









## POLAND.

Comparison of the year 1794, when Poland fell, with the year 1849, when Hungary was crushed, and the Polish people are now again in the hands of their oppressors. Since half a century yet hath rolled away. Since northern hordes festered on their prey! Poland was then, by force compelled to yield To big armies, and sink beneath their shield! Yea, history's pages still in anger heave, At crimes that darkly stain the fold of heaven. They tell of deeds which make the heart to chill, And stagnate into hate, 'gainst Northern Wills Of "Royal Robbers," who, their age disgraced, And Poland, Europe's brightest gem, defaced! Does power of kings, in plunder only shine, To tell the world they reign by laws divine? Speak out each page, historic of the world, And let the darkest page be now unfolded! 'Tis on the midnight page, and let the light shine The light of darkness through each crowded line; And then the black comparison we'll know, Between those years of blood, and crime, and woe! Shall Haynau's carnage with Suwarrows vie, In ghastly horror, and in purple dye? Shall Danube's rolling tide to ages tell, How tyrants conquered, and how freedom fell? Or shall the waves of Danube's gladly smile, Of triumph glowing on the freedom's cheek, The harbinger of brighter triumphs tell, When Deminski shall bend each tyrant's will? And Phoenix, like the freeman's power will rise, And sweep the tyrants from beneath the skies! Remembered long will be that ghastly day, When Bathynau's butchery was the prey! Waved high the scroll, 'till the licence of a king— Did that assassin, Haynau, vilest thief, That crawled upon the brave Hungarian soil, And nobles victims sought for vengeful spoil, Unstarred avants! no freeman's lawless law! A thing so vile, whom all the world abhors!

WASSER.

Baron Haynau, it appears, complains that his authority has been disregarded by those who had presumed to execute Count Bathynau, by shooting that nobleman, it being Bathynau's express command that the Count should be left in the hands of the common hangman.

When Haynau was remonstrated with respecting his cruelty, he replied, holding up the sky, "I am a tiger, a lion, and I care not, and they shall feel the full force of my unlimited power to punish."

## REVIEWS.

THE WORKS OF G. P. R. JAMES. Parlor Library Edition. Vol. I: *The Gipsy*; Vol. II: *One in a Thousand*. London: Simms and McIntyre, Paternoster Row.

NOVELS and romances heretofore published at the aristocratic price of thirty shillings, may now be purchased for a single coin of that denomination. The volumes before us afford another and remarkable proof of the enterprising spirit of Messrs. SIMMS and MCINTYRE. The author, too, is entitled, to the thanks of the public for his share in this laudable undertaking. Mr. JAMES thus expresses the motives and objects which have induced him to assent to this cheap re-publication of his works—

"If works of a good and elevating tendency were as cheap and easily procurable as the debasing trash which is daily poured forth upon the public, at a very low rate, the poisonous stream and the pestilence of immorality, would not altogether dried up, at least greatly diminished. But if we place a floodgate to dam up the purer stream, we compel our fellow-men to have recourse to foul and corrupted sources. The office of the artist is not only to permeate but to diffuse, and one-half of its utility is lost if we put a barrier against the exercise of its influence upon the unwieldy classes by immoderate prices."

With such views, it was natural I should have been anxious to secure an opportunity of publishing a cheap and respectable firm, to carry out my views to the utmost possible extent, and that I should see with great satisfaction, rapid and extraordinary success attending their efforts. A plebeian myself, my strongest sympathies are, of course, for the poor, and it has given me no light gratification, within the last two years, on entering many a cottage, and many a tradesman's dwelling, to find a little range of books calculated to amuse and interest, as well as to instruct and to elevate. When an opportunity was offered me by a proposal from the publishers to whom I have alluded, of sending forth my own political productions at a price which would place them within the reach of all, I gladly seized it, in the hope that I might contribute something, however small, to the improvement and to the happiness of my fellow-men."

Mr. JAMES's works having been long before the public, it is only necessary to state, that, in this marvellously cheap edition they are given without any abridgement. Of course the sale will be enormous.

*The Public Good*, No. 1: JANUARY. London: C. Gilpin, 5, Bishopsgate-street.

THIS is a new monthly publication, remarkably cheap, consisting of thirty-two small octavo pages, and sold for two-pence. In politics it is of the Struttian and Vanebo school—advocates parliamentary reform, direct taxation, the peace principle, totalitism, early closing, &c. &c. The contents of the first number include essays on politics, political economy, history, morals, &c. &c. For extract we select an article from the pen of the editor—

ENGLAND'S WEAKNESS AND ENGLAND'S STRENGTH. Doubtless any one who views the character and condition of England, may see many things which wring his heart, and make it bleed with pity. He may see thousands in rags and wretchedness—he may see men and women, who could work and gain an honest living, but who are idle, and who are idle, as they have no work to do—he may see young men behind the counter, or the desk, working from early morn till late at night, tired, exhausted and prostrated, physically and mentally—he may see women—yes, tender, beautiful women, who are doing a better destiny, playing the needle for sixteen, eighteen, and twenty hours a day, and that for the most paltry pittance—and he may see, on the other hand, a proud and pampered aristocracy, rolling in riches, and faring sumptuously every day, and who expend enough in dissipation and idleness, to pay the wages of the poor. He may see a huge national debt, which too significantly forebodes national bankruptcy—he may see taxes indirectly wrung from the working and commercial classes, and recklessly appropriated to unwarlike purposes—he may see game-laws which exist for the benefit of a few nobles, and which comfort and happiness of innumerable families have been sacrificed—he may see a church, many of whose bishops and dignitaries live in wealth and splendour, and many of whose hard-working parsons starve for the bread that perishes—may see immense tracts of unproductive waste lands, and thousands of famishing men remaining idle—he may see rich and extensive landowners dying, and leaving their estates to their eldest sons, while the other members of their families are left penniless, and unprotected, for who can not dig, and to beg assistance from the political influence, and corruption, are lifted into places to be maintained in influence by the public purse—he may see intemperance with its million plagues, where no other God but Bacchus is worshipped, and whose worshippers have destroyed the health, the industry, and their homes—he may see untold numbers of England's fairest women brought to shame and infamy, and who pass through life plucking flowers, which only grow on the paths of iniquity and around the margin of the grave—he may see gibbets to which women, in all the glow and freshness of youth, are forcibly carried to be publicly executed, when their shrieks pierce the skies, and rend the hearts of the congregated thousands—he may see the Smithfields and the Tyburns, where the cruelties are perpetrated of the most barbarous ages—he may see towns undrained, houses unventilated, and their inhabitants correspondingly dirty; localities where diseases breed, and death life—he may see the spirit of selfishness pervading the commercial transactions of the people, and competition in its pitiless way, trampling on the weak and unfortunate, reckless of benevolence and many other considerations which should nourish and gladden life—he may see ignorance enthroned in the minds, and wrapping its gloomy mantle around the prospects of millions, and deeper than any of these evils, which are observable on the surface, may be seen vice and moral degradation in countless shapes, holding captive the bodies and minds of multitudes. But there is a bright as well as dark side to the picture. We have not only national virtues, but national vices. Doubtless, there has always been any great deal of active benevolence, and sterling worth among our population; but never, I throw, as much as at the present time. If we have organised wrongs, we have also organised into societies to put down such wrongs. We have missionary societies for the conversion of the heathen, infirmaries, and hospitals supported by voluntary contributions. We have peace societies trying to remove war systems and the war spirit

from the world—temperance societies battling with intemperance—educational institutions in England, ignorance—parliamentary and financial reform associations, labouring for the political elevation of the people—sanitary commissions and boards of health sweeping our streets and closing roasting places—benefit societies, building societies, insurance companies—associations to build houses, model lodging houses; and a thousand other associations, for a thousand other purposes. I do not mean to say that all these associations fulfil all they promise, and that associations and the principle of co-operation may not be abused, but I have reason to believe that the people are beginning to see the potency and practicality of co-operating together, for the multiplication of means for comfort and elevation. I see in this fact one of the grand characteristics of the age, and it tells where England is going, and what day will be as significant as any future or circumstance of the nineteenth century. England, with her omnipotent public opinion, her liberties and hospitalities, stands like a beacon among the nations of the earth. She is the home of the free, and she is the centre to which men of letters and commercial princes resort. Yes, "England, with all its faults, I love the soil." Glorious has been thy past with all its crimes, and more glorious will be thy future. Thou has shaken grovelling nations with war; and thou shalt, in years to come, devote thy matchless strength and inexhaustible resources to consolidating the peace and promoting the prosperity of all peoples. Though errors fester in thy bosom—though injustices and suffering impair thy mightiness—though shalt grow, and gradually grow stronger, holier, and happier.

An Earnest Appeal to the Middle Classes. By A WORKING MAN. Manchester: J. Leach, 42, Turner-street.

THIS is a spirited address to the middle classes by one who has suffered in his own person the wrongs he exposes. The author's manner will be understood from the following extract—

"If the working classes look for help to those whose labour has raised to affluence, they point to the number of their children as proof of their folly and imprudence, and to the undivided wastes of Australia or Van Diemen's Land as havens of refuge for the destitute! If they look to the press—a mighty power for evil or for good—it, too, delights to blacken with infamy the tyrants of honest men, and lauds their tyrants as beneficent dispensers of benefit to the people. If they look to the law, they turn to the laws of their country for redress, they proclaim the sons of poverty as vagrants, idlers, and impostors, allied against that prosperity they are made to protect; if they turn to the judges and executors of the law, they are told that the law is in their hands, and are, therefore, cast away without mercy."

We understand that this pamphlet may be had of Mr. A. Heywood, and all other Manchester booksellers.

## PROTECTION FOR NATIVE INDUSTRY.

On Monday night a public meeting of the working classes, convened under the auspices of the National Association for the Organisation of Trades, was held in the Hall of the Edinburgh Hotel, for the purpose of discussing the expediency of adopting resolutions in favour of legislative protection for native industry, against the present untried and ruinous system of competition; and certainly it never fell to our lot to attend a meeting of so large a number of persons, who had gathered in question. It was announced that Mr. George Frederick Young would take the chair. Before the hour for commencing the proceedings (half-past seven), the hall was filled with men, and the platform was Mr. Richard Ostler, Dr. Brooks, Mr. Paul Fosskett, and other advocates for protection; as well as Mr. Samuel Kydd, Mr. Campbell, Mr. Clark, and other leaders of the Chartist party. Mr. G. F. Young was called to the chair, and 3,000 persons present, and the numbers appeared to be equally divided, that it was almost impossible to determine whether the yes or noes for Mr. Young's election had it. Mr. Young, however, was duly elected, and he then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them.

Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTERIS, in opening the proceedings, remarked that he had always been the friend of free discussion. At the same time, he was bound to state that the present was not a meeting for discussion, but for the purpose of hearing certain statements, and then voting on them. He then read the principles of protection. Mr. CHARTER



...those gradual and undermining measures which ultimately brought the whole fabric to the ground. Pauperism and poor rates were

Again, the Marquis says :—" That Emigration from this country is largely increasing. In the year 1845, there were 93,501 ; in 1846,

ere were not less than 300,000 left their native shore."

Trembling, shrinking from the spoiler's hand—  
Far, far away, thy children leave the land.

Now, Emigration is no new thing. Land-  
rds and capitalists have, at all times, held  
up as the panacea for the grievances inflicted

Under Protection, the workers were inconveniently numerous for the owners of land and money, the ready expedient was to ship them off to foreign lands, just as Mr. SIDNEY HERBERT proposes to do now with the Sempres. Emigration, in fact, has been a standing recipe with the ruling classes for all social

men; and when the Marquis of GRANBY  
 talks of "the children of the land trembling  
 shrinking from the spoiler's hand," who does  
 he mean by "spoilers?" Has not Ireland  
 contributed by far the largest proportion of the  
 100,000 who last year left our shores? Who  
 did the Irish fly from? Why from their land-  
 lords, who, under Protection, had enriched

on them the last farthing—beggared and pauperised tenant and labourer, and have now made large portions of the country a waste, rather than give up political ascendancy, based upon territorial possession. Nor are the English landlords alone in this nefarious conspiracy against the happiness, and the prosperity

is well known, at all times treated the labourers on their estates as vermin, whom it was absolutely necessary to keep down as such as possible. The most cruel, disgraceful, and inhuman methods have been resorted to for this purpose, in comparison with which emigration is beneficence itself. The labourers

have been compelled to huddle together in  
miles, under roofs which did not keep off  
water, and within crazy walls whose numerous  
cracks and crannies gave free admission to  
the piercing winds of winter—hovels not fit  
for piggeries. The object was to drive them  
from the estate, and save rates. Whether  
they were driven into our large towns, to add

the desperate struggle for existence which rages among the unemployed competitors for the barest pittance—or sought that labour and subsistence in other lands which was denied them here, the landlords neither knew nor cared; sufficient for them was the fact, that they had been got rid of.

trials, commercial, and social history of this country under Protection, we see nothing that can justify the people in restoring to the landlords the monopoly of which they have recently been deprived. Pauperism, crime, prostitution, and misery, prevailed among the masses under their sway, as it does now. We

the ascendant, it would be otherwise. On the contrary, they cling to the old system of land tenure and high rents. They neither promise equitable leases nor corn rents. They propose an alteration whatever, that has a tendency to liberate the soil from the fetters in which it is bound by the old feudal arrangements. They

low material of all wealth—THE LAND—and allow its use only upon such terms as may suit their interests and convenience. The people who dwell upon a soil thus appropriated, are the virtual slaves of the appropriators, no matter by what name they may be called. They have been robbed of their birth-

As regards the other party in the contest, we candidly confess, that we have quite as little faith in them as in the landlords. Free Trade.

the abstract, is, no doubt, very right and proper; but as it is now practised, or likely to be practised in this country, it is synonymous with the continued deterioration of the working classes. The very vastness of the productive powers at the disposal of society, increases the power of our suicidal competitive system for evil. Machinery and capital in the hands

seignior and interested persons, are used like the land; for the promotion of individual, not national interests. The question never arises, how can these immense powers be best directed, to promote the general welfare by the abundant production and equitable distribution of wealth among the whole population—simply, "How can I make the most of this?"

The Free Traders point to the cheapness of services, and the increase of our exports; as proofs of the success of their system, and of the improved condition of the people. Never was there a greater fall in the price of

ice does not invariably imply at the same time the power to purchase—increase of exports may be the result of forced sales, in which three bales of goods have to be given for the price of two or one. The test of all healthy trade is the profits it leaves the employer—the wages it pays the worker.

will be found that we have nothing to boast—that the condition even of our manufacturing population is of a very inferior description—that large masses of urban labourers are sunk in the deepest gulf of misery and wretchedness, to which even the most sanguine advocates of the benefits of Free Trade will

We go further, and say that, instead of ameliorating their condition, Free Trade will aggravate it, and steadily add to the number those so situated.

The essential tendency of our present system is to dispense with manual labour, and to cheapen the price of machine-made goods.

s will act, as certainly as gravitation does in the physical world, to pull down profits and wages always to the very lowest point. But the loss and the misery will, in all cases, fall heaviest and heaviest upon the worker. He has no right to fall back upon. Cut off by the territorial system from the use of the land

The mere faction-fights of landlords; mill-  
lords, and money-lords, will do nothing to

the redress of this radical evil, and the working classes will do well to keep aloof from it. The only method by which they can hope to rise in the social scale, is to concentrate their efforts upon obtaining political emancipation, as the indispensable foundation upon which alone a harmonious and just social construction can be raised.

Let the rival factions fight their own battle. We masses have a mightier and nobler task before them—the emancipation and the elevation of the Labourer!

---

THE REV. JAMES SHORE.—The committee appointed to conduct the case of the Rev. James Shore, the prosecution of the Bishop of Exeter.

ced at their disposal by the public was £614 2s. 7d. This amount £525 16s. 10d.; including £310 16s. 4d. to the Bishop of Exeter, the cost of the proceedings in the Court of Arches has been expended, the balance; £88 6s. 9d., handed over to Mr. [illegible]







## Ireland.

which was, as was demanded by a "threat-  
ening," some weeks ago.—*Leinster Express.*

**LINEN TRADE.**—Though there has recently  
slight depression in this trade, and a conse-  
quently lowering of the wages, we still are inclined to  
think that the prospects of the new year are of an  
encouraging kind. Though the exports of linens and  
from this place last week were not nearly the  
figure of those of the week previous, they were  
valuable—viz., linens 54 boxes; 22 bales; yarn,  
in 11 skips; maulin, 6 boxes; thread, 3 boxes.—  
The quantities of linen yarn remained unchanged; the  
demand still continues dull, but this was anticipated.  
The present season, and the increased demand is  
*By-fair* New Letter.

**PAUPER UNDO.**—A strange scene occurred at  
workhouse on Wednesday, after the sale  
of the goods.—When some of the articles purchased were  
on them for removal, the paupers rushed out to  
take them being taken away, arms were used to  
prevent any robbing and shooting the most fright-  
ful manner. One young gentleman, brother-in-law  
of the plaintiffs, was struck with a stick on  
and by one of the paupers, and had it not been  
timely arrival of head constable Taylor, and  
the men under his command, there is no telling  
the consequences. The constable was obliged to  
use the staff for the purpose of bringing the matter  
to the notice of the commissioners. — *Clare*

At the LOUGHBURGE UNION WORKHOUSE.—On a very early hour, a number of tradesmen were busy about the workhouse, which continued to burn for a considerable time before assistance could be obtained to stay its progress. 'About two o'clock, a party of police, under George McCullagh, Esq., and a company of the 50th Regiment, arrived to beat down the flames, and assist with the fire-engine. Were it not for the timely assistance of the party, the building would have been consumed. The highest credit is due not only to the military but police for their exertions. The building was covered with inflammable furniture, bedding, and clothing. The origin of the fire is quite a mystery. All the books and papers connected with the union are fortunately preserved.

REGISTRY.—The registries continue to be neglected, and will remain so until a large number of the franchise is made. Even in the County of Louth, one of the most prosperous parts of the Kingdom, the *Newry Examiner* thus describes the state of the constituency:—'The presence of a large number of the county made anything but a satisfactory trial to the friends of liberal opinions. At present Quarter Sessions only one liberal was elected for the county; while three conservatives had their names placed on the roll of parliament for the county. The friends of the majority of the liberal party of late; they have the political opponents to obtain so great ascendancy, as regards numbers, that, in the event of an immediate election a liberal candidate would have no chance of obtaining a seat in the A. S. Association.—At the gathering of his friends on Monday, Mr. John O'Connell took the opportunity to reiterate his determination to retire from English parliamentary life; at the same time he declared that when death should overtake him he would return to the country. And as soon as the native troops re-assembled in College-green, Mr. O'Connell might, perhaps, take his seat in that body as one of the twelve metropolitan members for the county of Dublin.

NATION of Mr. J. O'CONNELL.—The  
*Chronicle* says:—"Mr. John O'Connell,  
 a letter to Joseph Murphy, Esq., secre-  
 tary to the committee which assembled last week,  
 stated that he will not vacate his seat in  
 the House until the Liberal party in the city have  
 a candidate of their own choice to succeed  
 him."  
 THE OPENING OF PARLIAMENT.  
 (FROM Tuesday's *Gazette*.)  
 PARLIAMENT.—Victoria R.—Whereas our Par-  
 liaments prorogued to Wednesday, the six-  
 ty-first of this instant January, we, with the  
 assent of our Privy Council, do hereby publish and  
 that the said Parliament shall be further  
 opened, on the said sixteenth of January instant,  
 this day, the thirty-first day of January in-  
 stant, and we have given order to our Chancellor  
 of the Exchequer to read a Commission bearing the  
 following tenor:—We do hereby further, with  
 the assent aforesaid, declare our royal will and  
 that the said Parliament shall, on the said  
 day, the thirty-first day of January instant,  
 be and be holden for the despatch of divers  
 and sundry affairs of State, and of all civil, spi-  
 ritual, and temporal, and the knights, citizens, and  
 burgesses, and the commissioners for shires and  
 boroughs, and the House of Commons, are hereby re-  
 commended to give their attendance  
 accordingly at Westminster, on the said Thursday,  
 the thirty-first day of January instant.—Given at  
 St. James's Palace, this eighth day of January,  
 in the sixth year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred  
 and in the thirtieth year of our reign,—  
 by the Queen.

ERS AT SEA.—The journals of the Channel contain accounts of various disasters at sea during the recent storms. The English sloop *Yarrow*, from Plymouth, was picked up on the night of the 31st ult. by a pilot boat going to Dunkirk, and towed into that port : she lost her sails, chains, and anchor. An sloop, the *Vivid*, from Newhaven to Dunkirk on the coast, near Maryland, but it was too late to save the vessel. The *Yarrow* entered Dunkirk with the loss of twelve men and the brig *Jane*, of North Shields, to Constantinople with coals, went down by the side of the coast, and the crew, consisting of twelve men, succeeded in escaping in the boats. The vessel *Vow Maarte*, lost her mast, and had to be towed to Dunkirk. A vessel, supposed to be from the coast of Spain, was freighted with slaves, and was on the coast of Fécamp, near Fécamp, and would, it was supposed, be lost; the crew, however, were saved.

...Lola, from Morlaix, from Bordeaux to Brest, ...  
 ...from some leagues from Benodet, on the ...  
 ...the Falmouth, she succeeded in reaching ...  
 ...the Marie, of St. Vast, ...  
 ...at Harbourg, but was towed off by a steamer ...  
 ...for that purpose. On the coast, near ...  
 ...pieces of wreck have been picked up, and ...  
 ...of a three-masted vessel has been found ...  
 ...sinking. The sea continued violently agi- ...  
 ...of winds, and in three hours after the ...  
 ...wreck had gained its greatest height. ...  
 ...MONTES and HER HUSBAND.—EXTRACT OF A ...  
 ...FROM CADIZ, DEC. 27.—Lola Montes and Mr. ...  
 ...have been here for the last ten days. They ...  
 ...near Barcelona. She is much altered and ...  
 ...not so goodlooking as when here in 1842. ...  
 ...is still not at all improved, and her delight ...  
 ...to be there. Heald, the latest visitor, ...  
 ...her. Heald made his escape with his Eng- ...  
 ...from the hotel Ismenze (where they ...  
 ...saying on Christmas morning,) and is sup- ...  
 ...have gone to Gibraltar. Lola was furious, ...  
 ...in a French steamer that evening, with ...

means, if he should not succeed in getting the Pacha, she hopes to catch him, reported on good authority to-day that Heald had arrived this morning on board the *Pacha*, and was enabled to land on the shore. He doubtless will feel grateful to his friend for all she has done for him. The *Observer* states that Mr. Heald has arrived in London, and put up at the Grosvenor Hotel, Grosvenor Street.

**SIGNATURES AND INHIBITIONS.**—The Florentines have the same right to sign their names on the pictures, as to have read "And to this purpose I remember, for the moment, that the machinery of the propagation of Florentine writings, as merchants of Lucardo kept in their pay writers to copy the best authors of the best cities, and used to send out a literary hunt-order that in the port of the east coast, whenever such merchandise was marketable, the Florentine cova and that of the other muses might gain credit together. And so to go to Oxford, in the celebrated Library," is a mistake. The *Libro* is copied from the first MS. text, which had been carefully to envelope a consignment of these when the Bardi were merchants in Florence. It was known that the "Laudamus" was the name of the great library kept beside the two mouse-traps, on account of the length of this cheasy codex; by the mine, so length it was called in English, the "Book

**PHYSICAL VERSUS MORAL.**—Whether the physical wants be remedied through the moral, or the moral the physical, has been a question which has occupied philosophers and philanthropists for ages. It demands the attention of the statesman as well as the citizen. It is no doubt that when the physical condition is remedied the moral will be improved. But if it demands the first attention. For instance; a man who is afflicted with a violent cough would be unable to appreciate the sublime lessons of philosophy, though enunciated by the divine Plato. How much more welcome to the sufferer would be a box of Blair's Balm, and his kind words, "Be ye as the hills, so efficacious in eradicating this lung malady."

**SELECTED AND EFFECTUAL CURE OF A SEVERELY DYSPEPTIC BY HOLLOWAY'S OINTMENT.**—Extract of a letter from J. W. HOLLOWAY, 103 N. 3rd St., New York, dated Jan. 1, 1848, to Professor Holloway, dated New York, 1847. "I have been afflicted with dyspepsia for some time, and my employment knocked his ankle so severely, that I was unable to walk or attend to my duties. My friends recommended me to use your Ointment, and after several applications were applied, I was enabled to get up, and to be able to resort to your invaluable ointment, when by the use of a single pot, his ankle was perfectly cured, and







