

principles you have now (perhaps by chance) enunciated, you will find that they lead to any thing but the establishment of the theories of Fre-

circumstances you have now (perhaps by chance) anticipated, you will find that they lead to any other thing but the establishment of the theories of Free Trade!

The facts adduced by the *Chronicle* fully show what has been the price at which we have purchased our present trading "prosperity." Those facts will show that we have not much to boast of; that we had better sing small; or we may chance to have to sing, in a very short time, a far different tune. Our "prosperity" has not any of the elements of *endurance* in it. It is but a *gleam*. The clouds are not all cleared away. A short time may see the sun of "prosperity" completely shrouded from view; completely hidden behind the black darkness of utter despair.

With the light afforded by the Free-Trade *Chronicle* in the foregoing extract, read the following twaddle from *Mother Goose* :—

"FOOD IS NOW CHEAP, AND TRADE IS BRISK! Trade is brisk in relation to each other for the cause and effect. Trade is brisk because food is cheap. The great body of consumers, having less to spend on food, have more to spend on clothing and other necessities. Hence the makers of cloth, and cotton and woollen goods, are comparatively busy. Here, then, there is a knock on the head of those foolish reasoners who say that 'if the Corn Laws were abolished and food were made cheap, trade will immediately fall off;' fact being the reverse of the reverse.

"Another fact is worthy of notice. THE TENDENCY OF WAGES IS NOW TO RISE. As trade is brisk, Halifax, since the demand for labour, that a considerable advance of wages has, in many cases, been made. The same is observed in Scotland, in several towns. Trade is brisk. Now, be it observed, at the very same time when this increase of employment and rise of wages, have taken place, food has been falling in price. Here, then, is another knock on the head to those foolish reasoners, who say that if the Corn Laws were taken off, and the price of food lowered, wages would fall;"—fact being, as the former case, exactly the reverse."

Here *Mother Goose* is strangely at war with her "leading organ," the *Chronicle*. Both are Free-Trade-ers; and both assign different and distinct causes for the "briskness of trade." "Trade is brisk, because food is cheap," says *Goosey*. "Trade is brisk, because FREE has forced our merchants to give their goods away," says the *Chronicle*. Which is right? I vote for the *Chronicle*. He shows the most "improved feeling."

"The great body of consumers having less to spend on food, have more to spend on clothing. So says *Goosey*. What a falsehood! It is not well known that the reductions in wages during the last two years, are more than equivalent to the reduction in prices of food! How then is it possible that "the great body of consumers can have more to spend" on anything! Have the colliers more? who are now receiving only, in many places, EIGHTEEN-PENCE a day! Have the spinners of Lancashire more? Have the weavers of Lancashire more? Have the silk-weavers more? Have the frame-work knitters more? Have the linen-weavers of Barnsley more? Have the men employed in the Iron-works more? Have the copper-makers more? Have the woollen-workers of Yorkshire more? Have the men employed in the neighbourhood of Heckmondwike more? Have the power-loom tenters of the Huddersfield STARKER'S more? Have the fancy-weavers, of the fancy district, more? And above all, and before all, have the PRINTERS in Mr. COBDEN'S EMPLOY AT CHORLEY, MORE! Answer *Mother Goose*! And in doing so, mind and nose give yourself another "knock on the head," as a "foolish reasoner."

"THE TENDENCY OF WAGES IS TO RISE." We are glad to hear it! Good news it is, because it is those who are now just wageless! We fancy however they would much rather *feel* the "rise," than hear of it. Have the wages of the cotton spinners, tendency to rise? Or the wages of the cotton weavers; or the copper makers; or the furnace-makers; or the silk-weavers; or the linen-weavers; or the fancy-weavers; or the woollen-workers! If they have a tendency to rise, we fear it is to rise *now*! WARDS!! What say Mr. COBDEN'S printers!

"At Bradford and Halifax, since the demand for labour, that a considerable advance of wages has many cases been made." Very *considerable*, truly! Something indeed to boast of! A few workers, one department, that of wool-combing, in the town of Bradford and Halifax, have just effected a very slender "advance" in their wages, for a time; and this proves that the "tendency of wages is to rise." Poor *Goosey*.

There is before us at this moment a table exhibiting the prices paid for the combing of all sorts of wool, previous to the rise, and the amount of the advance on each sort. It was furnished us by the men themselves. It is accompanied by the following statement, which will shew the "More" that the wool-combers have gotten, even with the "rise!"—

"To show the actual condition of the Woolcombers even after the advance in wages has been effected, we will show you what amount of labour he has to perform, and what his weekly earnings, with incessant toil, we only want to say. We will suppose, therefore, that all the wool was taken from the warbouse 64 lb. was marked, say, long time. This has to be washed; the combed; a second time washed, and combed over again. He will then have about 48 lbs. of wool to be paid for. He will then state that he has to wash and comb the processes will take him sixteen hours a day for the use through. THE RESULT WILL BE, THAT FOR ALL THIS LABOUR HE IS REMUNERATED WITH FOUR SHILLINGS, EVEN AT THE ADVANCED PRICE. THE MASTERS YIELDED TO OUR WISHES MORE THAN THE DREAM OF DESPAIR THAN ANY SYMPATHY WITH THE CONDITION OF THEIR SLAVES."

Rare "tendency to rise!" Plenty of "more!" Ten shillings a week, for sixteen hours' labour each day! What an amount to spend on "cheap food!" What did the woolcombers get, when food was DEAR! Can poor *Goosey* say? We will wait to see.

The Times, i.e. the Old Times, has also had its "song of triumph" on "OUR PROSPERITY." The "song of Tuesday last is full of boasts of the great "improvement" in all branches of trade. We would ask the vaunters of what avail is this, or any other improvement to that portion of the working class who toil from day break to mid-night to make profits for their taskmasters, without the means of extracting from their wages a single farthing to add to that store which, after a long life of toil should be ample as a retiring salary for the over-worked operative? Where is the fund out of which compensation for loss of limb is to be awarded to the sufferer? or out of which the widows and the orphans are to be compensated for the loss of their supporter's life? Does not the *bastille* haunt them as the only refuge for premature old age? Is not the combination of the masters, under the double influence of capitalists and administrators of the law, so complete, as to enable them to reduce wages to the merest existence point? Where, then, we would ask, is the slave's share of our great "commercial triumph?"

Amid this boast of general "improvement," have the poor rates been diminished or can they be diminished? Are the long lines of our best mechanics, now turned into street-sweepers and stone-crackers, by aught reduced? Not a bit of it. The great advantages of "improvement" are confined to the owners of the nonconsuming producing power to the foreign jobbers, who traffic with them; and the tax-eater. If this great "improvement in trade is not generally beneficial to all, of what avail is it to the working classes? Do the proceeds circulate equitably through all classes of society? Have the community of shopkeepers joined in the "O. N."

and fall will be a heavy loss. They neither saw the thought of the bases which subjected them to periodical changes. They have discovered, however, that certainty was capricious, and but of short duration; while uncertainty was sure to follow, and of long existence.

So much for the mere commercial branch of the subject: let us now direct attention to the agricultural portion. This great "improvement" is in the main attributed to a succession of two good harvests. We would ask, then, ought not the farmers, in such case, to be the loudest in exultation? Has the system become so complicated and entangled as to deprive the grower of all participation in "improvement," while his industry and capital furnish increased means for the manufacturing speculators to gamble upon in the manufacturing market? Does Ireland, a wholly agricultural country, participate in this general "improvement"? Have the operations of RENESCA, solely based upon agricultural distress, been relaxed in consequence of this succession of two good harvests? Has MR. CORDEN erased one foul epithet from his agricultural vocabulary in consequence thereof? Have the complaints of the English and Scotch farmers been in any wise diminished? Have the landlords evinced their satisfaction at this "improved" state of things? Has the agricultural hostility to the Prime Minister, who has brought them about, been silenced or in any degree lessened? No; and for this simple reason; because the system of which he is the head and front is a system of centralization, by which the few owners of non-consuming producing power are enabled to appropriate to their own "sole use and behoof and benefit," all the resources which legitimately belong to all the people, and even he, the Prime Minister, will find himself, in the midst of this "prosperous" system, like "the starving man in a cook shop." The money is there: we admit it; but it is not THERE for his benefit, or to his account. Ten per cent additional assessed taxes will not contribute much to his Exchequer; because each House has not its fair share of the nation's wealth; and we much doubt that his Exchequer will receive an increase of Income Tax, consequent upon the boasted "improvement of trade."

We have no desire to deny that more cotton imported, that more goods are manufactured, and that the manufacturing world is just now "active" on the contrary, we rejoice at it; and for this special reason: THE CO-EXISTING POVERTY OF THE PEOPLE WILL BE THE PRACTICAL ANSWER TO THE FREE TRADE MALTHEUSIANS. A "succession of two good harvests," with a "brisk trade," and "undaged provisions," will convince the working classes that such a multiplication of advantages having failed to confer any, the slightest, benefit upon the order, they must henceforth look, not to the exhaustion of capital for employment; not to the manufacturing of foreign cotton as the field for the exercise of industry; and not to the power-loom as the only implement of labour. They will look to their arms in their capital—to the Land as their labour-field—to the spade as their working implement—and to the CHARTER as the means of insuring CERTAINTY and of conferring the permanent advantage upon themselves.

THE LEEDS MERCURY AND HIS "BUBBLE."

Of all the turning, twisting, slippery, self-deceptions that any one ever engaged with, certainly the *Leeds Mercury* is the most tortuous and the most disingenuous! He is indeed "cunning of fence," a regular trickster in debate.

In the *Northern Star* of August 26th, 1843, we had an article on the Land question, founded on statement of the doings of Mr. LINTON, of Salford, for the present year, 1843. In the course of the article, we noticed a controversy that Mr. O'CONNOR had formerly had with the *Leeds Mercury*, and again addressed Mr. O'CONNOR's triumphant answer to the *meer* with his inferences from actual fact had been met by the "profound political economist" of the *Mercury*: that answer containing, from the *Leeds Mercury* itself, statement of doings on the Land, which left Mr. LINTON far in the shade. We made a little merry on the occasion; and concluded by stating that in another article we should prove, from Mr. BAINES himself, that "the Land, the Soil, was our last and only resource," as a remedial measure for the many evils inflicted upon us by the labour-displaying operations of machinery: that Mr. BAINES had himself long ago, seen that "there was no help, no EMPLOYMENT IN THE SOIL."

In the *Mercury* of the succeeding week, i.e. the 2nd of September, this article of our's drew forth from the "profound political economist," a leader which opened thus:—

"THE LAND BUBBLE.—In the *Northern Star* of Saturday, we find four columns of words, with about the same number of *ideas*, to prove that farmers four acres of land may, by the skilful management of their farms, realize a profit of £300 a year, after paying their rents, taxes, and wages!"

On the latter portion of his assertion we joined issue with him. We denied that we had attempted to prove any such thing as that "a profit of £300 could be made from four acres, after paying rent, TAXES, and WAGES." We stated that it was impossible for him to have drawn such a statement from our words; that it was a purely false and groundless assumption; an assumption made to account under circumstances as precluded its being attributable to mistake or accident: for we had more than once in the course of the article he pretended to replying to, distinctly set forth that the £300 was the "RETURN FOR LABOUR, after rent, taxes, seed, and wear and tear of implements had been paid for;" that in fact, the £300 was THE WAGES; not "CLEAR PROFIT" after wages had been paid, as the *Mercury* in another portion of his 2nd of September article asserted. We put it to himself, whether he had not been practising "gross delusion" upon the public, in putting forth such statement as it was ours; and then reasoning, that statement, and on that statement only, for the purpose of exposing its "absurdity." We further desired him to explain how the mis-statement had happened; to meet the question fairly, allowing us to state our own case, and not tax his powers of invention to misrepresent.

Now it was the article in the *Star* of August 26th, in the "wordy" article with only "four ideas" in that the *Mercury* said had attempted "to prove" that farmers of four acres might, by the skilful management of their farms, realize a profit of £300 a year after payment of rents, taxes and wages." It was to that article, and to that article alone, that we asserted applied. It was that article, and that article alone, that we charged him with wilfully misrepresenting; for as we shewed him, the misrepresentation could not be accidental. It was to the statements in that article that we invited him to turn his attention, and combat fairly; offering, if he would do so, "to tussle the matter with him."

The strong case of glaring wilful misrepresentation that we made out, would not allow the *Mercury* to shy off. He felt himself convicted before the public of a very dirty trick, unless he could manage to wriggle out of the mess. To leave it where it was, would be damning. Some attempt must be made; and accordingly in last week's paper we heard him. He took a fortnight to consider on the

BISHOP, attempted to prove certain statements; and when you are accused of wilful misrepresentation you rebut that accusation, by quoting from the *Star* of the 22nd of April!! Clever debater! The *Star* man!!

But the whole of the *Mercury's* FAIRNESS is not yet apparent. It was to our article that he took exception. It was with our "words," "ideas" as they were, that he found fault. It was to that he attributed the attempt to "prove the £3 CLEAR PROFIT, after payment of rent, tax and wages!" It was to the Editor of the *Northern Star* that he was addressing himself in his article the 2nd of September; and it was the Editor of the *Star* that charged him with misrepresentation with downright sheer invention, for the shallow purpose of replying to his own-created "absurdities," as though they had been ours. It was to that he had addressed himself; it was to that the controversy lay. And how does the *Star* man; the *honest* man; the *ingenuous* man; he does he prove that the statement which he attributed to us had been, as he said, made by us. How does he prove that? By quoting from a letter written by Mr. O'CONNOR, and signed with Mr. O'CONNOR's own name, and which appeared in the *Northern Star* more than four months before the article of ours, to which he took exception, even thought of!!! If this be not an *honest* way of getting out of a mess, commend us to one that is! O, the virtues of a *shift*! the usefulness of *trick*! the convenience of a *stretching* conscience!

And after the *fair* man has thus acted; after has thus *tricked*; after he has thus *dodged*; after has done that, which a man with a spark of honour would have despised himself had the bare thought of doing it only crossed his brain: after he has just done this, he modestly says:—

"We do not know that it is necessary to say anything in answer to the vapouring of the *Northern Star* of the 9th instant, except that all the terms 'misstatement,' 'wilful misrepresentation,' 'disingenuous conduct,' &c., &c., recoll, not by assertion, but by demonstration, upon the heads of those who use them."

Was ever impudence more impudent than that of this earth? If there were, pray what was it like? The terms are applicable to *you*, and to you alone, *Mfr. Mercury*. You have not shaken them off. You have only *fixed* them more certainly.

With the ingenious calculations this *Mercury* has based on the quotation from Mr. O'CONNOR's letter of April 22nd, we shall not, at present, meddle. We have no need to do so. They cannot by possibility have anything to do with the question in dispute between the *Mercury* and us. What was written by Mr. O'CONNOR on the 22nd of April cannot by possibility be made to appear as an article of ours of the 26th of August. To that article we put it as *Mercury*. It was to that he replied; designating it as "four columns of words with about the same number of ideas." From that we shall not at present budge. We are not going to allow the *Mercury* to lead us a dance over any period of time he likes. Our dispute is a simple one. To ourselves he must confine it, if he pleases. If he be content to let him say so. If he is conscious that he cannot longer maintain the controversy, unless he gets some one else to aid him, let him also say so; but till he does so confess, he must pardon us for not permitting him to "run from the question." To the article he has attacked he must reply; and not seek to justify those attacks by quoting from others.

We feel the less called upon to examine his calculations, so founded, because he himself gives the up as of no moment. He distinctly says:—

"The tanso to be decided, however, does not depend upon three or four pounds an acre in wages, but upon the infinitely more important question, whether or not such profits as £70 or £80 an acre, *wages included*, can be made yearly in land in general. We deny that the said profit of £70 or £80 is realized in ordinary years, and we deny, secondly, that the said profits are made in ordinary crops, under any system of cultivation, and we say that if either the rich or the poor should embark their time or their money in land under such expectations as those held out by Mr. O'CONNOR, and if they were to do so, they would be miserably deceived, and will be swept to throw up in disgust, pursuit, which, if followed with perseverance and sober and well-regulated expectations, might conduce essentially to their happiness and to the general prosperity."

Now here, for the first time, we have something tangible. For the first time is the question fairly put. For the first time has the *Mercury* given up the chance of anything to reply to.

The *Mercury* "denies that one-tenth part of £ can be realized in ordinary years, by ordinary crops, UNDER ANY SYSTEM OF CULTIVATION." But on what does he found his *denial*? Does he adduce facts? Does he prove those who we have adduced? No. His bare *denial* is all that he essays to offer. Whether the world will consider that *denial* sufficient, when contrasted with the *facts* of other people remains to be seen.

On a former occasion, on the 26th of August last, we said that Mr. JOHN LINTON, who lives on at Selby, some nineteen miles from Leeds, had conclusively *proved* that he could grow upon little more than three-fourths of an acre of land, produce which would bring him in £57 3s. 4d. after he had paid a RACK RENT; paid taxes; paid for seed, and for wear and tear of implements. This statement we have given the *figures* for, under Mr. LINTON's own hand. The *Mercury* must, therefore, excuse us, if we prefer Mr. JOHN LINTON's *hard facts*, the result of *actual experience*; to his *soft denial*. The *Mercury* has certainly *PROVED* that it is possible with a certain "system of cultivation," to get more than "one-tenth of £70 an acre, *wages included*."

We might be content to leave this portion of the question just where it is. The pitching of a fact against a mere assertion; an assertion unaccompanied by reasoning; is generally thought to be sufficient. But we are not so content. The *Mercury* shall have more *facts*. And when he replies to them, we trust that he will attempt to gainsay them by something stronger than mere assertion and *denial*.

The *fact* we shall next adduce, to show that more than "one-tenth of £70 can be realized from an acre of land," is the *experience* of a farmer more than two miles from the *Mercury* Office. Does he pursue a certain "system of cultivation"; and the following is what he has to say on the subject:—

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NORTHERN STAR.
 SIR,—Having been for some time of opinion that the "Land" was the only resource; the only means which we can employ the labour of our machineries to support the population; I have been much interested in the various accounts of experiments in *stretching* ground, which you have published from time to time in the *Star*. I have also read with pleasure your account of the "Potatoe" war which you have been carrying on with the *Mercury*. I have seen his last article in the *Mercury* of Sept. 23rd, in which he tells us that his position in the old-fashioned "can't-be-done" mode; saying "we deny that one-tenth part of £70 or £80 *wages included*, can be made yearly in ordinary years, and we deny that the said profits are realized in ordinary crops, under any system of cultivation, and we say that if either the rich or the poor should embark their time or their money in land under such expectations as those held out by Mr. O'CONNOR, and if they were to do so, they would be miserably deceived, and will be swept to throw up in disgust, pursuit, which, if followed with perseverance and sober and well-regulated expectations, might conduce essentially to their happiness and to the general prosperity."

I send you a few more such for him to "settle" in the same way: being convinced that the CAUSE "with the *Mercury*," is a *barren waste* of *empty bellies* with *growing* *wearhouses*; which have produced in a *stretching* *amount* of labour unemployed, while the Land is so *paraphrased* a barren waste for the want of that labour will very soon be satisfied to all, if the question is made such "settlers" as the *Mercury* has attempted to give it.

First, then, for "Potatoes," as they seem to be standing this, on Monday last I was very curious to

acres of potatoes, 2783 stones, at 4d..... 2
Part pots of do. 60 days eating for one cow 43
1 acre of rape after the potatoes; first cut, 3
in the beginning of March next,
will feed 20 cows 32 days 32 0
Second cutting at the end of April, will feed
the same 20 cows 32 days 15 0
1 acre of Sweet turnips, after the rape;
tops of the Sweets, food for 20 cows;
33, drills, 2 feet apart, 220 yards long; the
mangel, &c. in the part in the drill, will
give 16,824 turnips averaging 5 pounds
each, or about 38 tons of bulbs: these,
with 1216 stones of straw, will keep 20
cows 61 days 61 0

£161 7

Deduct for 1216 stones of straw, at 3d.
per stone..... 15 4

And you have produce of 1 acre in two
years..... £146 3
Four acres at the same rate..... £584 15
Giving as the worth of produce for four
acres, for one year..... £292 7

The potatoes I have calculated at less than 1s per
selling at 1 now sell at sevenpence per score, or
twenty-one pounds: I have calculated them at six pence.

The rape I have calculated at less than what the
writers on agriculture give as the average produce an
worth. The produce of the turnips is from my own
data. What I have easily done, I expect to be able to
do better.

I calculate the worth of food for a cow at one shilling
per day. My produce, actual and estimated, I have
measured by that standard; and the foregoing is the
result.

If I only calculated the produce when converted
into milk, and sold in Leeds, as I sell mine, at 2½d.
quart, the result would have made the *Mercury* start.
But I am free to confess that if I pursued "any system
of cultivation," I could not then realize it; but pursuing
the method of sowing grass seed to the land, both
with labour and manure, the land acts profusely to
wards me.

The following extract from Mr. Blacker's work on
Small Farms, will show that I have not over-estimated
my crops. He says:—"The immense produce of rapeseed
is beyond anything that can be imagined. If let stand
until it gets into blossom, it grows to the height of 5
feet. I am almost afraid to say that I believe that with
the addition of some straw, no acre will keep thirty head
of cattle in full milk for a month."

I am therefore much under the mark; for I have calcu-
lated for two cuttings; and Mr. Blacker says one will
nearly as much as I have set down for both.

My turnip crop is only an average one. Fifty-five to
have been grown to the acre would have made the
Trustee that I will follow up the *Mercury* well.

I am, yours, respectfully,

A. LEEDS, September 27th, 1843.

Now, this is from an occupier of land just under
the nose of the *Mercury*. He "holds" under the
present M. P. for Leeds; and we have not yet heard
that he has been "liberal" enough to avail himself
of the "free" hint of the *Mercury* to raise his re-
rent! We believe he is content with the rent he
gets.

Let us not be misunderstood, however. We mean
not to contend that it is possible to cultivate every
acre of land to such a result as that of either Mr.
LINTON or our correspondent A. We never intend
to do any such thing. In all that we have said,
all that we have done, we have merely tried to show
the great value of labour, when scientifically applicd
to the land; and to show this, we have produced
facts as to what has been done: but we well know
that the result must always differ, according to the
local circumstances. Under all circumstances,
however, we certainly do contend that it is possible
on any land, if it be land at all, to realize year-
ly much more than "one-tenth of £70, wages included"
by a proper and scientific "system of cultivation."

The *Mercury* further says:—
"We are glad to see the Chartists turning their atten-
tion to the cultivation of the land; it will give the
countrymen the tranquillity and good order of
society, and make them more valuable to the State,
ever is valuable in the Government and Institutions
of the country. We hear that a plan was promulgated
at their late Conference in Birmingham, for the pur-
chase of 1,000 acres of land for this body, on which
our principal fear is, that it will never be realised."

It is something to have the *Mercury's* good
wishes. He is "glad the Chartists are turning their
attention to the land." He was not very "glad"
when he sneered at them for doing so; or, if he was
a sneer was a rather curious mode of expressing
"gladness." Has not his "gladness" sprung out of
the position in which we have placed him, in relation
to this Land question? We have shown this in
"turning attention to the Land," the Chartists
have but followed the advice given them years ago
by Mr. BAINES, in the report from his pen which
we lately inserted in the *Northern Star*: and we
opine that it is the appearance of that document
that truth-telling document; that has changed the
tone of the *Mercury*; and not "the plan promulga-
ted at the late Conference at Birmingham."
Changed, at all events, that tone is. Now, he no
longer sneers, but expresses "gladness."

He fears that "the plan for the purchase of
1,000 acres of land will never be realised." Let him
render aid then. If he really entertains this fear,
he may do something to quiet it. His "share"
we know, in some concerns, not as likely to realise
"one-tenth of £70 a-year," as an acre of land well
cultivated is: let him "invest" with the Chartists,
and he will have done his part towards getting rid
of what he now fears never will be realised. We
have a right to expect, if there be any heart in the
expression of "*fear*" and "*gladness*," that every
exertion will be used by the *Mercury* to give the
Chartists an increased interest in the tranquillity
and good order of society." It is all the Chartists
desire. Give them this, and they will be content
"*anxious to preserve whatever is valuable in the*
Government and Institutions of the country."

DEVELOPEMENT OF THE NEW "HOLY
ALLIANCE" FRANCE, SPAIN, AND
IRELAND.

WHO IS THE PROPHET?

It was really very presumptuous in us, not
only to have made a prophecy but to have enu-
merated its fulfilment with so many details;
nevertheless we receive daily proof that we were
correct not only in our prediction, but in the re-
means by which it is to be fulfilled. The English
press allowed our bait to float for sixteen days upon
the surface, until dire necessity compelled the fish
to nibble; and since then we have had a succession
of greedy bites, not only from our English contem-
poraries but from our brethren upon the Continent.
La Presse, a French journal, very hostile to Eng-
land, now anticipates the enlistment of a large
French force for the advancement of English policy
to the great cost of France; while the *Debat*, a
journal devoted to the service of any ministry that
Louis PHILIPPE may honour with his countenance,
deals in an unusually lengthy declaration against
DANIEL O'CONNELL, and the Irish Repeaters. Add-
ed to these facts that one OLIZAGA, the coadjutor
of the bloody NARVAEZ, has left Madrid upon a
secret embassy to Queen CHRISTINA and the King of
the French. As we have no wish to mistake the
opinions of French writers we will here set forth
those portions upon which we mean to comment.
La Presse says:—
"The resignation of our ambassador, whoever may
replace him, will restore to England the ground she has
lost, and make us lose all the advantage we had gained;
still fortunate if we are not asked to interfere to increase
our deficits, to interrupt our great works, and to lend
the support of one state to another. But we will not
for those portions upon which we mean to comment.
La Presse says:—
"The resignation of our ambassador, whoever may
replace him, will restore to England the ground she has
lost, and make us lose all the advantage we had gained;
still fortunate if we are not asked to interfere to increase
our deficits, to interrupt our great works, and to lend
the support of one state to another. But we will not
for those portions upon which we mean to comment."

Spirit of the Press.

Spain continues to be of absor
by sanguinary factions, it is plun
and confusion of anarchy. The

[illegible]

tic legitimacy, may not Louis F. crush Repealers? The antagon

dicles of popular liberty and aristocratic tyranny
 rapidly concensing their passions and ranging
 'we've in fatal opposition. Education, both secular
 religious has opened the eyes of the millions, a
 struggle is inevitable. Be the conflict brief or protra
 we bid God-speed to the rights and liberties of t
 social, moral, and political.—*Dublin World.*

PUNCH'S LIVES OF EMINENT SCOUNDRELS
 PROEM.

Let it be granted that whoever commits robbery
 murder is a scoundrel, and consequently that the m
 robbery and murder he commits, the greater scound
 he is. Now we hope the reader will not be startle
 our entrance on our list of scoundrels, individuals w
 may have been taught to call heroes. Without m
 ad, let us measure pence with Plutarch.

SCOUNDREL THE FIRST—ALEXANDER THE GREAT

This notorious thief was the son of Philip, King
 Macedonia, who was a thief before him, and of Olym

some, himself and his mother (who had been deranged) among the nuns.

was the son of Jupiter.

Alexander had the advantage of certain modern heroes of his stamp, who have mostly come to the same end, and he was not without a certain charm that him his Alphabetagammadelta. His finishing tutor was the philosopher Aristotle, who instructed him how to fight with syllogisms; but—that was not sort of fighting for him.

He gave while yet a boy, a strong proof of his sagacity, by observing that a quality so indispensable to gentlemen of the predatory profession, in the person of Philip and the whole Court, in the great of that part of his person, he tamed, by his prov the wild horse Bucephalus, afterwards the "Br Bear" to his Dick Turpin.

When he was a little stronger, at the early age of thirteen, he was sent to his first office, as Philip had marauding to Byzantium, and had left young Alexander in command of the rest of the gang. The Medd whose territory Philip had appropriated, were being to show symptoms of wishing to have their over again. Alexander, at the head of a select band of his own picked troops, and his own chosen, then turned his Alphabetagammadelta, out of house and home, and

at thieving with his respectable f

On the death of Phillip, who was stabbed by or his own fellows in which transaction his husband was suspected of having been concerned, Alexander became king of the co-thracians. They were ignorant of the death of Phillip, but they were induced to reason by knocking some of the most refractory on the head. He then led them on an house-raiding expedition against Thebes. The Thebans objected to stand and deliver, stood, without delivering, against him on the field. They had better have let him have their money quiet, for Alexander would have taken it, and he would have placed on the ground to be with; then he took their city, pillaged it first, rose afterwards, and sold all the inhabitants, who were murdered, for slaves.

The Greeks, upon this, perceived that Alexander was a great hero. They formed themselves, therefore, into a league, and the Boeotians, and he, nothing murthering at the head of them into Asia.

en comprised thirty thousand foot soldiers and mounted highwaymen. He p

himself with no more than a month's pay for maintenance, being of opinion that the slave who had been so long in the hands of his master should at least be paid for what they should say themselves out of what they stole.

His grand series of atrocities now commenced. At the battle of the Granicus, his first, he destroyed twenty-four thousand five hundred men, losing thirty-four of his own ranks.

At the battle of Miletus, by storming a military operation which consists in burning, denuding, the indiscriminate slaughter of men, women, children, and other proceedings, for which civil men are usually hanging. He subdued the rest of Asia Minor, committing, in so doing, a number of sanguinary crimes that need not be here catalogued.

He defeated Darius, the Persian King, who was taking his aggression, near Issus, in Cilicia. On occasion he left a hundred and ten thousand vid dead on the ground, besides mangle and crippling as many more for life. In addition to this he is reported to have stolen an enormous amount of property, and to have been so greedy of gain, that he gave to him to state, he treated with great civility to ruffian, letting them break their hearts in quest with

little he stole more property at Da

At Arbela, after a wholesale murder on the grass-
land, he finally routed the army of Darius, where
the whole of Persia became his prey. Hereupon,
he made his army to sack the cities, to pollute the
and to steal, take, and carry away money, jewels,
wings apparel, and furniture to the value of forty
thousand talents.

He now ravaged Media, Syria, Egypt, and the whole
of India, in which last country his spoiliations and
rapines were so extensive, that he gathered up
named BULL have been since. When he had let
robbed as much as he could, he is reported to have
because he could rob no more.

Alexander did not come to be hanged; but, hav-
ing plenty of rope given him, in conformity with the ad-
vice of his friends, he put on a surcoat of leather
all the spoil they could carry. he retired to Babylon,
where, like most eminent scoundrels who are pros-
perous, he set to work to enjoy himself, by indulging
in all kinds of luxury and dissipation. Here, after a
few days, he was seized with a violent fever, and

quency, and died, aged thirty two, by anybody who knew him.

Latterly, indeed, he had given in greatly to drink, and one day, in a state of fermented liquor, committed the mildest murder of the many he was guilty of, running his friend Clitus through the body. On another occasion, being tipsy, he burnt down the city of Ptolemais, as the little boys say "for a lark."

Arson, robbery, and murder, were thus the passions which gained him the surname of Great.

Let us consider the exploits of Alexander, as well as we can numerically. Besides multitudes which he has not been enumerated, he killed, as we have seen, his fellow-creatures—

At Thebes	6,000
The Granicus	24,500
Issus	110,000
Tyre	2,000
	142,500

Suppose that in his other battles and sieges he killed only as many again (an estimate far beneath the truth no doubt), he must have done at least 285,000 murders without reckoning that of Clitus; consequently,

... villain than Courvoissier.

BE QUICK, FOR I'M IN HASTE.—May is considered an unfortunate marrying month. A counsellor says, that a girl was asked not long since, to unite herself in the silken tie to a brick shab, named May in his proposals. The lady then hinted that May was an unlucky month for marrying. "Well, make it June, then," hastily replied the swain, anxious to accommodate. The dam paused a moment, hesitated, cast down her eye and said with a blush, "Would not April do well?"

FIRE!—FARNHAM, SEPT. 22.—This morning, about eight o'clock, a fire broke out at the Burles farm, situated about midway between this town & Applegate, the property of John M. Aune, Jr. The fire, it is supposed, was caused by a candle. The fire spread so rapidly that Mr. Payne had finished picking hops the previous day, but had allowed the pickers to sleep on the premises, and to commence the journey homewards the following morning; and it is supposed that, after leaving the place, they would have been able to escape.

fire caught some loose straw,
to the work of the building.

which had recently been covered with pitch. Fortunately, there were not more than five or six kegs of hops in the store room. In less than an hour, nothing but the bare walls remained. Damage done about £360.

to their care. The prisoner, who was much affected during the four hours' inquiry, was released from custody. The deceased had been four years in the regiment, and was twenty-two years of age.

