



Poetry.

GOD'S WORLD IS WORTHIER BETTER.

It's all an idle tale they tell, but, then, who blames their telling it?
The rogues have got their cant to sell, the world pays well for selling it.
They say this world's a "desert drear," cursed in their own stark blindness!
That we were sent to suffer here—what, by a God of kindness?
That since the world has gone astray—it must be so for ever.
And we must stand still, and obey its desolators—never!

We'll labour for the better time
With all our might of press and pen;
Believe us, 'tis a truth sublime—
God's world is worthier better men.

In Paradise the world began, a world of love and gladness—
Its beauty hath been marred by man, with all his crime and madness;
Yet, 'tis a bright world,—still love brings sunshine for spirits dreary.

With all our strife, sweet rest hath wings to fold our hearts—a weary
The sun, in glory, like a God, to-day in heaven is brighting.

A bloom of stars smiling on the sod, as love with flowers is smiling;
Earth's heart throbs with immortal youth.

Her voice still rings of Eden—then
Believe us, 'tis a noble truth,
God's world is worthier better men.

Oh! they are bold knaves, over-bold—who say we are doomed to anguish—
That men in God's own image soul'd, like hell-bound slaves must languish,
Probe Nature's heart to its red core, there's more of good than evil.

And man, down-trampled, still is more of angel than of devil—
"Prepare to die"—prepare to live! we know not what is living.

And let us for the world's good give, as God is ever giving.
Give love, thought, action, wealth, and time,
To win the primal age again;
Believe us, 'tis a truth sublime,
God's world is worthier better men.

Spirit of Freedom. MARY.

SONG OF THE FUTURE.

"Midst all the storms and cares of life,
I see a brighter day,
Bursting through the clouds of strife,
To chase our wrongs away.
The advent of that day may seem
As though it ne'er would dawn,
And better times might be a dream,
From Fancy's empire dawn.

But knowledge sows the seeds of right,
Which grows in every mind,
And teaches men that moral might
Will freedom's beauty find.

The future opens with a smile,
And justice seems to call
Upon the toilers of our isle,
To watch their tyrants fall.

The past has been the age of woe,
Where reason never dawned,
And men were bent to make a show
Of what they never felt.

Oh! England's sons! may glory crown
Your acts and deeds with fame;
To conquer ease oppression's frown,
And win a glorious name.

A GLOVE-MARKER.

Reviews.

THE PEOPLE'S REVIEW OF LITERATURE AND PROGRESS. Edited by FRIENDS IN COUNCIL. No. 1. February. London: C. Mitchell, Red-Lion Court, Fleet-street.

From both principle and personal feeling we had hoped to have been able to have given a hearty welcome to this new publication. Announced as the "People's Review" we naturally expected to have met, under such a title, with a zealous exponent of the people's claims, and a determined assessor of their rights; and such a "Review" would have had our most earnest good wishes. As regards personal feeling—although we have never allowed that to mislead us so far as to move us to vote black white—we have always been anxious to ensure the language of praise, rather than censure; and, in the present instance having a personal regard for, at least, one of the conductors of the *People's Review*, we should only have been too happy could we have consistently praised the work of our friend, and his coadjutors. But we cannot do so. The *People's Review*, as a whole, has disappointed our expectations. We question not the integrity, nor the talent of the writers; the one is as above suspicion, as the other is above question. Nor do we dispute that those sections of the "people" who constitute the opinion of the "Mechanics' Institutions," "Manchester Athenæums," and "Whittington Clubs" may find this *Review* suited to their tastes; but the proletarians—the masses—are not very likely to recognise it as the "People's."

To say nothing of the peculiar views of the writers, their manner of "reviewing" finds anything but favour in our eyes. The ability displayed in the articles contained in the present number cannot be disputed, but the articles are rather essays than reviews; and, with all respect for the essayists, we would rather have had less of their writing, and more of the books they undertook to "review."

It would be an ungracious task to single out particular articles or particular passages for hostile comment. Instead of so disagreeable a performance, we have pleasure in stating, that at least portions of the contents deserve public approbation. The article headed "History of the Taxes on Knowledge," cannot be too warmly praised.

That our readers may not hastily or ill-advisedly condemn a new candidate for popular support, we recommend all who are curious in such matters, and can afford to expend pence, to purchase this first number and judge for themselves. We should add, that the work is neatly printed, and more than ordinary taste is evident in the getting up of the wrapper. We trust that on a future occasion we shall be able to speak in terms of unalloyed approbation of the "People's Review."

The Spirit of Freedom. Conducted by Working Men. New Series. No. II.—February. London: J. Watson, 3, Queen's-head passage, Paternoster-row.

This publication is pre-eminently the poetical propagandist of the principles of proletarian progression. Its very prose only needs to be put into long and short, to make a description of blank verse which would bear comparison with much that has emanated in that shape from certain recognised "poets." Such writers as our friends of the *Spirit of Freedom* have their mission—a mission others could not so well perform. Union themselves, they address the young in those fiery words and trumpet-like tones which are the peculiar property of those on whom the morning of life yet shines. They do well. A new generation of thinkers, workers, and leaders are growing up under their teachings—men who will at no distant day emerge from their present obscurity, and do good work in Liberty's warfare. Let us not be mistaken; that our friends can be practical in the ordinary sense of the term, as well as poetical (which we have shown may also be practical and effective), may be seen by the articles in this number of the *Spirit* on "Middle-class Expenditure," "Clerical Robbery," "Ireland," &c., &c. The first-named of these articles will speak nearly entire.

THE MIDDLE-CLASS EXPENDITURE. M. Louis Blanc, in one of his elegant Lectures on Socialism, remarks, when leaders of the people say to them, "follow us," the people should question where they are being led to; now, we think, if the honest answer was always given, it would often be, "a forty years' journey in the Wilderness;" and, as one of the people, we fume, and ask the multiplicity of leaders, "Where are you leading us?" For, although we hold that we must conquer the state by political reform, thereby to work out the social change, we question whether there are two of

the Charlestown leaders who know where they are leading us too, or how they would apply political reform to the betterance of the poor, and the extinction of misery. Brothers, it is a vile fraud intended to be practised upon a large portion of our suffering order, by the Parliamentary and Financial Reformers. Have you read the anecdote of the Kentuckian and the Indian, who was shooting one day, the produce of whose sport was a turkey and a crow, on the division of which the Kentuckian plied his sophistry to bewilder the Indian, in the following terms: "Now," said the Kentuckian, "I will have the turkey and you shall take the crow, or you shall take the crow and I will have the turkey!"

"Well," said the Indian, "it sounds very well, but, somehow, you always get the turkey, and I always get the crow!" This seems to me to illustrate the position of the middle and working classes in the appropriation of the results of reform; they get the turkey and we the crow. The language of the Financial Reformers is this: "Join us, for you are wiser than we are; and the secret of our power, not because it is an universal right, but because it is the wiser course; it is an instalment—a movement in the right direction, which must merge into universal enfranchisement!" This was the language of Brougham, Russell, and Burdett—that was a step in the right direction, that was a guarantee for the further extension of the franchise, and yet that very measure enabled the treacherous and bloody Whigs, in 1845, to pass their infamous Gagging and Alien Acts, in support of which they could muster 100,000 middle-class special constables! And clamoured for the Reform Bill, but having obtained their measure, and acquired power, they were at once the sworn enemies of the unfranchised, they had become respecters of the monopolists; they had got the turkey and we the crow! They had been to Reform Bill these men would have been with us '45, and at such a time, when the heart of society was yearning for change, and the spirit of revolution stirred the face of the deeps—like the bourgeois promoters of the French Revolution in Paris, must have been hurried further than was originally intended, and we could have swept away any government founded on oppression and bolstered by bullying wrong! We might now have had a government built on the suffrages and hearts of the people, instead of the despotic and insular rule of the middle-class class legislation. If the middle class have become more honest and sincere, let them come forward boldly and lend a hand for the attainment of our rights; and cease this sneaking policy of advocating the pennyworth of their Reform while agitating the rest of the people to the point of insurrection, and then, if they will let it fully and unqualifiedly, we could have Universal Suffrage next session, or revolutionise England! But they do not want that to be enfranchised. We claim the Suffrage as a birthright; we ask to be recognised as men, and not as dogs; we ask to be treated as the sons of the same God, and brothers of the same human family, that each shall have room for the full development of his own nature! We do not work for a change of tyrants, but for the regeneration of society! We wish to have this branding mark of human nature's nobleness, and the acknowledged right of mankind! The middle classes on the contrary, say it is expedient to enfranchise a portion of the people, on this qualification, if they are utterly selfish, which selfishness is the worst of all vices, that is the sense of taking care of oneself at the expense of everybody else! It is expedient to enfranchise four millions because they would be sufficient to carry Cobden and Co. into power, and Cobden and Co. know very well that it amounts to this, by giving the vote to four millions they let four millions of democracy which they could swim in gallantly! but by giving the vote to eight millions they would let in eight feet of democracy, in which they would be swamped inevitably, and it is Universal Suffrage would not carry them to power, as most assuredly it would not if it were not for the fact that when in power they would open the flood-gates to swamp themselves, no, we and the middle class are opposed in interest; they know it, and we must learn it! When capital and labour are combined in action they are in an interest, but separated and pitted against each other, they are in a deadly feud. Our interests are opposed to the men of capital. Therefore they hold out to us saying "Get! get!" "become one of us," "become respectable!" and by so doing we strengthen their party, and render the slavery of a large portion of our own class all the more despotically. We do not want a middle class despotism; it is far worse than the tyranny of feudalism! Feudalism only crushes humanity in the gross mass, this despotism will crush us in detail—man by man, woman by woman, and child by child. By giving unlimited power to the middle class, we are giving power to labour, labour must suffer eternal loss; again, under the iron rule of feudalism, the crushed slaves could make common cause in their misery, and unite to overthrow their oppressors; but this is impossible under the reign of democracy, which is a deadly feud, with unlimited competition, which is the head-evil of middle class liberty, every man's hand is against his brother, and every man's interest antagonistic! It is the out-throat course of every one for himself, and the devil take the hindmost!

We are not able to frustrate this movement, for the middle classes will inevitably proceed to power, yet they will not solve the problem of labour; they will not abolish slavery by destroying proletarian, or speculation in man by man; they will not legislate to better human misery, and it is for this which we combat; therefore, supposing we stood on a political equality to-morrow, our interests would be at issue immediately, for, while they seek a political change in order that they may present the coming social revolution, we, on the other hand, we seek to destroy the social one, which must follow; but, as we have not this political equality, we have to fight a double battle, and it behoves the workers to cling together, and if leaders stand in the way, they must be sacrificed at the shrine of principles.

T. MASSER.

The Champion, &c. E. Hobson, Ashton-under-Lyne; A. Heywood, Manchester.

This faithful champion of the rights, and able exponent of the claims of the factory workers, continues its useful though unpretending career. From the number for February 2nd, we extract the following notice of

It is impossible to overrate the importance of the question submitted to the judges in the Court of Exchequer, on Monday last, and now awaiting their decision. It involves not merely the physical, social and moral well-being and happiness of many thousands of our factory population, but the rights of persons of both sexes, especially of females, which of itself is a sufficiently serious consideration; but, relatively, from the points likely to be raised in the judgment about to be delivered, it will be found to involve certain principles in the politico-industrial system of the nation, upon the practical adoption or rejection of which very much of the future fate of England will depend. We listened attentively to the arguments of the learned counsel who conducted the case on each side of the question, and watched most anxiously the turns of the law, which the discussion appeared to take. There were several sentiments expressed in the course of the argument, as well by the judges as by the learned counsel, which appeared to us to be both novel and dangerous, and to which we shall send an early opportunity to revert. For the present, we will content ourselves to make a remark upon the dicta to which we refer. In the mean time, without at all anticipating the final decision of the bench, we would exhort the friends of the Ten Hours Bill to prepare to receive and act upon that decision, whatever it may be, with the same unflinching determination to see the case carried out, and to resist to the last, every attempt to evade its demands. Events, we believe, will confirm the opinion we recently expressed—that a new crisis in the Factory Question is at hand.

The Frame Work-Knitters' Advocate. No. I. Nottingham: R. Sutton, Bridlesmith Gate.

We welcome this new advocate of Labour's interests. We learn from the opening address, that "the Advocate will, on all occasions, be ready to assist the injured, and plead the cause of the oppressed; it will expose the abuses, errors, frauds, and deceptions which are still exercised in so many and such various forms. The working men, however illiterate and unlearned, will here find space to express their thoughts and views, couched in their own terms, and clothed in their own language, providing it contains nothing that is unreasonable or irrational. It will contain occasionally articles on all subjects connected with the interests of the trade; such as its history, past and present; wages, their rise and fall; comparison between the present and past; local customs in their different varieties; inventions and improvements in the manufacture of machinery. The laws that affect the rights of industry will meet with due attention, and the social and moral improvement of the working man will be our greatest object. In short, it will be the fearless advocate of all the rights, privileges, and immunities of those who produce the wealth of this country." It is almost superfluous to add, that our best wishes are given for the success of the *Frame Work-Knitters' Advocate*.

The Public Good. No. II. February. London: C. Gilpin, 5, Bishopgate-street.

The articles in this number of the *Public Good* are of the order previously indicated in our notice of number one. Perhaps the best in the copy before us is the second of a series on "the undeveloped resources of England." We quote the following from a letter by Yockloof, on board the Chinese Junk at Yokohama, to his kinsman, Lang-fang, in China:—

I have to inform thee, my dear Lang-fang, that I have visited London, which is the largest and richest city in the land of the barbarians. Since the arrival of our noble vessel, she has been visited by swarms of a peculiar class of barbarians called *Chinches*, together with a great number of the principal mandarins. But, if they were so curious and inquisitive about us, I was still more so in my inquiries about them. Know, oh! Lang-fang, that the capital of the barbarian empire is, empty of the capital of our country. There are no cities together, as if in hideous mockery of the hopes we entertain of earthly felicity—inexhaustible wealth, and the most splendid poverty; the most sumptuous palaces, and the meanest hovels; solemn temples of worship, and the most filthy dens of infamy; the scientific mental institutions for mental improvement, and gorgeous saloons dedicated to the demon of intemperance for mental degradation. Yet they will tell thee, Oh! Lang-fang! that this is the centre of civilisation, the cradle of the arts, the mother of humanity, the home of truth, the nurse of wisdom, and the benefactress of the world. Though the inhabitants of this country pretend to be the most moral and enlightened people in the world, yet there are perpetrated amongst them the most frightful atrocities, and unmitigated vices. They had the heart to reform Bill these men would have been with us '45, and at such a time, when the heart of society was yearning for change, and the spirit of revolution stirred the face of the deeps—like the bourgeois promoters of the French Revolution in Paris, must have been hurried further than was originally intended, and we could have swept away any government founded on oppression and bolstered by bullying wrong! We might now have had a government built on the suffrages and hearts of the people, instead of the despotic and insular rule of the middle-class class legislation. If the middle class have become more honest and sincere, let them come forward boldly and lend a hand for the attainment of our rights; and cease this sneaking policy of advocating the pennyworth of their Reform while agitating the rest of the people to the point of insurrection, and then, if they will let it fully and unqualifiedly, we could have Universal Suffrage next session, or revolutionise England! But they do not want that to be enfranchised. We claim the Suffrage as a birthright; we ask to be recognised as men, and not as dogs; we ask to be treated as the sons of the same God, and brothers of the same human family, that each shall have room for the full development of his own nature! We do not work for a change of tyrants, but for the regeneration of society! We wish to have this branding mark of human nature's nobleness, and the acknowledged right of mankind! The middle classes on the contrary, say it is expedient to enfranchise a portion of the people, on this qualification, if they are utterly selfish, which selfishness is the worst of all vices, that is the sense of taking care of oneself at the expense of everybody else! It is expedient to enfranchise four millions because they would be sufficient to carry Cobden and Co. into power, and Cobden and Co. know very well that it amounts to this, by giving the vote to four millions they let four millions of democracy which they could swim in gallantly! but by giving the vote to eight millions they would let in eight feet of democracy, in which they would be swamped inevitably, and it is Universal Suffrage would not carry them to power, as most assuredly it would not if it were not for the fact that when in power they would open the flood-gates to swamp themselves, no, we and the middle class are opposed in interest; they know it, and we must learn it! When capital and labour are combined in action they are in an interest, but separated and pitted against each other, they are in a deadly feud. Our interests are opposed to the men of capital. Therefore they hold out to us saying "Get! get!" "become one of us," "become respectable!" and by so doing we strengthen their party, and render the slavery of a large portion of our own class all the more despotically. We do not want a middle class despotism; it is far worse than the tyranny of feudalism! Feudalism only crushes humanity in the gross mass, this despotism will crush us in detail—man by man, woman by woman, and child by child. By giving unlimited power to the middle class, we are giving power to labour, labour must suffer eternal loss; again, under the iron rule of feudalism, the crushed slaves could make common cause in their misery, and unite to overthrow their oppressors; but this is impossible under the reign of democracy, which is a deadly feud, with unlimited competition, which is the head-evil of middle class liberty, every man's hand is against his brother, and every man's interest antagonistic! It is the out-throat course of every one for himself, and the devil take the hindmost!

We are not able to frustrate this movement, for the middle classes will inevitably proceed to power, yet they will not solve the problem of labour; they will not abolish slavery by destroying proletarian, or speculation in man by man; they will not legislate to better human misery, and it is for this which we combat; therefore, supposing we stood on a political equality to-morrow, our interests would be at issue immediately, for, while they seek a political change in order that they may present the coming social revolution, we, on the other hand, we seek to destroy the social one, which must follow; but, as we have not this political equality, we have to fight a double battle, and it behoves the workers to cling together, and if leaders stand in the way, they must be sacrificed at the shrine of principles.

T. MASSER.

The Champion, &c. E. Hobson, Ashton-under-Lyne; A. Heywood, Manchester.

This faithful champion of the rights, and able exponent of the claims of the factory workers, continues its useful though unpretending career. From the number for February 2nd, we extract the following notice of

It is impossible to overrate the importance of the question submitted to the judges in the Court of Exchequer, on Monday last, and now awaiting their decision. It involves not merely the physical, social and moral well-being and happiness of many thousands of our factory population, but the rights of persons of both sexes, especially of females, which of itself is a sufficiently serious consideration; but, relatively, from the points likely to be raised in the judgment about to be delivered, it will be found to involve certain principles in the politico-industrial system of the nation, upon the practical adoption or rejection of which very much of the future fate of England will depend. We listened attentively to the arguments of the learned counsel who conducted the case on each side of the question, and watched most anxiously the turns of the law, which the discussion appeared to take. There were several sentiments expressed in the course of the argument, as well by the judges as by the learned counsel, which appeared to us to be both novel and dangerous, and to which we shall send an early opportunity to revert. For the present, we will content ourselves to make a remark upon the dicta to which we refer. In the mean time, without at all anticipating the final decision of the bench, we would exhort the friends of the Ten Hours Bill to prepare to receive and act upon that decision, whatever it may be, with the same unflinching determination to see the case carried out, and to resist to the last, every attempt to evade its demands. Events, we believe, will confirm the opinion we recently expressed—that a new crisis in the Factory Question is at hand.

The Frame Work-Knitters' Advocate. No. I. Nottingham: R. Sutton, Bridlesmith Gate.

We welcome this new advocate of Labour's interests. We learn from the opening address, that "the Advocate will, on all occasions, be ready to assist the injured, and plead the cause of the oppressed; it will expose the abuses, errors, frauds, and deceptions which are still exercised in so many and such various forms. The working men, however illiterate and unlearned, will here find space to express their thoughts and views, couched in their own terms, and clothed in their own language, providing it contains nothing that is unreasonable or irrational. It will contain occasionally articles on all subjects connected with the interests of the trade; such as its history, past and present; wages, their rise and fall; comparison between the present and past; local customs in their different varieties; inventions and improvements in the manufacture of machinery. The laws that affect the rights of industry will meet with due attention, and the social and moral improvement of the working man will be our greatest object. In short, it will be the fearless advocate of all the rights, privileges, and immunities of those who produce the wealth of this country." It is almost superfluous to add, that our best wishes are given for the success of the *Frame Work-Knitters' Advocate*.

The Public Good. No. II. February. London: C. Gilpin, 5, Bishopgate-street.

The articles in this number of the *Public Good* are of the order previously indicated in our notice of number one. Perhaps the best in the copy before us is the second of a series on "the undeveloped resources of England." We quote the following from a letter by Yockloof, on board the Chinese Junk at Yokohama, to his kinsman, Lang-fang, in China:—

I have to inform thee, my dear Lang-fang, that I have visited London, which is the largest and richest city in the land of the barbarians. Since the arrival of our noble vessel, she has been visited by swarms of a peculiar class of barbarians called *Chinches*, together with a great number of the principal mandarins. But, if they were so curious and inquisitive about us, I was still more so in my inquiries about them. Know, oh! Lang-fang, that the capital of the barbarian empire is, empty of the capital of our country. There are no cities together, as if in hideous mockery of the hopes we entertain of earthly felicity—inexhaustible wealth, and the most splendid poverty; the most sumptuous palaces, and the meanest hovels; solemn temples of worship, and the most filthy dens of infamy; the scientific mental institutions for mental improvement, and gorgeous saloons dedicated to the demon of intemperance for mental degradation. Yet they will tell thee, Oh! Lang-fang! that this is the centre of civilisation, the cradle of the arts, the mother of humanity, the home of truth, the nurse of wisdom, and the benefactress of the world. Though the inhabitants of this country pretend to be the most moral and enlightened people in the world, yet there are perpetrated amongst them the most frightful atrocities, and unmitigated vices. They had the heart to reform Bill these men would have been with us '45, and at such a time, when the heart of society was yearning for change, and the spirit of revolution stirred the face of the deeps—like the bourgeois promoters of the French Revolution in Paris, must have been hurried further than was originally intended, and we could have swept away any government founded on oppression and bolstered by bullying wrong! We might now have had a government built on the suffrages and hearts of the people, instead of the despotic and insular rule of the middle-class class legislation. If the middle class have become more honest and sincere, let them come forward boldly and lend a hand for the attainment of our rights; and cease this sneaking policy of advocating the pennyworth of their Reform while agitating the rest of the people to the point of insurrection, and then, if they will let it fully and unqualifiedly, we could have Universal Suffrage next session, or revolutionise England! But they do not want that to be enfranchised. We claim the Suffrage as a birthright; we ask to be recognised as men, and not as dogs; we ask to be treated as the sons of the same God, and brothers of the same human family, that each shall have room for the full development of his own nature! We do not work for a change of tyrants, but for the regeneration of society! We wish to have this branding mark of human nature's nobleness, and the acknowledged right of mankind! The middle classes on the contrary, say it is expedient to enfranchise a portion of the people, on this qualification, if they are utterly selfish, which selfishness is the worst of all vices, that is the sense of taking care of oneself at the expense of everybody else! It is expedient to enfranchise four millions because they would be sufficient to carry Cobden and Co. into power, and Cobden and Co. know very well that it amounts to this, by giving the vote to four millions they let four millions of democracy which they could swim in gallantly! but by giving the vote to eight millions they would let in eight feet of democracy, in which they would be swamped inevitably, and it is Universal Suffrage would not carry them to power, as most assuredly it would not if it were not for the fact that when in power they would open the flood-gates to swamp themselves, no, we and the middle class are opposed in interest; they know it, and we must learn it! When capital and labour are combined in action they are in an interest, but separated and pitted against each other, they are in a deadly feud. Our interests are opposed to the men of capital. Therefore they hold out to us saying "Get! get!" "become one of us," "become respectable!" and by so doing we strengthen their party, and render the slavery of a large portion of our own class all the more despotically. We do not want a middle class despotism; it is far worse than the tyranny of feudalism! Feudalism only crushes humanity in the gross mass, this despotism will crush us in detail—man by man, woman by woman, and child by child. By giving unlimited power to the middle class, we are giving power to labour, labour must suffer eternal loss; again, under the iron rule of feudalism, the crushed slaves could make common cause in their misery, and unite to overthrow their oppressors; but this is impossible under the reign of democracy, which is a deadly feud, with unlimited competition, which is the head-evil of middle class liberty, every man's hand is against his brother, and every man's interest antagonistic! It is the out-throat course of every one for himself, and the devil take the hindmost!

We are not able to frustrate this movement, for the middle classes will inevitably proceed to power, yet they will not solve the problem of labour; they will not abolish slavery by destroying proletarian, or speculation in man by man; they will not legislate to better human misery, and it is for this which we combat; therefore, supposing we stood on a political equality to-morrow, our interests would be at issue immediately, for, while they seek a political change in order that they may present the coming social revolution, we, on the other hand, we seek to destroy the social one, which must follow; but, as we have not this political equality, we have to fight a double battle, and it behoves the workers to cling together, and if leaders stand in the way, they must be sacrificed at the shrine of principles.

T. MASSER.

The Champion, &c. E. Hobson, Ashton-under-Lyne; A. Heywood, Manchester.

This faithful champion of the rights, and able exponent of the claims of the factory workers, continues its useful though unpretending career. From the number for February 2nd, we extract the following notice of

It is impossible to overrate the importance of the question submitted to the judges in the Court of Exchequer, on Monday last, and now awaiting their decision. It involves not merely the physical, social and moral well-being and happiness of many thousands of our factory population, but the rights of persons of both sexes, especially of females, which of itself is a sufficiently serious consideration; but, relatively, from the points likely to be raised in the judgment about to be delivered, it will be found to involve certain principles in the politico-industrial system of the nation, upon the practical adoption or rejection of which very much of the future fate of England will depend. We listened attentively to the arguments of the learned counsel who conducted the case on each side of the question, and watched most anxiously the turns of the law, which the discussion appeared to take. There were several sentiments expressed in the course of the argument, as well by the judges as by the learned counsel, which appeared to us to be both novel and dangerous, and to which we shall send an early opportunity to revert. For the present, we will content ourselves to make a remark upon the dicta to which we refer. In the mean time, without at all anticipating the final decision of the bench, we would exhort the friends of the Ten Hours Bill to prepare to receive and act upon that decision, whatever it may be, with the same unflinching determination to see the case carried out, and to resist to the last, every attempt to evade its demands. Events, we believe, will confirm the opinion we recently expressed—that a new crisis in the Factory Question is at hand.

The Frame Work-Knitters' Advocate. No. I. Nottingham: R. Sutton, Bridlesmith Gate.

We welcome this new advocate of Labour's interests. We learn from the opening address, that "the Advocate will, on all occasions, be ready to assist the injured, and plead the cause of the oppressed; it will expose the abuses, errors, frauds, and deceptions which are still exercised in so many and such various forms. The working men, however illiterate and unlearned, will here find space to express their thoughts and views, couched in their own terms, and clothed in their own language, providing it contains nothing that is unreasonable or irrational. It will contain occasionally articles on all subjects connected with the interests of the trade; such as its history, past and present; wages, their rise and fall; comparison between the present and past; local customs in their different varieties; inventions and improvements in the manufacture of machinery. The laws that affect the rights of industry will meet with due attention, and the social and moral improvement of the working man will be our greatest object. In short, it will be the fearless advocate of all the rights, privileges, and immunities of those who produce the wealth of this country." It is almost superfluous to add, that our best wishes are given for the success of the *Frame Work-Knitters' Advocate*.

THE MIDDLE-CLASS EXPENDITURE. M. Louis Blanc, in one of his elegant Lectures on Socialism, remarks, when leaders of the people say to them, "follow us," the people should question where they are being led to; now, we think, if the honest answer was always given, it would often be, "a forty years' journey in the Wilderness;" and, as one of the people, we fume, and ask the multiplicity of leaders, "Where are you leading us?" For, although we hold that we must conquer the state by political reform, thereby to work out the social change, we question whether there are two of

THE NORTHERN STAR.

GOD'S WORLD IS WORTHIER BETTER.

It's all an idle tale they tell, but, then, who blames their telling it?
The rogues have got their cant to sell, the world pays well for selling it.
They say this world's a "desert drear," cursed in their own stark blindness!
That we were sent to suffer here—what, by a God of kindness?
That since the world has gone astray—it must be so for ever.
And we must stand still, and obey its desolators—never!

We'll labour for the better time
With all our might of press and pen;
Believe us, 'tis a truth sublime—
God's world is worthier better men.

In Paradise the world began, a world of love and gladness—
Its beauty hath been marred by man, with all his crime and madness;
Yet, 'tis a bright world,—still love brings sunshine for spirits dreary.

With all our strife, sweet rest hath wings to fold our hearts—a weary
The sun, in glory, like a God, to-day in heaven is brighting.

A bloom of stars smiling on the sod, as love with flowers is smiling;
Earth's heart throbs with immortal youth.

Her voice still rings of Eden—then
Believe us, 'tis a noble truth,
God's world is worthier better men.

Oh! they are bold knaves, over-bold—who say we are doomed to anguish—
That men in God's own image soul'd, like hell-bound slaves must languish,
Probe Nature's heart to its red core, there's more of good than evil.

And man, down-trampled, still is more of angel than of devil—
"Prepare to die"—prepare to live! we know not what is living.

And let us for the world's good give, as God is ever giving.
Give love, thought, action, wealth, and time,
To win the primal age again;
Believe us, 'tis a truth sublime,
God's world is worthier better men.

Spirit of Freedom. MARY.

SONG OF THE FUTURE.

"Midst all the storms and cares of life,
I see a brighter day,
Bursting through the clouds of strife,
To chase our wrongs away.
The advent of that day may seem
As though it ne'er would dawn,
And better times might be a dream,
From Fancy's empire dawn.

But knowledge sows the seeds of right,
Which grows in every mind,
And teaches men that moral might
Will freedom's beauty find.

The future opens with a smile,
And justice seems to call
Upon the toilers of our isle,
To watch their tyrants fall.

The past has been the age of woe,
Where reason never dawned,
And men were bent to make a show
Of what they never felt.

Oh! England's sons! may glory crown
Your acts and deeds with fame;
To conquer ease oppression's frown,
And win a glorious name.

A GLOVE-MARKER.

Reviews.

THE PEOPLE'S REVIEW OF LITERATURE AND PROGRESS. Edited by FRIENDS IN COUNCIL. No. 1. February. London: C. Mitchell, Red-Lion Court, Fleet-street.

From both principle and personal feeling we had hoped to have been able to have given a hearty welcome to this new publication. Announced as the "People's Review" we naturally expected to have met, under such a title, with a zealous exponent of the people's claims, and a determined assessor of their rights; and such a "Review" would have had our most earnest good wishes. As regards personal feeling—although we have never allowed that to mislead us so far as to move us to vote black white—we have always been anxious to ensure the language of praise, rather than censure; and, in the present instance having a personal regard for, at least, one of the conductors of the *People's Review*, we should only have been too happy could we have consistently praised the work of our friend, and his coadjutors. But we cannot do so. The *People's Review*, as a whole, has disappointed our expectations. We question not the integrity, nor the talent of the writers; the one is as above suspicion, as the other is above question. Nor do we dispute that those sections of the "people" who constitute the opinion of the "Mechanics' Institutions," "Manchester Athenæums," and "Whittington Clubs" may find this *Review* suited to their tastes; but the proletarians—the masses—are not very likely to recognise it as the "People's."

To say nothing of the peculiar views of the writers, their manner of "reviewing" finds anything but favour in our eyes. The ability displayed in the articles contained in the present number cannot be disputed, but the articles are rather essays than reviews; and, with all respect for the essayists, we would rather have had less of their writing, and more of the books they undertook to "review."

It would be an ungracious task to single out particular articles or particular passages for hostile comment. Instead of so disagreeable a performance, we have pleasure in stating, that at least portions of the contents deserve public approbation. The article headed "History of the Taxes on Knowledge," cannot be too warmly praised.

That our readers may not hastily or ill-advisedly condemn a new candidate for popular support, we recommend all who are curious in such matters, and can afford to expend pence, to purchase this first number and judge for themselves. We should add, that the work is neatly printed, and more than ordinary taste is evident in the getting up of the wrapper. We trust that on a future occasion we shall be able to speak in terms of unalloyed approbation of the "People's Review."

The Spirit of Freedom. Conducted by Working Men. New Series. No. II.—February. London: J

LETTERS

TO THE WORKING CLASSES.

LXXV.

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

THE MASK THROWN OFF—THE GAUNTLET
THROWN DOWN.
THE HAYNAU OF CEYLON.
SOCIAL PROGRESS—CO-OPERATION.
EXCITED STATE OF PARIS.

BROTHER PROLETARIANS,

Wherever two or three of you are gathered together in the name of Liberty, you will neglect your duty if you fail to give a vote of thanks to Lord JOHN RUSSELL.

It was predicted by the political seers, that the present session would be the most important England has seen since the passing of the Reform Bill. Judging by the proceedings which thus far have filled the pages of the daily papers, the seers are very likely to win for themselves the title of false prophets. The contemptible "speech from the throne" followed by Lord JOHN RUSSELL's insulting declaration, leaves no longer room for doubt that the people have nothing to expect from the patriotism of the Government; that if they really desire reform, they must stretch forth their hands and help themselves.

After the humbug-reports of the recess, and the humbug-doings on the first two nights of the Parliamentary session, it is impossible to be too thankful for the bit of downright speaking contained in the following sentences uttered by the PREMIER on Monday evening last:—

"The hon. member for Montrose had addressed to the house some observations on the subject of the extension of the franchise. He would not enter into the arguments, or give his reasons at the present moment, but it was NOT THE INTENTION OF GOVERNMENT TO PROPOSE ANY FILL FOR THE EXTENSION OF THE FRANCHISE IN ENGLAND, DURING THE PRESENT YEAR. He hoped that some gentleman would bring the subject under discussion, and he (Lord J. Russell) should then be ready to maintain the opinions which he now holds."

In my letter in the *Star* of January 12th, I warned you against putting too much faith in the rumour so craftily got up by the *Weekly Chronicle*, and so trickily endorsed by the *Times*. I reminded you of the salutary lesson conveyed in the old and admirable proverb:—"Blessed are those who expect nothing, for verily they shall not be disappointed."

The *Weekly Chronicle*—a ministerial journal—professed to have "great pleasure in being enabled to announce, that among the earliest measures to be submitted to Parliament, would be bills to provide for an extension of the suffrage both in England and Ireland." The *Times* commenting on this announcement, observed, "The Ministerial measure would, most probably, be carried this session." Simple-minded persons could not have imagined that both journals were but making fools of the people; yet that such was their work is now evident to all Europe. Lord John has thrown off the mask, and thrown down the gauntlet. He has declared that he does not intend to propose any extension of the franchise during the present year; and he defies the advocates of Parliamentary Reform to discuss the question. If any gentleman will bring the subject under discussion, his lordship will maintain his own opinions. Thus much will he do for the people, but the devil a bit more.

The cool and haughty defiance, flung by Lord John into the teeth of all Reformers—sham and veritable—is quite refreshing, and contrasts most favourably with the hypocritical whinnings of the Protectionists, and the false-hearted liberalism of "the Manchester School." As "a plain, bold-faced villain" is certainly preferable to a "Jeremy Diddler," so the Whig leader, declaring that he will make no concession, yield not one jot to the demands of the people, shines by comparison with the knaves who use words not to express but to conceal their thoughts; and who, whether they champion "Protection" or "Free Trade" look upon the people only as forces to be used for their own selfish purposes—not as heirs of a common country, or human beings having the same rights to "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness," as themselves.

If unshrinking insult, added to unmitigated wrong, be sufficient to move the injured to action, then will the people take up the gauntlet thrown down by Lord JOHN RUSSELL, and force him to eat his own words "during the present session." But how accomplish a work so much needed? The answer must be by a national union of the unrepresented classes, aided by those who, though they possess the franchise, find themselves really unrepresented by the operation of the "Reform Bill." Such a national union, however, will be impossible as long as one section of Reformers agitate for "the Charter," another section for "the Little Charter," and a third section for "freehold franchise." There can be no real union without oneness of object. That oneness of object can only be accomplished by all but one section abandoning their pet schemes. Shall the Chartists abandon their Charter? No; for the Charter means justice to all, justice to none. Rival schemes do not mean justice to all, and, therefore, do mean injustice to some; and those, too, the most unfortunate, miserable, and oppressed; those, indeed, who most need legislative representation, that they may thereby release themselves from the miseries of wages (and no wages) slavery; that, as was happily observed by one of the speakers at the London Tavern, they may be enabled to protect themselves from the Protectionists, and free themselves from the Free Traders.

It is useless to tell those who would not be represented under the Little Charter, that they ought, nevertheless, to support that measure as an "instalment." Mr. Ross, at the meeting at John-street Institution, on Tuesday last, exploded that fallacy. He had no objection to take an instalment; but as the "Little Charter" would not invest him with a vote, it would be no instalment to him. Moreover, the Charter itself is but an instalment of the people's claims; it is, however, an instalment that would be shared by everybody, and give to the people without distinction, the means of wresting further instalments from the privileged classes, until such time as the debt was discharged in full.

Admittance of the possibility of the "Parliamentary Reformers" getting up the steam to a very considerable extent. Those who command wealth, may command almost anything—unreflecting and excited multitudes included. But, all discouraging circumstances notwithstanding, the people have advanced from that which they were in the time of the Reform Bill. Then HENRY RUSSELL stood alone. Now "HUNTS" in every town, and "Village Hamlets" in every country, men who look upon the Charter as a necessary instalment to enable them to obtain veritable social reforms, are neither few nor important. These men will work for a complete and conclusive measure of Parliamentary Reform, but for no half-and-half measures.

Let the Parliamentary Reformers reflect. They may command a national organisation if they will; but to do so they must enlarge their "little Charter," so that it may include all the unrepresented, and ensure the representation of all. Lord JOHN RUSSELL has defied them. They may answer his puny defiance by the thunder-voice of the people's voice, if they will only awaken the energy and enthusiasm of the masses, by raising the cry for "the Charter, the whole Charter, and nothing less than the Charter!"

Although I have given Lord JOHN RUSSELL credit for his boldness—perhaps I should say impudent—declaration that he means not to return this year, I am sorry to add that, in his political nature as a Whig, "his Lordship," has been shuffling, after a most

discreditable fashion, in his relations with the committee appointed by Parliament to investigate the conduct of Lord TORRINGTON, governor of Ceylon. The atrocious doings of that aristocrat must be yet fresh in everybody's recollection. Misgovernment, taxation, oppression, and insult, having driven the unhappy people into "riotous excesses"—the outburst of disaffection was never formidable enough to earn the title of "revolt," "rebellion," or "insurrection."—Lord TORRINGTON and his agents, resolved to "strike terror" to the hearts of the suffering people; committed acts of atrocity, which, as Mr. H. BAILLIE said last night in the House of Commons, were unparalleled by the cruelties even of that monster HAYNAU. Well, public opinion having demanded inquiry into these horrors, a committee was appointed last session to make the investigation. Lord JOHN RUSSELL promised the committee, that during the recess any witnesses, whose attendance in England the committee might deem necessary, should be summoned to this country; whereupon the committee unanimously instructed their chairman, Mr. BAILLIE, to communicate to the Secretary for the Colonies, the names of the witnesses they required. When, however, Mr. BAILLIE sent into Earl GREY, the names of seven witnesses whose presence they desired, he refused to send for them, on the plea that the Committee had exceeded their powers, in delegating to their Chairman the function of communicating to him the names of the necessary witnesses. Mr. BAILLIE then appealed to Lord JOHN RUSSELL, who expressed his concurrence with Earl GREY. This was during the recess, and, of course, for the moment there could be no appeal from the Ministry to the Parliament. In the meantime, the Colonial Secretary took care to send for witnesses interested in whitewashing Lord TORRINGTON, whilst the persons who are prepared to prove that worthy's crimes are still in the island of Ceylon.

You will read for yourselves, the debate in which this shuffling and disgraceful conduct of the Whig Government was laid bare. An unscrupulous majority enabled Ministers to defeat two successive motions; and the arrival of the hour of adjournment (six o'clock on Wednesday evening) put an end to the debate without the motion of the Under Colonial Secretary for the appointment of a Select Committee being decided on. There will, consequently, be another debate, and it is to be hoped that when that comes off, the independent members will insist on a full discussion of the atrocities committed by Lord TORRINGTON's Government—atrocities which should make every Englishman blush for the foul deeds done in England's name; but done by those who have no legitimate right to represent the English people—those who, usurping power over their own countrymen, use that power to plunder and murder nations even at "the furthest ends of the earth."

The atrocities committed by the directions of Lord TORRINGTON, and by persons calling themselves officers and agents of "HER BRITANNIC MAJESTY," I will merely indicate, not examine in detail. Twenty-eight persons were shot, twenty-two banished, and sixty-six imprisoned. The burning of villages, and wholesale confiscation of property, must be added to the list of these enormities. The poor wretches who were condemned to death by court-martial, had for their judges three military officers, all of whom were ignorant of the native language. The persons condemned were at once led from the scene of their condemnation to the place appointed for their execution, and there shot as you would shoot mad dogs. Amongst the proclamations issued by the British was the following:—

"Unless all those who have helped concealed the effects of the late Governor's delinquencies, and who, in property, or give information about the same without delay, shall be considered as traitors, and their property confiscated." (Signed) A. WATSON, Captain Commanding."

Did HAYNAU ever indite a worse proclamation! Deeds, too, were in accordance with these threats, as has been already shown; but I must add one or two striking examples of Lord TORRINGTON's "vigour." In one of his despatches, he wrote to Earl GREY that he had caused "an influential priest to be shot in full robes." It is true that subsequently, when he found that this atrocity—not only revolting to humanity, but also an outrage to the religious feelings of the people of Ceylon—was by no means generally approved of in England, "his Lordship" attempted to show that the priest was not influential, nor did he suffer in "full robes," but merely in a yellow waist cloth. Whatever his dress may have been, the wretched priest was shot. In the course of the riots which were made the pretext for these barbarities, it was given out that a "pretender" to the monarchy of Ceylon was in the field, at the head of a body of "rebels."

Although this pretended "rebel" was in the ordinary sense of that term, were somewhat difficult to find; and there appears to have been at least equal difficulty in getting hold of the alleged "PRETENDER." But the humane British were no way particular; if they failed to catch the right man, they contented themselves with shooting the wrong. Mr. BAILLIE stated that a person having been arrested, who was said to be the PRETENDER, was forthwith condemned by court-martial, shot within half an hour, and his body hanged upon a tree. Nine days after that execution, Lord TORRINGTON wrote to Earl GREY, saying that was a mistake to have supposed that that man was the PRETENDER, he was only the PRETENDER's brother. But, by another post, Lord GREY was informed that the victim was no more the PRETENDER himself—he was only an "adherent." In this manner a million and a half of "British subjects" are governed by Lord TORRINGTON.

In the present state of things it is impossible for the friends of Justice to do more than expose the crimes of irresponsible rulers, and invoke against them the condemnation of public opinion. For the natives of the British Colonies and Dependencies there can be no hope that they will obtain redress of their manifold wrongs, while the British Parliament shall continue to be constituted as at present. When the people of this country obtain power over the Legislature, their brethren beyond the seas will obtain justice. Until then, there is no hope for the people of Ceylon, or any other colony or dependency—unless, indeed, strong enough to right themselves by hoisting the flag of independence, and repeating the glorious lesson given by WASHINGTON and JEFFERSON—that Governments must exist for the good of peoples, not peoples to be the prey of their rulers.

Turning from the contemplation of aristocratic misgovernment and parliamentary juggling, to a more general subject, I rejoice that the working men are beginning to make "social reform" a matter of more than mere words. Pages upon pages of the *Morning Chronicle* have been devoted to revelations of the "sweating system," and the other evils which combine to render the mass of operative tailors, a most wretched and cruelly used body of workers. Meetings too have been held, and from the lips of the victims themselves, statements have gone forth, elucidatory of wrongs and miseries awful to contemplate. A Government worthy of the name, would at once endeavour to grapple with these evils, and aid the victims to escape from them. But we have no such Government. The let-alone principle is in the ascendant, and the Government exists merely to devour taxes, and to give aid to the powerful in keeping down the weak. Under these circumstances, it is cheerless to observe that, instead of further yielding themselves to despair, a portion, at least, of the workers are anxious to do something for

their own social salvation. A Tailors' Co-operative Association has been founded, and will almost immediately commence operations. It is pleasing to be able to add, that several men of property actuated by purely philanthropic motives, have given their aid to this good work. Owing to their assistance, the necessary capital in hand, premises have been taken in Castle-street, Oxford-street, and under the management of Mr. WALTER COOPER, the Association—modelled on the Parisian Operatives' Associations—will almost immediately commence business.

It is to be hoped that this attempt will not result in an addition to the list of failures which in many instances have attended the efforts of working-men to free themselves from the tyranny of mastership. With good management, patience, perseverance, and a fair share of public support, the scheme can hardly fail to succeed, and being successful, give birth to many more efforts of a like kind. The Association, by its carrying out its object, will assist in stirring up the friends of progress in this metropolis to give the Association their support. All true Democrats, all earnest advocates of Social Progress, will support and encourage every attempt at proletarian emancipation. Whilst on this subject, I should not omit mention of the Boot and Shoe Makers, whose address appeared in last Saturday's *Star*. Driven by oppression to resist the injustice of their late taskmaster, they have commenced manufacturing on their own account. My metropolitan readers, who may not have observed the address of our friends, will do well to turn to the second page of last Saturday's *Star*. It is to be hoped that this Co-operative band will also succeed in obtaining public support. A question arises, whether it is not wise for the Cordwainers as traders, to take the same course as the Boot and Shoe Makers, instead of leaving the work to a few, they were to apply to it the energetic action of the trade at large, they might find parties to assist them in the same manner as the Tailors are being assisted. Successful in their efforts to free themselves from the tyranny of their taskmaster, and Cordwainers would give a wonderful impulse to the cause of Social Reform.

I must confess that I have no faith in such associations being successful to the extent desirable, as long as the present political system shall endure. In my opinion, only when the veritable people shall be in a position to command the power and resources of the state, will the principle of "Association" have a chance of being fairly tested. Not even then, unless the people have been previously prepared to make use of the suffrage to reform the social system, they may not have observed the political readers, who may not have observed the success of such experiments as the Tailors' Co-operative Association. The good that association, if successful, will effect for a few will be of some moment; but the good influence it will have in stimulating the masses to get rid of all sectional and party feelings, and to unite in the struggle for the progress of social justice, will be of much greater importance. The social justice is to be the end of political reform, the people must know how to save themselves, when rid of the obstacles that at present impede their progress from bondage to freedom, and from misery to happiness.

It is to be hoped that the remarks, on British bullying in Greece, and the perilous position of Switzerland; but the length to which this letter has already extended, compels the postponement of comment on those topics. The outraged, insulted, and noble people of Paris have resisted the impositions employed by the men of blood who at present rule in France, to drive them to insurrection. The tremendous progress of Red Republicanism in the departments strikes the order-mongers with consternation, and they are now trying to get up an insurrection to have a pretext for placing Paris in a state of siege, suppressing the true Republican journals, and consigning the Democrats and Socialists to a general massacre. To provoke a civil war was the object of cutting down the liberties of the people. Up to the time I write, the villains in power have been aided by the good sense of the people; who at the same time have given unmistakable evidence of their devotion to the Republic. Let Louis Napoleon, and his infamous confederates do their worst, Democracy will sweep over Europe and destroy the last vestiges of despotism. Not all the tyrants and traitors on the face of the earth can prevent the regeneration of the human race.

"My first steps, liberty I love! I sometimes may falter—
Till the march will not cease nor my banner be furled,
Till the sun and the land shall be red with a world of
To the God of the Free, or the Thrones of the World!"

L'AMI DU PEUPLE.

Feb. 7, 1850.

PROCEEDINGS IN PARLIAMENT.

The first of a series of Tuesday evening meetings, to watch over and discuss the proceedings of Saint Stephen's, was held on Tuesday, February the 6th, at the Literary and Scientific Institution, John-street, Tottenham-court-road; and notwithstanding the inclement weather there was a very numerous attendance.

Mr. W. DIXON was called to the chair, and said he always was, and trusted he ever should be, the friend of free and fair discussion, and therefore in the course of the proceedings would endeavour to gain for himself, and for the cause, the most complete liberty. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from Joseph Hume, asserted that the people do not require parliamentary reform, and that the government did not intend to submit any measure for the purpose of extending the franchise. (Hear, hear.) Lord JOHN RUSSELL, the first minister of the crown, had last night, in reply to a question from

ceeded in examining the numerous witnesses he would inform the jury that since the last meeting he

thirteen, and three or four in Bishop Auckland.
The first was a man named Jesse Andrews, a
A dreadful fire occurred on Saturday, the 21st,
near Baldock, supposed to be the act of an incendiary.
Several farms were burnt down and a number
of persons were injured. The amount of the
£10,000 upwards. A high wind added to the
conflagration, which it was painful in the extreme
to behold. People seem at a loss to account for the
act of the incendiary, who has been a single able-bodied
man, the owner, nor has there been any
winner, all the labourers having been well employed.

GANG LAW VENGEANCE.—At the Ashendon petty
sessions on the 1st instant, Jesse Andrews, a labourer
of Westcott, was charged with being concerned in
the murder of George Griffin, gamekeeper for the Rev.
George Outwood, of Chilton-house, before Messrs.
Bernard and Martyn, with having on the morning
of the 22nd ult. been armed with a gun, and
having been in the property of the Marquis of
Chandos. The prisoner was defended by Mr. Jones,
solicitor, Aylesbury. Joseph King and Robert
Thomas, Hine, watchers for the above, were
also present. The evidence of the witnesses was
used was fought with a gun and a pheasant on hand.
The magistrates committed him to Aylesbury Gaol

The driver was dragged, and the body of the unfortunate man was pulled up about fifty yards below his own house. His arms were folded over his chest as if embracing himself, and his hands were clasped together in the palm of the tire and the cold must have been agonizing. The body of his father's arms, the body being in Monday discovered in the river eighteen miles below the spot where the man was drowned. The jury thought when the body was hanged. The jury thought a verdict "That the deceased was killed by a violent labouring under temporary insanity." The wife has been committed on a charge of shoplifting.

THE CASE OF A GAMWATER AT HONGKONG.—In the neighbourhood of Tsingtau, a short distance from this place, Richard Tasker, a gamewater, in the service of the Rev. J. Dymoke, was murdered by a gang of poachers early on the morning of Saturday last. The gamewater was accompanied by two companions who were with him, were able to recognise any of the party. The police, however, are on the alert, and this belief they have obtained some information.

PROVIDENTIAL ESCAPE.—On Tuesday morning, about six o'clock, the inmates of the Craven Arms Hotel, Coventry, were alarmed by the cry of "Fire,"

ends:—“Evictions, destitution, and all will be added by the summary process now going on. The number of the poor is increasing at the rate of one hundred and twenty per month.” Even in some parts of Clare, according to the testimony of Mr. Major, a most competent authority, there are manifestations of the same distress. The following are a few of the most atrocious for these wholesale evictions described by Sir Robert Peel, in his memorable speech last session, is sinking deeper and deeper in destitution and suffering.

—ANOTHER DEEPLY CALVARYED IN A WORKHOUSE. —TWENTY-SEVEN LIVES LOST.—The *Limerick Chronicle* of Thursday week contains an account of a most singular and horrible case in the gaol in Clare-street, in the city, on the night before last, after the inmates, 500 females, had retired to rest, a false alarm of fire was given by one of the inmates, which had an idle intention of causing annoyance or by design.

The prisoners were panic-struck, that almost instantaneously the female on the first leap leaped from their beds, and, in the darkness, rushed in a body to the windows, and, perceiving that the portion of the building to the ground floor. Uttering the pailings on the other lofts congregated in the nar-

Nabonassar, who became king of Babylon 747 years before the Christian era, caused all the histories of his predecessors, his predecessors' predecessors, five hundred years later, Chiosus, to be destroyed; five ordered all the books in the empire to be burnt, excepting only those which treated of the history, geography, astronomy, metaphysics, medicine, the infancy of Christianity, and the life of Jesus Christ. It lasted in various parts of the Roman empire; Pagans and Christians being equally unscrupulous in destroying their respective books. In 390 the library of Alexandria was burnt by the emperor Theodosius. Scierap was pillaged and entirely despoiled. Myriads of books have been burnt in the frequent conflagrations of Constantinople; and when the city was sacked, the books in the library of the Caliphs (1,000,000 volumes) were distributed among the soldiers instead of pay, at a price, I am told, of three deniers apiece. At present thousands of the volumes were torn to pieces and abandoned on the outskirts of the city, piled in large heaps. The sand of the Desert, having been blown for many years, and were known as the hills of books.

The *Northern Star* of the 19th ult. gave a brief

an exterior bruise on the anterior and superior part of the head to the cheek; a bruise with a slight abrasion on the cheek, but I cannot give an opinion as to whether it was the cause of the death. The blow caused the death of Deenescu, or rather the blow caused it, which was a recent one. There was a bruise on the chest just below the collar bone, but I cannot give an opinion as to whether it was the cause of the death. There were wounds apparently inflicted by a bullet. That was the impression made on my mind immediately I saw them. There was a large slough on the right arm, but I cannot give an opinion as to whether it was the cause of the death. There was a large slough of old tissue, varying in size from half-a-cup to a cup, on the posterior part of the hip. The wounds on the back had been inflicted at a different time from the others. There were some of them covered with plaster and some of them were not. There were some of them which were two bruises, not very extensive, on the shoulders; and there were abrasions on the upper and lower part of the left arm, but I cannot give an opinion as to whether they were produced. On the upper part of the right arm, there were some abrasions on the fingers of the left hand were gone, as the tops of the fingers had been frostbitten; the nails of the first and fourth fingers had been gone.

