is altogether lost to us. Even if he go from the dominion and the protection of the British flag, or settle among a kindred people, still he is not altogether lost; for under the benignant system of Free-trade, he remains bound to us by the closest ties—if he ceases to be a neighbour, he becomes a benefactor and a customer. For us he turns the forests into corn-fields on the banks of the Mississippi—for us he tends the sheep

and prepares the fleece in the heart of Australia, and from us he receives, in return, all those commodities which are produced with most advantage in old communities, where vast masses of capital are accumulated. His candlesticks, his pots, his pans, come from Birmingham—his knife comes from Sheffield—the light cotton jacket which he wears in summer comes from Manchester, and the good stout cloth coat which protects him in winter comes from Leeds; and in return he sends us the produce of what was once a wilderness—the good flour, which is to be made into the large loaf that the English labourer divides among his children [immense cheering]. I believe that in these changes we see the best solution of the question of the franchise—not so much by lowering the franchise to the level of the great masses, as by the rise in a time, which is very short in the existence of a nation, of the great masses up to the level of a reasonable and moderate franchise. (Loud cheers.) Gentlemen, I feel that I ought to stop. I had meditated some other things to say. I meant to speak of the ballot, to which, you know, I have always been favourable—something, perhaps much, of triennial Parliaments, to which, you know, I have always been honestly opposed; I meant to have said something of your university tests—something also about the religious equality movement in Ireland; but I feel that I cannot well proceed. I thank you again, from my soul, for the great honour you have done me in appointing me, without solicitation, to the distinguished post of one of your representatives. I am proud of our connection, and I shall try to act in such a manner that you may never be ashamed of it."

Such was the speech of the member for Edinburgh, closed obviously, not from want of matter, but want of strength. As the orator sank into his seat, the cheering broke out again in all the heartiness of "Scotch emphasis," wound up by three cheers for Mr. Macaulay; and, oddly enough, three more for "The History of England."

#### THE MANCHESTER FREE-TRADE GATHERING.

MANCHESTER was again the theatre of a Free-trade demonstration on Tuesday. The scene was laid in the Free-trade Hall; the actors were the leading men of the Anti-Corn-law League; and the spectators its supporters. Some hundred and twenty members of Parliament—English, Irish, and Scotch—attended, or sent sympathetic letters apologizing for absence. Nearly forty towns sent industrial representatives. It was not a banquet, but a dessert, of which they assembled to partake; and the guests, three thousand in number, sat at tables covered alternately with pink and white drapery. Outspread on these were pies, sandwiches, and tarts by the thousand; grapes, raisins, almonds, by the hundredweight; some three hundred pounds of biscuits; the whole garnished with upwards of two hundred dozens of wine.

Mr. George Wilson, the old chairman of the League, presided. After prayer, the loyal toasts were given; and after these "the Free-trade Members of the House of Commons;" and Mr. Cobden, as the representative of the largest constituency in the kingdom, responded in a long speech. He said, they were there to see that the great question of Free trade and Protection should be brought to a speedy settlement; and why this question should be now raised, when everybody was convinced of the advantages of Free-trade, was because we had a "packed House of Commons." When Lord Derby came into power, he said he would take the sense of the country on the subject, and on that ground he had been let off all last session:—

"Well, gentlemen, we have had that election, and defective as is our representative system, still there is a considerable majority in the House of Commons pledged to Free-trade (loud cheers). I have the high authority of a member of the Government (Major Beresford) for this fact (laughter and cheers). Gentlemen, all I stipulate is that when Parliament re-assembles, we should know whether the Government be now Protectionist or Free-trade (hear, hear). Is there anything unreasonable in that? (No, no.) Why have we had a general election, but to decide that question? Why do we meet now before Christmas but avowedly to settle that question? (Cheers.) I propose, therefore, that to follow out that view, which seems to be so much in accordance with your sentiments (cheers)—I propose that the Free-trade members of the House of Commons should bring the Derby Government to a declaration of their principles upon this question (loud cheering). Now, I say, that if the Queen's Speech do not contain a distinct renunciation and recantation of Protection on the part of this administration (cheers)—then the Free-trade majority, if they are true to their principles, as I honestly believe they are, are bound, either by an amendment to the Address, or by a substantive resolution of the House, to declare that no Government will have the confidence of the House of Commons which does not avow—mind, I say avow (loud cheers)—its determination to adhere to the policy of Free-trade as it has been hitherto adopted, and to carry it out in every practicable way (loud cheers). I say, gentlemen, that the House of Commons ought to call upon the Government to avow its opinions, because I draw a very great distinction indeed between the declaration of a Government and the intimation, the mystical intimation, of a Government that they do not at present think of interfering with Free-trade, and the avowal of a Government that they have changed their opinion, and are honestly in favour of Free-trade (cheers). I say, that when nineteen-twentieths of the population of

the country, and a large majority of the House of Commons, are in favour of certain principles, that your constitutional system is a fallacy unless you can have a Government in consonance with that system (loud cheers). It ought not to satisfy you that those who have been the inveterate enemies of the principles you have met to support should be left in possession of the executive of the country, and free to damage the progress of those principles, and prevent their extension, and, if possible, to bring back a return to Protectionist principles. That will not satisfy you or satisfy the country. But the reason why such a specific and determined course is to be taken by the Free-traders is, that nothing short of that will ever settle the question of agricultural distress. The great seat of this delusion of Protection is in the dark corners of our agricultural districts. It is there that survives this faith in a Ministry, who promise one thing at the market tables, and talk in another tone in the clubs and coteries of London (cheers).

And by this talk they had diverted the farmers from their natural pursuits. As to the agricultural labourers, he protested that they were better off now than under Protection, though still badly off. The only way to improve their condition was to invest more capital in the soil; but that could not be done while the Protectionist delusion, fostered by Lord Derby and Mr. Disraeli, was kept up. In the interest of agriculture, therefore, he called upon the Free-traders of the House of Commons to bring the question to an issue. Would that suit political parties? He held that they should not conciliate parties in the settlement of the question. We want, he said, to bring the matter to a close; and, having cleared away the rubbish of Protection, we give them free scope to all fresh combinations of parties; and there is no honest man who wishes to see progress made in other questions who is not interested in removing the Protection and Free-trade question from the category of party contention (loud cheers).

"I know it is very fashionable among certain politicians to say, Why don't you members of the House of Commons get together, and form yourselves into a party? Some people out of doors will say, You should be a Radical party. Others say, Why don't you make yourselves into a progressive party? Well, I must confess that the people who look to the members of the House of Commons to form parties or determine the policy of the country, have a very insufficient notion of what it is that constitutes the force of political movements in this country. What is it that makes Free-trade now a powerful political question? What is it that gives to Free-trade in Parliament the vitality and force which it possesses? Not by a few members of the House of Commons getting together and determining to make a party question of Free-trade. Free-trade did not become a powerful question in the House of Commons, or among politicians, until long after some men, rather young in years, and who had never been known as politicians before, engaged most actively and energetically in the promotion of the doctrines of Free-trade out of doors, and, by means of such meetings as the present, gave an impetus to the question, and enabled the members of the House of Commons to carry it triumphantly. (Cheers.) But if anybody supposes that, until the question is settled, any members of the House of Commons can meet together and form any other party—until the people out of doors have indicated what they want, and prepared a question for members to deal with—they have forgotten the Free-trade agitation, and are ignorant how parties are constituted in the House of Commons." \* \* \* \* "Gentlemen, I should not wonder if we are met by some of those wise politicians with the question, 'What are you going to do if you turn out this Government? How will you make up another Government?' Now, I think this question is much easier of solution after the experience of the last six months than it was before. (Laughter and cheers.) I do not think we should have any great difficulty in finding a Government after the formation of the present. (Laughter.) It comprises a dozen or so of very worthy and respectable men; but I venture to say there are at least five hundred men in this hall quite as competent to fill the offices of Cabinet Ministers. (Cheers and laughter.) We have seen that it is not requisite that your ancestors should have been Ministers. It does not require you to have been an adept in red tape all your days. It does not require a very broad coat of arms, or even a crest. (Laughter.) It does not matter what race you belong to. (Continued laughter.) There is no sort of embargo henceforth upon anybody being a Cabinet Minister. Therefore the difficulty we used to meet with is very considerably lessened. (Cheers.) Free-traders started by declaring that they had no political object to serve. Now, I will not be guilty of such a transparent piece of hypocrisy as to affect the modesty of not being able to make as good a Cabinet Minister as some half-score of persons upon whom that dignity has been conferred. (Loud and long-continued cheering.)"

We must have an emphatic recantation from Ministers.

"They must say Free-trade does not lower wages—(cheers)—they must say Free-trade does not cause a drain of gold from this country—(cheers)—they must say that Free-trade has not thrown land out of cultivation—they must say the land of this country is still worth something—(cheers)—and they must say that wheat, good wheat, has not been imported into this country, and cannot be imported into this country, at 24s. per quarter. (Cheers.) Now, these are a few of the things which they must say in opposition to what they said before. (Cheers.)"

There must be no talk about compensation. They must carry out Free-trade in all its consequences; advocate Free-trade, and not sneer at the Manchester

school; but in every way promote the extension of the principle in all its ramifications. He had been sneered at as a Utopian, because he connected Free-trade and Peace; but he was only securing the legitimate consequences when he said it would render nations more independent of each other, and being independent of each other, they will be bound together in bonds of amity and friendship.

"I am not Utopian. I am practical, and I can give a reason for the faith that is in me. I see Free-trade an accomplished fact in this country; and as the greatest commercial country in the world, I say that its example must be followed, and must lead to the extension of our intercourse with other nations. Men must be made peaceable, because it is their interest to be peaceable. (Cheers.)"

After a speech from Sir William Clay, not containing anything more remarkable than the last sentence, in which he said that the friends of Reform must advance from the Corn-law victory to future triumphs, Mr. Bright spoke to "The Anti-Corn-law League." When the League was re-formed last March, people said it was only the ghost of that body. But their opponents were not the first band who had been frightened from the field by a ghost.

"I take leave, however, to assert, that the manifestation of opinion during the last few months, and especially during the period of the general election, has been such as to show, that if the League was buried, its spirit is still an existing and a living spirit (cheers)—a spirit that dare and does defy any Cabinet that may exercise authority in this country to touch again the sacred question of Free-trade. (Loud cheers.)"

He pointed to the facts of the case, as affording good ground for reconstituting the League.

"Lord Derby, the notorious and unscrupulous leader of the most intolerant of the Protection party, came into office. It is difficult to say how he came there. I have heard of generals surrendering with whole armies at discretion. I am not sure that the leader on our side of the House did not surrender without discretion. (Laughter.) Some say his staff was disordered; some say his troops mutinied. Some felt that they were almost as often led into the ranks of the foe as led against them. But, whatever be the reason, somehow or other Lord Derby came into office. We had Protection blasts; and finally, Lord Palmerston offered himself as the great trumpeter, and the walls of the Whig Jericho fell at once to the ground. (Laughter and cheers.)"

But now the Protectionists were in, they sang small about Protection.

"A Whig poet wrote a couple of lines about the Whigs, which may well enough be applied to the Protectionist party:—

'As bees on flowers alighting cease their hum,  
So, settling into places, squires are dumb.'

(Great laughter.) But I take it for granted that such persons throughout the country—farmers and others—who are honestly convinced that Protection is a sound policy, and that these men in office ought to endeavour to advance it, will ask what advantage it is to them that these talking oratorical Protectionists when in opposition, should become dumb dogs that cannot bark when in power. (Laughter and cheers.) I certainly anticipate a great and most interesting 'breach of promise' case (laughter); and what with corn, and ships, and colonies, Mr. Disraeli will be the defendant against the claims of three fair ladies at once. (Renewed laughter.)"

Contrasting the position of the Free-traders who had maintained their convictions so long, and Ministers who had surrendered theirs the moment they came into power, he continued—

"But the fact is, that we are not statesmen. (Laughter.) We are cotton spinners ('Hear,' and laughter), and manufacturers, and bleachers, and printers, and shopkeepers, and traders of all kinds, and professional men. ('Hear, hear,' and renewed laughter.) We are not statesmen, and we have never pretended to be so. In this country there has been a great gulf fixed between all those interested in industry and the paths of statesmanship; and, though we were right fourteen years ago, and have been right on this question ever since—though three Cabinets have been wrong, and one of them has not yet put itself right—it is to be held that we are not statesmen, and that those men only who could not see what was simply right on this great fundamental, all-absorbing question, are entitled to describe and to carry out the political policy of the nation. We have not hereditary brains. (Great laughter.) We are 'a Jacobin club.' (Renewed laughter.) That you know on the authority of a gentleman who is a member of the Cabinet, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and the leader, at least, of a minority of the House of Commons. (Laughter, some hisses, and cheering.) Why, a man who calls us a Jacobin Club must think it is not consistent with loyalty to the Throne to declare that the people of this country shall not be starved. We'll teach him whether we are a Jacobin Club or not. (Loud and prolonged cheering.) But we are the democracy. Lord Derby says this, and he must be a high authority, for his blood, for twelve generations, has flowed at the high level of an earldom. Yet not all the ancestors of the Stanleys ever did one-thousandth part so much to give comfort and tranquillity to this country as we, the democracy of the Anti-Corn Law League, have done. (Loud cheers.)"

He concluded that the present unconverted Ministry ought to be pointed at with indignation and scorn, and hurled from the seat of power! His peroration is remarkable:—



"I am not anxious that we should have other great movements for great objects. I myself have had so much of political agitation that nothing but the most imperative and overwhelming sense of public duty would induce me to connect myself with anything further of the kind; but I do believe that we owe it to posterity as to ourselves, that we should learn a lesson from this great movement which is about to terminate, and that we ought, if we can, during our generation, to make the course of our children, and of their children, easier in procuring such political ameliorations and changes as the circumstances of the country may require. (Cheers.) The patriotism of our day does not consist in the destruction of monarchies or the change of dynasties. Our fathers wrested the institution of an annual Parliament from unwilling and despotic monarchs. Be it ours—and I speak to those who can do it if we will it (cheers)—be it ours to wrest a real House of Commons from a haughty nobility, and to secure the lasting greatness of this nation on the broad foundations of a free Parliament and a free people. (Loud and enthusiastic cheering.)"

The other speakers were Mr. Bazley, Mr. Keogh, Mr. Cheetham, Lord Goderich, Mr. Milner Gibson, and Mr. F. Berkeley. Mr. Keogh made a sensation when he exclaimed, with obvious allusions to Mr. Lucas and his doctrines, that the Irish members were charged with sympathizing with tyranny and despotism, but he was there to declare that they sympathized with no tyranny abroad, and they obeyed no tyranny at home. (Here the whole company rose, and the cheering and waving of handkerchiefs lasted for some time.) Having long experienced, under the *régime* for which they were not answerable, crushing despotism themselves, they must be as bereft of mind as devoid of feeling, if they sympathized with any one that tyrannized over the bodies or the consciences of men. (Great cheering.)

The meeting broke up about eleven o'clock.

#### LETTERS FROM PARIS.

[FROM OUR OWN CORRESPONDENT.]

##### LETTER XLV.

Paris, Tuesday, November 2, 1852.

EVENTS are hurrying on. The day after to-morrow the senate re-assembles for the purpose of decreeing the famous *Senatus-Consulte*, the object of Louis Bonaparte's ambition. It will positively be drawn up in the terms I stated in my last letter. All the questions raised on the subject of the Empire are now resolved. The convocation of the Electoral Colleges for the adoption of the *Senatus-Consulte* is fixed for the 21st inst., and the Legislative Corps will meet on the 28th to proceed to the general verification (*dépouillement*) of the votes. The proclamation of the Empire (I need scarcely say that I am only giving you the best authenticated rumours) will take place on the 2nd of December (immortal anniversary!), and the coronation, if not postponed to the spring, on the 20th. The marriage with the Princess Wasa was, I hear, but scarcely believe, decided on Monday last (yesterday); she was to abjure Protestantism, and to be "reconciled" to the Catholic faith by the hands of the Bishop of Brunn.

The question of the succession is also decided. Once more, old Jérôme, the formidable depositary of the family secrets, has carried the day in the face of an opposition at once numerous and violent. Jérôme had an interview with Louis Bonaparte, which resulted in the decision of the latter that the collateral succession should go to Jérôme and the issue of his marriage with the Princess Catherine of Wurtemberg. This special provision is designed to prevent any ulterior claims on behalf of the children of the first marriage, who settled in the United States of America. To this effect the *Senatus-Consulte*, dated *Floréal, An. XII.*, will be revived, according to which, in default of issue of Louis Bonaparte, the imperial crown devolved upon the issue of Jérôme. Nevertheless, Louis Bonaparte has reserved to himself the right of choosing a successor in the different branches of the imperial family. In consequence of this decision, all the *fracas* of opposition raised by certain senators against the candidature of Napoleon Jérôme, the son, falls flat. It is even asserted that Louis Bonaparte, hearing his cousin accused of his factious tendencies, replied, "that such an imputation was no obstacle to his claims, since in 'doing' opposition he was only playing his part of Pretender." For all this, however, Louis Bonaparte is particularly anxious to get rid of his most dear cousin, and, it is reported, has offered him the viceroyship of Algeria. Separated thus by the sea from his competitor, the occupant of the throne would have less to fear. He knows well enough, by his own experience, that when nothing but the act of violence stands between the conspirator and the crown, the crime is not long deterred.

I have reason to believe that the question of reconstituting the constitution has been also decided by Louis Bonaparte. "It will not do to change a constitution every six months," he says; "modifications are necessary,—let all be done at once that circumstances demand." Therefore Bonaparte is to be seized of the

Dictatorship during the interval between the *Senatus-Consulte* and the proclamation of the Empire, for the purpose of making all the modifications in the constitution he may deem advisable. I have already acquainted you with the nature of the modifications proposed. The object is neither more nor less than the extinction of universal suffrage, which is to be replaced by a counterfeit. The people will cease to be electors. Only the Government functionaries and the municipal councillors will retain their electoral rights. Now, as Bonaparte reserves to himself the right of dissolving these municipal councils, and of culling them from a triple list of candidates, you will readily understand how derisory this pretended right of suffrage will become. The rights and privileges of the legislative corps will also be restricted. The quasi-publicity of the sittings, as it exists at present, will be absolute, and no discussion allowed. The council of state will discuss, and the legislative corps proceed to vote, aye or no, without a word.

This will be the "liberty of the tribune," according to the Empire. As to the liberty of the press, four journals will be authorized, and all the rest suppressed. In a word, all the rights and liberties of the French nation will be summed up in the right of paying taxes for the good pleasure of his Majesty, Emperor Bonaparte.

In the meantime, the Imperial Guard is being organized. New regiments are in course of formation: among others, the regiment of "Guides de l'Empereur." More than 800 applications have been made to serve as officers in this regiment. Eight hundred applications, out of which *forty* are to be appointed! The military and civil household are being constituted. All the appointments are already distributed. A herd of chamberlains and valets are waiting impatiently the moment to enter upon their functions. Their brilliant costume is designed. A list of other appointments is complete. The twelve marshals to be appointed will be created Dukes; the generals of division, Counts; and the generals of brigade, Barons.

The whole army, however, does not appear to be so well satisfied as these gentlemen.

A military conspiracy was lately discovered at Fontainebleau; two officers and two *sous-officiers*\* were secretly shot, without trial, in the night of the 29th ult., at Vincennes. This is the seventh or eighth conspiracy that has been smothered in blood since December. Here, in truth, is the weak side of Bonaparte: he leans on the army, and on the army alone; and it seems the army, as a whole, neither respects nor loves him. Therefore the Government sedulously contradicts all reports of military conspiracies. Faithful to its policy of misleading public opinion, it converts this affair at Fontainebleau into an obscure civil plot.

A number of projects, financial and political, are attributed to our ruler, and all marked by a certain hardihood of design. The financial projects are said to consist in abolishing all the *octrois* (town dues) throughout France, amounting altogether to a total of thirty-two millions of francs (1,280,000*l.*), not including Paris. The towns included in this sweeping measure would be indemnified by the product of the tax on licences (*l'impôt des patentes*), which would be surrendered to their profit. As these licences produce as much as thirty-five millions of francs, (1,400,000*l.*) the loss to the State would be compensated by the re-establishment of the Salt-tax, in addition to a tax on paper, horses, domestic servants, and dogs, as had been in contemplation last May.

Paris alone would not be comprised in this abolition of the *octrois*. But, as I told you in my last letter, the *octroi* of the capital is to be extended to the line of the present fortifications, and the duties on certain articles considerably lowered.

Bonaparte, I am informed, is to take advantage of the Dictatorship of a few weeks, with which he will be invested, to assume the responsibility of these various measures, in the more regular execution of which he might have reason to apprehend at least the hesitation of the legislative corps.

As for the political projects which rumour lends to the forthcoming Dictatorship, they are quite of a different character. Louis Bonaparte thoroughly understands, we are told, the impossibility of re-establishing the Empire, *without restoring its grandeur*. He has well considered the vast contradiction there must be between declaring himself the successor of the Emperor, and submitting to the treaties of 1815 which humiliated France. He has concluded that on this ground, satisfaction is due at once to the army and to the nation. Accordingly, he has just proposed an European Congress, for the revision of the said treaties. His pretensions are very modest: he demands certain modifications, but in case of their being refused, he will be con-

\* The *sous-officiers* in the French army are what in our army would be called "non-commissioned" officers.

tent to demand the erasure from the text of those treaties, of all such clauses as have been in effect infringed by changes that have occurred during the last thirty-seven years. The new and revised text would confirm and sanction the actual *status quo*, including the absorption of Poland by Russia, the occupation of Cracow by Austria, the possession of Algeria by France, the reintegration of the Bonaparte family, in all its rights to the imperial crown of France, etc. etc. To induce Great Britain to enter into this new European league, Louis Bonaparte is now promising your Government (such is the report) to obtain from this European Congress a limitation of the boundaries of the United States of America,\* so that England may be henceforth guaranteed against any new annexation, which would inevitably tend to an inordinate and exorbitant expansion and increase of the maritime, commercial, and political power of the United States. Any new "annexation" would be considered as an infringement of the "balance of power," and punished by the combined forces of the European Governments. I don't know how far England is likely to be cajoled by these seductive proposals: but I do know that, so far as French interests are concerned, such a policy would be a deliberate treason on the part of Bonaparte: our natural and political interests having nothing to say against the development of the American Republic.

Bonaparte anticipates another result from this European Congress. For the moment he conceals his designs under the mask of a profound deference to the will of the great European Powers; but his real object in thus declaring himself ready to hold cheap the dignity of France, is to sound the Congress on the grand question of assuring the future tranquillity of Europe against the deluge of revolutionary ideas. The moment he has brought the Congress on to this ground, *he will be its master*.

In effect, the conclusions are easily deduced. France is the focus of revolutionary ideas in Europe. To insure the repose of the existing monarchies, either France must be dismembered, or governed by a strong hand, that will be responsible to the rest of Europe for its tranquillity. This strong hand already grasps the sceptre. But it must be sustained: and to sustain it, some satisfaction, some compensation must be given to the national spirit. Such will be the first *thesis* of Bonaparte. Passing then to the state of Europe in itself, he will point out the minor states as so many eventual *foci* of revolution: to wit, Belgium, Piedmont, Switzerland, Italy, and portions of Germany; and he will conclude for the absorption of these minor States by the great Powers.

By these two paths, Bonaparte hopes to win the great Powers to his own purpose—the NEW MAP OF EUROPE; in which France will resume the Frontiers of the Rhine. To compass this result, he is ready to concede Southern Germany to Austria, and Northern Germany to Prussia. As to Russia and England, he would give Constantinople to the one, and Egypt to the other—if he had not his eye on both, and if the Mediterranean were not destined to become "a French lake."

Such, I derive from no mean sources, is the secret purpose of this European Congress. M. Drouin de l'Huys has for some weeks opened negotiations with the great Powers on the subject. We shall not have to wait long for the results.

The *régime* of compression still flourishes in France. It is even exaggerated to absurdity. I mentioned in my last letter the official representation at the Théâtre Français; where the audience was composed solely of functionaries, and the piece was Corneille's *Cinna*, *ou la Clémence d'Auguste*. Jules Janin, in his critique for the *Journal des Débats*, took the liberty to review this play, and to remark the allusions which every party that rises to the surface of power in succession borrows for its plumes! For this horrible licence of pen, M. Bertin, director of the *Débats*, was summoned by the Censorship, and from the lips of M. Latour Dumoulin, received a bald and harsh reprimand.

S.

#### CONTINENTAL NOTES.

##### ABD-EL-KADER IN PARIS.

ABD-EL-KADER has been the lion of Paris since his liberation and arrival in that city to see its wonders and to be seen, himself the greatest wonder. His noble and lofty bearing, the mingled fire and serenity of his mien, the dark, deep eye, the finely-chiselled face, the lonely grandeur of the expression, the chivalrous and gallant air, all conspire to make the chief a true hero of romance,—a pure type of the Caucasian race so dear to the imagination of Mr. Disraeli. His manners, too, are at once gentle and imposing: gratitude towards his liberator comes un-

\* We only wish M. Bonaparte or his "intimate personal friend" on this side of the water, may get this precious limitation ratified by our brothers across the Atlantic. We trow not.—Ed. *Leader*.

stinted from his heart, in clear and graceful language, and while faithful as all true Moslems to the precepts of his grand and simple faith, he drops the knee at the hour of prayer in the midst of a Parisian crowd, he does not fail with a large and liberal spirit to do homage to the symbols of another faith, to examine with lively intelligence the marvels, the graces, and the refinements of a new and strange civilization. He has visited the principal churches and public buildings, and has ascended the tower of Notre Dame. Everywhere he has been received with unfeigned respect. He went to St. Cloud last Saturday, to have an audience with Louis Napoleon, who happened to be engaged with the Ministers in Council as he arrived; but the grand saloon had been prepared for his reception, and coffee, pipes, and cigars were served to the guests. As the hour of one struck, Abd-el-Kader suddenly became silent, stood up, and apologising rather by gesture than by words, unfolded his burnous, placed it on the ground, and knelt upon it. He bent his head, and in a moment seemed as completely absorbed in mental prayer as if he was unconscious that any living being was near him. He soon rose, folded up his mantle, and with the most perfect ease resumed the conversation which his devotions, always, it seems, practised by him at that hour, had interrupted. A message soon after arrived from the President, to say he was ready to receive his distinguished visitor. Louis Napoleon stood in the middle of the large saloon, near what is called the Galerie d'Apollon. The Emir approached, took hold of the President's hand, and bent his head to salute it, but Louis Napoleon opened his arms and embraced him—Abd-el-Kader returned the embrace with much warmth. After the ordinary compliments, and some conversation, the President proposed to show him over the palace. The Emir, however, intimated, through his interpreter, that he wished first to repeat in form the oath he had pledged at Amboise, and asked permission to say a few words. He spoke nearly as follows:—

"Monseigneur,—I am not accustomed to your usages, but I long to say some words to express to you, and to all these Lords assembled, the nature of my sentiments. You, Monseigneur, have been good and generous to me. To you I owe the liberty which others had promised to me, but which you had not promised, and which, nevertheless, you have granted to me.—People have told you that I will violate my promises—have no faith in those that say so. I swear to you never to break the oath that I have made to you. I am bound by gratitude, as by my word—be assured that I will never forget what both impose on a descendant of the Prophet, and on a man of my race. I do not desire to tell you so only by word of mouth. I also desire to leave in your hands a writing which shall be for you a testimony of the oath I now come to repeat. I deliver to you this paper—it is the reproduction of my thought."

These words were delivered with much emphasis, both in accent and gesture. The President replied:—

"Abd-el-Kader,—I have never doubted your faith. I did not want this written paper you so nobly offer me. You know that I have never asked from you oath or written promise. You have desired to deliver it to me—I accept it; and the spontaneous manner in which you have explained your thoughts is to me a proof that I was right in having confidence in you."

The President then showed the Emir the apartments of the palace, the grand gallery of Apollo, adorned with the masterpieces of Lebrun, the chapel, the orangery, &c. He then visited the stables, and Louis Napoleon pointed out his favourite horses, which the Emir much admired. The President informed him that one was placed at his disposal whenever he wished to ride, and that he should give him a beautiful Arab horse for the approaching grand review of cavalry. The stables particularly attracted his attention and excited his admiration, and he pronounced them to be "like unto a palace." The Minister of War presented to the Emir his colleague, the Minister of Justice, and explained the difference between their respective functions. Abd-el-Kader replied, "A good government reposes on two things—on justice," bowing to M. Abbateucci, "and on the army," saluting the Minister at War. It was remarked, that on several occasions Abd-el-Kader alluded in an emphatic manner to what he declared to be an error generally entertained about a Mussulman not being bound by an oath pledged to a Christian, and he protested in the strongest manner against it. On taking leave of the President, he said,—"My bones are old, but the rest of my body has been renewed by your benefits." He then pressed the President's hand to his lips, and withdrew with his attendants. The visit had lasted an hour and a half, and the Emir returned to Paris at four o'clock.

On Tuesday, Abd-el-Kader was present on horseback at a grand review given in his honour at Versailles. After the review the grand waters played, and in the evening he returned to Paris, to a dinner given by the Minister of War. On Wednesday he paid visits to the principal Ministers and to the Archbishop of Paris, to Jérôme Bonaparte at the Invalides, where he visited Napoleon's tomb and the Infirmary. He also went to see the Menagerie of M. Huguet de Massilia, whose courage in entering the den of lions had not, he said, been seen since the time of Daniel.

When he was riding out in the Park of St. Cloud, on Monday, with the President, he was asked how his aged mother was in health. "When I was a captive, she required a stick to support her step; since my liberation, she can walk alone," he replied. The Arab chief is the idol of the ladies in Paris, and is quite beset with *billets-doux*.

The Senate met on Thursday. Ten members demanded an appeal to the people in favour of the re-establishment of the Empire. M. Fould, in the name of the Government, consented, and the report is to be presented this day.

The Courts of Appeal and of *Première Instance* have petitioned for the Empire, thus adding the last sanction of the law to the forthcoming popular demand.

The prosecution of the persons charged with taking part

in the processions of 1848 and 1849, in memory of Robert Blum, at Leipsic, has only just concluded. They have been sentenced to six weeks' imprisonment; four of the accused are members of the learned professions.

St. Paul's Church, at Frankfort, in which the German National Assembly of 1848 held its sittings, was opened for public worship on the 24th.

Lord Roden, Captain Trotter, and the other gentlemen of the English deputation which was to wait upon the Grand Duke of Tuscany in order to obtain from him the release of M. Madiat and his wife, arrived at Florence on the 22nd.

Lord Roden writes to Lord Shaftesbury that the reply of the Tuscan Minister to his letter announcing the object of the deputation, gives him some hopes at least of a partial remission of the Madiat's imprisonment. The prisoners had suffered already in health, from the effects of confinement. The deputation is said to cause a great sensation at Florence; but the letter of the Duc de Casigliano reads like a rebuff.

Funeral military services have been held in every garison throughout the Austrian empire, in honour of the Duke of Wellington. The Duke having been a Protestant, the religious service was omitted. At Venice, 4000 men were drawn up in grand parade, the officers wearing crape round their left arms. The vessels in the port had their flags half-mast high.

The King of Prussia has named the deputation of the Prussian army to the funeral of Wellington. It consists of three veteran comrades of the deceased, who served under the orders of Marshal Blucher in the allied army. Besides, the Duke's own regiment (the 28th infantry) will be represented by a deputation of officers.

The Duke of Parma, that interesting young potentate, who lately issued a decree against civilian beards, moustache and imperials, and whose prime minister, ambassador plenipotentiary, and representative at the court of Austria, is Thomas Ward, once a Yorkshire groom, and now Baron Tomaso Ward, decorated with we know not how many orders, stars, and titles, has just recognised Queen Isabella II. of Spain and her dynasty. Baron Ward was presented to the Queen on the 26th ult. as the bearer of a formal declaration to that effect, signed by the Duke of Parma. The legitimist obstinacy of the Duke is explained by the fact that he is the son of Don Carlos Luis de Bourbon, Infante of Spain, and is married to the daughter of the Duke of Berri, sister of the Count of Chambord. The Queen of Spain has, in return, granted to the Duke of Parma all the prerogatives and honours of an Infante of Spain.

The Madrid *Gazette* publishes a Royal decree providing that French vessels, in Spanish ports, shall not hereafter be required to pay higher dues than those to which Spanish vessels are liable in the ports of France.

General Concha (late Governor of Cuba) is reported to be appointed to represent the Spanish army at the funeral of the Duke of Wellington.

It is said that the salt-works of Spain are to be offered for sale.

Sir Henry Bulwer returned on the 23rd instant to Florence, from his mission to Rome, and, we are told, is satisfied with the results of his last interview with Cardinal Antonelli on the 21st inst. He is said to have obtained the eventual pardon of Edward Murray, the Pope's disavowal of Archbishop MacHale and the more violent of the ultramontanists in Ireland, and the removal of the Papal anathema from the three Colleges of mixed education, at Cork, Galway, and Belfast.

The intrigues of France in Belgium and Piedmont have borne their fruits in protracted Ministerial crises in both countries; and in both, the clerical and refugee questions have been the difficulties of the "situation." In Belgium the crisis has been solved by the election of M. Delforce, the Liberal candidate, to the Presidency of the Chamber of Deputies, and the consequent acceptance of office by M. Henry de Brouckère with a Liberal Government; of which M. Rogier, the representative of more decided liberalism, and of the pure national party, and peculiarly obnoxious to the French Government, does not form a part. But M. Piercot, the burgomaster of Liege, one of the new Ministry, is considered a personification of M. Rogier's policy, and quite as extreme a Liberal as M. Frère Orban, the late Minister of Finance. It is not expected that the new Cabinet will satisfy the exigencies of France either as regards the tariff, or the press, or the refugees. The position of the King is very perplexing. Bonapartist agents are everywhere, and it is suspected that even in the army there are officers in receipt of French gold.

In Piedmont, after the resignation of M. d'Azeglio, whether from desire of retirement, or from the difficulty of resisting French threats, or from a misunderstanding with the French (and it is even said the English) ambassador, Count Cavour was sent for by the king. Count Cavour, an able finance minister, had been more decidedly liberal than D'Azeglio; but since the marked attentions of the Elysée during his recent visit to Paris—it may be remembered that he dined with Louis Napoleon, in company with Rattazzi, the liberal President of the Chamber—he is reported to have returned to Turin less enamoured of English Parliamentary government, and more disposed to court the Bonapartist alliance. However this may be, he has found it impossible to form a ministry "off his own hook," having received several refusals from distinguished men. Count Cesare Balbo (one of the clerical party, and a strict conservative) has been since invited to form a cabinet, but by the last accounts had not succeeded in forming an administration. It is thought probable that D'Azeglio and Cavour may confederate. The Civil Marriage Bill and the ecclesiastical question generally are the prevalent obstacles.

Arrests have recently been made at Milan, Como, and Lodi, by the Austrian police. At Ancona wholesale executions are expected.

The Austrian Union treaty between Austria and the duchies of Modena and Parma has been signed.

## THE ELECTRIC TELEGRAPH COMPLETE FROM LONDON TO PARIS.

MONDAY saw the opening of complete telegraphic communication between London and Paris. At the offices in Cornhill a large party of notables assembled, among whom were Earl Cadogan, Lord de Mauley, Mr. John Masterman, M.P., Mr. Samuel Laing, M.P., Mr. W. Chaplin, M.P., Count de Flahault, Baron Kubeck, Count Streleski, C.B., Ernest Bunsen, Esq., Mr. Samuel Gurney, Sir James Weir Hogg, and many others. From one o'clock, messages of all kinds were exchanged, of which the following are specimens. A message by Brett's Printing telegraph was transmitted by the Submarine Company's superintendent, Mr. G. V. Robinson, at 7.30 p.m., to Calais, as follows:—

"Cornhill to Calais.—Permit the endorsement of the sentiment—'When France is content, the world is tranquil. Vive la Ligne!'"

At 10 minutes past two (London time), the question was asked of Paris, "What time is it?" The answer was "2.10 p.m."

A question was then asked of Arras, a French town between Calais and Paris, as to the state of the weather. The answer received immediately was, "overcast and dull."

The inquiry was made of the name of the transmitting clerk. The reply was "Brassard."

A further message was forwarded:—"Lord De Mauley presents his compliments to M. Foy, and begs him to allow experiments with the needle instruments between Paris and London."

[Lord de Mauley, it should be stated, is the chairman of the board of directors.]

"From Paris to London.—M. Foy (director-general of French telegraphs) presents his compliments to the Hon. F. Cadogan."

But the most extraordinary proceeding of the day was the following message with which the experiments closed:—

"The Directors of the Submarine Telegraph Company beg leave to approach his Highness the Prince President with the expression of their best thanks for the assistance which he has uniformly given towards the establishment of this instantaneous means of communication between France and Great Britain. May this wonderful invention serve, under the *Empire*, to promote the peace and prosperity of the world.—Dated Nov. 1, 1852, 30, Cornhill."

M. Bonaparte did not deign a reply. But here is a public company, among whose members there are some persons calling themselves *Englishmen*, officiously recognising the Empire!

## THE LAUNCH OF THE BENGAL.

THE *Bengal*, a huge screw steamer, belonging to the Peninsular and Oriental fleet, intended for service in the Indian seas, was launched at Glasgow on Monday. She is ten feet longer than the *Great Britain*, and of 2300 tons burthen. A fatal accident nearly happened. The supports gave way before the proper time, and the *Bengal* careered off into the water. The workmen had just time to run out of danger. In the evening there was a banquet in honour of the event; there the health of Mr. Anderson, the managing director, was proposed, and in reply he gave an interesting account of the formation of the company.

"The origin of the company might be dated about the close of the year 1835, when a few private persons hired one or two steamvessels, and ran them occasionally to Lisbon and Gibraltar, in order to test the feasibility of establishing a steam communication with the Peninsula. They at first lost about 500*l.* in each trip they made; which, however, did not discourage them from persevering; and they resolved to construct some vessels of an improved description for establishing the communication. He would not then dwell on the various difficulties with which the originators of the enterprise had to struggle, but would merely state the fact that before it became remunerative the parties concerned had sustained a loss to the amount of something upwards of 30,000*l.* Such was the origin of the company, and he would now come to its present position. It had now in active service and in progress of construction a fleet of 41 steamships, of the aggregate tonnage of 52,000 tons, and of about 16,000 horses' power of machinery, and being in value upwards of 2,000,000*l.* sterling. The company was incorporated by royal charter on the 31st of December, 1840, and since that time yielded a dividend of 7 per cent. for the first two or three years, and, since then, of 8 per cent., to its shareholders. The annual distance which its ships navigate in carrying out the various communications in which it is engaged amounts to very nearly 1,000,000 of miles—a distance which he need scarcely tell any schoolboy would be nearly equal to 50 times the circumference of the globe. The ships required for the extended communication, to commence the ensuing year, would require about 3000 seamen, &c., to navigate them; and, in addition thereto, it gave employment to 60,000 tons of sailing ships and 3000 seamen in the transport of coals to its various stations at home and abroad. Its annual expenditure for current disbursements and outlay of capital for new ships is now not less than 1,000,000*l.* sterling, and may be estimated to afford subsistence to 100,000 persons employed and their families." (Applause.)



The company carry the mails to and from Alexandria, the East Indies, Singapore, China, and Australia. Mr. Anderson is quite justified in claiming for the Peninsular and Oriental Steam Navigation Company the rank of the first maritime private enterprise the world has yet seen.

### THE STATE OF TRADE.

BASING its remarks on the usual trade reports for last week in the daily papers, the *Globe* surveys the actual state of commerce with reference not only to the week, but to the progressive advancement of prosperity for several weeks past.

"Glance over the whole country and its staple trades, and you will find the same character of activity; the exceptions confirming the rule by their peculiar character. The iron-trade is uncommonly brisk, and is subject to a progressive rise of price. Bargains are now made under the conviction that iron will be 10% a ton before it is lower. The 'suffering' in this trade is felt 'by those who have not had prudence or foresight to lay in stock six or eight weeks ago.' Whether we look to heavy machinery, hardware, rails, or guns, it is the same; orders are 'hawked about!' The ancillary trade of coals partakes in the briskness. Here the anticipated difficulties are, that the men will require more wages, and that the supply will not keep pace with the demand. In Manchester they are reporting a progressive increase: yarns are a farthing per pound higher than they were last week; a penny three-eighths more than they were a month ago. Shirtings continue to go up, and are now 10½d. per piece above what they were a month back. In Leeds, which, down to last summer, did not seem to be altogether keeping pace with the development of prosperity in some of its off-lying towns, there now is reported 'a steady, and continuous, and legitimate trade throughout the entire month,' both in the halls and in the warehouses; with an upward tendency at the last moment. The trade of the present autumn was 'never exceeded.' Bradford, we know, is very busy, and has been so for months, after a very brief depression falling upon a trade that had astonished the men themselves for some years. In the summer, Bradford men were prophesying blackly; they are now as busy as they can be. Even in Nottingham, so often desponding, active work inspires hope and confidence; and the hosiers 'are, if possible, more fully engaged than ever.' Linen is in the like condition. It is not at home, therefore, that we must look for any causes of serious apprehension.

"There is not a branch of commerce in which America does not occupy a conspicuous place. Manchester acknowledges America both a consumer and a producer in the highest rank; a large part of the orders brought to the iron districts come from America; America is active in Nottingham, particularly in helping the otherwise dull branch of lace; the 'fall trade' in Leeds has been great; in Bradford, the American houses are active; and in Belfast 'there is every prospect of a good spring trade with the United States.'"

It has been remarked that, at all the fairs and markets for the disposal of produce which have been recently held in Wales, the stock has been sold at advancing prices, and, generally speaking, a rise has been established upon all kinds of live-stock and grain. In those districts where railways are in the course of construction, or in contemplation, agricultural men servants demanded and obtained higher wages.

### EMIGRATION AND COLONIZATION.

MR. ALEXANDER CAMPBELL, secretary of the Canadian Land and Railway Association, has forwarded to us the following resolutions submitted by him to a meeting of engineers connected with the late disputes, and agreed to:—

"That as skill and labour are the most essential elements for the production of wealth, it is, therefore, of great importance that every person able and willing to work should be found employment, as idleness leads to individual poverty, to ignorance and crime, and consequently to national depravity, anarchy, and ruin.

"That in order to avoid the evil consequences on compulsory idleness, resulting from Trade Societies, strikes, or otherwise, it is now indispensable that the societies should be reorganized according to law upon sound principles of association, for the regular employment of their skill, labour, and money capital.

"That the first practical step towards the reorganization of Trade Societies is the full recognition of individual rights and duties. That skill and labour is individual capital. That the wages received is the interest of that capital, and that such capital can be better employed and made more productive for the individual and society on the principle of Co-operative Joint Stock Association than can be obtained by isolated exertion and competition.

"That the plan submitted to the executive council of the Amalgamated Society of Engineers, &c., by Mr. Alexander Campbell, Secretary of the Canadian Land and Railway Association, for the establishment of industrious colonies in connexion with the railways about being commenced in the provinces of British North America, appears to this council based on correct principles, offers a favourable opportunity for the establishment of engineering and other operations combined with trade, manufactures, and agriculture, and therefore well worthy of being supported by the whole trades of Great Britain and Ireland."

### RAILWAY SMASHING.

"ACCIDENTS" will happen on railways, it appears, but they are mainly caused by want of punctuality and disregard of rules. On Monday the express started

from Brighton ten minutes after its proper time; those ten minutes were not regained. Mark the consequences. At the Redhill station, there stood a "pick-up" engine, that is, an engine which had been engaged in gathering together here and there goods wagons all up the line. These were being disposed of on the sidings about the time when the express should have dashed past Redhill. The signals were down, intimating to the express driver that the line was clear; and on he came. But want of punctuality inflicts injury on others than those who are unpunctual. It was ten minutes after the express time. The driver of the pick-up, not regarding the fact that the signals were down, commenced "shunting" his engine, and before he had completed that dangerous process up came the express at a furious rate, and dashed into the pick-up; both engines danced about in a fearful manner, and when they came to a stand the passengers got out. Nobody was killed, but there were black eyes and bleeding noses in great plenty, and one lady broke her thigh.

The next day the guard, driver, and fireman, of the goods or pick-up train, and the pointsman, were examined before the Reigate magistrates. It was clearly shown that the pick-up should not have shunted until the express was known to have passed; that the pointsman ought not to have opened the points; and that there was great carelessness on all sides. It was also shown that the station was under-manned. The following order and circular were read:—

"London, Brighton, and South-Coast Railway,  
Traffic Manager's office, Brighton, Sept. 13.

"NOTICE TO STATION-MASTERS, SIGNALMEN, AND OTHERS.

"No engine or train must be put across the main line on any account until the distance signals have been pulled over to 'Danger,' and no engine or train must be crossed at any junction when an express train is due, under any circumstances. I am, &c. "GEORGE HAWKINS."

"Traffic Manager's Office, Brighton, July, 1852.

"Sir,—I have seen, with a great deal of pain, in the public prints, that several very serious accidents have lately occurred on different lines of railway.

"There are few of these accidents which might not have been prevented if common care, forethought, and attention had been used.

"I am still more sorry to say there have been several acts of carelessness on our own line, which might have led to serious results, and which would lose us the proud distinction of being one of the most carefully conducted lines in England.

"Fellow-servants, let me entreat you not to forfeit your good name; let increased care and attention show your determination to prevent these awful occurrences here. Above all, regard the main line as something sacred, never to be obstructed unless absolutely necessary, and then only after every precaution has been taken and every signal rightly shown.

"Engine-drivers, you know the dangerous points; be watchful there, prompt and ready to act with decision and energy if the signal-man has done wrong. All of you remember, a moment's thoughtlessness may cause the loss of precious lives, and that we can only retain our reputation by never-ceasing vigilance.

"Yours truly, (Signed) "G. HAWKINS."

The four men were sentenced to two months imprisonment, with hard labour.

Mr. Coningham, who was in the express train, has sent the following letter to the *Times*:—

"SIR,—Permit me to direct public attention to the real cause of the accident which occurred yesterday on the Brighton Railway—namely, want of punctuality, which has also been the cause of most of the fatal collisions on railways.

"The 10 o'clock express train, by which I was a passenger, started eight minutes after 10 from the Brighton terminus, and was further delayed by some obstructions on the road, so that it arrived at the old Red-hill station fully 10 minutes after the time at which it was due. The want of punctuality in an express train was bad enough, but the "shunting" of a goods' train backwards and forwards, across the line by which the express was approaching at a rapid rate, was a wilful and reckless mode of trifling with human life, which cannot be too severely punished.

"The amount of human suffering inflicted in a moment of time by such a collision cannot be estimated merely by the apparent wounds and contusions. The violence of such a shock as this has sent more than one unfortunate victim prematurely to the grave, and made the remainder of his life a scene of miserable and prolonged suffering.

"I have the honour to be, Sir, your obedient servant,  
"WILLIAM CONINGHAM.

"Kemp-town, Nov. 2."

Mr. Coningham has hit the right nail on the head. But how, when unpunctuality is a system, can accidents be expected, out of courtesy to the passengers, not to happen?

### PROGRESS OF ASSOCIATION.

Letter from M. Lechevalier St. André to the Society for Promoting Working Men's Associations.

[We have received, and very willingly publish, the subjoined letter from M. J. Lechevalier St. André, to the Secretary of the Society for Promoting Working Men's

Associations. The importance of the communication justifies the length; and the length compels us to omit again this week the first of a series of articles on the Reports of this Society and of the recent Co-operative Conference.]

20, Albany Street, Regent's Park,  
November 3rd, 1852.

MY DEAR FRIEND SHORTER,—I have received, in due time, your note of the 21st October last, being a summons for the Special General Meeting of the Council, which was to take place on the 2nd inst.

You mentioned in your communication that the object of the meeting was "to consider the present condition of the Council and the state of the Society generally."

It was my duty to attend, or, if unwilling or unable to do so, I should have answered your summons before the time appointed.

Owing to a great pressure of occupations, for which I am more especially responsible, and which are, in fact, my work for daily bread, I could not find leisure to write to the Council to such extent as is required by my present state of mind with respect to the principles and constitutions of the Society, and the manner in which they are carried on.

I beg you, at your first opportunity, to offer this my excuse to the General Council for not having been present at the meeting, and to state that I am resolved no more to attend any meeting of the Society for Promoting Working Men's Associations, as long as that Society remains under its present constitution; or, if the constitution is to be reformed, until I have stated in writing my views on the subject.

If what you style "a Special General Meeting" of the Council had been summoned for considering and adopting the Report just published, (and I believe that such a meeting of the Council previous to the publication of the Report would have been expedient, not to say anything more,) I would have done, on that occasion, what I am now doing: this being the first opportunity offered to me since I have left the Central Co-operative Agency: and, indeed, it would have prevented my personal responsibility being involved in principles and business statements which I cannot undertake to support—nay, which I feel now bound in duty to disavow.

I have always considered, and I do still consider, the work begun by the Rev. Prof. F. D. Maurice, as President of the Society, in obedience to the earnest wishes of his friends and disciples (among whom I shall always be happy to be numbered, as far as compatible with the dictates of my conscience in certain especial cases), as one of the most important and best justified temporal initiatives ever assumed by any ordained minister of the Church Catholic, ever since the apostolic preaching and establishment of Christianity. It is really, in my opinion, the work of the Church in this present age, and therefore I have done, and am doing every day, my best to serve it. But, on account of these very reasons, I never took any step, either as ordinary or as extraordinary member of the Council, without mature consideration, and in perfect calmness of mind. I wish the Council to accept this as my apology for writing to you to-day at such length.

You may recollect that I was one of the first and the most earnest in advocating the necessity of an organisation, of a council, of a central board, finally, of a constitution.

The constitution, as first adopted, seemed to me very imperfect, but it was understood that it would be modified according to the teaching of time and experience.

Ever since, time and experience have taught much, and, I dare say, in the sense of the measures which I often advised the Council to adopt. "Time and tide tarry for no man," as the proverb says. It is especially true with respect to men of business, and Working-men's associations are, above all, business. They must not be, they cannot be, charitable institutions.

A move became soon necessary, and, as the Society for Promoting Working-Men's Associations did not move, the Central Co-operative Agency was instituted as a matter of business-convenience, and even of necessity.

I found that my personal position as a partner in that concern, was incompatible with the position of an ordinary member of the Council, which I had occupied hitherto. I resigned, and proposed to remain an extraordinary member, which I still profess to be.

Whatever amount of good the Central Co-operative Agency has done, and is still doing, I felt that, on account of the first results, brought about after one year's working of the constitution of that establishment, I was no more wanted there, and also that something else had to be done, in several ways, to secure the success both of the Co-operative Stores and the Working-Men's Associations, nay, to prevent their complete failure as thriving specimens of true industrial association and co-operation. Such being the case, I resigned my situation as partner in the Central Co-operative Agency, to seek out elsewhere for the complementary conditions of "our common work." I say "our common work," because it is so, and will remain so, in spite of any individual and personal separation. Division of labour must not be turned either into moral dissidence, or into antagonistic competition.

Among the most immediate exigencies of our common work, must decidedly be reckoned the object pointed out in the summons sent to me, namely, "to consider the present condition of the Council, and the state of the Society for Promoting Working-Men's Associations."

I am determined, in consequence, to take this opportunity of considering, more maturely still than I did before, the difficulties, the scruples, and the indescribable mental anxieties under which I have laboured, these last three years, with regard to the affairs of the Society, to put in writing the views I have to state, and to submit at once the whole of them, not only to a self-elected and self-limiting council, but to the public at large, in order that friends and enemies of industrial association and co-operation (God never stirs up useless enemies to a good

and holy cause) may do, each of them, their appointed work, and the final justice of God may come out, through an effort of what is termed *public opinion*.

It might be said by persons of quiet conscience and sound judgment, unacquainted with the facts, and whose opinion I am anxious to conciliate, that any critical observations or available suggestions I have to set forth, would find their proper place in a discussion with the council. But after about three years practice of the proceedings and dealings of the Society, and after as much forbearance and concession as I could afford, without compromising *essential duty*, I have come to that conclusion, that any efforts I might attempt to modify, in the points I consider as *vital*, the constitution of the Society, with respect either to principles or to business, would be useless if managed as they were before.

Here, again, one might doubt whether what I name *forbearance and concession* has not been rather the reverse. *Facts* will afford shortly the means of a fair judgment.

As soon as I shall have done writing the observations and suggestions I have to make, on occasion of the published Report of the *Society for Promoting Working-men's Associations*, they will be put before the council, for them to consider the views of a friend who has done his best to work with them, and is still ready to do so, when some sound and *definite* purpose shall have been devised and concerted.

Meanwhile, I beg you, my dear and much esteemed Shorter, to offer my respects to the President and Council, and to believe me, ever yours faithfully,

J. LECHEVALIER ST. ANDRÉ.

MR. THOMAS SHORTER,  
Secretary of the Society for Promoting  
Working-men's Associations,  
Society's Hall, Castle-street East.

### MILITIA PROSECUTIONS.

ACCORDING to a daily paper, Government have sanctioned prosecutions against some persons for distributing hand-bills and posting placards, intended to dissuade men from volunteering for the Militia, in Bucks, Herts, and Suffolk. It appears, that for some time past numerous hand-bills have been circulated, especially in the rural towns and districts, of an "anti-militia" character, and tending to prevent the carrying out of the law in respect to voluntary enlistment. Some of the placards were said to emanate from the Peace Society, and were headed, "Flogging in the Militia." The Government have taken the opinion of the law officers of the Crown on the subject, and have determined to make the offence a matter for Government prosecution. The following letter to Colonel Berne, of the 34th Light Infantry, has led to prosecutions in Suffolk:—

"Whitehall, 7th October, 1852.

"SIR,—I am directed by Mr. Secretary Walpole to inform you that he has under his consideration the two placards intended to dissuade men from volunteering for the militia, which accompanied your letter of the 4th ultimo, and he is advised that they are libellous, and that, consequently, their publication is an indictable offence. If magistrates should think it their duty to hold a person accused of such publication to bail to answer the charge at the assizes, Mr. Walpole will instruct the Solicitor to the Treasury to conduct the prosecution.

"I have the honour to be, Sir, your obedient Servant,  
"D. W. JOLLIFFE."

Parties have been held to bail in the above-mentioned counties.

### MISCELLANEOUS.

Mr. Thomas Jones Barker has painted an excellent likeness of "the Duke," and the picture is now exhibiting at Mr. Grundy's, in Regent-street. The old hero is represented in his cabinet, at Apsley House, reading despatches from Sir Henry Hardinge and General Gough, recounting the battles on the Sutlej in 1846. His features express pleased attention; and the pen with which he had been writing when they were brought in, has fallen from his hand, while the fingers have not closed. It is a careful picture, and an admirable likeness. We understand that it will be engraved.

Prince Albert, on Tuesday, took the oaths on his appointment as master of Trinity-house.

The Queen has been pleased to appoint Thomas Price, Esq., to be Her Majesty's Treasurer for the island of Antigua.—*Gazette*.

The Earl of Derby has been memorialised by the inhabitants of Wellington to be allowed to send a deputation to attend the funeral of his grace, as he took his title from that place, and was also lord of the manor.

The citizens of Norwich have determined upon erecting a statue to the memory of the late Duke of Wellington.

Mr. Hungerford Colston, of Lydford, and Mr. Tudway of Wells, were out shooting last week, when Mr. Tudway's gun exploded, and the contents lodged in Mr. Colston's knee. He was carried home; and died under the operation of amputating the limb.

Sir Charles Napier has been appointed to command in the Kent Military district.

The *Liverpool Journal* announces that two block ships are ordered to the Mersey as floating batteries, for the purposes of national defence.

A true bill has been found against Mr. Wallace, the proprietor of the *Anglo Celt*, for an alleged libel against the 31st regiment engaged in the Six Mile-bridge affair.

The Attorney-General for Ireland has obtained a rule against the next of kin of those who were killed at Six Mile-bridge to show cause why the proceedings of the Coroner's inquest should not be quashed.

Last week Mr. McDermott, barrister, publicly horse-whipped Major Fairfield, of Dublin. The result has been another "harmless" duel—Mr. McDermott fired in the air; explanations were tendered, the combatants shook hands, and were pronounced "satisfied."

Mr. Charles Pearson addressed a meeting at the London Tavern on Monday, in furtherance of his plan of connecting the city with the Northern Suburbs of London by means of underground railways, starting from a central terminus in the city. His project was received with approval by the audience; and a committee was appointed to set about the preliminaries for effecting the object. Mr. Pearson undertook to advance the preliminary expenses; and it was resolved that the deposits of shareholders should be placed in the Bank of England to the account of trustees; so that they may be repaid without deduction, if the company does not proceed.

The Queen's school at Windsor has been the earliest to take advantage of the recent Minute of the Board of Trade, enabling Eleemosynary Schools to purchase Drawing Copies, Models, and Examples at half the prime cost, and on Tuesday evening last, St. Thomas's Parochial School, in Goswell-street, a large school of more than 500 persons, children and adults, directed by the Rev. W. Rogers, was the first to inaugurate the new system of Drawing Classes, instituted by the Department of Practical Art. On this occasion Mr. Robinson, the newly appointed "Teachers' Training Master," delivered an introductory address to a large and an attentive audience of men, women, and children of both sexes.

We understand that the report of the Government having purchased the plot of ground near Kensington as a site for a new National Gallery is incorrect. The property in question has been purchased by the Royal Commissioners with the surplus funds of the Great Exhibition. We believe it is intended to present it to the nation, and to request the Government to erect upon the land buildings suitable for a new National Gallery, for a museum for the trades collection formed from the late Exhibition, which will be greatly augmented when suitable accommodation is afforded; also suitable premises for the School of Design, at present temporarily located in Marlborough-house; and for affording the means of carrying out a system of "industrial education" similar to that suggested in the first report of the Royal Commissioners.—*Morning Chronicle*.

We may take this opportunity of mentioning, that in a private letter from Captain Kellett to a gentleman in London, he states that when at the mouth of Wellington Channel, he and his officers saw a great number of birds perched on what turned out, on examination, to be square pieces of whale blubber, which were drifting out of the channel. They bore every appearance of having been cut from the animal. Captain Kellett came to the conclusion that the Prince Albert was close at hand, but that ship was at the time in Regent's Inlet. The blubber, must, therefore, have been cut either by Esquimaux, or by Franklin's party. We should state, that when the blubber was seen, Sir E. Belcher had not gone up Wellington Channel.—*Athenæum*.

The *Melbourne*, late H.M.S. *Greenock*, bought of the Admiralty by the Australian Mail Packet Company, put into Lisbon on the 24th ultimo, dismasted, and leaking badly. When out at sea the topmast suddenly broke down; the wrecks got entangled in the screw; and it took a long time and great labour to cut it away. The *Melbourne* had on board 253 passengers, the mails, and a valuable specie cargo. It was hoped that she would be docked at Lisbon and repaired.

Great was the consternation on 'Change on Tuesday when the train from London arrived without a single morning paper for Manchester. All were at a loss; and the greatness of the privation furnishes some gauge of what business men in the country would be without their daily paper. Inquiry was made by the news agents here; but all that could be learned was that the van filled with the morning papers for Manchester had been somehow unaccountably missed somewhere, but whither no one could tell. A telegraphic message was despatched to Liverpool to inquire if the missing van had strayed thither; but *echo*, along the telegraphic wires answered "No." Think of the Manchester Royal Exchange, at high 'Change hours on a Tuesday, turned into a huge Calcutta blackhole of intelligence; everybody gasping for news, and none to be had for love or money. At length a gentleman who had bought a copy of one, on leaving London in the morning, was found obliging enough to yield his solitary copy for the benefit of the public; it was placed on a stand in the Exchange, and at first it was like a rush to read the news of a great battle and victory in the old war time. During the afternoon, further telegraphic inquiries were made of various stations along the line as to the whereabouts of the missing van; but without success. The guard of the train ultimately discovered the Manchester papers when at Preston junction, and left them there to come back by the North Union train, and they arrived here about 3.15 p.m. This is the second miscarriage of the London morning papers to Manchester within a month; and we need scarcely say it is productive of great inconvenience.—*Manchester Guardian*.

David Macfarlane has been sentenced by the Lord Mayor to seven days imprisonment for setting a bulldog to torment a cat; and threatening to urge the animal to bite a passer by who interfered.

Mary Steer gave birth to an illegitimate child. Shame had withheld her from mentioning the fact that she was liable to that misfortune. She concealed the birth, cut the poor baby in pieces, and threw them into a cesspool.

In removing some things at the Waterloo-station, a hat-box was found. It had remained there at least twelve months. On opening it the remains of a female infant were discovered.

There has been another garotte robbery near Leeds, on the high road to Harrogate. A gentleman named England, walking home, was attacked by two men; one seized him round the throat; the other beat him over the head with a life-preserver. Mr. England gallantly, but vainly resisted; he was overpowered and plundered.

The Reverend Mr. Cullen, a Roman Catholic priest at Liverpool, last week kicked one of his congregation while at her devotions by way of showing his contempt for her because she annoyed him. The magistrates very properly said that if he were annoyed they would protect him, but he must not take the law into his own hands.

One of the most horrible of recorded murders was committed at Milton, near Plymouth, on Friday week. Mrs. White, an old woman, did not appear as usual on Saturday morning, and her house, which was locked, was entered by the window. The man who performed the escalade, found Mrs. White apparently sleeping; but on her bed. He turned down the clothes, and found that her throat was cut through to the spinal cord! The house had been plundered; no clue was found of the murderer.

Mrs. Phillips, a lady living at Camden-town, missed some jewellery from her house. Miss Diana Campbell had been staying with her on a visit. She was suspected. A policeman went to a villa, near Maidenhead, where Miss Campbell was staying, and taxed her with the robbery. She denied it, and threw the blame on the daughters of Mrs. Phillips. Search was made, and the property found. There was no escape. Miss Campbell was brought before Mr. Broughton. In defence, it was alleged that Miss Campbell was going to sell the jewels for the daughters, whom she was going to get into a convent. Miss Campbell is a Catholic; and several letters were put in, bearing on matters connected with the theological doings of certain young ladies connected with Miss Selton's establishment. Miss Campbell admitted *taking*, but not stealing the jewels. Mr. Broughton, after carefully reviewing the whole of the evidence adduced, remarked, that the endeavouring to proselytize the daughters of a Protestant clergyman, and induce them to enter a convent, was an offence of a most serious description, and he should remand the prisoner till Monday next. On being removed from the bar by Addey, the gaoler, she burst into tears, and exclaimed, "Oh, for God's sake don't send me to prison. I'm an officer's daughter, and a general's granddaughter." But she was locked up.

The dispute between the masters and men in the "Strong Bootmaker's Strike," which has existed since the 18th of October, when about 900 men struck, was amicably settled on Saturday. It appears that a meeting of the masters and men, twelve on each side, took place, and the conference lasted fourteen hours. Both sides appeared to be satisfied with the arrangement that has been entered into between them.

Application made to the Court of Queen's Bench to admit Alain and Baronet to bail has been refused.

A cannon has exploded at Gibraltar while practice in firing red-hot shot was going on, and several soldiers and two officers have been wounded.

Anderson, the clown, killed himself on Sunday, by leaping out of a window in Fetter-lane.

The fine female giraffe, which has been so much admired by the visitors to the Zoological gardens, where she has resided for nearly thirty years, has just died. She was the parent to the fine giraffes now at the gardens.

Certain buildings at Battersea, wherein Mr. Phillips manufactures the fire-extinguishing charges for his "fire-annihilator" were destroyed by fire on Sunday. The wife of the man who has charge of the premises was burnt to death. Her husband had gone out to fetch some garden-stuff for dinner; when he was surprised by a loud report, and looking back saw the building in flames. It is thought that the fire was wilful. After a long investigation, the coroner's jury returned a verdict of "accidental death," adding their opinion that the fire occurred from the ignition of wood in the oven or drying-room, by reason of a too near approximation thereof to the flues.

Lambeth was, on Wednesday, at the mercy of a mad bull, which, after tossing several persons, killed one. The bull was blockaded in a court at last, and killed by a butcher.

From recent official returns, it appears that the number of arrests in the department of the Seine on different charges was—from 1834 to 1840, 13,008; from 1841 to 1845, 15,110; and from 1846 to 1850, 24,538. Of this number 44 in 1000 were set at liberty; 16 in 1000 were sent to the hospices or depôts of mendicity; and 7 in 1000 were removed to the frontier or to their respective departments. More than half of the number arrested had previously been in the hands of justice, and 166 in 1000 were arrested twice or thrice in the same year. Of the persons arrested in Paris, foreigners amount to 73 in 1000. These foreigners are chiefly natives of Belgium, Holland, Prussia, Bavaria, Switzerland, and Sardinia. From the same return we learn that the number of suicides in 1850 was double what it was 25 years ago. From 1826 to 1830 the annual average was 1739, whereas from 1846 to 1850 it was 3446.

### HEALTH OF LONDON DURING THE WEEK.

The mortality of London has varied little during the last three weeks of October. In the week that ended last Saturday the deaths from all causes amounted to 1090. In the ten corresponding weeks of the years 1842-1851



the average number of deaths was 961, which if raised, for comparison with the present mortality, according to increase of population, becomes 1057. Hence it appears that last week's return is slightly in excess of the corrected average.

In comparing the results of the last two weeks a decrease is perceptible in the aggregate of mortality from epidemics, which is principally owing to the continued decline of diarrhoea, though it will be seen that scarlatina shows no abatement, but makes considerable progress, and last week numbered upwards of 100 deaths. The fatal cases of this epidemic were in the last three weeks, 73, 92, 104. The Registrars in their notes refer to its ravages in particular houses. Influenza is recorded in 4 cases last week; diarrhoea in 17, which is only half the number of the preceding week. Five children and two adults died of small-pox; amongst these was a man, aged 28 years, who died of confluent small-pox, never having been vaccinated, and of whom it is stated that he bore the marks of an attack which he had 6 years before.

Last week the births of 686 boys and 714 girls, in all 1400 children, were registered in London. The average number in seven corresponding weeks of the years 1845-51 was 1400.

At the Royal Observatory, Greenwich, the mean height of the barometer in the week was 29.278 in. The mean temperature of the week was 45.6 deg. The mean daily temperature, which was 49.4 deg. on Sunday, fell to 41.6 deg. on Wednesday, which is 5.2 deg. below the average, rose on Thursday to 46 deg., which is about the average, fell on Friday to 41 deg., and again rose on Saturday to 52.6 deg., which is about 6 deg. above the average. The wind blew from the north-west on Thursday, and in the same direction on part of the days preceding and following, and generally from the south-west during the rest of the week. The rain that fell in the week amounted to 2.01 inches.

## BIRTHS, MARRIAGES, AND DEATHS.

### BIRTHS.

On the 29th of October, at 81, Eaton-square, the Countess de Morella: a daughter.

On the 29th, at Eton, the wife of the Rev. Charles O. Goodford: a daughter.

On the 29th, at Ealing, Middlesex, the wife of Samuel Lover, Esq.: a daughter, stillborn.

On the 31st, at Weavering, Maidstone, the Lady North: a son.

On the 1st of November, the wife of Frederick Mayhew, Esq., of 14, Chalcut-villas, Haverstock-hill, and of Gray's-inn: a daughter.

### MARRIAGES.

On the 28th of October, at Framfield, Sussex, the Bishop of Sierra Leone, to Anne Adelaide, fourth daughter of the Rev. H. Hoare, Vicar of Framfield.

On the 28th, at St. Peter's Church, Everton, the Rev. C. A. Swainson, M.A., Fellow and late Tutor of Christ's College, Cambridge, son of A. Swainson, Esq., Liverpool, to Elizabeth, daughter of Charles Inman, Esq., Everton.

On the 4th of November, at St. Mary's, Bryanstone-square, Mr. George Walker Strachan, of Hitchin, Herts, to Anne, daughter of Mr. Michael Chapman, of the same place.

### DEATHS.

On the 25th of October, at his residence, Sydney, near Plympton, Devon, in the eighty-third year of his age, Zachary Mudge, Esq., Admiral of the White.

On the 28th, at Gogmagog-hills, Cambridge, the Lady Godolphin, in her fifty-third year.

On the 29th, Frederick, infant son of the Rev. C. F. Newell; and on the 30th, of pleurisy, Anne Elizabeth, wife of the Rev. C. F. Newell, incumbent of Broadstairs, and daughter of the Right Hon. S. M. Lushington.

On the 30th, at Strete Raleigh, Whimble, Devonshire, after three months' illness, Thomas Wentworth Butler, Esq., commander, R.N., and one of Her Majesty's Tithe and Enclosure Commissioners for England and Wales, aged sixty.

On the 31st, at Buckland Rectory, Surrey, in the seventy-ninth year of her age, Mary, relict of Edward Berkeley Portman, Esq., M.P., of Bryanston, in the county of Dorset, eldest daughter of the late Sir Edward Hulse, Bart., of Breamore-house, in the county of Hants.

On the 31st, at Woolley-hall, Berks, Jane Elizabeth, wife of Sebastian Smith, Esq., of 1, Connaught-place West.

On the 31st, at Kensington, in his thirtieth year, beloved by all who knew him, Vincent, youngest son of Mr. Leigh Hunt.

On the 1st of November, at Streatham, in the seventy-ninth year of his age, John Henry Capper, Esq., formerly of the Secretary of State's office, Whitehall, having been in the Home Department fifty-three years. He served under seventeen successive Secretaries of State, and held the appointment of Superintendent of Convicts for thirty years.

**DELAYS IN THE COURT OF CHANCERY.**—The new act "To Amend the Practice and Course of Proceeding in the High Court of Chancery" will remove several causes of delay which have hitherto obstructed suits in equity, especially with regard to having all parties before the Court, and also as to bills of revivor and supplemental bills on the death, marriage, &c., of any of the parties. By the 51st section of the 15th and 16th Victoria, c. 86, the Court may decide between some of the parties without making others interested parties to the suit. In case of abatement (by another provision), by marriage or otherwise, the Court may make an order which shall have the same effect as a bill of revivor or supplemental bill. The order so made is to have the effect of making the persons named parties to the suit without the delay of a supplemental bill. There is another clause to prevent supplemental bills. New facts, after the commencement of a suit, need not be stated in a supplemental bill, but may be introduced as amendments.

## TO READERS AND CORRESPONDENTS.

It is impossible to acknowledge the mass of letters we receive. Their insertion is often delayed, owing to a press of matter; and when omitted, it is frequently from reasons quite independent of the merits of the communication. No notice can be taken of anonymous communications. Whatever is intended for insertion must be authenticated by the name and address of the writer; not necessarily for publication, but as a guarantee of his good faith. We cannot undertake to return rejected communications. All letters for the Editor should be addressed to 10, Wellington-street, Strand, London.

[The following appeared in our Second Edition of last week.]

## Postscript.

SATURDAY, October 30.

### THE DUKE OF WELLINGTON'S FUNERAL.

THE *Daily News* of yesterday gives the following as the Official Programme for the procession to St Paul's Cathedral:—

Six Battalions of Infantry of 600 men each.  
Eight Squadrons of Cavalry.  
A Detachment of Foot Artillery with 17 guns.  
A Detachment of Horse Artillery.  
A Detachment of Horse Artillery, with — Nine-pounder Batteries.  
Marshalsmen on Foot.  
Messenger of the College of Arms on Foot.  
Eight Conductors with Staves on Foot.  
Chelsea Pensioners, in number eighty-three.  
Trumpets and Kettle Drums.  
Two Pursuivants of Arms in a Mourning Coach.  
The Standard of Pennon,  
Carried by a Lieut.-Colonel, supported by two Captains in the Army on Horseback.  
Servants of the Deceased.

Trumpets.  
Lieutenant and Deputy-Lieutenant of the Tower.  
Deputations from Public Bodies:  
Merchant Tailors' Company.  
East India Company.  
Corporation of the Trinity House.  
Barons and Officers of the Cinque Ports,  
With the  
Lieutenant and Deputy-Lieutenant of Dover Castle.  
Captains of Deal, Walmer, Sandgate, and Sandown Castles.  
Board of Ordnance, and Ordnance Department.  
Delegation from the University of Oxford.  
Deputation from the Common Council of the City of London.

[After the Procession has passed through Temple Bar, will fall in here,]

Trumpets.  
Two Pursuivants of Arms in a Mourning Coach.  
The Guidon,  
Carried by a Lieut.-Colonel, supported by two Captains in the Army on Horseback.  
Physicians to the deceased,  
Chaplain of the Tower, } In a Mourning Coach.  
Chaplain-General of the Forces, }  
Attendants on the Body at the lying in State.  
High Sheriff of the County of Southampton.  
Sheriffs of London.

Aldermen and Recorder of London; a Deputation consisting of Three Carriages.  
Companions of the Order of the Bath, represented by three.  
Knights Commanders of the Order of the Bath, represented by three.  
Knights Grand Cross of the Order of the Bath, represented by three.  
Trumpets.  
Herald.

Banner of Wellesley.  
Carried by a Lieut.-Colonel, supported by two Captains in the Army on Horseback.  
Officers of the late Duke's household with Staves.  
The Lords Justices of Appeal.  
Master of the Rolls.  
Chief Baron of the Exchequer.  
Chief Justice of the Common Pleas.  
Lord Chief Justice of the Queen's Bench.  
Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster.  
Chancellor of the Exchequer.  
The Right Hon. the Secretary-at-War.  
The Right Hon. the Judge Advocate-General.  
Secretaries of State under the degree of a Baron.  
[Speaker of the House of Commons, if not with the House.]

Barons.  
Bishops.  
Viscounts.  
Earls.  
Marquesses.  
Dukes.  
First Lord Commissioner of Her Majesty's Treasury.  
Earl Marshal of England.  
Lord Great Chamberlain.  
Lord Privy Seal.  
Lord President of the Council.  
Lord Archbishop of York.  
Lord High Chancellor.  
Lord Archbishop of Canterbury,  
[At Temple-bar, the Lord Mayor, carrying the City Sword, will join in the procession.]  
His Royal Highness Prince ALBERT,  
attended by

Assistant Quarter-master-General, Assistant Adjutant-General,  
Aide-de-Camp to the Deceased, Aide-de-Camp to the Deceased,  
Deputy Quartermaster-General, Deputy Adjutant-General,  
Quartermaster-General, Adjutant-General

Four trumpets.  
Sergeant Trumpeter.  
Herald.

The Great Banner,  
Carried by a Colonel, supported by two Lieutenant-Colonels on Horseback.

[Here, on reaching the Cathedral, the dignitaries of the Church, meeting the Body at the West Door, fall in.]

The Spurs borne by York Herald.  
The Helmet and Crest borne by Richmond Herald.  
The Sword and Target borne by Lancaster Herald.  
The Surcoat borne by Chester Herald.  
Norroy King-of-Arms.  
Foreign Batons.

Austria.  
Hanover.  
Netherlands.  
Prussia.  
Portugal.  
Russia.  
Spain.

The Baton of the Deceased, as Field Marshal, borne on a Black Velvet Cushion in a Mourning Coach,  
by the Marquis of Anglesea.

Gentleman { The Coronet of the Deceased, } Gentleman  
Usher. { borne on a Black Velvet Cushion } Usher.  
          { in a Mourning Coach, }  
          { by Clarenceux King at Arms. }

### The Body,

Covered with a Black Velvet Pall,

adorned with Escutcheons,

in a

Funeral Car drawn by Eight Horses.

The Pall Bearers, Eight General Officers, in Mourning Coaches.

Gentleman { Garter Principal King of } Gentleman  
Usher. { Arms in a Mourning Coach. } Usher.

Supporter. { THE CHIEF MOURNER } Supporter.  
          { In a long Mourning Cloak, }  
          { his Train borne by }  
          { Assistants to the Chief Mourner. }  
          { Executors. }

Relations and Friends of the Deceased.  
The late Duke's Horse led by a Groom.  
Officers and Men from every Regiment in the Service; with Bands, representing every such Regiment.  
Carriages of the Queen and of the Royal Family.  
Troops to close the Procession.

It is now definitively settled that the body will lie in state at Chelsea Hospital for five days, and be conveyed thence to the Horse Guards on the night previous to the funeral.

The funeral car is described as follows:—The base is intended to be formed by a square bronze platform, about twenty-one feet long by eleven wide. This will rest upon six elaborately-ornamented massive bronze wheels, about five feet in diameter. These wheels will be divided from each other by six broad panels of the same sombre metal, and will descend from the platform or base of the car in the form of an inverted cone, reaching downwards until about level with the axles of the wheels. The panels themselves are highly ornamental, being surrounded with rich bronze borderings, and bearing in their centre allegorical figures of Fame, Victory, War, and other emblems of the departed hero's career. From this platform or base will rise a second one, about two feet high, seventeen long, and eight or nine feet broad. Each side of this second stage, which will also be made of bronze, will be divided into ten or twelve square panels, inscribed with the names of Wellington's most celebrated achievements, while the corners will be decorated with heraldic bronze ensigns. The spaces between the panels will be embellished with rich chasings. Resting upon this platform will be disposed four groups of weapons from the Tower, arranged in the most striking and martial manner, each group surmounted by a pedestal supporting a velvet cushion, on which the ducal coronet will be placed. In the centre of the groups of weapons the bier will be fixed. This is intended to be about ten feet high, and will be covered with a pall of the finest black velvet, richly embroidered with silver lace, and edged with deep fringes of the same costly material. From the corner of the upper, or second stage, and on a level with the bottom of the bier, will be four three-footed triangular basements, serving as stands to as many metal halberds, about twelve feet high. From these will be suspended a canopy of rich gold tissue, underneath which, and resting upon the bier, the coffin will be laid. The total height of the whole car will be about twenty feet, its breadth at the base twenty-one. From the great weight and size of the car, it is conjectured that from twelve to sixteen horses will be required to move it, even at the slow pace to which custom has restricted such mournful ceremonies.

Among those present at the "Religious Equality" Conference in Dublin on Thursday were:—Mr. Sergeant Shee, M.P., Mr. George H. Moore, M.P., Mr. J. F. Maguire, M.P., Mr. F. Lucas, M.P., Mr. James McCann, M.P., Mr. F. Scully, M.P., Mr. W. Keogh, M.P., Mr. James Sadleir, M.P., Mr. W. H. F. Cogan, M.P., Mr. Robert Potter, M.P., Mr. C. G. Duffy, M.P., Sir T. O'Brien, Bart., M.P., Mr. P. O'Brien, M.P., W. H. Magann, M.P., Mr. Bellew, M.P., Mr. D. O'Connor Henchy, M.P., &c.

The following resolutions were agreed to:—  
"1st. That the public opinion of this country demands for all classes and denominations of Irishmen complete ro

ligious equality in the eye of the law, and will not willingly tolerate in any religious denomination civil power, pre-eminence, or ascendancy over any other.

"2nd. That the settlement of the Church question on the basis of perfect equality is essential to the establishment of that entire equality, civil and religious, which alone can or ought to produce content.

"3rd. That the present Irish church establishment is at once a badge of conquest and a legalized robbery of the Catholic population, which—while it insults and wrongs the people—convulses society, and impresses the Catholic people with a belief that the legislature which sanctions its continuance is hostile to the peace and prosperity of the kingdom.

"4. That all laws which impose penalties on the ecclesiastics of any church, or prohibit the performance of spiritual functions, or the exercise of ecclesiastical rights, order, or jurisdiction, are inconsistent with the constitution of these realms, or require peculiar oaths or tests from the members of any religious persuasion, practically declare the parties affected thereby to be inferior in the eye of the law to their fellow subjects, and ought to be at once absolutely and unconditionally repealed.

"5. That religious equality is inconsistent with the exclusion from public offices of any subject of the crown because of his religious faith, and that all such exclusions should be at once abolished.

"6. That we consider it the special duty of the Irish liberal members of Parliament to urge upon the attention of the legislature at all convenient times the grievances endured by the poor and friendless Catholics in all parts of this empire, so far as these grievances depend upon bad laws, or a bad administration of them; and that in order to enable members of Parliament efficiently to discharge their duty in these matters, we respectfully request of the Catholic bishops and clergy at home in Great Britain and in the colonies, to supply, at their earliest convenience, the statistical and other information, without which it will be impossible to have the claims of these unprotected classes adequately laid before Parliament."

Abd-el-Kader was in Paris, and visited the Opera, on Thursday night, when M. Bonaparte paid a state visit.

A change of Ministry has taken place at Turin. MM. d'Azeglio, President of the Council and Minister of Foreign Affairs; Pernati, Interior; and Cibario, Minister of Finances, tendered their resignations, which have been accepted by the King. MM. Cavour and San Martino will form part of the new Ministry. MM. de la Marmola, War; Buoncompagni, Public Instruction; and Paleocapa, Public Works, remain in the Ministry.

The *Official Journal of the Two Sicilies* of the 20th contains a list of pardons and commutations of punishment, granted by the King of Naples to a large number of political offenders. Seven persons condemned to death have had their punishments commuted into various periods of hard labour. One sentence of twenty-six years' hard labour is commuted into exile. Forty sentences of hard labour for various periods have been considerably reduced; four of the persons in this category have been pardoned. Proceedings against 720 persons, 4 of whom are in prison, to be judged by the tribunal of Cosenza, are stopped. Others, against 878 political prisoners, 40 of whom are in prison, to be tried by the tribunal of Catanzaro are stopped, as also those against 292 communists, one of whom is in prison. Among the names of the prisoners, we find those of Antonio Scialoja, Silvio Spabenta, Don Domenico Savri, Don Raphael Arnedos, Don Francesco de Rose Nimmo, &c.

As many as "one hundred and eighty-three" persons have given notice of their intention to apply to be admitted attorneys of the Court of Queen's Bench in the ensuing Michaelmas Term commencing on Tuesday next.

Much excitement has lately prevailed in the town of Northampton and the neighbourhood, in consequence of a report which has become current, involving a serious charge against the moral character of a clergyman. The accusation has been made by a fair accomplice of the rev. gentleman, and so general has the scandal become, that the accused has deemed it prudent to apply to his bishop to issue a commission of inquiry, which has been done.

About two o'clock yesterday morning, the Assembly-rooms of Webber-street, Blackfriars-road, were discovered on fire by a policeman. The flames spread most furiously, and ere the arrival of the engines, the whole building and contents were enveloped in flames. Every endeavour was made to prevent the extension of destruction, but the fire extended its fury to the adjoining houses in Blackfriars-road, as also Webber-row. The engines being kept, however, constantly in operation, by five o'clock the fire was extinguished, not, however, until the entire destruction of the lecture-room, dancing-room, and every valuable.

It will have been observed from an advertisement which has appeared in our paper on various occasions within the last eight days, that Mr. Henry Allsopp, of the Brewery, Burton-on-Trent, has received a second letter from the celebrated Justus Liebig, in reply to attacks made on previous advertisements of Mr. Allsopp. In this second letter the greatest chemist of the present day repeats, in the most explicit terms, all he had previously said in favour of Mr. Allsopp's pale ales.—*Morning Advertiser*.

# The Leader

SATURDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 1852.

## Public Affairs.

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

### WHAT WILL COME OUT OF IT ALL?

CABINET councils have sat from day to day during the past fortnight: and these councils sat, says the *Morning Herald*, two, three, and even four hours, and yet the *Times* is silent. Why? because they indicate in its own vigorous phraseology of a former day, a "great fact," and the *Herald* proceeds to describe the fact. It is indeed momentous. "The Cabinet has existed for nine months, united," and now these Cabinet councils are held; so says the *Herald*. Assuredly the monthly nurse must have been sent for? Yes, that is the "joyful fact"! Filled with the coming triumph, the exulting *Herald* proceeds to deal out Homeric taunts against all and sundry. It makes merry with "Paddy;" gibes at Cobden, "chapfallen, though cleverer, a little, than the impudent clique of which he is the voluble spokesman;" cites as its authority for saying "it won't do," "the venerable patriarch of reform, Joseph Hume;" and foresees its own vanquishing of the *Times*.

But it tells us more, and the more is valuable. The Cabinet whose knocker is tied up, and whose monthly nurse is sent for, is doing well. The *Herald* is even descriptive. The Conservative Cabinet, we are told, is "at the opening of this present November, cheerful and resolute in countenance and attitude." This is very cheering. But the *Herald* has yet further hopes in store: it foresees that the Opposition will not oppose; the Opposition is already beaten. The *Herald* cites the *Globe* as confirming its views, in so many words, that "no party or leader in the House of Commons can be benefited by the premature expulsion of Lord Derby's Government." But "this is not all," exclaims the *Herald*; and then it quotes again:—"We most unaffectedly trust that the present Cabinet will be able to hold its own for at least a considerable portion of the next session."

Good heavens! here is pleasant intelligence for Derby and *Herald*. A part of next session undisturbed! What if the Radical party do have leisure "to amalgamate its own members with Lord John's more intimate supporters?" What if Lord John do take time to consider the course after he shall have heard Mr. Disraeli's great scheme? The Derby Government is at least promised part of a session undisturbed. It is true that Lord John's plan is confessedly unknown, even to his friends; since he will not shape his plan until he knows the plan of Mr. Disraeli; and if Mr. Disraeli shall propose to act promptly, Lord John, on his side, may act promptly too; and then the fraction of a session may be denied to undisturbed possession. Still the mere talk of non-disturbance is pleasing to the heraldic mind; and accordingly into that open session it marches with its large promise of what is to be brought forth by "the existence, for upwards of nine months, of a Conservative Cabinet, united," and the daily debating of two, three, and even four hours, in Cabinet Councils. The very arithmetic has an imposing effect. Nine months of Conservative existence, and fourteen days of protracted incubation. Instead of *ridiculus mus*, really one might almost expect a whole flock of *ridiculi mures*!

### EUROPEAN LEAGUE AGAINST AMERICA.

"From the moment at which the Democratic Convention of Baltimore proclaimed General Pierce to be the candidate of that party for the Presidency of the United States, we have never entertained a doubt of his success; and our conviction on this point has been materially strengthened by the divisions and blunders of the American Whigs." We assure the reader that we are

not quoting from any old number of our own paper, but from the *Times* of Wednesday last. It is satisfactory to us to observe that the leading journal is, and has been, so well informed on American affairs. We have no doubt that the writer states the literal truth, when he says that he has seen the result from the commencement.

But let us continue the prospect in the language of our contemporary. "As General Pierce is known to be favourable to low tariffs and liberty of trade, no doubt can be entertained that the period during which he may probably conduct the affairs of the United States will witness a vast and rapid extension of their own resources and of their relations with this country. On the score of the internal policy of the Government no apprehensions need be entertained." The less so, since, as the *Times* has so truly indicated in the foregoing passage, prosperity of every kind, to the commerce and to the arms of the Union, lies before it in its path.

The sole want of confidence to which the writer confesses, is in the *foreign* policy of the American Government, which is expected to require "an unusual amount of firmness and prudence in the new President." We have as little doubt that these qualities will be demanded in the new President, as that they will be supplied in Franklin Pierce; but we view that necessity without any of the apprehensions conveyed in the tone of the *Times*. The prospect, indeed, excepting to those who are fastidious for this working world, or too timid, is one of the brightest, both for America and for Europe. It is true that new impulses have taken possession of the American Republic. "A new President, elected at the very moment when the passion of conquest and aggrandizement seems to have possessed itself of the nation with increasing violence, will naturally find it more difficult to control these mischievous and unprincipled tendencies." Strange terms these for a writer of the nation now holding so largely by conquest; but let that pass. It is true that Mr. Fillmore "seems to share neither the passions nor the enthusiasm of his fellow citizens," and that in that respect he signally differs from Franklin Pierce, who enlisted in the *Volunteers* with the expectation of serving even as a common soldier on the field of Mexico. Although we may take exception to the manner in which the *Times* notes these facts, we are willing to compound for any annoyance at the terms, by satisfaction at seeing that the force of the facts themselves is appreciated by the leading public writer of England. At all events, the public is taught to understand the strength and direction of the political forces in the West.

The necessity for that knowledge is urgent; as the crisis may come at a day's notice. The *Times* most usefully draws attention to another point:—

"Among other circumstances that may tend to the gratification of these passions, it seems that the Navy Department under Mr. Fillmore has gradually formed a squadron of unusual strength, now lying ready for use in the harbours of the United States. The expedition against Japan is still the motive or pretext for the equipment for this armament, and we have no doubt that this squadron does consist of a line-of-battle ship, three or four steam-frigates, and some sloops of war, equal in their respective kinds to the vessels of any navy in Europe. But, compared to the existing naval forces of some other countries, such a squadron is inconsiderable, and we should watch with interest, amounting to wonder, the advance of such a force, numbering in all but 219 guns, against the unknown but not inconsiderable powers of resistance of the Empire of Japan. In the present aspect of affairs with Spain, we are, however, by no means satisfied that Japan is the true destination of this little fleet; and it will certainly be extraordinary if this important detachment of the American navy be sent across the Eastern Archipelago, and entirely out of reach, at a time when the relations of the United States with any European power are unsettled or insecure."

We believe, indeed, that the squadron is intended for Japan; but the remark of our contemporary, that, as a time is near when a present use is imminent nearer home, the squadron will scarcely be sent so great a distance, is that of a man who understands public movements. That the United States will be arrested in its own intentions by any threats on the part of Spain, even backed as those threats may be by "powers" more properly so called, no one can expect. We can only regret to see the Spanish Government taking up a false position of discourteous repul-



sion, if not of armed resistance, to the great Republic. We are confident that an appeal to the spirit of justice in the American people, especially if it were made in a tone, not of humility, but of fairness, sincerity, and outspoken candour, would meet with the reception that it deserves; but by the petty course of repelling American vessels, even under the American flag and officered by the federal commission, precludes the Government of Spain from making that appeal which the American people could receive. That the American Government has been remarkable in its forbearance, has indeed almost exhausted the patience of its own people in resisting the temptation to take advantage of Spanish insults, we know. It has, as long as possible, kept the negotiations with Spain and her colony on a strictly diplomatic footing, according to the rules of international law. It is Spain, with her local Government, who is removing the controversy from that amicable and peaceable field to an issue of force; and it is not the Government of Washington that can be blamed for the consequences. The result, indeed, can be foreseen by any statistical writer who is able to compare, even in the most cursory manner, the resources of the two conflicting States; and it is Spain, we repeat, who has chosen the issue for herself.

But the reason which makes us so well pleased to see the able writer in the leading journal confronting the facts is, that we are most anxious for our own Government, and still more for our own public, to understand the nature of the contest, and of the forces and interests engaged in it. There has been some talk of dragging England into the dispute. She could scarcely enter it at all, to remain passive and neutral: she must either keep firmly out of it, or must be content to share the disasters which Spain is drawing upon herself, or must take some other course, dictated with a view to her own interest, to the inevitable career of the great Republic, and to the ultimate destinies of mankind, which England and America, divided, may influence so mournfully—united, so blessedly.

And it is against America that France is said to be leaguering Europe! The project is natural for any adventurer speculating in the patronage of the despotic powers; and if England were one on the side of *the infamous alliance*, a force might be formed which could for some years oppress the European peoples, and harass the American Republic. But where would the victory remain in the end? America is too strong in her territory, her youth, her ambitions, and her vigour, to rest content with defeat. She will continue to grow, and to fight, until she conquer. And where would English interests be in the mean time? Waging a war of extermination on the ocean against her great naval rival, they would be terribly damaged, year by year, and possibly at last exterminated. England sacrificed for the benefit of an ephemeral Napoleon and his despot patrons! We do not know whether this rumoured project be seriously in deliberation, or really advancing; but the English public ought to know what its Government intends, or rather, ought to know that England will have nothing to do with any such suicidal infamies.

#### THE PROFANITY OF PRESENT "SABBATH OBSERVANCES."

At a period when the use and genuineness of the Christianity professed by the Church of England is beginning to be questioned, boldly, but not irreverently, by large numbers of thinking men, in more quarters than one, it is certainly incumbent on the Ministers of that church to vindicate their principles, and the application of those principles to the necessities of the world around them, on every possible occasion, and in the clearest possible form. The Venerable Archdeacon Hale, and eighty of the London clergy, appear to be of this opinion. So they meet together at Sion-college, (on Thursday, October 28th) to let us see how implicitly we, who are the laity, can trust in them as fair and competent interpreters of the teaching and example of the Founder of Christianity—by protesting against the opening of the Crystal Palace at Sydenham, on Sunday afternoon, to the vast mass of the population of London who can only visit it on that day.

Readers of this journal do not require to be told what our opinion is on this last, cruellest, most senseless development of the "Sabbath Ob-

servance" fanaticism. We have already argued and re-argued the question now before us; we have found that our convictions are partaken by fair-minded men of all classes and all creeds, good churchmen included; and we had hoped that this miserable agitation against a Sunday walk through a beautiful building filled with beautiful objects, had been set at rest—smothered in its own pulpit cushions—for ever. The meeting at Sion-college shows the enemy to be once more in the field. We have no resource, therefore, but to come out, and do battle again in the cause of Christianity and common sense.

The best known of the reverend speakers at the Archdeacon's meeting, and their chief, judging by the length and elaborateness of his oration, was Dr. Croly. We shall certainly do our opponents no injustice if we proceed to estimate the truth that is in them, and in their convictions, by the arguments and opinions of the author of "Salathiel." The Doctor began with "Paradise," "the Wilderness," "the Ten Commandments," "the local law of Moses," and "the seventy years captivity." As all this concerns the Jews, and as we happen to be a Christian people, we beg to be excused from saying a word to Doctor Croly in his character of an Israelitish archæologist. We will also give him the full oratorical benefit of a certain proclamation of James I., to which he next alluded—being of opinion that people who live in the nineteenth century, and in the reign of Queen Victoria, have got rather beyond the reach of precedents drawn from the period of James I. Having pretty well disburthened himself of his historical responsibilities as a speaker, by beginning with the garden of Eden, and ending with Charles I. and "Laud's Popish tendencies," Doctor Croly was at length at liberty to occupy himself with present affairs, and to tell us why he and his brethren objected to the opening of the New Crystal Palace on Sunday afternoon.

He dissented altogether from the notion that the working-classes required amusement on Sunday to refresh them. Their proper refreshment was "rest," a "quiet walk, the domestic meal, and the domestic evening." If Doctor Croly and his friends had been legislating about Sabbath observance for *the working-classes*, their definition of proper Sunday refreshment would be perfect. A "quiet walk" (in the fields) for poor Dobbin, a "domestic meal" (of grass) for Dobbin and his quadruped friends, and a "domestic evening" for the miserable, exhausted brutes (say rolling comfortably on their backs and shaking themselves in company) to crown all. Very good and very humane for over-worked *horses* on Sunday,—but for over-worked *men*! men who have souls; men who have minds to be cultivated, and hearts to be refined; men whose higher God-given faculties collapse under the leaden pressure of labour all the week,—is it unchristian, is it any infringement of any word spoken by Christ, to make the "quiet walk" of these men a walk that shall tend towards informing their minds and ennobling their hearts, that shall do something more for them than merely stretching their muscles and purifying their lungs? Is such a purpose as this a purpose for clergymen (or any men) to protest against? And is not this really and truly the only object we want to achieve (and shall achieve) by opening the Sydenham Palace on Sunday afternoon?

As for the "domestic meal" and the "domestic evening," those who know more about the ordinary food and ordinary home of the London artisan, than the eighty London clergymen at Sion College would appear to have known, can judge for themselves how far these ingredients in the working-man's Sunday-life, are likely to refresh him sufficiently, in any sense of the word, physical or otherwise. We leave our readers to settle this question for themselves, merely observing that our poor brothers and sisters would be perhaps better occupied over their "tea," better amused through the rest of their evening, by talking of pictures, statues, beautiful trees and flowers, wonderful inventions of science, and other subjects of this sort, which the realization of the good and great project that we are now advocating would give them to talk of, than in occupying themselves with the small gossip of the neighbourhood or the work-shop, which is all that "Sabbath observances" have left to them at present, as subjects of conversation through the Sunday evening and over the Sunday meal.

But "Religion!" but "Church-going?"—When the vast mass of people of whom we have been writing, and to whom we want to open the Crystal Palace on Sunday, are taught so much of their religion by the clergy as may dispose them to go to Church, we shall be happy to show how church-going and innocent sight-seeing may be perfectly and religiously harmonized together. At the present time, a walk through any poor neighbourhood in London, during the hours of "Divine-service," is quite enough to show anybody, even a member of Sion College, that the working-classes do not go to Church. They are either basking in the sun, or quarrelling at home, or waiting against the gin-shop walls for the opening of the gin-shop doors. We only want to offer them something better to do than this; we are willing, out of respect to church-goers, to put off pulling these "humble classes" out of their Sunday morning mire, till the Sunday morning service is over; and one of the results of our attempting to achieve this very fair purpose in this very considerate way is, that Archdeacon Hale and eighty of the London clergy call a meeting with the express object of protesting, on religious grounds, against us and our design.

Doctor Croly dissented also from the notion that "the show" (as he called it) would thin the customers at gin palaces; and though he was impartially ready to admit that there might possibly be occasional instances of drunkenness on Sunday evening in the streets (!) he really could not remember the time when he himself had seen one of those instances! There is a description in one of Coleridge's poems, of a certain owl who, after first shutting both his eyes, vaingloriously flew about, hooting "at the sun in heaven," and crying out, "Where is it?" That owl may not have been a doctor; but nothing will ever persuade us that his name was not Croly.

Returning for one moment to the assertion, that "the show" would tend to empty the gin-palaces (to state that they are filled on every Sunday, in every quarter of London, is equivalent, if people choose to open their eyes, to stating that two and two make four), we may observe that this assertion simply assumes the aphorism, and to which the experience of the whole civilized world bears witness, that "Public amusements help to keep the people from Private vice." Give men, as at present, no Sunday choice but the church or the tap-room, and, as we see and know, thousands and tens of thousands choose the tap-room.

But give them a third choice—some such choice, for instance, as "the show" at Sydenham: are Doctor Croly and his friends bold enough to assert that none of the drinkers in public-houses (drinkers, because drinking is the only Sunday amusement which Sabbath observances now permit) would go to see that "show," and, going to see it, that they would get drunk in the midst of the sight? Men do not intoxicate themselves in public; men do not degrade themselves where the eyes of all classes are turned on them. They get drunk privately in tap-rooms, not publicly in Crystal Palaces. How many cases of intoxication were there in the streets, or in the building, when the Great Exhibition was filled by its hundreds of thousands a day? Doctor Croly must have been thinking of *that* period when he stated the results of his experience in the observation of London drunkenness.

Other arguments were brought forward by the Doctor and his reverend brethren—such, for instance, as comparing the *abuse* of Sunday as it is in Paris, with the *use* of Sunday as it might be in London—to which we have not space to advert in full. And we the less regret this, because we find, on referring to the archdeacon's proposed address to Lord Derby, at the end of the report of the meeting, that the strongest argument *against* the opinions of the reverend Sabbatarian agitators, is supplied by themselves. In the third paragraph of the address to which we have referred, occur these words:—

"It is not, however, the gigantic character of the preparations which are making to draw myriads of people to one spot on the Lord's day, which fills us with apprehensions of the demoralising effects of such an assemblage, but rather the *intellectual* character of the pursuits which we *fear* (!) will there be offered to the public, and which, however they may refine the mind (!!) teach nothing which relates to Christian religion" (!!!) &c. &c. &c.

Here, then, we have it at last! The eighty London clergy, after all their arguing and all their speech-making, really object to opening the Sydenham Palace on Sunday, because it is an intellectual recreation, and because they believe that the process of refining the popular mind has nothing whatever to do with the Christian religion! Here, in the nineteenth century, under the spiritual rule of the Reformed Church of England, we have the monstrous old Popish blasphemy, that the education of the mind and the well-doing of Christianity are downright incompatibilities, publicly revived and restated by eighty London clergymen, with an archdeacon, and, we may add, arch-pluralist, at their head! Look well to that third paragraph of the address, my Lord Derby, when it is presented to you. If you want proof of the real profanity of the principle on which the Sabbath Observance men proceed, you have it *there*; and if you want a good reason, an unanswerable reason, for holding to your first resolution, and sanctioning the opening of the new Crystal Palace on Sunday afternoons, why, by every law of Christian logic, you may find it there also!

#### THE CRISIS IN TURKEY.

ALL fears respecting Turkey are to be dispelled upon the assurance of the journal which professes to be the ministerial organ. The *Morning Herald* avers, that "the gloomy predictions of the Opposition journals with respect to the late events in Turkey have been fortunately refuted by the manly and honourable conduct of the Sultan." We fail, indeed, to discover in this assurance the substance of anything that is really reassuring. The principle of the statement in the *Morning Herald* seems to be, to abuse everybody who is in favour of the loan, and to praise everybody who opposed the loan. "His Majesty has refused to ratify the loan," says the *Herald*, "which his faithless or incompetent Minister, Prince Callimachi, contracted under conditions utterly at variance with his instructions." Now, we doubt many items of this assertion. It can hardly be true that the error lay with Prince Callimachi; for if it had, what could have been easier than, recalling that "faithless and incompetent minister," to have caused the loan to proceed in accordance with original instructions? It is, we believe, an utterly false suggestion, that the question really lay in Paris; on the contrary, we incline still to think, that the authority to negotiate the loan was given in Constantinople, to persons in Constantinople; also, that the opposition to the project arose with other persons in Constantinople—to wit, the old Turkish party, which resented money dealings with the infidels, and with the Russian party, jealous of French accommodation for the insolvent Porte. To treat the subject of the loan only as a diplomatic error in Paris, is to deal with the tip end of the subject. If anybody in Paris was to blame, it must have been Messrs. Devaux, the agents; and they would naturally refer back to their principals, the partners of the Bank in Constantinople. But that Bank, we have no doubt, had the full authority of the Sublime Porte; and the revocation of the authority is a distinct change of policy in the Cabinet of the Sultan—a change of policy as distinct as the change of the Ministers themselves. The late Vizier, Ali Pasha, was favourable to the alliance with Western Europe, and favourable, most assuredly, to raising the wind for the pressing exigencies of the imperial treasury; but the Turkish Tories, who stood by Koran and State, threatened; Russia instigated and supported those Tories; the Sultan was obliged to yield, and Ali Pasha was displaced by Mohammed Ali Pasha, a man of the reactionary party. The denial, therefore, which refers only to Paris, goes simply for nothing.

The *Herald* vaunts itself that "the Sultan has been counselled not to ratify an iniquitous engagement, which would have fettered himself and his dynasty for, at least, twenty-three years." Awful fact! A national debt of 2,000,000*l.* sterling, to last for twenty-three years! Surely this is enough to alarm any *English* writer! Colonel Rose has, we learn, contributed to rescue the Sultan from that ruinous position. Colonel Rose, who enjoys the confidence of Lord Malmesbury, the *Herald* is careful to inform us, received his advancement from Lord Palmerston; for the Tory writer feels he cannot stand unless he drags in an old voucher of Lord Palmerston's for a pro-

sent act, which that nobleman could not have contemplated.

The remainder of the article is made up of an attack on M. de Lavalette, the French ambassador. We are told that he has *not* asked for his passports, but that "he has compromised his Government and alarmed his colleagues by his language." Who his colleagues are, we do not know; but the context would imply that they are the diplomatic representatives of other countries. M. de Lavalette may have been too impetuous, but the question is, Whether he is supported by his Government? And that he is supported, at least in very high pretensions, is proved by the fact, that he entered the Dardanelles in the *Charlemagne* war ship, supported by his Government in this flagrant violation of treaties; and that he has upheld that domineering policy in the East which is illustrated by Louis Napoleon's claim to be called the "Protector of the Holy Places." The assurances of the *Herald*, therefore, amount to nothing more nor less than confirmations of all that has been said upon the subject; namely, that France is making demands upon the Turkish Government; is supported by a local party, and has on her side the interests of the money dealers in London and Paris; that she has been suffered to assume that position through the negligence, faithlessness, or incompetency of diplomatists on the spot; and that she is resisted by a Tory-Turkish reactionary and Russian party, with whom England finds herself in a false alliance. This, we say, is outrageous bungling; it places England in a position from which she could only act mischievously. Our attention is the more drawn to the subject, since we see signs of other movements menacing to Turkey.

The Emperor of Austria has just given his sanction to a new line of railway, to extend from Steinbruck to the Croatian frontier. Austria and Russia, we must remember, are competing for the master influence in Slavonian Turkey; that is, in four-fifths of Turkey. Russia already possesses the mouths of the Danube; has a large force stationed on the other side of that river; could cross the Pruth at any point; has proved that she can cross the Balkan; and could, in short, occupy Constantinople at the shortest notice.

In an opposite direction, the Turkish authority is in contest. The Druses and the Bedouins have attacked the Turks in Syria. Communication has been interrupted, and the Turkish commander seems to have some trouble in maintaining his ground.

It is at such times as this that France appears in the Golden Horn, defiant of treaties, with a line-of-battle ship, bullying the insolvent Sultan, and almost forcing him to accept, at an exorbitant rate of interest, accommodation. And it is at such times as this, that England is seen diplomatically playing, through the hand of a subaltern agent of all work, the game of that overwhelming power which can seize or "protect" Turkey at a moment's notice.

#### A CHECK FOR RAILWAY DESTRUCTION.

AGAIN the rail is stained with blood! The collision on the Brighton line has added to the numbers of those who are convinced that "something must be done." Indeed, the number of those in whom that conviction has been implanted, by shocking experience of their own, begins to grow formidable; and various suggestions are afloat for the coercion of Railway Companies into something like rational and decent attention to the comfort and safety of the passengers. There have been exhortations. Railway Managers have been assured that if they were to attend to the wants of passengers, they would be repaid for it in the increase of traffic. The total neglect of this incentive by Railway Managers proves, for the thousandth time, that the law of "supply and demand" is *not* effectual in procuring the greatest amount of convenience for the public. Competition has been expected to do wonders; but we see the fallacy of that incentive in the last instance of competition. The Oxford and Banbury line establishes competing railways from London to Birmingham; but the very opening of the Banbury line was signalized by a collision.

Supply and demand and competition failing, some other motive is desirable. A correspondent of the *Times*, for whom that journal vouches as really "One conversant with Railway affairs,"

suggested a system of fines. The Banbury accident was the result of the grossest unpunctuality; and although the Great Western, is far from being conspicuous amongst Railway Companies for dilatoriness, there is a general complaint that the arrival of trains is long after the appointed hour. More than one recent accident by which a quick train cut a goods train in half are also instances of unpunctuality. The primary cause of the Brighton accident is the same, aggravated by inattention to orders. Railway managers put carriages on the lines to run fast or slow, with very little reference to the relations of time. Unpunctuality, therefore, is a fruitful cause of accidents; and "One who is conversant with Railway affairs," proposed to meet that offence by enabling railway passengers to claim the forfeiture of their fare when the train shall arrive more than fifteen minutes after the specified time.

At the first blush this looks like a very promising suggestion; but the *Times* made an alarming objection, that in their anxieties to save the fines, the Company would scramble overground even more perilously than at present. Certainly there is no occasion for that. It is not the slowness in locomotion, but the long and unexpected delays which contribute to unpunctuality. The objection, however, is powerful, and would very likely prevail. Leave other things as they are, and Railway Companies would be inclined to indulge delay as much as ever, while they would endeavour to make up for it by reckless speed.

Protected only by a political economy, which takes little account of life, or by Lord Lyttelton's Act, which allows an uncertain compensation for certain accidents, the railway passenger feels but little confidence in his own destiny when once he is handed over to the custody of the railway official. If the fine protected him in respect of punctuality, it would expose him the more to being dashed to pieces by another species of neglect.

We still, therefore, want something else. Government assumption of Railways is not probable under the existing circumstances, and the not unnatural prejudices against Government management. Railway Directors appear to grant themselves an irresponsibility wholly at variance with the duty to society, or to the passenger placing himself in their charge. It is difficult, however, to find out a method of coercing a kind of animal, like the Railway Director or the fox, that can always turn on his own path. Mr. Glyn, for example, says that Railway Companies are forced into it by competition. Mr. Laing, of the Brighton Board, has made light of accidents, treating them as things to be expected. Practically, all Railway Companies show that they are not appalled by the chance of disaster. The grand fault then seems to lie in the impossibility of bringing Railway managers to a sense of their duty. Competition cannot do it; argument cannot do it; and while the Railway managers hold the highways of the kingdom in their own hands, the passenger who must travel by their railroads, who has no appeal to their enlightened self-interest, or their philanthropy, is made to cast about for every plan of inducement. One indeed would promise to be very effectual if it were possible. It is the boast of those who officially cultivate Christianity, that it is the true doctrine of doing to your neighbour as you would be done by, and that it comprises all practical wisdom and philanthropy. It occurs to us, therefore, that this would be a good mode of bringing Railway managers to a sense of their reason and to their duty—to convert them to Christianity.

#### A CLERICAL WITNESS TO CHURCH ANARCHY.

"THESE are days which need plain language to set forth important truth." Such is the opening sentence of a letter in the *Times*, signed by the notorious parson, "Sidney Godolphin Osborne," who takes a "common sense view" of Church matters. His subject is the Bishops and Clergy, whose relations to each other he farcically describes, as they come out into strong, *very* strong, relief at the "visitations" and the "confirmations." Take a specimen of the former:—

"Once in three years we have a visitation: we are summoned to a neighbouring town to meet the Bishop; we follow him to a morning service in the church, and hear one of our brethren preach a contro-



versal sermon; our names are then called over; we stand before the communion rails, within which the Bishop sits; he, from his chair, proceeds to read a long essay on church matters in general, his own views regarding them, and the particular legal measures on church matters which have been passed since the last visitation, or which may be expected before the next. We receive his blessing, and disperse—until the hour of dinner."

The dinner is pictured as a dull affair, which "poor curates" cannot, and "indifferent rectors" do not attend; and whereat there is "small ecclesiastical talk at the episcopal end of the table, and some good stories from the secretary at his end." The Bishop bows, and goes away for another three years. The Reverend Sidney Godolphin Osborne thus comments on the departure of his brethren:—

"The clergy get into their 'four-wheels,' and go home. Rural Dean Rubricus tells Mrs. R., 'The Charge was able, but evasive. He wants courage, my dear, to speak all he feels about our need of Convocation. The sermon was a sad exposure; a Dissenter might have preached it.' The Rev. C. Lowvein, rector of Gorhamville, tells Mrs. L., with a sigh, 'The Charge was able; his Lordship is very clever, but it was very unsound. It is evident he leans towards Exeter. But, my dear, we cannot be too thankful; Octavius Freeson preached the truth as boldly as if he was on the platform of a C. M. meeting: we have asked him to print it.' Dr. Oldtime, the aged rector of Slowstir, tells his curate the next day, 'It was a slow, dull business; the Bishop prosed, the preacher ranted, the Red Lion sherry has given me a headache.'"

We need add nothing. But if this be true, what becomes of the awful pretensions of the Church of England? What becomes of the arguments against Convocation? and a proper setting of these things to rights? Hapless the land whose children tolerate such spiritual pastors, and woe unto those who make them their guides unto salvation!

Here is another incidental sketch of a piece of Church service:—

"The next episcopal appearance among the clergy is at the confirmations. This is a *hurried* affair; eleven o'clock at Pumpford, three o'clock at Market Minster, and so on for a week or two in each year; travelling some twenty-five miles a-day, being so hurried that he is forced to transgress the *rubric* by saying that to four children at a time which he is ordered to say to each one: it is no wonder that his clergy see but little of him on these occasions. Some few may meet him at dinner, wherever he may stay to dine and sleep, but they find him fatigued, and he has to play the guest to his host's family; he could hardly be expected to do more."

Comment is superfluous. These are sketches of "an ordinary diocese, with an ordinary bishop." There is something more behind:—

"In an extraordinary diocese, with an ultra Anglo-Catholic ritualistic bishop, there would be some alteration in the details. A communion at the church; a sermon on symbolical architecture or consubstantiation; a charge full of invective against latitudinarianism, *i.e.*, everything which is not *Church first*; a deploring of the degeneracy of the day, and imploring the accession of a time when the Church should be purged of untrusting children, have her own convocation, and by her synodical action repress schism and advance her pure apostolical system, &c. At the dinner the clergy would be dressed like Roman Catholic priests; the waiters like orthodox Protestant parsons. So far as any real *useful end* being answered by the occasion, there would be little difference between the two visitations."

Yet *both*, we suppose, are sanctioned by the Church of England!

The Bishop, it is admitted, is too worldly; there is too much of the "spiritual peer" about him; curates are not at ease in his presence; he would be more useful "were he a less *great* man." Claims for political service have been "most powerfully acknowledged in the appointment of bishops." "The Bench, even of late, has shown in some of her members a deplorably mercenary spirit." "Nepotism has at times been very rife." And the remedy is—"more bishops, but of a very different worldly position." The clergy play "antics in out-of-the-way places." "The state of the Churches is shameful."

"Is not this a dainty dish  
To set before a king?"

Mr. Osborne has a remedy, of course—more bishops, as we have said—in fact, "gig-bishops."

Don't think he means Gigmanity in lawn and mitre. Nothing of the kind. He proposes the appointment of a set of sensible hard-working gentlemen, at a salary of fifteen hundred a-year, who shall travel round and round their little dominions like spiritual poor-law inspectors, to advise, admonish, preach for, pray with, and dine with curate and rector—all to be done "without fuss." Really a very sensible scheme—if it would work. But how it would "get rid of the scandals which attach to the Bench," also of "plotting Church unions," and "useless archdeacons," we cannot see. How the scandalous divisions in the Church would be cemented is a puzzle. Mr. Osborne, indeed, states the evil to be remedied by the simple establishment of a staff of "gig-bishops," more forcibly than we can; for he speaks from within, we from without the clerical camp:—

"At present few clergymen really know or are known to their Bishop, except as mere acquaintances, unless, indeed, they are active agitators. The laity are left to the mercy of endless, ever-changing forms, ceremonies, and rules for divine service. They see large sections of the clergy meeting at clerical societies, some to conspire to exalt the forms of the Church far above her spiritual teaching, others to throw contempt on all form and decent order by their neglect of it. They hear brother rail at brother—they know not which way to turn; there is no quiet, no peace. They hear of a bishop's riches, and the fallacies of episcopal accounts; but they seldom ever hear of or see a bishop acting as a friend among his clergy, treating all in a spirit of love, trying to reconcile their differences, and improve their practice."

Does not that paragraph contain a pretty closely packed array of reasons, not for more bishops, to be drawn from the ranks of these unfraternal persons, but for a free assembly of the Church? Strangely enough, the writer thinks not. Like Mr. Micawber, he lives on the hope that "something will turn up"—a "*coup d'état*" at Westminster, or the like, with the laity as the Lewis Bonaparte saving the Church. No doubt, a "spirit of love" dictated these words:—

"I am satisfied, Sir, that within these next two months the Church will shake off many a rotten branch. Rome's priests will pick them up,—I would they had had them sooner; but far worse will follow, unless some means are taken to show the laity that unprotestantizing bishops cannot be borne in a Protestant church. We are saved from a convocation which would have made our sores yet more public; let us now hope that the good sense of the country may look for measures which shall heal, not aggravate those sores."

Mr. Osborne would make an excellent surgeon. When he had patients, he would cure their sores by covering them up; drive round in a "gig" to see that the wrappings were all right; and to prevent a further spread of the disorder, call in, say a railway engineer to prescribe. The sores *will* exist, even if Convocation be instantaneously prorogued next week by "J. B. Cantuar;" and the laity are about as likely to heal them, as likely to eject unprotestantizing bishops, as the railway engineer or other inappropriate person to prevent the spread of leprosy.

"Let who will proceed to the work, Church reform must be worked by lay aid, and the less the Bench have to do with it the better; all mistrust them."

We are not directly concerned about the consequences which flow from his dictum; but does not Mr. Osborne see that he calls in question the utility—nay, the alleged divine origin of the episcopal and clerical orders, when he falls back for Church legislation upon the laity, who, in the Legislature, which would have to enact the remedy, count up no insignificant number having no belief in the Church, nor in her monopoly as the national curer of souls. His proposition is—that the laity are wiser than the clergy; if so, whence the necessity for the existence of the latter; and chief among them, of the Reverend Sidney Godolphin Osborne? It is he who has proposed the query—it is the nation who will respond.

However that may be, we trust we have placed before our readers what we promised at the outset—"a clerical witness to Church anarchy."

#### SANITARY GOVERNMENT.

So vicious has been the old system of "purifying" our towns, that the path of the working reformer's cutting new drains is one of danger. This week we have reports of two men killed by excavating too near an old sewer. Thus the

means intended for preserving life become mortal, through neglect of a science positive enough in all conscience, and clear enough to the understanding. But while insidious poison is tolerated, medicine, which is too obvious, irritates the fastidious sense. "A Sufferer" recently complained to the *Times* that "Mr. Mechi is pumping a solution of dead animals, from a horse to a pig, with animal and vegetable manure, and every kind of decayed vegetable and offal," over his fields, and the writer seemed to imagine that the process is a direct diffusion of cholera. The Sufferer only represents the intelligence of the public at large, which tolerates condensation of decayed vegetable and animal matter in towns where it cannot be reconverted into living organism; and he is terrified at it in the fields, where it becomes more obvious, but is immediately converted from death-bearing poison to life-giving nutriment. "Dirt is only matter in the wrong place." Under the microscope of science, the most revolting substance becomes an object of wonder and admiration, for the working of those vast laws to which it is subjected, in common with other substances which human wisdom calls "higher." The most revolting of substances, no longer placed where it impedes the operation of those laws, stored to poison the atmosphere of towns, or intruded upon the presence of life, but, conveyed to the place where it is wanted, totally changes its character, and falls in with the general circle of convertibilities,—the true poetical metamorphoses of nature,—and reappears as grass or as vegetables, the food of beast and man. It is not in perceiving the natural odour of such substances that the mischief arises. The mischief is not in the scent, but in the permanent proportion of gases not available for respiration; and, where the conversion is rapid, as it is amongst the vegetation that requires nutriment, that poisoning of the air does not take place. As Mr. Mechi replied in the *Times*, "A Sufferer does not reflect. Horses, pigs, and other animals *will* die: what becomes of them now?" Farmers make dung heaps, and spread them over the country, strewing abroad unpleasant substances, which less manifestly scent the air, but which remain much longer to give forth their noxious gases. In fact, exactly the same process as that to which the Sufferer so strongly objects, is employed at present, only that the conversion is much less rapid and much less complete. Seeing is believing. Smelling is the raw material of faith; and the uneducated man, like "A Sufferer," believes in proportion to his powers of smelling. The deadened sense of towns is content to feed the lungs with the diffused matter of refuse and corpses, but a transient breeze from a recently manured field causes a nervous faintness. This want of real intelligence is the grand obstacle to sanitary reform; it makes the public indifferent; it makes the official executive really inclined to defeat that which it pretends to further.

By degrees, however, a progress is made, and the multiplication of experiments will gradually make the English public understand, by the only process intelligible to the English public, that of tangible proof, how the circle of conversion is to be kept up. In several new towns, Tottenham being the nearest to the metropolis, plans have been adopted, under the Public Health Act, for establishing a system of house drainage with tubular drains, and a constant supply of water, by which the refuse is sluiced rapidly away, or converted into liquified manure, available at once. About fifty towns have undertaken an expenditure amounting, in the aggregate, to nearly 400,000*l.*, in order to establish this system of drainage on a greater or smaller scale. These towns will become models for other places; and, if the agriculturists in the neighbourhood were to aid in the work, they would derive a considerable profit to themselves, while they would be performing a service to their country. As usual, in this, too, human wisdom consists in following as closely and diligently as possible the divine laws that regulate the life of the Universe: those who expedite the conversion of refuse into living and life-giving organisms, are practical "ministers" of the Divine Government.

#### A SCREW FOR PUBLIC HEALTH OFFICERS.

The Chinese have a practice of engaging a medical man to keep a certain number of human

beings in health, and paying him an annual salary for so doing, but stopping his payment during the illness of any one under his charge. We in civilized England might be imitators of a practice less rational. The principle, we imagine, might be beneficially applied in the working of public as well as private affairs.

Wide as is the gap between rulers and people, and Utopian as may be the desire for a nobly paternal government, we still indulge a hope that a being made in "God's own image" shall be at least as well provided with the physical comforts necessary for his sustenance as the beast of burden.

In the Registrar General's returns we lately read—"Mr. Lane, the medical attendant, writes on his certificates, 'The effluvia from the drain very offensive;' and Mr. Murray, the registrar, adds, 'I learned from informant that the drains mentioned are not the house drains, but a gully-hole, in connexion with the sewers, directly at the corner of the house. Another child in the family is now suffering from the same complaint.'" And the *Times* of Wednesday last recounts how two men repairing a drain perished under the very mischief which they went to correct. These reports are still of disasterously frequent occurrence. We do not feel it to be as necessary now as it would have been five or six years ago, to detail the peculiar character of the evils arising from bad ventilation and drainage; those evils are become patent, and there are few of us who inhale the fragrance of a gully-hole or dead-well without knowing that we do but smell fever and premature death.

We know these things well enough, and we appoint men to do the right thing—to eradicate the evil; but it isn't done. There wants a sufficient motive. Why not try the application of the principle with which we started? Create an organized body of active men, to be well paid during the proper performance of their functions, but to be direct sufferers when the certificate of a medical man should bear testimony to the inadequate fulfilment of their duties.

Indeed, there are a number of men who already possess both knowledge and place; apply it to them. Suspend the salary of the Commissioners of Sewers, or other health officers, during infectious fragrances or endemic diseases; or, if they have not power enough, suspend the salaries of their superiors.

#### HINTS TO NEW M.P.'S. PROSPECTS OF THE SESSION.

GENTLEMEN,—While you are progressing through the barbarous rite of "taking the oaths" upon faiths, as "Christians" and "Roman-Catholics" (for Parliament distinguishes), which you may vaguely entertain; while you are sauntering about club rooms, yawning your scepticisms as to what is to become of Ministers, and lounging away your longing for the 11th in November fogs; you may have time and inclination for a few more hints and warnings, which, like my previous suggestions, may still be acceptable to you for their perfect unreserve. I flatter myself there is at least this point in my remarks—bluntness.

In a word, then, Gentlemen, I fancy that your feast of reason, at Manchester, was a mess; and I suspect from the look of the rehearsal, that the performance may be a failure. Not that the casting of the parts does not seem admirable; and from Mr. George Wilson, the benevolent uncle of the piece (why was *his* firm selected for Radical pledges?), who is to bless everybody at an autumn banquet, to Mr. Marplot, M.P., who is shyly to set everybody by the ears, and so, as usual, keep up the interest for Mr. Wilson, the selection does credit to Mr. Bright, *bénéficiaire* on Tuesday. But there is an objection I start to you all at the outset. You are beginning as amateurs, Gentlemen. The Manchester banquet was only private theatricals. You forget your author, the people, and are all too eager in making parts for yourselves. And there is another error I notice. Who is your manager? Not Mr. Bright, surely; such a manager would be Charles Kean in a company—always having the stage to himself. And even if "*ma femme et trois ou quatre poupées*" would beat Mr. Disraeli out of his present *grata arva* on the sunny side of the House, I doubt *your* qualification for Marionettes. Well for us, the strangers, perhaps, if there were more sticks than "whips" among you.

The result of the Manchester banquet? Is there a Radical party for specific Radicalism? I have read the speeches, and admire them properly; wondering, however, why all you new M.P.'s were brought there to hear the slight variation of Wilson, Cobden, Bright, and Gibson, upon the more stock entertainment of Gibson, Bright, Cobden, and Wilson. Anything for a change, however. There were other speeches in the mere list of names—eloquent, though silent members, whose presence spoke of vast resources, each name representing a different principle, and the congregation reminding us of Sancho Panza's account of the muster of the peasant-knights—each new comer was the "most valiant," on his own showing, and each had a different weapon! The Radical armoury has no pairs. Radical politics are got together on the same system pursued by economical Germans at the fair—twenty bad razors are bought at a time, with the chance that there is one in the lot which will shave! Still, it is true, there are some precautions taken. The rule is, that every gentleman is to regard party success in Parliament as a lottery; and the word is passed that each is to take a different number—except to Mr. Hume, who goes halves with all. But there are some gentlemen high in regard—say Mr. Gardner, of Leicester—who act upon the cunning idea of the Parisian grisette, who took no ticket at all in the lottery, but still thought that "*Le Hasard*" might bring her up a prize!

Clearly, however, although the Radicals have not yet learned how to originate a parliamentary policy, they frequently find themselves in a party made for them by others; and the attitude they have now assumed, strengthened on one side by *ex post facto* defiance of Lord Derby, and on the other by anticipatory sneers at Lord John Russell, being an attitude of preparation to be knocked down by the highest bidder, we must look, in enquiring into the chances of popular legislation, to the prospects of Tories, Whigs, and Peelites, on whose manœuvres and fortunes the chances of helpless Radicals themselves are completely dependent. It was an American (General Jackson) who said that history was a "series of accidents," implying that statesmen should consider themselves mere Micawbers—perpetually awaiting something to "turn up"; and at least it is obvious that Radical statesmanship would reduce itself to the functions of shutting eyes and opening mouths—to bawl at and bully fortune. As it has been so it will be. It is still a question, not what will Molesworth, Roebuck, Cobden, Walmsley, Bright, or Osborne do; but what will Sir James Graham bid—how far will Lord John Russell go—is Gladstone open to reason (of the rougher sort)—is the Duke of Newcastle in earnest? Let us, then, discuss the probabilities for Manchester Micawbers. Out of the vague and circuitous eloquence of that class of orators, let us endeavour to extract some fact we can rely on, and work upon.

The pivot of the Manchester Banquet was an "if." "If the Tory Government do so and so," was the refrain of the evening. But "if" the Tory Government should eventuate as a Liberal Government—that contingency was insufficiently calculated. And why not? There is not much heartiness of political sentiment in the English nation just at present; and a character for Liberalism (as Sir James Graham and Mr. Cardwell ought to know) is easily got. It may be that Mr. Disraeli would prove himself to be an excessively dishonest man if he brought forward a budget (as some people anticipate he will) which should not only not re-tender Protection, but which should develop the principle of "Free-trade" throughout our financial system. But would he not be forgiven? Our morale for our statesmen is not very high. Peel did in 1829 what Disraeli is expected to do in 1852. In 1827, Peel opposed Canning so vehemently on the question of Catholic Emancipation that he carried Wellington and others out of Canning's cabinet with him; and people said that Peel's hostility broke Canning's heart—other people, however, attributing that usually not over sensitive statesman's death to catarrh. Canning died; and in two years Peel passed Catholic Emancipation, and as Wellington's papers will surely show, not because either he or Wellington feared a civil war. Peel underwent a good deal of abuse; but he lived through it; and rose the higher for all the opposition, which drove him into self-development. Are we more precise in our principles

now? The nation forgave Peel the inconsistency because Peel left off on the nation's side. Would not the inconsistency of Mr. Disraeli be equally profitable to us all—his own party, whom he considers first, included? And if profitable would we not forgive it? Nemesis may revive in good time; but meanwhile the unserious British nation only smiles at Mr. Disraeli's unscrupulousness, and in fact admires him all the more for having succeeded in spite of dishonesty. Mr. Cobden, speaking for the whole Liberal House of Commons, had only one policy for enlightened Radicalism—to compel Mr. Disraeli to speak out. Manchester will insist on retaining its opportunities for being important: and will not admit that Protection is dead. "We must first settle this question," said Mr. Cobden; as if Mr. Disraeli's last budget had not settled it—as if the complete silence of Protectionists had not settled it! Mr. Cobden obviously, in his speech on Tuesday, retorted on my "Hints" to him: and he sneers at those who, as I do, call on him and his friends to push on beyond the formulas of 1846 into the real politics of 1852-3. And, not believing that the Free-trade question is settled, Mr. Cobden scouts the notion of a Parliamentary organization of Radicals, and summons the nation simply to take Mr. Disraeli by the throat and to demand a Yes or No; and while he, by implication, still expresses his faith in agitations for progress (as if any further agitation were wanted to prove that the country wants two or three things—say, for one, extension of the suffrage), Mr. Bright, without offering, as a compensation, his aid in a warfare of Parliamentary tactics, elaborately announces that he for one is sick of agitation. Mr. Disraeli may rejoice in Mr. Cobden's obstinate blunder, and may congratulate the country party on the genteel intentions of Mr. Bright for the future; and the result will be that while Manchester goes to Parliament to oppose, and to talk its silliness about "speaking out" (nearly one year having been already fruitlessly spent in the endeavour to induce Ministers to confess their fraud, and it is not quite usual with men who are winning to cry "*Pec-cavi*"), Mr. Disraeli will unexpectedly talk "popular principles," propose financial, and social, and legal measures, which will force reluctant approval from the whole Opposition, the Palmerston and Clarendon section of it probably intimating their delight by taking places—one way, at least, of suggesting to Mr. Cobden that "this question" needs no more settling. But this is not certain; Ministers may not be wise, may flounder, and get turned out. Is that probable? Lord Derby and Mr. Disraeli (and the talk of society seems to admit that they are united in objects and motives) are perfectly masters of the position. They have already practically admitted that the policy of 1846 is irrevocable; and though they may make such an alteration in the Income Tax (Schedule A) as would tax farmers on their profits and not on their rentals, as at present—this being a clever concession few would object to—for the purpose of saving appearances as farmers' friends—it is an insult to the understandings of such remarkably keen politicians to suppose that they would court defeat by introducing any measure which a working majority of the House of Commons would not perforce have to vote for. They wish to keep office, clearly: they can only keep office by a bold financial liberal policy, and by a partial admission of all the current popular claims; and there is every reason to suppose that, calculating the confusion in the Opposition, they would remain, after a good Budget, the strongest Parliamentary party in the country. There are no circumstances around them which lend strength to their opponents—the Whigs. The country is unwontedly prosperous—this prosperity is likely to continue; and we know that the English nation is not theoretical in politics when it is easy in pocket. The Peelites waver, and would join a successful Tory government. Lord Palmerston, a personality of mark in the nation, and who has a reputation for avoiding sinking ships (some people supposing that he arranged his decadence from the Whig government), is unpledged, and would, doubtless, join his forces to his old friend and *protégé*, the member for Bucks, if he saw that lively gentleman at all secure of being endured by the country. Against the personal potency of Lord Derby neither that of Sir James Graham nor of Lord John Russell can be matched. The vast landed, church, and "gentry," with much of



the commercial influence of the empire, is on Lord Derby's side; and the career of the Duke of Wellington should teach us that even weak governments in the House of Commons can be saved by the compact support of the House of Lords.

Lord John Russell, sneered at by Manchester, scouted by Hume, and generally despised, with as strong a feeling as they can at present get up for any public man, by the democracy,—Ireland, north and south, dead against him on all questions,—the Peers distrustful of his habit of bidding for popularity, more particularly as he never wins,—and his own followers sulky under the impression that he had no business to resign this year, and still more suspicious of his capacity, seeing that he, too, is going to Parliament without a policy,—what can Lord John Russell individually do in a quiet era against a party in power, led by the adroit and yet daring genius of Disraeli? Sir James Graham? That right hon. baronet's pre-eminence is a very hazardous one, and his position hardly *prononcé* enough for a party to be formed upon. The death of Sir Robert Peel promoted Sir James in public view; but two years have passed, and he has done nothing beyond making the joke that Mr. Disraeli is a conjuror. Out of the House there is a vague belief that he is an able man, but there is also a vague impression that he is a dishonest one; and in the House men know him as the first administrative genius of his age, but also as a man who has lived, and will always continue to live, upon second-hand ideas. Neither he nor Lord John, then, are in the circumstances to construct a progressist party out of the scattered elements of the existing "Free-trade" sections of the House; and unless an individuality be found to lead into office representatives of each section—Manchester, philosophical Radical, Conservative Whig, and anti-Protestant Ireland—Lord Derby, assuming that he has a passable Budget ready, may be safe for years. As gold comes in, earnestness will go out; and if we have a war, the effect would be the same on the Tory Government of this day as on the Tory Government of other days—they would have their own way until the war was over, by a battle lost or won: in the one case to be sacrificed; in the other to obtain a sustaining popularity for another term.

Then, Lord Derby being strong by the frailty of Palmerston and Peelites, and the weakness of Lord John and Sir James, what can the Radicals do? Why nothing, so long as Mr. Cobden declares he is not ambitious of office, notwithstanding he confesses it sometimes gives great opportunities for good; and so long as Mr. Bright argues only in the abstract the capacity of the middle class to be as fit governors as the aristocracy. Why should not Mr. Cobden aim at office as part of the business of his public life; and why should there not be a middle class Ministry? It is not to be done under the present electoral system. Therefore the first business of Manchester (and if "practical" Mr. Cobden had set to at this business in 1847 he would not have had to call meetings to "settle this question") should be to arrange Radicalism into a Parliamentary Reform party,—the business of that party being to keep that question before the country day by day by means of all the forms and tactics of Parliament. Such a party should fix upon its terms, and wait till Whigs and Grahamites could come up to them; and when a Reform Bill was carried, it should be by the Reformers, and not by either section of the aristocracy. Perhaps this sounds Quixotic. But until you mean this, Mr. Bright, should you not suppress those eulogies upon the middle class, which are utterly at variance with your practical course in leaving the middle class to follow humbly at aristocracy's heels?—perpetually being kicked, and perpetually snarling, but faithful always as those well-trained curs who may be seen constantly dodging on either side of their master's legs, but never daring to rush boldly ahead.

But we shall see no such Radical party; and neither Whigs nor Tories will volunteer such a Reform Bill as would give us a middle class Ministry: and we shall see no such measure soon forced for them; first, because a "party" will not be formed to force it; and secondly, because the country is too well off to be eager for political revolutions at home, however it would passively support the man or men working for it in the direction of real reform in

the House of Commons. And there being no such Radical party, the prospects of the session are tolerably clear. Mr. Disraeli will not talk Toryism; but he will not act liberalism, except in so far as it is incumbent on him to have a comprehensive budget. With the questions which will arise when finance is disposed of, he will play consummately, balancing *quids* by *quos*; as, in his Irish policy, in putting Mr. Napier up to propose a Tenant Right Bill, and at the same time insisting on Mr. Whiteside asking for a Bill to prohibit the interference of priests at elections; Lord Eglinton managing the rest by pushing the Dublin Exhibition, and taking Sir Francis Head's hints about the usefulness of the police in keeping a peasantry in subjection; and the actual prosperity of the country doing, *pro tem*, all that bills and intrigues would fail in. What may be done in an Irish policy is practical also in the government of England. Party may be set against party—question against question; and those questions which press for some sort of solution, as suffrage reform, education, the condition of the Church, may with facility, in an era like this, be postponed to the limbo of "next session"—Lord Derby and his friends arranging, no doubt, for their ark in good time for the deluge threatened when the "next session," with its many arrears, comes at last. The colonies can get on in the old way. Lord Malmesbury has been endured six months; why not for years? England has had nothing to say to foreign politics these ten years; she is, therefore, reconciled to her political extinction in Europe. Nobody—as a party—is prepared to "speak out" on anything except in the announcement volunteered to us, with a great air of candour, by politicians of all sorts, that we can't go back to Protection. And supposing that Mr. Disraeli does make himself intelligible on the one point on which he can hardly be reserved—the amount and character of the taxes we will have to pay in 1853-4—he will very likely be permitted to compensate himself by leaving every other point in the statesmanship of the day in deepest mystery. At least, as the Opposition depends upon him for their notions of finance, he will wait on their views on every other subject; and if no combination be formed to propose a general policy, and to develop it as a ministry, then it will be quite within the means of those men now in office to accept or reject what they like; and so to make the session resultless, except in getting rid of another year, which is a certain gain in an age when philosophical Radicals trust entirely to time.

But, as General Jackson would say, a session is a series of accidents. Mr. Disraeli may blunder; and Lord John may make a hit. And as there are more than a hundred of you, gentlemen, is it not possible that one man may arise from among you all, capable of seeing his way for ten years ahead, of managing and uniting the perplexed liberal parties, and of ending for us, for a little while, this dismal period of indolent mediocrity and purse-proud fatuity, in which only a Derby Ministry could govern, and a Manchester banquet be dull.

Your obedient Servant,  
A STRANGER.

#### FALLACIES OF MACAULAY.

MR. MACAULAY made some statements at Edinburgh, which we cannot allow to pass without a protest.

1. He described the scenes of 1848 as instantaneous "confusion and terror," following on the 24th of February. We will not quarrel with this: it may have been confused and terrific to him. But he should at least remember that "terror" arose from the doings of the conspirators who plotted in the name of order—in reality, for themselves. The mistake arises from the adoption of different points of view, and is therefore natural enough. But when Mr. Macaulay stigmatises the whole of the popular insurgents of 1848 and 1849 as "a race of Huns fiercer than those who marched under Attila, of Vandals more bent on destruction than those that followed Genseric"—the produce of "vice and ignorance"—the barbarism engendered by civilization, to destroy her; and when he theatrically exclaims—stooping by the way to borrow an "idée Napoléonienne"—such was the danger—it passed—"civilization was saved"—we simply beg to remind him, with all deference, that his splendid rhetoric is a splendid error, and that he

does not state the facts. If we insist on no others—there are, at least, Mazzini and Kossuth and Kinkel living witnesses of noble struggles, not the product of "vice and ignorance," not the leaders of barbarians, to contradict him; beside the brave and noble who died by the bullet and the gibbet, in Italy and Hungary.

2. "I think that good times are coming for the labouring classes in this country. I do not entertain that hope, because I think that Fourierism, or St. Simonianism, or Socialism, or Communism, or any of the other isms, for which the plain English word is *robbery*, will prevail." We beg to call Mr. Macaulay's attention to the fact, that difference of belief in the developments of economic science does not constitute an advocate of robbery. We differ from Mr. Macaulay as to the merits of Whiggism, but we do not call his political creed a swindle, and himself a swindler by implication. Galileo was accused as an impious heretic—but that did not make him one. Mr. Macaulay might be libellously called a Thinker; but it would not follow that he is one.

3. But it is not only in matters of fact that he has sinned. His logic is not less at fault:—

"We have seen by the clearest of all proofs, even when united with secret voting, that [universal suffrage] is no security against the establishment of arbitrary power."

Here is an obvious allusion to France. Let the reader judge of the quality of the logic from a converse of the same sentence based on the experience of America—

We have seen by the clearest of all proofs, that, when united with secret voting, universal suffrage is a security against the establishment of arbitrary power.

Yet such is the staple of Whig commentary on continental revolutions, and Whig argument against the deepest economical science, and the widest extension of the suffrage!

#### TAXATION REDUCED TO UNITY AND SIMPLICITY.\*

##### VII.

##### SPECIAL APPLICATIONS OF OUR PRINCIPLES.

To discuss the application of our principles to particular classes of cases, may not only afford solutions of some disputed questions in taxation, but may anticipate some possible objections and illustrate the practical bearing of our views. A few prominent kinds of cases will, however, supply all needful subjects of examination; these will be the cases of

- The mortgagee and rent-charge owner;
- The tradesman's creditor;
- The fundholder;
- The reversioner;
- The owner of patent, copy, or manorial rights;
- The merchant trading abroad.

We start from the principle we have already enunciated, that every intangible right to a matter of present use or enjoyment is a lien on some visible and tangible property, and is, *pro tanto*, a deduction from the value of that property to its ostensible owner. In all private transactions a public impost on tangible property would distribute itself amongst the virtual owners of that property, either by explicit agreement or by the implicit process of adjustment of market values. The national authorities need take no care, and can take no advantageous care, of that which necessarily rights itself by force of the interests of the parties concerned.

The subsequent discussions chiefly turn on these points:—

- Is there a *present* property to be protected?
- If there is, how is it taxed by this system?
- If the tax is to be shared with others, *under the control of law*, in what proportion is it to be authoritatively divided?

The chief guiding considerations thus exhibited we proceed to an examination of the cases above-mentioned.

1. *The Mortgagee and Rent-charge Owner.*—In this case the lien is on property distinctly designated, and the inducement to the loan is a fixed rate of interest. In case of a mortgage effected after the establishment of the new system of taxation, the parties would agree on the proportion of the tax to be paid by each; or, what comes to the same thing, the mortgagor would consider what interest he could afford to pay if he also agreed to pay the whole tax himself. The present Income Tax resorts to this very principle; it was driven to do so by finding on trial, from 1798 to 1803, that on no other could it work the tax with any approach to fair effect: the incumbrancer pays his Income Tax through the possessor.

\* See *Leader*, Nos. 108, 111, 115, 134, 135, 136.

The difficulty, if any, lies in dealing with mortgages effected before the establishment of the new system of taxation. In many such cases, no doubt, new engagements would be made, equitably settling all interests in accordance with the new state of things. In case, however, of a mortgage which for any reason could not be removed, the obvious rule would be for the mortgagee to repay to the possessor so much of the tax as bore the same proportion to the whole tax, as the mortgage bore to the whole estimated value of the property.

A rent-charge, on being fairly capitalized, falls under the same principles as a mortgage; its share of the tax would be to the whole tax what its capitalized value would be to the estimated value of the whole property.

2. *The Tradesman's Creditor.*—This case differs from that of the mortgagee in that the lien is not specifically on some designated article of property, but on all the possessions of the debtor. It further differs in that it is not a specific rate of interest, but a general view to advantage, which induces the creditor to place his goods or money in the debtor's hands. Both parties, in considering the total effect of their proceedings, take the tax into account just as they do rent, insurance, or any other expense. The tradesman has to consider whether it is to his own advantage to hold ostensibly his creditor's property and pay the tax on it; the creditor has to consider whether the tradesman is likely to hold his property safely and to advantage with that burden on it. If the tradesman had no tax, or a small tax to pay, he could give a greater price for the goods he retails, or a higher interest for the money he borrows: if he has a large tax to pay he can give only a smaller price or a lower interest. Thus, although there is no formal, there is not less a real, partition of the tax, either in exact proportion to the interest of the several parties in the property, or in that proportion affected as all other transactions are by the comparative skill, diligence, or commercial power of the parties.

This, it is true, is only one phase of the complicated question of the ultimate incidence of taxation, and a very incomplete view of that question; but it is sufficient for the present purpose of showing that under the proposed system the tradesman's creditor would not go untaxed, and that he would bear such a share of the tax on goods held for him by others, as circumstances beyond the control of any law or government permit to reach him.

3. *The Fundholder.*—This is a case of lien such as we have already discussed, affected, however, by special circumstances. The lien is on the entire property of the nation, and is not the less real for being, like the tradesman's debt, not specifically assignable, to individual objects amongst that property.

In any other case the holder of the lien would be taxed, explicitly or implicitly, through the possessor of the encumbered property. But here the natural operation of private interests cannot take place; for no voluntary arrangement can be made, and no ascertained share of the tax can be assigned by law as between individual parties. It is, therefore, necessary to provide by law, in this abnormal instance, for that which everywhere beside would provide for itself.

The fundholder is himself a member of the body bound to supply the means of satisfying his claim. The justice of including the funds in the category of taxable property becomes manifest on remembering that if all other taxes were repealed, and a tax on property substituted for them, the fundholder would remain untaxed, if his claim were not so included, and that the actual holders of his unsevered share would, in fact, pay his share for him, having already paid their own. For, the liability to pay interest to him deteriorates their property by the amount of the capital due to that interest, if not by more; and if he do not pay his share of the common expenses in proportion to his lien, he just leaves them to pay it for him, after suffering that deterioration.

Reduced to its simplest form, the case is that of an estate owned in partnership by two persons, and mortgaged to the wealthier of them. If the mortgagee, being a partner also, does not pay his share of the interest on the mortgage, by its being included in the account of disbursements, the other partner pays both shares.

Our position, then, scarcely requires to be strengthened by the fact, that all prior taxation, applicable to them from its nature, has been made to affect the funds and their dividends, just as it affected other property. The dividends pay income-tax.

When we propose to tax the funds, we must repeat that this is a sole parliamentary tax, imposed in abolition of all other. Being freed from all other taxes, the fundholder is only called on to bear exactly the same burden as his fellows.

The foregoing principles show that the foreign holder of British funds is just as liable to taxation as the British holder himself. His unsevered property,

or, in other words, the property on which the foreigner is secured, is *here*, entitled to and enjoying all the protection afforded by our laws and national stability, and it is for him to pay his proportionate share of the expense of its protection, just as he would pay if his property were invested here in some specific and definable objects.

We might thus seem to be conducted to the conclusion that property in the funds should be taxed like all other property; or, what is the same thing, that its nominal capital should be added to the estimated value of the visible and tangible property, and then one rate made to run over the whole. But here another fact obstructs us, and mere good faith in fulfilling existing engagements, may be said to require an artificial character to be put on what would otherwise be a simple and natural arrangement. The engagements with the national creditor have been founded, whether wisely or not, on the principle that the nation engages to pay so much income, the principal being irredeemable, except at the option of the Government; the whole transaction is based on income. In other affairs, and naturally, the subject-matter of sale is the capital; here, by artificial arrangement, it is the income. In those other affairs, and naturally, the estimate of money value, variable from circumstances, is based on the invariable matters forming the capital in kind; here and artificially, it is based on the invariable income in money. This is the essence of the funding system. The national creditor may say that he ought not to be taxed by the decree of his debtor, on property, while his transaction with that debtor related to income.

Not, then, from the nature of the case, but from the manner in which it has been dealt with, it may be urged that we have here in good faith to consider, contrary to general principles, how the income of the fundholder should be taxed, as income, so as it put its owners in the same position as they would have been had they been proprietors of visible and tangible property, and had been taxed accordingly. Let us see to what this view will lead us.

Obviously, such an adjustment can be made only in the way of an average. Different fundholders might have employed their property in different ways, with various results, but only one rule of estimate for all can be carried into effect. What that rule should be, or rather within what limits it will probably be found, when justly determined on examination of all the facts, may appear as follows:

In our article of October 23rd, we showed that, as far as it is yet known, the taxation of the United Kingdom may be fairly estimated at one-sixth of the income. But this income is partly the earnings of skill, industry, and even of severe labour, while that of the fundholder is purely the interest of capital, received without any expenditure of time or effort; that is, without any admixture of earnings. If, then, the entire income of the country could be separated into two parts, one the produce of property, the other of skill and labour, it is clear that the taxation which would fall to the share of pure property—such as the funds are—would be more than one-sixth. The true tax of the fundholder, on this principle, considered as one on property commuted from necessity of circumstances to one on income, will not be less than one-sixth of his dividend. If the data on which this proportion is founded should hereafter be corrected by better knowledge, a corresponding correction will be required in the application of the argument, but none in the argument itself. Meanwhile, we take the lowest limit of the fundholder's taxation at one-sixth of his dividend.

The highest limit may be found by considering that land in general may be taken as worth from twenty-five to thirty years' purchase; that is, that it yields from  $3\frac{1}{4}$  to 4 per cent. per annum, as an investment, and that, consequently, a rate of about one per cent., such as the proposed system would at present require, must amount to about one-fourth of the rent. The landowner, however, has generally an advantage over the fundholder, in the improvable character of his property; he may derive from it a larger absolute income, although he pay an equal proportion of his gross income in tax. The fundholder's property is fixed and unimprovable. In endeavouring to place the fundholder in the same situation as to tax, as he would have been in had he held visible and tangible property, this difference may justify his being rated not quite so highly on his income as the landlord.

It seems, then, that the tax on the fundholder would lie between one-sixth and one-fourth of his dividend; probably one-fifth, twenty per cent. would be a fair average. For this he would be *free of all other parliamentary taxes whatever*.

But this conclusion, however true at present, is founded, in part, on a supposition, which, under a change of circumstances, would involve an error,—viz., that the general taxation is one-sixth of the general in-

come. If the taxation should diminish, or the income increase, (both probable events,) so that the proportion of one-sixth no longer obtained, the fundholder would be entitled to a revision of his quota.

If it be imagined that any necessity of treating this special case as income, if established, would impugn the soundness of our general principle, that property is the true subject-matter of taxation, we need only repeat that this case is made special by the irreversible acts of the parties themselves, one of whom is the very power which imposes and regulates taxation. These acts, if admitted to affect the case, change conventionally the character of this particular relation, but they change nothing beyond it; and, to argue from a case so disturbed by artificial considerations, to those depending on the great natural relations of Government, society, and individuals, would be an error most calamitous, in the end, for all parties.

But more;—if a bargain so obviously changing the ordinary obligations of the borrower to the lender, establish here a necessity of dealing, as to taxation, with income, not with property, it is an easy inference that beyond that bargain, property and not income is the true matter to be taxed.

To tax, however, the fundholder on the nominal value of his stock, would come so nearly to the same thing, as to leave little doubt that the position, in respect of taxation, assigned to him above, is the true one. For a tax of one per cent. on the nominal capital would commonly be not quite one-third of the income,—a proportion which, under any equitable system, would probably fall on other incomes equally secure, and equally exempt from the necessity of labour, to realize them. The difference between this result and that of one-fifth, arrived at above, is somewhat more than one-eighth;—a difference which, in the coarse operations of taxation, has often been thought inconsiderable, and which does not here prevent the mutual confirmation of the two conclusions.

4. *The Reversioner.*—We here use the word reversion in the widest sense, without regarding distinctions between the different kinds of deferred interests.

All property is reversionary, the only difference being that, in some cases, the reversioner is already designated, or may be designated, independently of the will of the present owner, while, in others, the present owner has the power of designating his successor.

Inasmuch as a reversion has a saleable value, it is argued that it is a fit subject of taxation. But whatever is the value of the reversion, is just so much subtracted from the entire value of the property to its present owner; and as to taxation, it is, on our principles, an incumbrance, taxable, if at all, only through the actual possessor.

A reversion differs from other incumbrances in being realizable only after a given event: the reversioner has no *present* right or enjoyment. The mere fact of the deferred right being saleable, proves nothing as to the taxableness of reversions; for such a sale is a mere transfer of a deferred right, to a person who is willing to exchange for it a right in present activity. The saleableness of a property goes no further, in matters of taxation, than to ascertain the share of tax which a given object ought to bear, if it be taxable at all. In the sale of a reversion, there is no measure, as in other sales, of one active right by means of another active right, both admitted to be taxable alike; there is only an interchange in the situation of two persons, and we are left to discover whether or not a reversion is taxable, by the aid of other principles.

There is no difficulty as to reversions to be created subsequently to the establishment of the system proposed. Whoever creates one, then, may do so on his own terms, tax being taken into account when he fixes them.

The State can have nothing to do with existing reversions except in cases where the present and future owners do not agree; and then its only question can be of the repartition between them of the entire tax on the property, whether any, or, if any, in what proportion.

Other incumbrancers having present virtual possession of their property may justly be called on by the taxed possessors to contribute their quota to the expense; but the reversioner possesses nothing as yet for the state to protect. Is not taxation *this* year's contribution to *this* year's expenses? and will it not be time for the reversioner to pay his share when he comes into possession?

It is said, however, that because the State protects the property for the future benefit of the reversioner, as well as for the present advantage of the present possessor, the reversioner ought to pay his share of the cost of the present protection. A sufficient answer to this would be that the State cannot look so far, nor interfere with liabilities so extremely uncertain in their incidence and extent as those thus said to attach to reversions in



their infinite variety and intricacy of forms. A rigorous application, however, of the very principle on which the taxableness of reversions is asserted, leads, as follows, to the same result.

If the protection of the State is for the benefit of the next reversioner, so is it also for that of each one of the indefinite line of reversioners, designate and non-designate, who will succeed him. For the sake of argument, let the first reversioner be made the representative of all who follow, and let him be charged accordingly by the present possessor, with the quota of each future owner to the present expense, whatever that quota may be; and let him pay it. When he comes into possession, he will have, for each year, exactly the same claim against his next successor; *exactly* we say, for the elision of the first life from the indefinitely extended series does not practically affect the result. He thus receives in one year just what he had paid in another. Each successive owner comes into the same position, and is thus placed in the same situation as though he had paid the expenses for his own time, without the right of charging any portion of them to the next reversioner.

It would make no difference if the next reversioner were entitled to the future fee simple: all the future non-designate reversioners would then actually be summed up in him to just the same effect as, for argument's sake, we have supposed them to be represented by him.

If in this view there be any remaining difficulty, it relates only to the commencement of the system, the present owner not having had the advantage of former exemption. But the disadvantage could not be serious, and it is doubtful whether any measure could be framed to remedy it without incurring greater evils.

We believe, however, after all, that the true view is that which considers the tax an annual payment for the then present annual expense, no party looking forward to the indirect and uncertain consequences concealed in the future. But whoever takes the other view must nevertheless come at last to the same practical conclusion. A reversion then appears to us to be no fit subject of taxation, and the State we conclude ought not to interfere to enforce a partition of the tax between the present owner and the next reversioner.

*The Owners of Patent Rights, Copyright, or Manorial Rights.*—These are rights to acquire future income. Except as to legal disputes, they are not capable of protection from government. When their income is realized it is necessarily taxed, whether it be spent or saved.

*Foreign Commerce.*—This costs us a large sum for its protection, while under the proposed system it would be entirely free from duties on the subject-matters of its occupation. We cannot renounce it; neither can we leave it unprotected. It would be altogether impracticable to apportion its advantages amongst ourselves, and so follow its advantages with taxes; nor could we make any such attempt without letting in principles which have led to the vast and manifold evils of indirect taxation.

Nor do such devices seem to be required. The existence and wanderings of a British ship are always known; and there is little doubt as to her value wherever she may be. The nature and value of her cargo are always known, approximately at least, to her owners, as well as attested by documents essential to the management of the business in which she is employed.

We have said before, that although our present illustrative statements and deductions proceed on the supposition of all property being taxed by one uniform rate, yet that particular kinds of property may appear from experience to incur to the State different proportions of expense for its protection, and may, therefore, be discovered hereafter to be justly chargeable with different rates of taxation on the value. Of these classes possibly shipping and foreign commerce may form one, to be charged with a rate somewhat higher than the average. Let us suppose it to be found reasonable hereafter that ships and cargoes be charged two per cent. per annum instead of one per cent., the result would be somewhat as follows:—

Our export commerce may be taken at 60 millions per annum, and the import must be about of the same value. Taking the average length of voyages for this 120 millions, and remembering that British ships are employed in much commerce which never comes to England, we can hardly estimate the cargoes afloat at less than 50 millions sterling. The vessels themselves amount to 3,500,000 tons, which at 8 $\frac{1}{2}$  per ton would form a value of 28,000,000 $\frac{1}{2}$ . The total 78,000,000 $\frac{1}{2}$  at two per cent. would yield 1,560,000 $\frac{1}{2}$  per annum, and our commerce would at the same time be freed of duties amounting to 22,000,000 $\frac{1}{2}$ . We need employ no words to estimate the effect of such a change on the activity and extent of our foreign commerce, or of the internal industry which must be consequent upon it.

These instances of the application of our principles will supply answers to perhaps all the cases which in practice can be proposed. We need hardly repeat that any error in the actual figures employed does not invalidate the correctness of the principles.

We purpose next to enter on an examination of M. Emile de Girardin's work, *L'Impôt*, and through it to exhibit the actual taxation of France.

#### DESSERT BANQUETS FOR PUBLIC MEETINGS.

THERE is one thing which public agitators may learn from the Manchester school, and that is, the pleasant way of getting rid of the cumbersome part of a public dinner. Few men engaged in such affairs have not felt that, to close at a reasonable hour, the evening was too short for hearing all whom they would wish to hear; and on the other hand, that the dinner with which it commenced was a tedious incumbrance. Considered as a feast—which is something worth thinking of, in itself—the public dinner is generally a failure: the viands are seldom selected with such exquisite tact as to elevate the feast to the true standard of aesthetics; the cookery, be it said with all respect for meritorious servants of the public down stairs, seldom has a fair chance; and it is very rarely that the price of the ticket is sufficient to cover the machinery of attendance necessary to make the whole go smoothly. The dinner is never quite what we expect, save in some extraordinary instances, possibly, of three guinea tickets; and the politicians who can deal in three-guinea tickets are a limited class.

But the money spent in the dinner might procure a much more agreeable occupation for the teeth of the listeners, if it were spent in a light dessert, pleasantly sustaining, rather than encumbering, the faculties under the operation of the speaker. The Manchester people introduced the practice, with the organized agitation for Free-trade. In process of time, the improvement will no doubt be carried still further; but the idea is a good one, and it was well illustrated at the great Manchester banquet.

Reporters, indeed, may regret the loss of a savoury perquisite; but for the company at large, we believe, it is agreeable to be relieved of an untimely obstruction of fish, flesh, and waiters, and to carve as soon as possible at the speaking, which mixes as pleasantly with the wine as the walnuts do. London is still behind Manchester in this reform.

#### THE ACCUSER.

A YOUNG lady who advanced some of the most telling charges against Miss Sellon, and the Sisters of Mercy at Plymouth, has been brought to a police-court for robbery. It will be natural for the friends of Miss Sellon and the enemies of Ultra-Protestants to make much of this catastrophe, which appears in itself to destroy the evidence against them. To us the incident has a deeper moral, which all parties might well consider.

It is much to be doubted whether Diana Campbell is capable of the turpitude implied in her actions. She furtively took certain things from a lady with whom she was living; and her apology, that she took them to provide for two young ladies who were to be placed in a Convent, or for some other equally benevolent purpose, may be rejected as worthless. But the readiness with which she has appropriated property not her own, the facility with which she made herself the subject of a police investigation, and then the alarm that she showed at the inevitable result when she was committed to prison—"Oh! don't send me to prison, for I am an officer's daughter and a General's grand-daughter"—suggest the idea that hers is one of those easily moved unreasoning minds which are at the mercy of any temptation for the moment. There is cruelty in dealing harsh with her, as there is in dealing with all weakness; but it is to be observed that this police investigation has not altered her character, nor can it have disclosed its essential features as they ought to have been discerned previously, by any discovery. The young lady must always have had an unstable, uncertain, irrational mind; not quite capable of distinguishing between right and wrong, and ready to do either in a small way upon compulsion. To suborn evidence like hers against people, impressed, however erroneously, by a grave sense of duty and the desire to fulfil an earnest mission, is a far worse offence against right than any which Diana Campbell could have committed. Neither Catholic nor Protestant should consent to found much upon the actions or asseverations of a poor girl who cannot keep out of a police-office, and who rests her hope of judicial salvation on her military birth.

#### THE CLOCK À LA FRANÇAISE.

WHEN Mr. Babbage was before the Select Committee on his calculating machine, according to tradition, a noble *savant* asked him whether, if a question were put incor-

rectly, the faithful and intelligent instrument would, nevertheless, return a correct answer? Such is Mr. Babbage's reputation for candour, that, although he was the inventor of the machine, he is reputed to have replied modestly in the negative! The electric telegraph is not more infallible than the calculating machine. The gentlemen who were on Cornhill the other day, proclaiming the French Empire and other important truths, exchanged information with their *confrères* in Paris about the time of day. At ten minutes past two the telegrapher in Cornhill asked the telegraph in Paris, "What is it o'clock?" "Ten minutes past two," was the reply—the difference of longitude notwithstanding! The interchange of question and reply, however, clearly shows that either in London or Paris these imperial telegraphers don't know what's o'clock.

#### ABD-EL-KADER AND ARCHDEACON HALE.

THE Crescent has more than once taught true religion to the Cross. Our Sabbatarian friends may take a lesson from the Moslem. While the Earl of Shaftesbury, and that strange compound of Church dignitaries, Archdeacon Hale, with his eighty London clergymen, would fain forbid their poorer fellow-creatures to worship God in his marvellous works, because, cooped up all the week, they will not, on the one day of rest, inhale foul air, like proper "miserable sinners," in orthodox pews, Abd-el-Kader extorts the respect of the Catholic Archbishop, by the simple fervour of devotions offered up to the one God, not once or twice, but many times in the day, in the crowd, the palace, and the street. The prayer of the Arab springs from the heart; the "divine service" of the Archdeacon and his clergy savours too much of "the Scribes and Pharisees who sit in Moses' seat."

#### NOTICES TO CORRESPONDENTS.

The continuation of "Letters of a Vagabond" is unavoidably omitted in our present number by extreme pressure of political and other matter on our space. The series of letters will be completed in twenty numbers.

Several communications, in type.

Mr. Dry's letter is much too long. Reduced to half its length we would endeavour to insert it.

We are obliged to a high-minded subscriber for a note on the subject of a passage in our last Paris Letter, and we can assure him that we are very far from sharing the moral prejudice the sentence alluded to would seem to him to convey. In speaking however of the *hereditary* pretensions of an imperial crown solely founded on a certain putative descent, it was doubtless the object of the writer of the Paris Letter to expose the hollowness of the claim, and the delusion of *Bonapartist* France. No moral prejudice can have dictated a sentence in a purely political letter, and our frank and generous subscriber only does the *Leader* justice in supposing that it would repudiate any such vulgar notion. We heartily echo the doctrine that "No man can be degraded save by his own act." We were only showing that it is by that test, and that alone, that Louis Napoleon ought to be judged.

*CHARACTERISTICS OF A BORE.*—Our bore is admitted on all hands to be a good-hearted man. He may put fifty people out of temper, but he keeps his own. He preserves a sickly solid smile upon his face, when other faces are ruffled by the perfection he has attained in his art, and has an equable voice which never travels out of one key, or rises above one pitch. His manner is a manner of tranquil interest. None of his opinions are startling. Among his deepest-rooted convictions, it may be mentioned that he considers the air of England damp, and holds that our lively neighbours—he always calls the French our lively neighbours—have the advantage of us in that particular. Nevertheless, he is unable to forget that John Bull is John Bull all the world over, and that England, with all her faults, is England still.—*DICKENS'S Household Words*

*SAW YE JOHNNY COMIN'!*—The laughter and applause which followed this tune, which the band played after drinking the health of Lord John Russell at the late dinner, attracted the noble Lord's attention, and led him to inquire into the cause of Lord Kinnaird. His lordship gave him the words of the popular air and the ex-minister was not slow in making the application to an expected return to Downing-street. His lordship was said to have been highly amused with the appositeness of the musical figure, and considered it quite a harmonious call back to office.—*Perth Courier*.

*MANCHESTER FREE LIBRARY.*—The number of persons who visited this institution on each day during the week ending Saturday, October 2, was as follows:—Monday, 2253; Tuesday, 2310; Wednesday, 2384; Thursday, 2324; Friday, 1967; Saturday, 2400: total, 13,638. The number of books taken from the shelves in the reference library on each day was—Monday, 323; Tuesday, 310; Wednesday, 309; Thursday, 291; Friday, 283; Saturday, 331: total 1847. The number of volumes issued from the lending library was—Monday, 251; Tuesday, 260; Wednesday, 256; Thursday, 293; Friday, 296; Saturday, 441: total, 1797.—*Manchester Guardian*.

## Literature.

Critics are not the legislators, but the judges and police of literature. They do not make laws—they interpret and try to enforce them.—*Edinburgh Review*.

"THE Age of Reviews is passed," we are often told. It would be a matter of regret to us could we believe the assertion; for whatever improvements may take place in journalism, they can never really make Newspapers supply the one eminent quality of Reviews—we mean the careful and extensive treatment of particular subjects. Reviews enable us to have elaborate essays, in lieu of volumes, on certain subjects, well worth careful treatment, yet not naturally requiring voluminous treatment; and further admit of criticisms more exhaustive and mature than journalism can pretend to furnish.

In the *British Quarterly* we always find thought, learning, earnestness, and abundance of antagonistic matter provoking thought. The number just out (besides very able articles on *Oxford* and *Sir W. Hamilton*) contains two very notable papers, one on the *Theology of the Old Testament*, and another on *Shakspeare and Goethe*, both calling for some notice at our hands.

The Old Testament is, unhappily for Christianity, so linked on to the New, that the two cannot be separated. The savage Hebrew God, the Lord of Hosts, the "jealous God, visiting the sins of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation," must be accepted, however shocking to one's reverence, because the *proof* of Christ's divinity is derived from the fulfilment of prophecies. If, therefore, the Old Testament must be accepted, the acute theologian has to make it acceptable by explaining away the "difficulties" which alarm the timid. In the article before us this is attempted, with an ability we readily acknowledge, although, we need scarcely say, without in the least altering our opinions. Theological writing is all of one cast. A certain boldness of assertion captivates the willing captive; and when the rebel confronts this, he finds the bold assertor has "covered a retreat" in an unexpected corner. As an example:—

"As for the hypothesis of a gradual evolution of a pure monotheism out of an original polytheism—an hypothesis which, in various shapes, has found advocates among recent German writers,—we shall content ourselves with saying that when its supporters shall discover some basis of *fact* on which to rest it—when they shall produce a single instance of a nation setting out from polytheism and arguing itself into monotheism, we shall admit that they are entitled to be heard on its behalf. In the meantime all history is against them."

This magnificent paradox will be greedily accepted. When recalcitrants like ourselves, venture to question it, and say: Had not Greece and Rome their polytheism, and did they not evolve therefrom into monotheism? we foresee (experience in polemics having warned us) that the escape will be made through the words "arguing itself into!" The Greeks and Romans did not argue themselves into monotheism, they were argued into it! (XENOPHANES, SOCRATES, *et id omne genus*, were not a "nation.") The *ergo* is plain: The Monotheism of the Jews was no evolution of human thought, but a divine revelation!

Another point mooted, and skilfully mooted, is the anthropomorphism of the Old Testament. The writer ingeniously argues that it is all "figurative," and necessarily so.

"Should any feel startled at this assertion, we beg them to consider whether it be possible for us to conceive or speak of God at all positively, except *κατ' ἀνθρώπου*. Of the infinite and the eternal, as he is in himself, we can know nothing; all our knowledge of him must be relative; and hence we have no means of conceiving of him except by ascribing to him certain attributes expressive of the relation in which he stands to his creatures. A God without attributes is to us no God at all. But we can arrive at the conception of such attributes in God only by instituting an analogy between his relation to his work and our relation to ours."

Very true; but to us it seems that this admitted impossibility of our knowing the Infinite should make us as *humble* as we are *arrogant* in our language respecting him—should inspire us with a calm faith, a faith of reliance upon his will, and not make us set up an Image drawn from our own imperfection. We know nothing of him as he is; but—and here lies the fallacy we are combating—our ignorance should restrain that very assumption of knowledge implied in "ascribing certain attributes expressive of the relation in which he stands to us." Do we *know* that relation? When we call God a "jealous God," do we know the relation which we express by jealousy? When we say that he is angry at our disbelief, do we know the relation to him of our disbelief? Do we not rather *assume* the relation of sin, and then argue anthropically from that assumption?

We have argued elsewhere in these columns the question of sin, and need not therefore dwell upon it now; but in the following passage let us call attention to two general but not very creditable topics, always to be met with in theological writings: the implication of immorality in disbelief, and the insistence on fear as a sound religious basis:—

"Now it is certainly not pleasant to think of God as a being who hates sin and will condignly punish it, when one is bent on throwing the glare of human genius over the vices and follies of men—and it is undoubtedly very disagreeable to believe that 'God is angry with men,' and is 'a terrible God,' when one cannot but have the consciousness that, in order to make out a case against the Bible, he has been guilty of pretty extensive falsehood and misrepresentation. But as there is no logic which renders it imperative that objective realities should give way to sub-

jective feelings, the nearest advance we can make towards these gentlemen is to express our regret that they should have allowed their emotions so to get the better of their judgment, as to blind them to what enlightened reason, no less than Scripture, proclaims as a fundamental truth in morals—that God is displeased with and must punish sin. Take this away, and you destroy the foundations of moral obligation, and reduce responsibility to a mere matter of feeling or of convenience. Deny that God is susceptible of anger, and, as Cicero, Seneca, and Lactantius showed long ago, you *virtually annihilate religion*: for a God *incapable of displeasure is equally incapable of complacency*; a God who cannot punish cannot bless; and why should one worship or fear a God from whom one has nothing to expect or fear?"

Is there no *love* in a mother's heart for the baby in her arms, because she cannot be *angry* with it when it *will* grasp the flame of the candle, or *will* pull down that China vase and break it? "The child knows no better," you will say; but what is the mother's superior wisdom compared with that of the Infinite, who not only knows the weakness of his children but who *made* that weakness?

Let us quit this disagreeable topic, and announce by way of news that EDWARD MIALI has in preparation a work to arrest the attention of all speculative thinkers; it is to be called "*The Basis of Belief*;" or, an Examination of the Claims of Christianity as a Divine Revelation in the light of recognised fact and principle." Having made this announcement, we turn to quieter themes, and first to the paper on *Shakspeare and Goethe*, before mentioned. It is a psychological study, or rather let us say notes towards such a study, of the two greatest intellects of modern times. The writer very properly repudiates the hackneyed saying:—

"All that we know of Shakspeare is, that he was born at Stratford-on-Avon; married and had children there; went to London, where he commenced actor, and wrote plays and poems; returned to Stratford, made his will, died, and was buried." It is our own fault, and not the fault of the materials, if we do not know a great deal more about Shakspeare than that; if we do not realize, for example, those distinct and indubitable facts about him—his special reputation among the critics of his time, as a man not so much of erudition as of prodigious natural genius; his gentleness and openness of disposition; his popular and sociable habits; his extreme ease, and, as some thought, negligence in composition; and above all, and most characteristic of all, his excessive fluency in speech. 'He sometimes required stopping' is Ben Jonson's expression; and whoever does not see a whole volume of revelation respecting Shakspeare in that single trait, has no eye for seeing anything."

It is absurd to say that SHAKSPEARE has not expressed himself in his works; the truth is, we have so little of a clue to what really may be taken as an expression of himself; yet many things one can ascertain:—

"Let any competent person whatever read the Sonnets, and then, with their impression on him, pass to the plays, and he will inevitably become aware of Shakspeare's personal fondness for certain themes or trains of thought, particularly that of the speed and destructiveness of time. Death, vicissitude, the march and tramp of generations across life's stage, the rotting of human bodies in the earth—these and all the other forms of the same thought were familiar to Shakspeare to a degree beyond what is to be seen in the case of any other poet. It seems to have been a habit of his mind, when left to its own tendency, ever to indulge by preference in that oldest of human meditations, which is not yet trite—'Man that is born of a woman is of few days, and full of trouble; he cometh forth as a flower, and is cut down: he fleeth as a shadow, and continueth not.'"

SHAKSPEARE'S supremacy the writer thinks was in the faculty of expression:—

"In other words, Shakspeare was specifically and transcendently a literary man. To say that he was the greatest *man* that ever lived is to provoke a useless controversy and comparisons that lead to nothing between Shakspeare and Caesar, Shakspeare and Charlemagne, Shakspeare and Cromwell; to say that he was the greatest *intellect* that ever lived, is to bring the shades of Aristotle and Plato, and Bacon and Newton, and all your other systematic thinkers grumbling about us, with demands for a definition of intellect, which we are by no means in a position to give; nay, finally, to say that he is the greatest *poet* that the world has produced (a thing which we would certainly say, were we provoked to it) would be unnecessarily to hurt the feelings of Homer and Sophocles, and Dante and Milton. What we will say, then, and what we will challenge the world to gainsay, is that he was the greatest *expresser* that ever lived. This is glory enough, and it leaves the other question open. Other men may have led, on the whole, greater and more impressive lives than he; other men, acting on their fellows through the same medium of speech that he used, may have expended a greater power of thought, and achieved a greater intellectual effect, in one consistent direction; other men, too (though this is very questionable), may have contrived to issue the matter which they did address to the world, in more compact and perfect artistic shapes. But no man that ever lived said such splendid extempore things on all subjects universally; no man that ever lived had the faculty of pouring out on all occasions such a flood of the richest and deepest language. He may have had rivals in the art of imagining situations; he had no rival in the power of sending a gush of the appropriate intellectual effusion over the image and body of a situation once conceived. From the jewelled ring on an alderman's finger to the most mountainous thought or deed of man or demon, nothing suggested itself that his speech could not envelope and enfold with ease. That excessive fluency which astonished Ben Jonson when he listened to Shakspeare in person, astonishes the world yet. Abundance, ease, redundancy, a plenitude of word, sound, or imagery which, were the intellect at work only a little less magnificent, would sometimes end in sheer braggardism and bombast, are the characteristics of Shakspeare's style. Nothing is suppressed, nothing omitted, nothing cancelled. On and on the poet flows, words, thoughts, and fancies crowding on him as fast as he can write, all related to the matter on hand, and all poured forth together, to rise and fall on the waves of an established cadence. Such lightness and ease in the manner, and such prodigious wealth and depth in the matter, are combined in no other writer. How the matter was first accumulated, what proportion of it was the acquired capital of former efforts, and what proportion of it welled up in the poet's mind during and in virtue of the very act of speech, it is impossible to say;



but this at least may be affirmed without fear of contradiction, that there never was a mind in the world from which, when it was pricked by any occasion whatever, there poured forth on the instant such a stream of precious substance intellectually related to it."

Of GOETHE many true and excellent things are said, and the sort of things needful to be said, but they are not spoken from the same fulness of knowledge as those on SHAKSPEARE. The contrasts and resemblances, however, are suggestively stated. Here is one:—

"One thing these love-romances of Goethe's early life make clear—namely, that for a being of such extreme sensibility as he was, he had a very strong element of self-control. When he gave up Lilli, it was with tears, and no end of sleepless nights; and yet he gave her up. Shakspeare, we believe (and there is an instance exactly in point in the story of his sonnets), had no such power of breaking clear from connexions which his judgment disapproved of. Remorse and return, self-reproaches for his weakness at one moment, followed the next by weakness more abject than before—such, by his own confession, was the conduct, in one such case, of our more passive and gentle-hearted poet. Where Shakspeare was 'past cure,' and 'frantic-mad with evermore unrest,' Goethe but fell into 'hypochondria,' which reason and resolution enabled him to overcome. Goethe at twenty-five gave up a young and beautiful girl, from the conviction that it was better to do so. Shakspeare at thirty-five was the abject slave of a dark-complexioned woman, who was faithless to him, and whom he cursed in his heart. The sensibilities in the German poet moved from the first, as we have already said, over a firmer basis of permanent character."

So far from the age of Reviews having expired, here is a new appearance, a *Retrospective Review*, published by the antiquarian bookseller, Mr. RUSSEL SMITH. Its selection of papers is sufficiently various. The opening essay, on the *Dramatic Writings of Afra Behn*, treats a curious subject, but treats it without skill. That on Bishop BERKELEY's celebrated tract on *Tar Water* is very superior, and fulfils all the requisites of a Retrospective Review. *French Pictures of the English in the Last Century* is extremely curious and amusing; curious also that paper on *Population and Emigration in the Seventeenth Century*. We perfectly agree with the conclusions of the paper on *The First Edition of Shakspeare*. In a word, this new Review promises to be both entertaining and valuable; we hope it will meet with sufficient support.

The Magazines this month are duller than usual, and we find little that calls for notice here, beyond the account of Mrs. BEECHER STOWE and the BEECHER family in *Fraser*. Nine of these BEECHERS are authors, and all the members of the family present remarkable peculiarities:—

"All of them have the energy of character, restless activity, strong convictions, tenacity of purpose, deep sympathies, and spirit of self-sacrifice, which are such invaluable qualities in the character of propagandists. It would be impossible for the theologians among them to be members of any other than the Church militant. Father and sons, they have ever been in the thickest of the battles fought in the Church and by it; and always have moved together in solid column. To them, questions of scholastic theology are mummeries, dry and attractionless; they are practical, living in the real present, dealing with questions which palpitate with vitality. Temperance, foreign and home missions, the influence of commerce on public morality, the conversion of young men, the establishment of theological seminaries, education, colonization, abolition, the political obligations of Christians; on matters such as these do the Beechers expend their energies."

The new Magazine called *Public Companies Monthly Manual*, an Industrial and Statistical Magazine, confesses that this, its first number, does not all carry out its intentions; we will reserve our verdict, therefore, until next month, for the present simply announcing the existence of the work.

We have had to record many deaths of men endeared by their talents to a larger or a smaller public, men known to thousands and men known to few; but we have not hitherto had the pain of recording the loss of one within the nearer circle of friendship. We must do so to-day. VINCENT, the youngest son of LEIGH HUNT, has passed away from us in his thirtieth year. Known to the public he was not, although his gentle mind had such sweetness and such delicate strength in it, which one might liken to the quiet smiles of genius, that a collection of his poems would assuredly have found a retired niche for him in the great temple. But if unknown to the great public he was known to a large circle of friends, and loved wherever known for that generous nature of his, so loving, so faithful, so simple, so boyish! Among those friends we presume there are many of our readers, who will hear with sudden mournfulness that the delicate existence they must frequently have trembled for, has passed away from pain, its glimmering spark of life gone to shine in other forms of the Divine Life, leaving behind it that luminous trace which bright affectionate natures leave in human hearts, a trace more to be prized than all the dazzling talents which ever claimed the admiration of a crowd.

#### THACKERAY'S NEW NOVEL.

*The History of Henry Esmond, Esq., a Colonel in the Service of Queen Anne.* Written by Himself. In three vols. Smith, Elder, and Co.

The opening paragraph of this history is not only characteristic of its author, but of the work:—

"The actors in the old tragedies, as we read, piped their iambs to a tune, speaking from under a mask, and wearing stiffs and a great head-dress. 'Twas thought the dignity of the Tragic Muse required these appurtenances, and that she was not to move except to a measure and cadence. So Queen Medea slew her children to a slow music; and King Agamemnon perished in a dying fall (to use Mr. Dryden's words): the Chorus standing by in a set attitude, and rhythmically and decorously bewailing the fates of those great crowned persons. The Muse of History hath encumbered herself with ceremony as well as her Sister of the

Theatre. She too wears the mask and the cothurnus and speaks to measure. She too, in our age, busies herself with the affairs only of kings; waiting on them, obsequiously and stately, as if she were but a mistress of Court ceremonies, and had nothing to do with the registering of the affairs of the common people. I have seen in his very old age and decrepitude the old French King Lewis the Fourteenth, the type and model of king-hood—who never moved but to measure, who lived and died according to the laws of his Court-Marshal, persisting in enacting through life the part of Hero; and divested of poetry, this was but a little wrinkled old man, pock-marked, and with a great periwig and red heels to make him look tall,—a hero for a book if you like, or for a brass statue or a painted-ceiling, a god in a Roman shape, but what more than a man for Madame Maintenon, or the barber who shaved him, or Monsieur Fagon, his surgeon? I wonder shall History ever pull off her periwig and cease to be court-ridden? Shall we see something of France and England besides Versailles and Windsor? I saw Queen Anne at the latter place tearing down the Park slopes after her stag-hounds, and driving her one-horse chaise—a hot, red-faced woman, not in the least resembling that statue of her which turns its stone back upon Saint Paul's, and faces the coaches struggling up Ludgate Hill. She was neither better bred nor wiser than you and me, though we knelt to hand her a letter or a washhand-basin. Why shall History go on kneeling to the end of time? I am for having her rise up off her knees, and take a natural posture: not to be for ever performing cringes and congees like a Court-chamberlain, and shuffling backwards out of doors in the presence of the sovereign. In a word, I would have History familiar rather than heroic: and think that Mr. Hogarth and Mr. Fielding will give our children a much better idea of the manners of the present age in England, than the Court Gazette and the newspapers which we get thence."

It is to show us some reflected image of the time that this book is written; and therefore, unless duly warned, the reader may feel some disappointment when he finds that "Thackeray's new novel" is not a comic novel, scarcely a novel at all, and in no sense a satire. It is a beautiful book, not one sentence of which may be skipped; but it is as unlike *Vanity Fair* and *Pendennis* as a book written by Thackeray can be.

To those who look beyond the passing hour, and see something more in literature than the occupation of a languid leisure, *Esmond* will have many sources of interest. One of these may be the purely biographical one of representing a new phase in Thackeray's growth. Tracing the evolution of his genius from the wild and random sketches which preceded *Vanity Fair*, we perceive an advancing growth, both as a moralist and as an artist. In *Vanity Fair* the mocking mephistophelic spirit was painfully obtrusive; to laugh at the world—to tear away its many masks—to raise the crown even from Cæsar's head, that we might note the baldness which the laurels covered—to make love and devotion themselves ridiculous, seemed his dominant purpose; and had it not been for the unmistakeable kindness, the love of generosity, and the sympathy with truth which brightened those mocking pages, all that has been ignorantly or maliciously said of Thackeray's "heartlessness" would have had its evidence.

In *Pendennis* there was a decided change. The serious and nobler element, before subordinate, there rose to supremacy; the mockery withdrew into the second place. A kinder and a juster appreciation of life gave increased charm to the work. Although, perhaps, not on the whole so amusing, because less novel, and, in some respects, a repetition of *Vanity Fair*, it was, nevertheless, an advance in art, was written with more care, and, as before hinted, was less sarcastic and sceptical.

That vein of seriousness which ran like a small silver thread through the tapestry of *Vanity Fair*, has become the woof of *Esmond*; the mocking spirit has fled; such sarcasm as remains is of another sort—a kind of sad smile, that speaks of pity, not of scorn. Nor is this the only change. That careless disrespect, which on a former occasion we charged him with (*Vide* No. 39), is nowhere visible in *Esmond*. If as a work of art *Esmond* has defects, they are not the defects of carelessness. What he has set himself to do, he has done seriously, after due preparation.

Seeing, as we do, such evidences of growth, and of growth upwards, and remembering that he is only now in his forty-second year, may we not form the highest hopes of such a mind? Considered as a landmark on his career, *Esmond* is of peculiar significance. But we have here to consider it in another light; the reader impatiently asks, "What am I to think of it?"

Little Sir, you are to think *this* of it: An autobiography, written in the autumn light of a calm and noble life, sets before you much of the private and domestic, no less than of the public and historic activity of the reigns of William and Anne. The thread which holds these together is a simple and a touching one—the history of *two* devotions. All who have *lived* will feel here the pulse of real suffering, so different from "romantic woe;" all who have loved will trace a real affection here, more touching because it has a quiet reserve in its expression; but we shall not be in the least surprised to hear even "highly intelligent persons" pronounce it "rather a falling off." But you, good sir, who follow your *Leader*, will honestly declare that it touched and delighted you; that from the first page to the last you loved the book and its author.

Without pretending to that minute knowledge of the period which could alone justify an authoritative opinion, we may say that this book has so much the air and accent of the time, it would impose on us if presented as a veritable History of Colonel Esmond; and this verisimilitude is nowhere obtruded; the art has concealed the art.

In structure and purpose it reminds us of Leigh Hunt's *Sir Ralph Esmer*, to which justice has not been done, because it has been read for a novel. The men of those days, no less than the events, move across the scene, and we get hasty yet vivid glimpses of Addison, Steele, Swift, Bolingbroke, Marlborough, Atterbury, Lord Mohun, and the Pretender. True to that opening passage we have quoted, these historic persons have none of the "dignity of history"—they walk before us "in their habit as they lived."

The characters are numerous, but are rather "sketched in," as one would find them in memoirs, than elaborately developed, as in a fiction. Lady Castlewood and Beatrix are, indeed, full-length portraits; both

charmingly drawn, from the same originals, we suspect, as Mrs. Pendennis and Blanche Amory. The attentive reader will note, however, that in the portrait of the coquette, Beatrix, he has thrown so much real impulsive goodness, that she becomes a new creation—and, let us add, a true one. She is not bad—she is vain; and her fascination is made very intelligible.

What novel readers will say to Lady Castlewood's love, and to Esmond's love for the woman who calls him "son," we will not prophecy; for ourselves we feel, that although *vrai*, it is not always *vraisemblable*. Novel readers will be more unanimous about the dramatic interest of the scenes at the close of the first and third volumes.

We give no hint of the story; but by way of extract will take a passage or two of the purely reflective kind. Who will gainsay this:—

#### LOVE'S YOUNG DREAM.

"'Twas easy for Harry to see, however much his lady persisted in obedience and admiration for her husband, that my lord tired of his quiet life, and grew weary, and then testy, at those gentle bonds with which his wife would have held him. As they say the Grand Lama of Thibet is very much fatigued by his character of divinity, and yawns on his altar as his bonzes kneel and worship him, many a home-god grows heartily sick of the reverence with which his family-devotees pursue him, and sighs for freedom and for his old life, and to be off the pedestal on which his dependents would have him sit for ever, whilst they adore him, and ply him with flowers, and hymns, and incense, and flattery;—so, after a few years of his marriage, my honest Lord Castlewood began to tire; all the high-flown raptures and devotional ceremonies with which his wife, his chief priestess, treated him, first sent him to sleep, and then drove him out of doors; for the truth must be told, that my lord was a jolly gentleman with very little of the august or divine in his nature, though his fond wife persisted in revering it,—and besides, he had to pay a penalty for this love, which persons of his disposition seldom like to defray: and, in a word, if he had a loving wife, had a very jealous and exacting one. Then he wearied of this jealousy: then he broke away from it; then came, no doubt, complaints and recriminations; then, perhaps, promises of amendment not fulfilled; then upbraidings, not the more pleasant, because they were silent, and only sad looks and tearful eyes conveyed them. Then, perhaps, the pair reached that other stage which is not uncommon in married life when the woman perceives that the god of the honeymoon is a god no more; only a mortal like the rest of us,—and so she looks into her heart, and lo! *vacue sedes et inania arcana*. And now, supposing our lady to have a fine genius and a brilliant wit of her own, and the magic spell and infatuation removed from her which had led her to worship as a god a very ordinary mortal—and what follows? They live together, and they dine together, and they say 'my dear' and 'my love' as heretofore; but the man is himself, and the woman herself: that dream of love is over, as everything else is over in life; as flowers and fury, and griefs and pleasures are over."

Or this:—

#### A HOUSE DIVIDED AGAINST ITSELF.

"In houses where, in place of that sacred, inmost flame of love, there is discord at the centre, the whole household becomes hypocritical, and each lies to his neighbour. The husband (or it may be the wife) lies when the visitor comes in, and wears a grin of reconciliation or politeness before him. The wife lies (indeed her business is to do that, and to smile, however much she is beaten), swallows her tears, and lies to her lord and master; lies in bidding little Jacky respect dear papa; lies in assuring grandpapa that she is perfectly happy. The servants lie, wearing grave faces behind their master's chair, and pretending to be unconscious of the fighting; and so, from morning till bed-time, life is passed in falsehood. And wiseacres call this a proper regard of morals, and point out Baucis and Philemon as examples of a good life."

The question of "Woman's Rights," and especially of that unholy right Man exercises in the name of *husband*—a name which sums up in itself all domestic rights—having lately been discussed, let us hear Thackeray on

#### OUR SLAVES.

"Much of the quarrels and hatred which arise between married people come in my mind from the husband's rage and revolt at discovering that his slave and bed-fellow, who is to minister to all his wishes, and is church-sworn to honour and obey him—is his superior; and that *he*, and not *she*, ought to be the subordinate of the twain; and in these controversies, I think, lay the cause of my lord's anger against his lady. When he left her, she began to think for herself, and her thoughts were not in his favour. After the illumination, when the love-lamp is put out that anon we spoke of, and by the common daylight you look at the picture, what a damb it looks! what a clumsy effigy! How many men and wives come to this knowledge, think you? And if it be painful to a woman to find herself mated for life to a boor, and ordered to love and honour a dullard: it is worse still for the man himself perhaps whenever in his dim comprehension the idea dawns that his slave and drudge yonder is, in truth, his superior; that the woman who does his bidding, and submits to his humour, should be his lord; that she can think a thousand things beyond the power of his muddled brains; and that in yonder head, on the pillow opposite to him, lie a thousand feelings, mysteries of thought, latent scorns and rebellions, whereof he only dimly perceives the existence as they look out furtively from her eyes: treasures of love doomed to perish without a hand to gather them; sweet fancies and images of beauty that would grow and unfold themselves into flower; bright wit that would shine like diamonds could it be brought into the sun; and the tyrant in possession crushes the outbreak of all these, drives them back like slaves into the dungeon and darkness, and chafes without that his prisoner is rebellious, and his sworn subject undutiful and refractory. So the lamp was out in Castlewood Hall, and the lord and lady there saw each other as they were. With her illness and altered beauty my lord's fire for his wife disappeared; with his selfishness and faithlessness her foolish fiction of love and reverence was rent away. Love?—who is to love what is base and unlovely? Respect?—who is to respect what is gross and sensual? Not all the marriage oaths sworn before all the parsons, cardinals, ministers, muftis and rabbins in the world, can bind to that monstrous allegiance. This couple was living apart then: the woman happy to be allowed to love and tend her children (who were never of her own good-will away from her), and thankful to have saved such treasures as these out of the wreck in which the better part of her heart went down."

Before concluding, we must quote one of those simple passages, which,

coming quietly from the depth of real experience, go straight to the heart:—

"At certain periods of life we live years of emotion in a few weeks; and look back on those times as on great gaps between the old life and the new. You do not know how much you suffer in those critical maladies of the heart, until the disease is over, and you look back on it afterwards. *The day passes in more or less of pain, and the night wears away somehow.*"

#### BUTLER'S ANALOGY v. MODERN UNBELIEF.

*The Analogy of Religion, Natural and Revealed.* By Joseph Butler, D.C.L. (Standard Library.)

[SECOND ARTICLE.]

H. G. Bohn.

HAVING treated of Rewards and Punishments, Butler next proceeds to show that God's government of the world is *moral*, and that this moral government is the same as we find taught in Scripture. If men were in the habit of attending to logic when debating such questions, they would see at once that the proof of a moral government was no proof of the particular moral government for which Butler argues, but was proof as demonstrative as such proof can be, of the very *contrary*. And yet Butler himself emphatically calls upon us to employ our logic, to appeal to the supreme arbiter, Reason: the passage is so explicit that we must quote it:—

"I express myself with caution, lest I should be mistaken to vilify reason; which is indeed the *only faculty we have wherewith to judge concerning anything, even revelation itself*: or be misunderstood to assert, that a supposed revelation cannot be proved false from internal characters. For, it may contain clear *immoralities or contradictions*; and either of these would prove it false."

We meet him on this ground; we call in Reason to decide.

Let us begin with one of his propositions:—

"The fact that God has given us a Moral Nature is in itself a proof that He will finally support virtue. The fact that God influences mankind to act in the same way, and to favour virtue and to discourage vice, is not the same proof, but an additional proof of his Moral Government. It shows that He does at present favour and protect virtue."

Reason here may ask, Who gave us our *immoral* nature? To say that we gave it ourselves, is to say that God is *not* the Author of our Being, but only of a part thereof; to say that it belongs to our "fallen condition" is no answer—it only removes the difficulty, since the *origin* of the fall has still to be explained: Who is the author of that? God, Satan, or Man? And, with reference to this said "fallen condition," let Reason, also, suggest another question. We are told that although placed with a sinful nature amidst allurements to sin, yet we have Free Will, which, enlightened by Foresight, may guard us from sin. Our foresight of the consequences makes us responsible for our acts. The argument is held to be conclusive. It must be extended. If foresight makes *us* responsible, we must either deny foresight to the Creator, or hold him responsible! It is the old dilemma: either the Creator could not foresee the results of placing man in such a condition; or he could not help it. He is said to "permit wickedness:" but he must foresee the result of that permission, and yet he *punishes*! Butler lends us an illustration:—

"Suppose two or three men, of the best and most improved understanding, in a desolate open plain, attacked by ten times the number of beasts of prey: would their reason secure them the victory in this unequal combat? Power then, though joined with reason, and under its direction, cannot be expected to prevail over opposite power, though merely brutal, unless the one bears some proportion to the other."

If "power, joined with reason," cannot be expected to prevail over a wild beast, how can human strength prevail over Satan? And what is to be said of the morality which "permits Satan," and condemns the defeated struggler to eternal torments? These arguments have, of course, presented themselves to almost every mind "in the spacious circuit of its musing," and theologians, feeling their force, have invented a method of eluding them: this is the doctrine of Probation.

Life is said to be a trial, a state of moral discipline, preparing us for eternity. Moral government implies moral trial. There would be no virtue were there no vice. If men were not in danger how could they be strong?

There is in this general doctrine a truth which carries the assent of all religious minds; and we who hold the "development hypothesis," may readily concede what is here claimed. But, as we have noticed before, the artifice of gaining assent to a general doctrine, and then assuming that it proves the truth of a particular doctrine, is to be guarded against. One may assent to the assertion that there are winged creatures, and yet withhold belief in Ariosto's Hippogrif. In the observations we are about to make, therefore, the reader will bear in mind that they aim at the *particular* not at the *general* doctrine,—at Scripture, not at Religion,—at the Hippogrif, not at morality.

What, then, shall we say of the morality of a system of Government, wherein the governor publishes edicts which he knows *cannot* be obeyed by the vast majority of his subjects—which he foresees must be and will be disregarded, 1. By millions who can never hear of those edicts; 2. By millions who, having heard of them, *cannot*, under the circumstances, obey them; 3. By others who, having read them, cannot believe in their authenticity, but consider them to be forgeries? Such is the state of this world; and damnation is the result! Indeed, as Butler *naïvely* confesses,—

"Indeed the present state is so far from proving, in event, a discipline of virtue to the generality of men, that, on the contrary, they seem to make it a discipline of vice. And the viciousness of the world is in different ways the great temptation which renders it a state of virtuous discipline, in the degree it is to good men."

If "Analogy" tells us anything here, it certainly does not tell us that the Scriptural scheme is a moral one. Indeed, the very notion of a "scheme" destroys the idea of sin, when the Creator is the schemer; for, if sin were not involved in the scheme as a constituent element, it must



have an author *external* to the Creator. But it is taught by Butler himself that all things in this world are inter-related:—

"It is most obvious, analogy renders it highly credible, that, upon supposition of a moral government, it must be a scheme; for the world, and the whole natural government of it, appears to be so; to be a scheme, system, or constitution, whose parts correspond to each other, and to a whole, as really as any work of art, or as any particular model of a civil constitution and government. In this great scheme of the natural world individuals have various peculiar relations to other individuals of their own species. And whole species are, we find, variously related to other species upon this earth. Nor do we know how much further these kinds of relations may extend. And, as there is not any action or natural event which we are acquainted with so single and unconnected as not to have a respect to some other actions and events, so possibly each of them, when it has not an immediate, may yet have a remote, natural relation to other actions and events much beyond the compass of this present world. There seems indeed nothing from whence we can so much as make a conjecture whether all creatures, actions, and events, throughout the whole of nature have relations to each other. But as it is obvious that all events have future unknown consequences, so if we trace any, as far as we can go, into what is connected with it, we shall find that if such event were not connected with somewhat further in nature unknown to us, somewhat both past and present, such event could not possibly have been at all. Nor can we give the whole account of any one thing whatever; of all its causes, ends, and necessary adjuncts, those adjuncts, I mean, without which it could not have been. By this most astonishing connection, these reciprocal correspondences and mutual relations, everything which we see in the course of nature is actually brought about."

Having secured this admission, let us see what light it throws on the argument. The world is a world made by God:—

"And that which constitutes this our trial, in both these capacities, must be somewhat either in our *external circumstances*, or in our *nature*. For, on the one hand, persons may be betrayed into wrong behaviour upon surprise, or overcome upon any other very singular and extraordinary external occasions, who would otherwise have preserved their character of prudence and of virtue: in which cases every one, in speaking of the wrong behaviour of these persons, would impute it to such particular external circumstances. And on the other hand, men who have contracted habits of vice and folly of any kind, or have some particular passions in excess, will seek opportunities, and, as it were, go out of their way to gratify themselves in these respects, at the expense of their wisdom and their virtue; led to it, as every one would say, not by external temptations, but by such habits and passions. And the account of this last case is, that particular passions are no more coincident with prudence, or that reasonable self-love the end of which is our worldly interest, than they are with the principle of virtue and religion, but often draw contrary ways to one as well as to the other; and so such particular passions are as much temptations to act imprudently with regard to our worldly interests as to act viciously. However, as when we say men are misled by external circumstances of temptation, it cannot but be understood that there is somewhat within themselves to render those circumstances temptations, or to render them susceptible of impressions from them; so when we say they are misled by passions, it is always supposed that there are occasions, circumstances, and objects exciting these passions, and affording means for gratifying them. And therefore, temptations from within and from without coincide and mutually imply each other. Now the several external objects of the appetites, passions, and affections being present to the senses, or offering themselves to the mind, and so exciting emotions suitable to their nature, not only in cases where they can be gratified consistently with innocence and prudence, but also in cases where they cannot, and yet can be gratified imprudently and viciously: this as really put them in danger of voluntarily foregoing their present interest or good as their future, and as really renders self-denial necessary to secure one as the other; i.e., we are in a like state of trial with respect to both, by the very same passions, excited by the very same means. Thus mankind having a temporal interest depending upon themselves, and a prudent course of behaviour being necessary to secure it, passions inordinately excited, whether by means of example or by any other external circumstance, towards such objects, at such times or in such degree as that they cannot be gratified consistently with worldly prudence, are temptations—dangerous, and too often successful, temptations—to forego a greater temporal good for a less; i.e., to forego what is, upon the whole, our temporal interest for the sake of a present gratification. This is a description of our state of trial in our temporal capacity. Substitute now the word *future* for *temporal*, and *virtue* for *prudence*; and it will be just as proper a description of our state of trial in our religious capacity, so analogous are they to each other."

Again:—

"Every species of creature is, we see, designed for a particular way of life, to which the nature, the capacities, temper, and qualifications of each species, are as necessary as their external circumstances. Both come into the notion of such state or particular way of life, and are constituent parts of it. Change a man's capacities or character to the degree in which it is conceivable they may be changed, and he would be altogether incapable of a human course of life, and human happiness; as incapable as if, his nature continuing unchanged, he were placed in a world where he had no sphere of action, nor any objects to answer his appetites, passions, and affections of any sort. One thing is set over against another, as an ancient writer expresses it. Our nature corresponds to our external condition. Without this correspondence there would be no possibility of any such thing as human life and human happiness, which life and happiness are, therefore, a result from our nature and condition jointly; meaning by human life, not living in the literal sense, but the whole complex notion commonly understood by those words."

All this amounts to the assertion that God made us the weak erring creatures we are, made the external circumstances which are to cause our error, and he has done so in order that we may—become moral! The obvious answer that it would have been simpler, and, above all, kinder, to make us moral at once, cannot be met, except by sophistries it pains one to hear. [We may add, parenthetically, that for ourselves, we disapprove all arguments respecting what God *might* have done, in the same way as we disapprove arguments respecting what he has done; we employ the weapons, however, of those we combat.]

The sophistry which underlies Butler's argumentation, may be once more illustrated in the following passage:—

"We are an inferior part of the creation of God. There are natural appearances of our being in a state of degradation. And we certainly are in a condition which

does not seem by any means the most advantageous we could imagine or desire, either in our natural or moral capacity, for securing either our present or future interest. However, this condition, low and careful and uncertain as it is, *does not afford any just ground of complaint*. For, as men may manage their temporal affairs with prudence, and so pass their days here on earth in tolerable ease and satisfaction, by a moderate degree of care; so likewise with regard to religion, there is no more required than what they are well able to do, and what they must be greatly wanting to themselves if they neglect. And for persons to have that put upon them which they are well able to go through, and no more, we naturally consider as an equitable thing, supposing it done by proper authority."

Virtue is here represented as so easy, requiring no more than what we are all well able to do; yet awhile ago, we heard him tell us how really this world seemed a discipline of vice, owing to our fallen condition! and we would ask further, *Is belief easy?* If I do not believe in the Bible, I am to be damned, whether I have ever heard of that Bible, or not—whether I have even the "purity of heart" or the openness of intellect requisite or not; if I don't believe, the penalty is certain. Is that requisition easy? Will moderate care and prudence coerce my convictions?

Butler has called upon Reason as the arbiter even of Revelation. In answer, we call upon Reason to say what proof from "Analogy" it derives to demonstrate these propositions:—

1st. This life is a moral trial. We are surrounded by dangers meant expressly for our fall. The Creator, in scheming the whole of our life, foresaw that these temptations would in almost every case prevail, for he gave men temptable natures, as he gave oxygen an affinity for phosphorus.

2nd. But although he foresaw that men would fall, he gave them also a power of foresight which would warn them of their fall.

3rd. And if that foresight did not prevent their fall (he knew it would not), then as a punishment for falling he assigned eternal agonies in fire and brimstone.

4th. He gave them Free Will to choose between Virtue and Vice, but he gave them also a "fallen nature," which so adapted them to vice, that he foresaw which they must follow.

The moral trial thus becomes "analogous" to tight-rope dancing. Man may by sedulous efforts accomplish the perilous feat, after long training, of dancing on a tight-rope; but we do not regard that father as a strictly moral being who forces his son to learn that perilous art, even though "improved command of muscles" be the consequence of success, as broken bones are of failure. Nor can we regard that scheme as strictly moral, which says, The Creator made men, and as Virtue is his only delight, he wished them to be virtuous; for this purpose he placed them in a set of conditions which made virtue impossible to the vast majority, and infinitely arduous to the few; declaring, moreover, that all who were not virtuous should suffer everlastingly; that all who were virtuous should also suffer if they did not believe in the Book he had written, or caused to be written, although that Book never came under the sight of millions, and seemed preposterous to the eyes of many who did behold it.

Therefore, in the name of the New Theology against the Old, we say, that if Reason is called upon to decide in this matter, she decides emphatically against the "Scriptural scheme" as immoral and contradictory, and against Butler's *Analogy* as a false analogy.

In our next we shall extend this examination of the *Analogy of Natural and Revealed Religion*, for the present contenting ourselves with this illustrative passage:—

"And suppose the invisible world and the invisible dispensations of Providence to be in any sort analogous to what appears, or that both together make up one uniform scheme, the two parts of which, the part which we see, and that which is beyond our observation, are analogous to each other, then there must be a like natural tendency in the derived power throughout the universe, under the direction of virtue, to prevail in general over that which is not under its direction, as there is in reason, derived reason in the universe, to prevail over brute force."

N.B. We have received a letter from *Cronippus*, in reply to our first article, and we beg him to permit our withholding it until the completion of the series of articles, when we shall be happy to let him be heard in defence, no less than other correspondents who may feel disposed to take up the side adverse to our own. In making this offer, however, we must trust to the generous constructions of our correspondents, if the voluminousness or the tone of their letters do not allow us to publish all we receive. They will remember this is a newspaper, and it is only from a desire of fairness that we admit reply at all.

#### BOOKS ON OUR TABLE.

|   |                              |
|---|------------------------------|
| <i>Uncle Tom's Cabin.</i>   | G. Routledge.                |
| <i>Short Short-Hand.</i> By L. W. Tear.   | Whittaker and Co.            |
| <i>The Revenue and Commerce of the United Kingdom, for 1851, contrasted with the Transactions of Previous Years.</i> By George Troup. | T. Saunders.                 |
| <i>My Life and Acts in Hungary, in the Years 1848 and 1849.</i> By A. Görgei. 2 vols.   | David Bogue.                 |
| <i>The People's Palace and the Religious World.</i> By a Layman.  | Arthur Hall, Virtue, and Co. |
| <i>The Parlour Library—The Jacquerie.</i> By G. P. R. James.  | Simms and McIntyre.          |
| <i>Principles of Imitative Art.</i> By George Butler, M.A.  | J. W. Parker.                |
| <i>Tail's Edinburgh Magazine.</i>   | Partridge and Oakley.        |
| <i>The Reformer's Almanac for 1853.</i>   | Aylott and Jones.            |

#### The Arts.

##### TWO COMEDIES.

I HAVE seen two Comedies this week, which called up more reflections in my mind than I shall have time to express here, the more so, as you would feel but mediocre gratitude for such an assault upon your patience. One of these comedies was a work of high pretensions; the other was as modest as it was agreeable. *Richelieu in Love* is the name of the one; the name of the other is *Married Daughters and Young Husbands*. An "historical comedy" was the pretension of the HAYMARKET piece; a "comic drama" that of the LYCEUM piece.

Rumour attributing *Richelieu in Love* to a lady, I will be as tender towards it as natural gallantry commands; but this much I may perhaps

state without offence,—viz., whatever talent the play manifested, it certainly did not manifest *dramatic* talent—that peculiar art which is born with a man just as poetry is born with him, which no labour will acquire, which even genius moves impotently in, as many illustrious poets have too plainly shown,—that art, I say, is not given to the authoress of *Richelieu in Love*, and nothing on the stage will replace it. Now, that art the young and unknown author of *Married Daughters and Young Husbands* unmistakably has. I do not say he has it in any high perfection, as yet; but the critic will at once recognize in the skill with which the characters are presented and contrasted—in the spontaneousness of the dialogue, always pleasant, if not in the highest kind of wit,—in the dramatic touches of domestic feeling—and in the constructive skill—the presence of a real *dramatic instinct*; and I shall look forward to this young man producing some charming pieces, perhaps even a *chef d'œuvre*. Go and see the piece, and compare its gay life with the lifelessness of *Richelieu in Love*, and you will fully appreciate the difference between a dramatic work and a literary effort to be dramatic. Remember, I do not present this little drama to you as a wonder; it is a quiet, modest, pleasant little two-act piece, which would be alarmed at criticism, but which criticism may fairly acknowledge as belonging to the English drama—a genuine little comedy.

The acting in *Richelieu in Love* calls for little remark. Webster as the *Cardinal* was admirably made up; and in the scene where the *Queen* spurns his love, his face and bearing were most eloquent; but this scene is the only opportunity he has. Mrs. Stirling and Mrs. Selby did their best with two indifferent parts, and Leigh Murray, for the first time in his life, was positively “at sea” with his part.

The acting of the *LYCEUM* piece was good throughout; but especial notice is due to Mr. Suter's hearty and humorous picture of the grocer married above his “station.” Frank Mathews has a bit of character; Roxby a languid fop; Baker, a milkman, who “waits at parties” under the name of “Montgomery;” Mrs. Frank Mathews, a vulgar widow, horribly afraid of vulgarity; Julia St. George, a “proper” wife for the hearty grocer; and Miss M. Oliver, an interesting young wife. They were all in capital spirits, and played their parts as if they enjoyed them.

A line or two will be sufficient to chronicle the success of the new farce at the *HAYMARKET*, *A Capital Match*, which succeeded, because of the admirable acting of Keeley, who scarcely ever left the stage. It is a slight affair, and turns on Mr. Sunnyside's perplexities to secure a husband for a young lady who is already married.

I promised last week to speak at some length of *Anne Blake* after reading it; the book, however, is not yet published. Therefore, Mr. Chairman, with your leave, I move that the criticism be adjourned; those who are of that opinion will hold up their hands; the contrary theirs: carried!

VIVIAN.

### KING HENRY THE FIFTH.

Not content with making his solemn temple a school for the national drama, Mr. Phelps has converted Sadler's Wells into a school of martial fervour and national glory for the young militiamen of Middlesex, “of a roving disposition and five feet two,” as Mr. Macaulay describes them, who are training (in tight and staring stocks and scarlet) to die for our homes and altars, as policemen die for our areas and kitchens. Seriously I believe the production of *Henry the Fifth* to be a capital substitute for the ballot in completing our regiments of volunteers. The most unwarlike man that ever grasped a steel pen fires up and longs for a stouter weapon, as he gazes with a tossing heart on that page of England's annals so nobly illustrated by Phelps and his gallant army. Many (among whom I regret not to name myself) remember the production of this grand historical spectacle at Drury Lane as one of the crowning triumphs of Macready's direction. Mr. Phelps, who has with equal courage and modesty, and with all the fidelity and enthusiasm of a disciple, followed

the traces of his master, on a smaller stage and with humbler resources, revives *Henry the Fifth* at a most opportune moment, when National defence is the cry, and “Louis Napoleon in the Channel,” the vague expectation. Nothing can be more complete than the *ensemble* of this representation: every scene, every grouping, every movement, every *tableau*, carefully and intelligently studied. The result reminds you of the doings of the *Théâtre Historique* in the days of Dumas, for brilliant colour, and smart, unflagging animation. The moving panorama of the storming of Harfleur, and the various passages of the camp and the battle, are alone worth a visit even to the most illegitimate of playgoers, and well repay the rather tedious twang of Mr. Henry Marston, who (as *Chorus*) of the language and the glowing picturesqueness of the descriptions. The misfortune of Shakspeare's historical plays, considered as *acting* plays, is the crowd of minor characters (in a dramatic sense), but who, in fact, represent high-bred and gallant gentlemen, or, to say the least, human beings, who do not ex-aspirate their h's and assassinate the rhythm. Now, these parts necessarily falling to the talents of supernumeraries, who have not the finest ear for poetry in the world (not to speak of their tuneful voices or their discordant legs), whole scenes are literally *swamped*. You will at once imagine the attitudes so free and unconstrained, the easy badinage, the proud and haughty defiance, as we find all these artistic phases conceived by that dense array of unacknowledged tragedians who figure in the playbill and in the council chambers of *Henry the Fifth* and the *King of France*.

Now, having vented my acid dispositions, let me tell you what a fine presentment Phelps gave us of the *King*. He seemed to revel in the part. His bearing was kingly in the best sense: brave, generous, and kindly, and full of gentle dignity: and in the battle, he was Harry to the life. He gave the celebrated speech—

“This day is call'd—the feast of Crispian,”

with immense spirit, and carried the house away with him. In the scene with the soldier, the night before the battle, he wore well the humour, at once grave and genial, of the disguise. In that charming courtship of *Katharine* (deliciously played, by-the-bye, by Miss T. Bassano), in the last act, the homely heartiness of the *King*, so racy of the soil of England, was never divorced from a certain grace and chivalry of manner, at once simple and refined.

Let me say, that Mrs. Henry Marston was a capital *Mrs. Quickly*. The description of *Falstaff's* death, that exquisite bit of pathos, so far-reaching in its simplicity, was given with the intelligence of a real artist. I was sorry to observe, however, that a part of the audience, usually so discriminating, turned the pathos into ugliness, and laughed incontinently. The three “swashers” were well made up, and not inefficiently acted. Mr. George Bennett's reading is always careful and correct, and full of *purpose*, but he has a regrettable habit of balking his utterance by dragging the time on the last words of a sentence, and so making the sense inaudible. On the whole, I preferred the *Bardolph* (Mr. Knight) of the three.

Mr. Lewis Ball looked *Fluellen* like a genuine Welshman, and there was a choleric but kindly crispness in his manner, quite enjoyable. Mr. Barrott was a very sturdy and un-stagey *Bates*. That word “un-stagey” is high praise; for it implies naturalness, a rare vision on the stage.

On the whole, I again beg all my readers to go to Sadler's Wells to see *Henry the Fifth*. Even members of the Peace Society may go—they are typified in the play by that hyper-logical militia-man, *Williams*. As for myself, I freely confess that I came out of the theatre more than ever convinced that

“Upon one pair of English legs

Would march three Frenchmen.”

And a very proper and orthodox conviction, too!

LE CHAT-HUANT.

### SELF-EXPANDING TENDENCIES IN THE UNIVERSITY.

—The improvement in character in the aristocracy, though it had commenced long before 1832, did not save them from being compelled to share their power with those to whom, in fact, they owed that improvement; and as the altered system does its work, and suffuses society with another temper, the people are now demanding an analogous share in the intellectual to what they then obtained in the political advantages of the country. So far the universities have belonged to the old orders; they have improved themselves, but only for them, and in their direction; and they are now defined in the evidence before us as “finishing schools for the higher classes.” Yet the exclusiveness which is preserved in form and in general tone has not been proof against opinion; and, as in 1832, large portions of the aristocracy went over to the opposition, and assisted them in winning their privileges, so in this report before us, we have the happy spectacle presented to us of a large-minded body of gentlemen, who although trained by Oxford, and keenly and fully alive to her excellences, have dared to open their eyes to the imminent and inevitable changes which are coming on her, and are ready, with heart and hand, to guide and to assist. —“*The Oxford Commission*,” *Westminster Review*.

OBSCLETE FORMS INTERPRETED BY THE PREVAILING SPIRIT.—In all well organized human institutions the letter of obsolete laws remains as long as possible untouched; custom is recognised as the legal exponent of their meaning, and in all cases repeals them by neglect before they are blotted off the statute book. The outlaws of obsolete college statutes may indeed appear to lead a life of great complexity to the infringing these; but, in fact, they are an extensive and im-

portant precedent. The members of the Established Church pray weekly that the magistrate may have grace to maintain orthodoxy with the civil sword, and that the queen may govern according to the divine ordinances as having authority thereto from God, while yet they abhor persecution, while they will not allow their queen the free choice even of her own household, and would hold themselves emancipated from their allegiance if she ventured to impose a tax or punish a heretic without consent of Parliament. Insincerity in prayer is as serious as insincerity in an oath, if either deserve to be so called—but, in fact, there is no insincerity in one or the other: time has washed out from the words their historical meaning, and they are interpreted as subject to the limitations and changes to which all human things are liable.—“*The Oxford Commission*,” *Westminster Review*.

METEOR AT WAKEFIELD.—On Thursday evening, a beautiful meteoric phenomenon was observed in Wakefield, about half-past eight o'clock, by a large number of people. A brilliant body, somewhat resembling a comet in form and appearance, shot across the heavens from a south-eastern direction towards the north. Its head was of almost dazzling brilliance, and apparently much larger than either the planets Venus or Jupiter on a fine night, and its light clearer and more transparent. To this ball of light was attached a kind of tail, composed of a variety of colours of greater or less distinctness, the whole gliding off into a kind of misty whiteness. Before its final disappearance it extended to a considerable length, and was certainly a most beautiful phenomenon. The time occupied in its descent could not be more than three or four seconds.—*Wakefield Journal*.

## Commercial Affairs.

### MONEY MARKET AND CITY INTELLIGENCE.

#### BRITISH FUNDS FOR THE PAST WEEK.

(CLOSING PRICES.)

|                       | Satur. | Mond. | Tues. | Wedn. | Thurs. | Frid. |
|-----------------------|--------|-------|-------|-------|--------|-------|
| Bank Stock            | 223½   | 224½  | 224½  | 224½  | 223½   | 223½  |
| 3 per Cent. Red.      | 99½    | 99½   | 99½   | 99½   | 99½    | 99½   |
| 3 per Cent. Con. Ans. | 100½   | 100½  | 100½  | 100½  | 100½   | 100½  |
| 3 per Cent. Con. Ac.  | 100½   | 100½  | 100½  | 100½  | 100½   | 100½  |
| 3½ per Cent. An.      | 103½   | 103½  | 103½  | 103½  | 103½   | 103½  |
| New 5 per Cents.      | 103½   | 103½  | 103½  | 103½  | 103½   | 103½  |
| Long Ans., 1860       | 6½     | 6½    | 6½    | 6½    | 6½     | 6½    |
| India Stock           | 275    | 275   | 275   | 275   | 275    | 275   |
| Ditto Bonds, £1000    | 87     | 87    | 87    | 87    | 87     | 87    |
| Ditto, under £1000    | 84     | 84    | 84    | 84    | 84     | 84    |
| Ex. Bills, £1000      | 78 p   | 77 p  | 77 p  | 75 p  | 75 p   | 75 p  |
| Ditto, £500           | 78 p   | 78 p  | 78 p  | 78 p  | 78 p   | 78 p  |
| Ditto, Small          | 78 p   | 78 p  | 78 p  | 78 p  | 78 p   | 78 p  |

#### FOREIGN FUNDS.

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

|                           |     |                            |       |
|---------------------------|-----|----------------------------|-------|
| Belgian 4½ per Cents.     | 96  | Peruvian 3 per Cent. Def.  | 62½   |
| Brazilian 5 per Cents.    | 101 | Russian, 1822              | 118½  |
| (Rothschild's)            | 101 | Russian 4½ per Cents.      | 106½  |
| Brazilian New, 1829 & 39  | 101 | Sardinian 5 per Cents.     | 97½   |
| Buenos Ayres 6 p. Cents.  | 80½ | Spanish 3 p. Cents.        | 61½   |
| Chilian 3 per Cents.      | 78  | Spanish 3 p. Cts. New Def. | 25½   |
| Dutch 2½ per Cents.       | 64½ | Spanish Passives, Conv.    | 61    |
| Dutch 4 per Cent. Certif. | 97  | Spanish Com. Certif. of    | 31    |
| Mexican 3 per Cents.      | 24½ | Coupon not funded          | 31    |
| Peruvian, 1849            | 104 | Swedish Loan 6 per Cent.   | 104   |
| Portuguese 5 per Cents.   | 41  | Turkish Loan, 6 per Cent.  | 104   |
| Converted, 1841           | 41  | 1852                       | 3 pm. |



**WATCHES! WATCHES! WATCHES!**

Save 50 per Cent. by purchasing your Watches direct from the Manufacturer, at the Wholesale Trade Price.

Warranted Gold Watches, extra jewelled, with all the recent improvements ..... £3 15 0  
The same Movements in Silver Cases ..... 2 0 0  
Handsome Morocco Cases for same ..... 0 2 0  
Every other description of Watch in the same proportion.

Sent Free to any part of the Kingdom upon receipt of One Shilling Extra.

Duplex and other Watches practically Repaired and put in order, at the Trade Prices, at

**DANIEL ELLIOTT HEDGER'S WHOLESALE WATCH MANUFACTORY,**

**27, CITY ROAD, near Finsbury Square, London.**

\*\* Merchants, Captains, and the Trade supplied in any quantities on very favourable terms.

**THE GREAT PARIS BREWERY**  
(LA GRANDE BRASSERIE DE PARIS.)

Société en Commandite.

Capital, £100,000, in 25,000 Shares of £4, or 100f. each.

Deposit, £2; the remaining £2 on the 1st of May, 1853. The responsibility, according to the Laws of France, is limited to the amount of the share, which is payable to bearer, and transferable from hand to hand.

**CONSEIL DE SURVEILLANCE.**

John Gunning, C.B., Inspector-General of Army Hospitals, 14, Rue St. Florentin.  
Mordaunt Ricketts, Esq., 27, Avenue d'Antin, Champs Elysées.  
George G. Sigmond, Member of the Royal College of Physicians, London, Professor of Medical Botany, &c., 32, Rue de la Paix.  
George Smith, Esq., Chateau Boubiers, Enghien.  
Major Carmichael Smyth, E.I.C., 19, Rue d'Angoulême, Champs Elysées.  
Captain William Stewart, R.A., 46, Rue de Rivoli.

**BANKERS.**

The Union Bank of London.

**SOLICITORS.**

Messrs. Murray, Rymer, and Murray, 7, Whitehall Place, London.

**BROKER.**

Edward Cazenove, 39, Lothbury.

**ENGINEER.**

W. L. Tizard, late Manager of the Nine Elms Brewery, Vauxhall; Author of "The Theory and Practice of Brewing Illustrated," Patentee of the Mashing Attenuator, &c.

The vast superiority in the strength and flavour of the malt liquors of Great Britain over those of other countries is universally admitted, and arises, not as commonly supposed, from any peculiarity of climate but from the exclusive use of the best materials, and the care and attention bestowed in their manufacture. The quality of the water is, no doubt, a point of considerable importance; but an analysis of the water of Paris shows it to be equal, if not superior, to that of London for all the purposes of brewing, and, in some instances, similar to that used in the manufacture of the celebrated Burton ales. Excellent barley and hops being equally at command, the superiority of the English beers can only arise from the causes already mentioned.

The Great Paris Brewery is therefore established with a firm conviction that, with sufficient capital, the use of the best materials, care and attention in the manufacture, and the adoption of the most improved machinery, beer can be produced in France of a quality equal to the British, and of the various kinds so justly famed under the names of Scotch and Edinburgh Ales, Bitter Ale, London Porter, and Dublin Stout. Thus the Scotch Ale may be represented by "La Bière Impériale," the Bitter Ale by "La Bière de Santé," &c.

The consumption of beer in Paris and its vicinity is rapidly increasing, particularly amongst the middle and labouring classes, from a growing conviction that it is more conducive to their health and strength than their low-priced wines and spirits, even when unadulterated. The manufacture, therefore, of a superior description of beer to that in common use, which may be accomplished at the present or a triflingly higher price, would not only cause an increased demand, but, in a great measure, supersede the inferior article; and when the petty breweries of Paris are compared with the vast establishments in London, and the enormous fortunes realized by their owners, the success of the present undertaking can hardly admit of a doubt, nor any limit be assigned to its operations, extensive orders being anticipated from Algeria and other French colonies, California, &c.

Without any desire to excite undue expectations, it may be stated, that almost every Company in Paris, where directed by English skill and energy, has been eminently successful; and it is by the advice of those French gentlemen who intend to become members of this Association, that the Conseil de Surveillance is composed exclusively of English residents in Paris.

Applications for Shares, under cover and pre-paid, may be made in London to the Solicitors or Broker; and in Paris to either of the Council, or at the Office of the Company, 12, Place Vendôme.

8000 Shares only can be allotted in England, and no applications will be received after Saturday, the 13th instant.

**THE CONSUMERS' PROTECTION SOCIETY.**

It is proposed to establish a society for the protection of consumers, to comprehend all those persons who, recognising the principle, may desire to give the sanction of their names and stations to the correction of an acknowledged evil—to form an Executive Committee who would undertake to conduct the necessary correspondence through which it may be acquired, and agencies established in all parts of the kingdom—to invite the formation of local and auxiliary societies, and to assist all who may apply for special information, as a means of guiding them in their transactions. The publication generally to comprehend information regarding the production and supply of the various articles of food, building materials, medicine, clothing, furniture, implements, &c.—the elements of cost in raising, preparing, and distributing them—the adulterations, frauds and impositions practised, the means of detection, and the channels through which better supplies may be procured at fair rates.

Prospectuses may be had at the following Booksellers in London:—Messrs. Ridgway, 123, Piccadilly; B. and W. Boone, 29, New Bond Street; and Pelham Richardson, 23, Cornhill.

**THE OAK MUTUAL LIFE ASSURANCE**  
and LOAN COMPANY, 49, Moorgate Street.

Parties intending to effect Life Assurances or Endowments, or to purchase immediate or deferred Annuities, are invited to examine the prospectus of the above Company, which offers and secures advantages not to be met with in other institutions of a similar nature.

G. MANNERS COODE, Secretary.

Active and influential agents wanted in town and country.

**THE PENINSULAR AND ORIENTAL**  
STEAM NAVIGATION COMPANY

Book Passengers and receive Goods and Parcels for MALTA, EGYPT, INDIA, and CHINA, by their Steamers leaving Southampton on the 20th of every Month.

The Company's Steamers also start for MALTA and CONSTANTINOPLE on the 29th, and VIGO, OPORTO, LISBON, CADIZ, and GIBRALTAR, on the 7th, 17th, and 27th of the Month.

For further information apply at the Company's Offices, 122, Leadenhall Street, London; and Oriental Place, Southampton.

**EMIGRATION.—To the Proprietors of the**  
London and South Western Railway Company.

The undersigned is able to state that he has this day settled with his Shipping Agents, Messrs. Hotchkiss and Mobbs, the accounts of the Ship "Ballengiech," A 1, which sailed for Port Philip, Australia, on the 18th September, with 190 adults, and 247 souls on board.

This Ship was under Mrs. Chisholm's regulations and personal control.

In the case of provisions, water, and fittings, the undersigned in each case took the highest, and not the lowest, tender made, in order to secure to the Emigrants the best provisions.

The personal risk to the undersigned was upwards of £4000. He is able to state that the profit, when the proceeds from Australia of Cargo and Emigrants landed are received, will approach £500. He trusts that the above advantages of sending Emigrant Ships from Southampton rather than the Thames will be demonstrated by the result of this voyage, while the danger and delay of the Downs and Goodwin Sands will have been entirely saved to the Emigrants. The undersigned therefore trusts that all Government Emigrants will in future go from Southampton, and not from London, as all such persons now do. The Railway Company under whom the undersigned serves, has been amply paid for every Emigrant conveyed to the Ship, and every one of the Stores and Cargo so conveyed. Two boxes for Mrs. Chisholm were only paid for by that lady.

The undersigned merely inserts this advertisement that the result may be known, and that others with larger means than himself may go and do likewise.

WYNDHAM HARDING,

Secretary of the London and South Western Railway.

Wimbledon, 26th October, 1852.

P.S.—Since writing the above, the Secretary has received the acceptance by H.M. Land and Emigration Commissioners, of the Tender of this Company to provide Depôts at Nine Elms and Southampton, so that the emigrants may in future be embarked from Southampton, rather than from Deptford, by which they will avoid the perils of the Downs and Goodwin Sands, and for which he conceives there is reason to return thanks to Divine Providence.

**BARON LIEBIG ON PALE ALES.**

If I wished to associate with any individual brewery my remarks on the alleged adulteration of bitter beer with strychnine, it would have been only natural to have mentioned another brewery, in which alone, and not in Mr. Allsopp's, I was engaged in investigating the Burton mode of brewing, and it was also in that brewery, and not in Mr. Allsopp's, that the Bavarian brewers acquired all the instructions they obtained—at Burton. The admiration I expressed of this beverage, in my letter to Mr. Allsopp, is advertised in such a manner as to lead to the inference that my praise was exclusively confined to Mr. Allsopp's beer; this was not the case; my remarks referred to that class of beer.

JUSTUS LIEBIG.

Giessen, July 24, 1852.

N.B.—The Baron's original letter is in the hands of Mr. Miller, at the Jerusalem Coffee-house, Cornhill, where it may be seen by any one taking an interest in the matter.

**HEAL & SON'S EIDER DOWN QUILTS**

are made in three varieties,—The BORDERED QUILT, the PLAIN QUILT, and the DUVER. The Bordered Quilt is in the usual form of bed quilts, and is a most elegant and luxurious article. The Plain Quilt is smaller, and is useful as an extra covering on the bed, as a wrapper in the carriage, or on the couch. The Duver is a loose case filled with Eider Down, as in general use on the Continent.

Lists of Prices and Sizes sent free by post, on application to HEAL & SON'S Bedding Factory, 196, Tottenham Court Road.

**THE BEST MATTING AND MATS OF**  
COCOA-NUT FIBRE.

The Jury of Class XXVIII. Great Exhibition, awarded the Prize Medal to T. TRELOR, at whose warehouse (42, Ludgate Hill) purchasers will find an assortment of Cocoa-Nut Fibre manufactures, unequalled for variety and excellence at the most moderate prices.

Catalogues free by post. T. Trelor, Cocoa-Nut Fibre Manufacturer, 42, Ludgate Hill, London.

**BANKS OF DEPOSIT AND SAVINGS BANKS.**

INVESTMENT OF CAPITAL AND SAVINGS.

**NATIONAL ASSURANCE and INVESTMENT ASSOCIATION,**

7, ST. MARTIN'S PLACE, TRAFALGAR SQUARE, LONDON, AND 56, PAUL MALL, MANCHESTER.

Established in 1844.

**TRUSTEES.**

Lieut.-Col. the Right Honourable Lord George Paget, M.P.  
Rev. Joseph Prendergast, D.D., (Cantab.) Lewisham.  
George Stone, Esq., Banker, Lombard Street.  
Matthew Hutton Chaytor, Esq., Reigate.

The Investment of Money with this Association secures equal advantages to the Savings of the Provident, and the Capital of the Affluent, and affords to both the means of realising the highest rate of Interest yielded by first-class securities, in which alone the Funds are employed.

The constant demand for advances upon securities of that peculiar class, which are offered almost exclusively to Life Assurance Companies, such as Reversions, Life Interests, &c., enables the Board of Management to employ Capital on more advantageous terms and at higher rates of Interest than could otherwise, with equal safety, be obtained.

The present rate of Interest is five per cent. per annum, and this rate will continue to be paid so long as the Assurance department finds the same safe and profitable employment for money.

Interest payable half-yearly in January and July.

Money intended for Investment is received daily between the hours of 10 and 4 o'clock, at the Offices of the Association.

Immediate Annuities granted, and the business of Life Assurance in all its branches, transacted, on highly advantageous terms. Rates, Prospectuses, and Forms of Proposal, with every requisite information, may be obtained on application at the offices of the Association, or to the respective Agents throughout the United Kingdom.

PETER MORRISON, Managing Director.

Applications for Agencies may be made to the Managing Director.

ESTABLISHED 1837.

Incorporated by special Act of Parliament.

Intending Life Assurers and Policy Holders in other Companies are invited to examine the rates, principles, and position of the

**SCOTTISH PROVIDENT INSTITUTION**  
for MUTUAL LIFE ASSURANCE by MODERATE PREMIUMS.

THE SCOTTISH PROVIDENT INSTITUTION claims superiority over other mutual offices in the following particulars:—

- 1.—Premiums at early and middle age about a fourth lower.
- 2.—A more accurate adjustment of the rates of premium to the several ages.
- 3.—A principle in the division of the surplus more safe, equitable, and favourable to good lives.
- 4.—Exemption from entry money.

All policies indisputable, unless obtained by fraud.

**SPECIMENS OF PREMIUMS.**

Annual Premiums for £100, with whole profits.

| Age | 20   | 25     | 30    | 35     | 40     | 45    | 50    | 55     |
|-----|------|--------|-------|--------|--------|-------|-------|--------|
| £1  | 15 8 | 1 18 0 | 2 1 6 | 2 6 10 | 2 14 9 | 3 5 9 | 4 1 7 | 5 1 11 |

Annual Premiums, payable for 21 years only, for £100, with whole profits.

| Age | 20   | 25     | 30     | 35     | 40    | 45     | 50    |
|-----|------|--------|--------|--------|-------|--------|-------|
| £2  | 7 10 | 2 10 8 | 2 14 6 | 2 19 8 | 3 6 4 | 3 14 9 | 4 7 2 |

A comparison of these premiums with those of any other office will at once show the immediate advantage secured in the SCOTTISH PROVIDENT. The premiums payable for 21 years only are nearly the same as many offices require during the whole of life.

**PROGRESS.**

Since its institution in 1837, this Society has issued upwards of 5750 policies, the assurances exceeding Two Millions and a Half, a result the more satisfactory, as the Directors have firmly adhered to their rule of allowing No Commission to any other than their own recognised official agents.

Its whole affairs are in the most prosperous condition, as shown by the Annual Reports, which with prospectus, tables of annuity and assurance premium, and every information may be obtained, free, on application to the London Branch, 12, Moorgate Street, City.

GEORGE GRANT, Resident Secretary.

**PROFESSIONAL LIFE ASSURANCE COMPANY.**

Admitting, on equal terms, persons of every class and degree to all its benefits and advantages.

Capital—Two Hundred and Fifty Thousand Pounds.

Chairman—MAJOR HENRY STONES, LL.B.

Deputy-Chairman—JAMES ANDREW DURHAM, ESQ.

With upwards of Fourteen Hundred Shareholders.

There are two important clauses in the Deed of Settlement by which the Directors have power to appropriate ONE-TENTH of the entire profits of the Company:—

- 1st.—For the relief of aged and distressed parties assured for life, who have paid five years' premiums, their widows and orphans.
- 2nd.—For the relief of aged and distressed original proprietors, assured or not, their widows and orphans, together with 5 per cent. per annum on the capital originally invested by them.

All Policies indisputable and free of stamp duty.

Rates of Premium extremely moderate.

No extra charge for going to or residing at (in time of peace) Australasia—Bermuda—Madeira—Cape of Good Hope—Mauritius—and the British North American Colonies.

Medical men in all cases remunerated for their report.

Assurances granted against paralysis, blindness, accidents, insanity, and every other affliction, bodily and mental, at moderate rates.

A liberal commission allowed to agents.

Annual premium for assuring £100, namely:—

| Age | 20   | 25     | 30     | 35     | 40    | 45    | 50     |
|-----|------|--------|--------|--------|-------|-------|--------|
| £1  | 10 9 | 1 19 6 | 2 10 9 | 2 14 9 | 3 5 9 | 4 1 7 | 5 1 11 |

Prospectuses, with tables and fullest information, may be had at the Offices of the Company, or of any of their agents.

Applications for agencies requested.

EDWARD BAYLIS, Resident Manager and Actuary.

Offices, 76, Cheapside, London.

8, New Burlington Street.

MR. BENTLEY'S

## LIST OF NEW WORKS

For November.

I.

**CIVIL WARS AND MONARCHY**

in FRANCE in the 16th and 17th CENTURIES. Being a History of France principally during that Period. By LEOPOLD RANKE, Author of "A History of the Popes in the 16th and 17th Centuries." 2 vols. post 8vo.

\* \* This Work will be published simultaneously in London and Berlin. M. RANKE is equally interested with the English Publisher.

II.

**BASIL: A Story of Modern Life.**

By W. WILKIE COLLINS, Author of "Antonina," "Rambles beyond Railways," &c. 3 vols. [On the 15th inst.]

III.

THE SECOND VOLUME OF

**BANCROFT'S HISTORY OF THE**

AMERICAN REVOLUTION.—EPOCH THE SECOND: HOW GREAT BRITAIN ESTRANGED AMERICA. 8vo. 15s. [Now Ready.]

IV.

**MEMOIRS OF DR. BLENKINSOP.**

WRITTEN BY HIMSELF. Including his Campaigns, Travels, and Adventures; with Anecdotes of Graphiology, and some of the Letters of his Correspondents. Edited by the Author of "PADDIANA." 2 vols. 21s. [Now Ready.]

V.

**NARRATIVE of the ATTEMPTED**

ESCAPE of CHARLES THE FIRST from CARISBROOK CASTLE; including the Letters of the King to Colonel Titus. Now first printed from the Original, with Notes. By GEORGE HILLIER. Small 8vo.

VI.

**EXCURSIONS IN IRELAND**

DURING 1844 and 1850. With a Visit to the late Daniel O'Connell, M.P. By MISS CATHERINE M. O'CONNELL. Post 8vo. 10s. 6d. [Now Ready.]

**WORKS BY PROFESSOR BLACKIE.**

Just Published.

I.

**CLASSICAL LITERATURE in RELATION**

to the NINETEENTH CENTURY and SCOTTISH UNIVERSITY EDUCATION. An Inaugural Lecture, delivered in the University of Edinburgh, on 2nd November, 1852. Price 6d.

II.

**THE PRONUNCIATION OF GREEK;**

ACCENT and QUANTITY. A Philological Inquiry. In 8vo, price 3s. 6d.

Lately Published.

III.

**ON THE RHYTHMICAL DECLAMATION**

of the ANCIENTS. (Reprinted from the *Classical Museum*.) In 8vo, price 1s.

IV.

**ON THE TEACHING AND STUDYING**

of LANGUAGES. Two Lectures delivered in Marischal College. In 8vo, price 1s. Sutherland and Knox, Edinburgh; Simpkin, Marshall and Co., London.

**NEW WORK BY SIR ARCHIBALD ALISON, BART.**

On 15th November will be published, price 15s.,

VOLUME I.

**HISTORY OF EUROPE, from the FALL**

of NAPOLEON in 1815, to the ACCESSION of LOUIS NAPOLEON in 1852. By Sir ARCHIBALD ALISON, Bart., Author of the "History of Europe from the commencement of the French Revolution, in 1789, to the Battle of Waterloo," &c. &c. To be completed in 5 vols. 8vo, uniform with the Library (8th) Edition of the Author's "History of Europe from 1789 to 1815."

William Blackwood and Sons, Edinburgh and London.

Orders received by all Booksellers.

\* \* The Trade will be supplied with Prospectuses of the Work for distribution, on application to the Publishers, 37, Paternoster Row.

Now ready in foolscap quarto, neatly bound in cloth, price 10s.

**REMINISCENCES OF A YACHTING**

CRUISE. By Mrs. N. M. CONDY. Illustrated with Four Lithographic Drawings by F. G. Dutton, Esq., from Sketches by the late N. M. CONDY, Esq.

London: Ackermann and Co., Strand.

**SOCIETY OF THE FRIENDS OF ITALY.**

The First CONVEGNAZIONE of the Season will be held in the Music Hall, Store Street, Bedford Square, on the Evening of Wednesday, November 10. The Chair will be taken, at Eight o'clock precisely, by P. A. Taylor, Esq.

JOSEPH MAZZINI and LOUIS KOSSUTH will be present.

Cards of Admission—for Members, 1s., and for strangers, 1s. 6d. each—may be obtained at the Society's Offices, 10, Southampton Street, Strand; or at the Music Hall, before and on the Evening of Meeting.

## NEW NOVELS

TO BE PUBLISHED THIS SEASON.

I.

BY THE AUTHOR OF "MARY BARTON."

**Ruth.**

In Three Volumes, post 8vo.

II.

BY THE AUTHOR OF "OLIVE," "THE HEAD OF THE FAMILY," &amp;c.

**Agatha's Husband.**

In Three Volumes, post 8vo.

III.

**The Fortunes of Francis Croft.**

In Three Volumes, post 8vo.

London: Chapman and Hall, 193, Piccadilly.

## CHEAP AND ACCURATE ATLAS.

Now ready, in royal 4to, half-bound, price 15s. plain, or 21s. coloured,

**Lowry's Table Atlas.**

Containing 100 Maps, Constructed and Engraved from the most recent Authorities.

By JOSEPH WILSON LOWRY, F.R.G.S.

With an Index.

London: Chapman and Hall, 193, Piccadilly.

This day is published,

**POEMS. By B. R. PARKES.**

Post 8vo, paper cover, price 2s.

London: John Chapman, 142, Strand.

Shortly after the Meeting of Parliament will be published,

A NEW WEEKLY FAMILY JOURNAL, PRICE SIXPENCE.

**THE CIVIL SERVICE GAZETTE.**

It is proposed to establish the CIVIL SERVICE GAZETTE with the following Especial Objects:—

1. To advocate the cause and protect the interests of all Civil Officers and Clerks in the employ of the Government.
2. To expose abuses existing in any department of the Public Service, boldly giving publicity to the facts of each case, and discussing them in a vigorous yet temperate spirit.
3. To report promptly and accurately all appointments, making them the subject of contemporaneous comment, and watching jealously all Government Patronage.
4. To call the attention of Her Majesty's Ministers to cases where long and meritorious services have been inadequately requited and unjustly neglected.
5. To fearlessly unmask all nepotism, favouritism, undue family influence, without regard to the political opinions of any existing Administration.
6. To assist Gentlemen who seek Government Appointments, by supplying the earliest information on the subject of all vacancies, and to protect them from the frauds attempted by anonymous advertising agents.

Although established more especially with a view to elevate the position and redress the grievances of the employés of the Government, the CIVIL SERVICE GAZETTE will also advocate the interest of the officers of the Army and Navy, of the Military and Civil Departments of the Hon. East India Company, of those engaged in the service of the Bank of England—in Railway—Life and Fire Insurance—and all incorporated Companies. It will seek, in short, to bring to the aid of these classes the enlightened force of "public opinion," which in a free country, is both sword and shield—the true redresser of grievances—the sanctuary of the oppressed—the chivalry of the nineteenth century.

Writers of great eminence have tendered their cordial co-operation. The Paper, consisting of 24 pages, will include original Literary Articles, Reviews of New Works and Magazines, a Summary of the News of the Week, an Obituary of Men of Eminence or Desert in the Public Service, Parliamentary, Legal, Commercial, Foreign, Domestic, Theatrical Notices, University and Fashionable Intelligence. In short, nothing will be omitted that will tend to make it a complete Newspaper, and an instructive and entertaining Periodical. In no column will anything be found unfit for the perusal of every member of a family. In its religious opinions it will endeavour, avoiding all theological controversy, to breathe a spirit of unsectarian Christianity, and welcome that spirit in others.

There are nearly 16,000 employés in London alone, in addition to those holding office under Government in the Diplomatic Service, Customs, Excise, and Post Office throughout Great Britain and the Colonies. It is a fact, though not one as yet sufficiently notorious, that the most incapable are promoted through interest, the most able and meritorious neglected from the want of it; that golden sinecures are held by the wealthy, while a miserable stipend is often the sole reward of the toilsome labours of the indigent. We seem to have lost what is termed by Milton "that part of our freedom which consists in the civil rights and advancement of every person according to his merits."

On independent grounds, then, with uncompromising boldness, but with due courtesy of language, with no respect of persons, yet without private prejudice, by a wide collation of facts, and a fair use of argument, the CIVIL SERVICE GAZETTE will urge on the existing Administration, whether Whig or Tory, the necessity, not of those petty curtailments of salary, which, in the words of Macaulay, "bring on a Government the reproach of meanness, without producing any perceptible relief to the finances;" but of such an equitable adjustment of official income, and such a wise expenditure of the Revenue as may conduce no less to the Public Interest than to private welfare of the Public servants. With these objects in view, the proprietors of the CIVIL SERVICE GAZETTE invite the attention of all classes of the community to their projected Journal, and earnestly ask the co-operation of that class to whose cause it is especially devoted.

Subscribers' Names and all Communications to be forwarded to the Editor, 5, Catherine Street, Strand; or the Publisher, Mr. Joseph Smith, 49 and 52, Long Acre.

## NEW WORKS FOR NOVEMBER.

COLBURN &amp; CO.'S

## NEW PUBLICATIONS.

To be had of all Booksellers.

I.

**THE RIGHT HON. B. DISRAELI'S**

POLITICAL BIOGRAPHY of LORD GEORGE BEN. TINK. Fifth and Cheaper Edition, revised. 10s. 6d.

II.

**The BARONESS D'OVERKIRCH'S**

MEMOIRS, illustrative of the Secret History of the Courts of France, Russia, and Germany. 3 vols. 31s. 6d.

III.

**AUSTRALIA AS IT IS; ITS**

SETTLEMENTS, FARMS, and GOLD FIELDS. By F. LANCELOT, Esq., Mineralogical Surveyor in the Australian Colonies. 2 vols. 21s. [Just Ready.]

IV.

**REVELATIONS OF SIBERIA.**

By A BANISHED LADY. 2 vols. 21s.

"This interesting work gives a most important and valuable insight into the *terra incognita* of Russian despotism."—*Daily News*.

V.

**ADVENTURES OF THE CON-**

NAUGHT RANGERS. Second Series. By WILLIAM GRATTAN, Esq., late Lieutenant, Connaught Rangers. 2 vols. 21s. [Just Ready.]

VI.

**LIFE OF MARIE DE MEDICIS.**

By MISS PARDOE. 3 vols., with Fine Portraits, 42s.

VII.

**THE MARVELS OF SCIENCE,**

AND THEIR TESTIMONY TO HOLY WRIT. A Popular Manual of the Sciences. By S. W. FULLOW, Esq. Dedicated, by permission, to the King of Hanover. Second Edition, revised. 1 vol. 10s. 6d.

VIII.

**THE ROMANCE OF THE FORUM;**

or, Narratives, Scenes, and Anecdotes from Courts of Justice. By PETER BURKE, Esq., Barrister-at-Law. 2 vols. 21s.

IX.

**COLONEL LANDMANN'S ADVEN-**

TURES and RECOLLECTIONS. 2 vols. 21s.

"Full of interest and amusement."—*John Bull*.

COLBURN AND CO., PUBLISHERS,  
13, Great Marlborough Street.**THE GENTLEMAN'S MAGAZINE and**

HISTORICAL REVIEW for NOVEMBER, contains—

1. Pilgrimage to Our Lady of Hal.
2. Bronze Masks of the Ancients.
3. The Caesars and their Peculiarities.
4. Philosophy and Religion of the 19th Century.
5. The Thoughts of Joseph Joubert.
6. The Topography of Ancient Newcastle.
7. The Neighbours of Sir Isaac Newton.
8. Discovery of Concealed Lands, temp. Will. III.
9. The Religious Opinions of Spinoza.
10. The Character of Mr. Camden Field.

With Notes of the Month, Historical and Miscellaneous Reviews, Historical Chronicle, and OBITUARY, including Memoirs of Earl Somers, Dr. Townsend Bishop of Meath, Sir Digby Mackworth, Sir John H. Pelly, Rev. William Alderson, Rev. Hugh Salvin, Professor Macgillivray, Mr. Tierney Clark, Mr. A. W. Pugin, Mr. Arnold, Mrs. H. N. Coleridge, Mr. W. Finden, Mr. Angelo, &c. &c. Price 2s. 6d.

Nichols and Son, 25, Parliament Street.

**WORKS EDUCATIONAL AND SPECU-**

LATIVE. s. d.

|  |   |   |
|--|---|---|
| Euclid, the First Book only; an Introduction to Mathe-       | 2 | 6 |
| matics (with plates) .....                                   | 1 | 6 |
| A Practical Grammar of the Broad Rules of Speech .....       | 1 | 0 |
| A Handbook of Graded Exercises .....                         | 1 | 6 |
| Rudiments of Public Speaking and Debate .....                | 1 | 6 |
| A Logic of Facts, or Method of Reasoning by Facts .....      | 1 | 0 |
| The People's Review (30 articles complete) .....             | 0 | 2 |
| Literary Institutions—their Relation to Public Opinion ..... |   |   |
| The History of Six Months' Imprisonment (For the perusal     |   |   |
| of her Majesty's Attorney General and the British            | 1 | 6 |
| Clergy) .....  | 1 | 0 |
| The Task of To-Day—Vol. I. of the Cabinet of Reason .....    |   |   |
| Why do the Clergy Avoid Discussion and Philosophers          | 0 | 6 |
| Discountenance it?—Vol. II. of the Cabinet of Reason         |   |   |
| Life, Writings, and Character of the late Richard Carlile,   | 0 | 6 |
| who endured Nine Years and Four Months' Im-                  |   |   |
| prisonment for the Freedom of the English Press .....        | 0 | 6 |
| Paley's Natural Theology tried by the Doctor's Own Words     | 0 | 6 |
| Rationalism (Mr. Owen's Views Individualised) .....          |   |   |
| Roman Catholicism the Religion of Fear, with 8 plates,       | 0 | 3 |
| from Father Pinamonti .....                                  |   |   |
| The Philosophic Type of Christianity: an Examination         |   |   |
| of the "Soul: her Sorrows and her Aspirations, by            | 0 | 3 |
| W. Newman" .....   | 0 | 1 |
| The Logic of Death (Twenty-sixth Thousand) .....             | 0 | 1 |
| The Reasoner: a Gazette of Secular Advocacy. Weekly          |   |   |

London:

James Watson, 3, Queen's Head Passage, Paternoster Row.

LONDON: Printed by GEORGE HOOPER, (of No. 3, Portland Place, Kensington, in the County of Middlesex,) at the Office of MEMBERS, SAVILE and EDWARDS, No. 4, Chandos Street, in the Parish of St. Paul, Covent Garden, in the same County; and Published by THOMSON LEIGH HUNT, (of Broadway House, Hammersmith,) at THE LEADER OFFICE, No. 10, WELLINGTON STREET, STRAND, in the Precinct of the Savoy, both in the same County.—SATURDAY, November 6, 1852.