IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.—WEDNESDAY.

The SPEAKER took the chair at 12 o'clock.

PRIVATE BUSINESS.

The Severn Valley Railway (Extension of Time) Bill was read a second time.

The following select committee was appointed on the Portumna Bridge (Ireland) Bill:—Mr. Hamilton, Sir T. Burke, Mr. Gregory, the O'Donoboe, Mr. Waldron, Mr. Bagwell, and five members to be added by the Committee of Selection.

PETITIONS.

Petitions were presented by Mr. BRISCOE, from the inhabitants of Byfleet, Surrey, that idolatry may be deprived of the support, homage, and patronage of the British Government in India; by Sir J. OGILVY, from 120 publicans and spirit-dealers in Dundee, against the Billeting Act, which subjects them to many undue burdens, which they think should be borne equally by all classes; by Mr. NEWDEGATE, from a number of places, against the admission of Jews into Parliament, the opium trade, and the encouragement of idolatry in India; by Mr. BULLER, from Eastbourne, Devonshire, against the admission of Jews into Parliament; by Mr. CHILD, from Ellenhall, Staffordshire, and Willerby, Yorkshire, to the same effect; by Mr. BENTINCK, from Yaxham, Norfolk, to the same effect; by Mr. BEACH, from West Tested, Southampton, to the same effect, against the recognition of caste in India, and for the protection of natives who embrace the Christian faith; by Mr. BLACK, from the lord provost and magistrates of Edinburgh, against the system of billeting soldiers in Scotland—from a public meeting held in Edinburgh, against the annuity tax; by Mr. DILLWYN, from Swansea Mercantile Marine Service Association, and merchants, shipowners, and others interested in the port and trade of Swansea, for a harbour of refuge at the Mumbles Roadstead; by Mr. H. G. LANGTON, from a Baptist congregation in Bristol, praying that measures may be adopted to prevent any interference on the part of the Government of India to repress or promote any form of religion; by Mr. G. DUNDAS, from the trustees of the harbour and the seafaring men of Bo'ness, for the establishment of a harbour of refuge at Peterhead.

REPEAL OF THE SEPTENNIAL ACT.

Mr. COX gave notice that on Tuesday, the 30th of March, he should move for leave to bring in a bill to repeal the Septennial Act, and limit the duration of Parliament to three years. (A laugh.)

PARLIAMENTARY OATHS.

On the order of the day for going into committee on the Parliamentary Oaths Bill,

Lord J. RUSSELL said that he would state the course which he intended to take in consequence of an appeal made to him on a former night by the hon. gentleman the member for North Warwickshire (Mr. Newdegate). That hon. member had informed him it would be inconvenient to discuss that portion of the bill which related to the admission of Jews on a day when many hon. members might wish to attend her Majesty's levee. He was quite willing to recognise the cogency of the objection; at the same time it appeared to him that it would not be advisable to postpone any further the consideration of the bill in committee—(hear, hear)—but an opportunity would be afforded the hon. gentleman the member for North Warwickshire to propose any alterations in the bill when the report was made up. He (Lord J. Russell) would however state, for the convenience of the hon. gentleman, the alterations which he himself proposed to make in committee, and also the alterations he intended to suggest on the subsequent stage of bringing up the report. It had been objected that the 7th clause of the bill went further than was necessary in re-enacting and affirming the oath to be taken in that house by hon. gentlemen professing the Roman Catholic faith. The only object, however, which he had in view was that the bill should not affect the oaths taken by Roman Catholic members at all. This was a subject of great importance, and he felt that it could be more conveniently dealt with by itself; but in order that there might not seem to be any especial authority given by the act in reference to oaths taken by Roman Catholic members, he was prepared to leave out the latter part of the 7th clause, and in that case the clause would declare that nothing in the act should be deemed to alter the provisions of the 10th Geo. IV., c. 7, for the relief of his Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects. It would then be open to any hon. member on the bringing up of the report to move that the words expunged be restored. Again, it was said that the words of the oath in which the person subscribing to it declares that "no foreign prince, State, or potentate hath or ought to have any power or authority, ecclesiastical or temporal, within this realm," meant to signify that no foreign prince or potentate had any authority over the minds of persons professing the Roman Catholic faith. For his own part, he did not think the words bore that interpretation, but it might not be difficult to insert some words in the preamble which might tend to remove that objection and define more clearly the aim and purpose of the language used. The history of early legislation upon this subject appeared to be this, that by an act passed in the 20th year of the reign of Henry the Eighth, the Pope was deprived of all ecclesiastical and of some temporal powers (such as the levying of first fruits and the power of appeal to the Court of Rome) which he then enjoyed in these realms. Acts were subsequently passed in the first and second years of the reign of Queen Mary which repealed the act of Henry and restored to the Pope all the rights and privileges taken from him by the act of Henry. When Queen Elizabeth ascended the throne one of the very first Acts of Parliament passed in her reign was to declare that the jurisdiction of the Pope in this realm was a usurped jurisdiction, and to restore to the Crown of England the power of a Crown which was then declared to be wholly independent of all foreign jurisdiction whatever. The declaration was objected to on the part of the Roman Catholics, because it was directed against influence over the mind as well as the actions. He should therefore propose the omission from the 7th clause of the words objected to, and he should give due notice of any other amendments which it might be his intention to suggest on the bringing up of the report. This course would enable the hon. gentleman the member for North Warwickshire to raise the questions upon which he intended to take the sense of the house. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. NEWDEGATE thanked the noble lord the member for the City of London for the courtesy he had extended to him, as it would have been inconvenient for several hon. members to have attended the discussion of a great principle on a day appointed for her Majesty's levee. The hon. member then proceeded to call the attention of the house to a recent report of the committee on petitions, by which it appeared that a petition originated by the National Protestant Association, and signed by 320 clergymen of the Church of England against any measure that might unchristianise the character of the house, was returned as signed by four clergymen only. The reason of this, he believed, was that the signatures were written on small pieces of paper and afterwards stuck on the larger sheet containing the petition. He was anxious to call attention to this subject, as he was assured that the gentlemen who signed were all under the belief that their signatures were appended in proper form.

Mr. T. DUNCOMBE said he wished to ask the noble lord the member for the City of London two questions, upon the answer to which would depend the course which it was his (Mr. Duncombe's) intention to adopt in reference to the admission of Jews to Parliament. He could not imagine a more humiliating apology for Jewish emancipation, or a greater stultification of the votes formerly given by the house in favour of religious equality, than the measure now proposed by the noble lord. The questions therefore which he wished to ask were, whether, if the bill were passed in its present form, the noble lord could give the house any assurance that the bill would meet with a better reception in another place, for, as far as he could understand, it not only humiliated the house and stultified its former votes, but it had not the most distant prospect of conciliating its opponents. (Hear, hear.) He therefore asked the noble lord whether the bill was at all likely to meet a more favourable reception in another place, and if unsuccessful, whether the noble lord meant to adhere to his declared intention of bringing forward a resolution under which the House of Commons might of its own action seat Baron Rothschild? (Hear, hear.)

Mr. WALPOLE deprecated discussion on that subject at the present moment, and complimented the noble lord the member for the City of London on the fair and candid course he had adopted with reference to the bill now under discussion. With reference to the questions put by the hon. gentleman the member for Finsbury, they were so entirely different to the questions raised by the bill that he would suggest it would be far more desirable to discuss them upon a distinct motion made for the purpose. (Hear, hear.) He hoped the noble lord would print his amendments, in order that hon. gentlemen might have greater facility in considering them.

Mr. MONSELL said that the right hon. gentleman who spoke last appeared to treat the bill as a measure the only object of which was to admit Jews to Parliament; but he (Mr. Monsell) wished to remind the right hon. gentleman that an hon. gentleman intended to bring under the notice of the house the question of the position in which Roman Catholic members would be placed if the bill were carried into law.

Mr. B. CARTER, as one of the select committee on petitions, wished to state, in reference to the petition referred to by the hon. gentleman the member for North Warwickshire, that, by the standing orders of the house, no signatures to petitions could be received that were not written on the petition itself, and that the practice of writing signatures on slips of paper, and afterwards pasting the slips on the petition, was altogether irregular, and could not, under any circumstances, be regarded as a compliance with standing orders.

Mr. HENLEY said the subject was one of considerable importance, and that it might save trouble and disappointment if it were known that all signatures to petitions must be inscribed by the individual approving of the contents, and that signatures written on small slips of paper, and afterwards pasted on, or different signatures written by the same hand, could not be received.

Mr. DILLWYN expressed his entire approbation of the course taken by the hon. member for Finsbury in reference to the questions put to the noble lord the member for the City of London, and moved the adjournment of the debate in order that the noble lord might at once reply to them. (Hear, hear.)

After a few words from Mr. NEWDEGATE, Mr. SCOTT, and Mr. WARREN on the form of signing petitions,

Mr. STEUART asked the hon. member for Finsbury whether, in pursuance of a notice of motion given by him last month for discussing the question of admitting Baron Rothschild by resolution of the house, he intended to take any early opportunity of introducing the subject?

The SPEAKER then left the chair.

Lord J. RUSSELL said—I am now entitled to answer the questions put to me by the hon. member for Finsbury. The hon. gentleman asked me whether I could count on a majority in the House of Lords provided the bill passed the Commons; and, secondly, what course I intended to pursue in case the majority in the Upper House were hostile to the measure. With regard to the first of these questions, it seems doubtful who has the majority in this house, of which we are all members—(laughter)—and, therefore, it would be presumptuous of me to say who will have the majority in the House of Lords, which is a totally independent house, and has its own peculiar privileges and forms of procedure. (Hear, hear.) With regard to the second question, and to the hard epithets which the hon. gentleman has applied to the bill, my experience has taught me that it is very desirable, even in cases where the House of Commons has privileges which, if necessary, it can maintain against the courts of law and other authorities in the State, that the decision of this house should be sanctioned by the general assent of Parliament. (Hear, hear.) I find this has been desirable in other cases. I mean the case of Stockdale v. Hansard, which caused a great deal of excitement and disturbance, after a very angry and protracted debate. At the end of the discussion it was thought the best way of settling the matter was to send a bill to the other House of Parliament for its acceptance; and since then there has been no discussion or difference with regard to the publication of papers ordered by this house. I conceive, therefore, that this bill has been framed in a manner which, as far as I can guess, if the other House of Parliament is at all disposed to the admission of Jews, will be most conciliatory and most agreeable. In my view it is better so to act than to bring under discussion the question of our privileges. For as regards that, sir, it will be admitted that it would be inconvenient to raise that discussion now. There are two ways in which I might propose to proceed—one of admitting Baron Rothschild to take the oath, omitting the words "on the true faith of a Christian." But, sir, in that way we would come into collision with the courts of law, because they have had this question before them, and they have decided these words are a part of the oath. Another mode, which has the very high authority of the late Attorney-General, is, that this house might, under the authority of an Act of Parliament, declare that a declaration might be substituted for an oath, and that in this way Baron Rothschild, and all those members who preferred such a declaration to an oath, might take their seats. But it is not, sir, convenient to discuss these matters now. What I have already said upon this subject I do not think it advisable to repeat, or to pledge myself any further; my own opinion is that this bill is the best, the most conciliatory, and the most suited to the case, and I therefore propose that it now pass through this stage, for I believe upon the whole it will be found that it is most consistent with the wishes of the subjects of this realm, the rights of this house, and the general welfare of this country. (Cheers.)

Mr. T. DUNCOMBE thought that the speech of the noble lord afforded a perfect vindication of the course he had taken. The noble lord had in point of fact entirely evaded the question which he had put to him, and that question was as to the fate of the bill in the other house of Parliament. He was of opinion, and so he thought must be the house, that this measure would meet with the fate of its predecessors. He did not see why the House of Lords should be deterred from carrying out its conscientious scruples. He maintained that he was entitled to ask the noble lord what was the use of further attempts at legislation after the failures which had already occurred. At the close of the session of 1855, on May 28, the noble lord, addressing Mr. S. Smith, the secretary to the Liberal Association, used these words—"A majority of the House of Lords has expressed an opinion adverse to the bill, they are unchanged in their opinion regarding the removal of these disabilities, and they think that request may be safely refused." He wanted to know why and how the opinions of the noble lord had changed? Having tried the experiment twice, he saw no reason why the House of Lords would not again—the majority of the House of Lords acting on what they believed to be the conscientious discharge of their duty—reject the bill; and he wished to know why it was the noble lord persevered in this mode of introducing the measure? The noble lord on a previous occasion came down with hot haste to propose a motion for the admission of Jews into Parliament which he (Mr. Duncombe) was weak and foolish enough to support. That motion was insulting to Roman Catholics and Jews. He (Mr. Duncombe) had given notice of his intention to move that Baron Rothschild be seated by resolution—the noble lord moved the previous question, and he (Mr. Duncombe) acquiesced. After some further observations, the hon. gentleman concluded by saying that he was sick of voting for Jew bills any longer. The City of London had upon several occasions elected Baron Rothschild as its representative, and he must say he entirely mistook the character of the majority of the House of Lords if they would assent to the bill by virtue of any majority of that house. He believed the House of Commons would find itself at the end of the session where it was at the beginning, and, therefore, if the hon. gentleman who had previously moved a resolution upon this subject did not act as he had formerly done, he (Mr. Duncombe) would do so.

Mr. KNATCHBULL-HUGESSEN differed from the hon. gentleman the member for Finsbury, and thought some deference ought to be paid the noble lord. The hon. gentleman said on a former occasion that Baron Rothschild was, in consequence of contracts with Government, incapable of taking his seat—an opinion which had been distinctly and positively negatived by the decision of a committee of the House of Commons. He was of opinion that there ought to be due deliberation, and that, if possible, all chance of a collision between that and the other House of Parliament ought to be avoided. The measure had been for many years (or, at least, a measure for the emancipation of the Jews) had been carried by large and increasing majorities. Let this bill again go to the House of Lords without any dissension or division having been created amongst its supporters. He hoped that the opinions of the representatives of the people would not be scouted by the hereditary wisdom of the other branch of the Legislature; but, if a collision were to occur, let the House of Commons be at least firm, calm, and determined, after having exhausted every means of conciliation. The House of Commons had affirmed the claims of a class of her Majesty's subjects, which were not the less just because there was no popular agitation in support of them.

Mr. T. DUNCOMBE explained that the hon. gentleman who had just sat down was entirely mistaken. With respect to contracts, he had voted in exactly the opposite direction from that which the hon. gentleman had stated.

Mr. LOCKE differed altogether from the hon. member for Sandwich. Those bills for the emancipation of the Jews had been brought in session after session, carried by this house, and invariably rejected by the other. He hoped that before this session ended it would be found expedient to admit the Jews by resolution.

The amendment was then withdrawn, and the bill passed through committee, it being understood, on the intimation of Mr. NEWDEGATE, that any further discussion would take place on the report to be brought up on Monday next.

WAYS AND MEANS.

Mr. FITZROY brought up the report of the Committee of Ways and Means, and the house adjourned at half-past one o'clock.

PARLIAMENTARY BUSINESS—THIS DAY.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

Their Lordships will meet at five o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

The Speaker will take the chair at four o'clock.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

Cambridge University—Matriculation and Degrees Bill—second reading.
Marine Mutiny Bill—committee.
Mutiny Bill—committee.
Commons Inclosure Bill—committee.
Militia Act Continuance Bill—committee.

NOTICES OF MOTIONS.

Gen. Wyndham—To ask the Secretary of State for War whether any and what steps have been taken, or are in progress, to alter and amend the royal warrant dated Oct. 6, 1854.

Mr. A. Smith—Godrevy Lighthouse—Select committee to inquire into the circumstances connected with the erection of the Godrevy Lighthouse, and to report their opinion as to the proper position for the same.

Mr. Vance—Dublin Port Duties—In a committee of the whole house to move for leave to bring in a bill to repeal certain duties on ships entering the port of Dublin, and other imposts affecting its trade and commerce.

Mr. Slaney—Working Classes—That it is expedient to establish a standing committee, or unpaid board or commission, to consider and report from time to time on practical suggestions likely to be beneficial to the working classes.

Mr. G. Clive—Galway Freemen Disfranchisement—Bill for the disfranchisement of the freemen of the county of the town of Galway.

Mr. H. Berkeley—To ask Mr. Chancellor of the Exchequer whether her Majesty's Ministers intend to act on the intention of their predecessors, and appoint a select committee to inquire into the working of the Corrupt Practices Prevention Act; or what course they intend to pursue in relation to the act which will expire with the present session of Parliament.

Mr. Brady—Royal British Bank—Address for return of the expenses attendant on the prosecution of the Royal British Bank directors.

Col. Boldero—Contracts (Public Departments)—To nominate the select committee on Contracts (Public Departments):—Col. Boldero, Mr. Baring, Gen. Codrington, Viscount Duncan, Col. Gilpin, Lord Claud Hamilton, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Liddell, Lord Lovaine, Mr. Monsell, Mr. Mitchell, Sir Charles Napier, Mr. Newdegate, Lord Clarence Paget, Mr. Westhead, Mr. Philipps, and Sir John Ramsden; power to send for persons, papers, and records; five to be the quorum.

Mr. Secretary Walpole—London Corporation Regulation Bill—To nominate the select committee:—Lord J. Russell, Sir G. Grey, Mr. Secretary Walpole, Mr. T. Baring, Mr. Alderman Cubitt, Sir J. Duke, Sir J. Shelley, Mr. Baines, Mr. M. Gibson, Sir W. Heathcote, Mr. Hankey, Mr. E. Egerton, Mr. Ker Seymer, Mr. Lyall, and Mr. G. Clive.

Mr. S. Western—To ask the Secretary for the Home Department whether it is the intention of her Majesty's Government, during the present session of Parliament, to bring in any measure for the abolition of the turnpike system throughout England; or whether they intend to support the clause relating to turnpikes contained in the Highway Act of last session.

Mr. Grogan—To ask the Chief Secretary for Ireland if the Government intend to introduce any Police Bill for the City of Dublin this year.

Mr. Kinnaird—To ask the Under-Secretary of the Board of Control whether the report is true that six months' batta is all that the army before Delhi is to have in lieu of prize money; or whether it is only the first instalment, and all that the Governor-General was able to grant for their patient endurance and heroic bravery.

Mr. Kinnaird—To ask the Secretary for War whether it is in contemplation to issue medals to commemorate the capture of Delhi to all those engaged in that memorable siege.

Mr. Rich—East India (Insurgents)—To call the attention of the house to the treatment of the mutinous sepoys and other insurgents in India, and to move for the following papers:—Copies of any report or despatch relative to the protection afforded by Maun Singh and others to fugitive Europeans at the outbreak of the sepoy mutiny: Of any instructions given to officers in command of troops as to the treatment of mutinous sepoys or deserters: And, as to natives of Oude (not being sepoys) found in arms within the territory of Oude.

THE AUSTRALIAN GOLD FIELDS.

Further papers, recently presented to Parliament, relative to the discovery of gold in Australia, give official details of the amount and value of gold produced in New South Wales, Victoria, Tasmania, and New Zealand, from the discovery in 1851, to February and March, 1857.

The quantity of gold exported from New South Wales in 1851 was 144,120 ounces, which increased in 1852 to 818,751 ounces; in 1853 it was reduced to 548,052 ounces, and the export of gold from that colony has continued to diminish very rapidly, the amount exported in 1856 being only 42,463 ounces. That quantity, however, is far from representing the total produce of the gold districts, for during the first quarter of last year 36,909 ounces were taken into Sydney, and the quantity exported was but 17,088 ounces. The Government received during the same quarter of a year, for the conveyance of gold by escort, and for charges at the Mint for coining, at the rate of 2s. 3d. per ounce, £2,688. Gold was first coined at the Royal Mint at Sydney on the 14th May, 1855, and during that year 523,000 sovereigns and half-sovereigns were issued. The returns are subsequently made out quarterly, and in the quarter ended the 31st of March, 1857, there were 57,500 sovereigns and 160,000 half-sovereigns issued; the total value of sovereigns and half sovereigns issued in the year having been £809,000.

The returns from Victoria are more varied than those from Sydney, and contain, in addition to the amount of gold produced and exported, returns of the population and of the criminal convictions and punishments, and other particulars. The new Governor, Sir Henry Barkly, in his first despatch containing these returns, dated Feb. 7, 1857, gives a sketch of the history of the gold production of the colony, and compares the produce of 1856 with that of 1855. This comparison shows that the number of miners' licenses to dig gold had increased, that fresh auriferous districts had been brought into work, and that there had been an increase of gold forwarded to the shipping ports from 466,859 to 471,186 ounces. The addition to the population during the same period was about 35,000, from 146,042 to 181,000; but the increase of the number of adult males was only 5,693, the number of women and children having increased in a much larger proportion; from that fact Sir H. Barkly infers that the migratory habits of the diggers had in some degree diminished, and that a larger portion had become permanent settlers. The export of gold from Victoria during the five years from the date of that despatch Sir Henry estimates to have averaged annually at least 3,000,000 ounces, worth £12,000,000; and assuming the export during the last year to have equalled that of the years preceding, the value of the gold exported from Victoria during the last six years must have amounted to the enormous sum of £72,000,000. Ballarat continues to be the most productive of the gold fields of the colony, the comparative value of the produce of the different districts for the first two months of last year having been as follows:—Castlemaine, £211,377; Sandhurst, £327,650; Avoca, £334,178; Ballarat, £560,159; Beechworth, £225,694. The total yield during the two months was £1,659,058. Of the population nearly 20,000 are Chinese, and among that large number there are only two women and three children. There is also a great disproportion of males and females in the European part of the population, the number of women at the last returns having been only 27,064 to 91,654 men, and the children amounted to 38,091. In the annual circular of Mr. Khull, the eminent bullion broker in Melbourne, quoted by Sir H. Barkly, he expresses the opinion that the crushing of quartz will ultimately be the main source whence the bulk of the gold produce will be derived; and he attributes the increase in the yield of 1856 over 1855 to the successful application of steam power for doing that work; and he expects that the produce of gold will increase year by year with the gradual introduction of complete machinery. The duty of 2s. 6d. an ounce on the export of gold is stated to have yielded a revenue of £357,476. There was much smuggling going on to avoid payment of the duty, but this had been materially checked by a seizure of 2,000 ounces at one time. The exports of gold are, of course, principally to England, but in 1856 gold to the value of £774,496 was exported from Victoria to India and China, and £421,280 to Sydney. The last return from the Central Criminal Court of Castlemaine shows that 39 prisoners were tried, of whom 19 only were convicted, and were mostly sentenced to work on the roads of the colony for periods varying from seven years to nine months. There appears to be a disinclination to convict persons charged with murder. The offences for which the prisoners were tried were of the ordinary character. "The personation of a voter" was one of the offences of which a prisoner was found guilty, and sentenced to three months' imprisonment.

The papers relating to Tasmania and New Zealand principally refer to the explorations made in those colonies in search of gold. The reports from Tasmania are very favourable, and represent the geological features of the country to closely resemble those of the gold districts of Victoria. There were very few persons actually at work, and the machinery they were using was of the rudest kind. The produce of a single week at the "Fingal gold fields" is stated to have been 15 ounces, collected by 62 diggers; but that is more than the average quantity. The diggers were becoming disheartened, and talked of leaving; yet there were hopes that productive gold deposits would be discovered when the country was better known, and better machinery was introduced. A committee had been appointed, called the Fingal Gold Exploration Committee, who encouraged the search for gold by supplying rations of food to those diggers who were unsuccessful. The reports from New Zealand are brief and not very satisfactory. Gold has been found on several spots where diggers have collected, but their labours had not been productive of much result. The geological structure of the country, however, gives promise that gold is there; but as yet the means of obtaining it are rude and imperfect, and the search has been confined to the surface.

SEVERE SNOWSTORM.—"We find ourselves," says the *Inverness Courier*, "in the middle of a severe snowstorm, and all over the Highlands communication has been seriously impeded. Some of the mails have been very irregular, and all have been more or less affected. Between Dunkeld and Inverness, on the Great Highland-road, the storm was most severely felt, and the mails have been usually from twelve to fourteen hours behind time. At Lynvuilg, and at this end of Slochmuich, snow lies very deep. The North-road is heavily covered with snow. The coach was abandoned on the road near Alness on Monday night, and the mails were carried to Invergordon in a cart. Twenty-two men are engaged cutting the snow at Alness, and proportionate numbers at Evanton, Beauly, and other places where the obstruction is greatest. The mails are conveyed in a dog-cart between Meikle Ferry and Golspie. In the north of Sutherlandshire and along the Caithness-road, especially near Lybster, communication is very difficult. Last year a couple of sledges were purchased for use on this road, but unfortunately they are lying at Thurso, where the storm has not been so severely felt. The West mail has also been interrupted by the storm. There is a great deal of snow on the ground, in some places from 12 to 15 feet deep, and in these parts it was cut, but only to the width of allowing a horseman to pass."

THE MORALS OF MAYFAIR. 3 vols.—"The best proof that a novel is a good one is that it is interesting, and this is the character of the present story. The history of the hero, Philip, and the heroine, Marguerite, is narrated naturally, and the phase of fashionable life at the West-end, in which they for a time move, is exhibited strikingly, without any exaggeration or over-colouring. The author, or authoress, is most successful when dealing with the emotional, and in describing the dawnings of tender love in hearts yet young, pure, and truthful. Apart from its merits in this respect, the story, in its severer side, is a terrible lesson of the misery caused by mercenary marriages between persons wholly unsuited to each other in temper, years, and character."—*Morning Herald.*

CARDINAL WISEMAN'S RECOLLECTIONS OF THE POPES.—We are requested to state that Messrs. Hurst and Blackett, of Great Marlborough-street, have just published "Recollections of the Last Four Popes," by his Eminence Cardinal Wiseman, in 1 vol. 8vo, with portraits. Principal contents:—Pius VII., The Author's Arrival in Rome, The First Audience, Character of Pius VII., Condition and Feelings of Rome, Cardinal Consalvi, Policy of Pius VII.'s Government, Relations with England: Literature, Science, and Art; Brigandage, Leo XII, His Election, His Character and Policy, The Jubilee, The Pope and the English College, The English Cardinalate, Pius VIII., His Election and Previous History, Personal Character, French and English Cardinals, Principal Events of the Pontificate, Gregory XVI., His Consecration, Public Works, Cardinal Angelo Mai, The Remarkable Men and Events of Gregory's Pontificate, Character of Gregory XVI., &c.

COURT OF ALDERMEN.

A Court was held on Tuesday for the despatch of public business.

DISQUALIFICATION OF MEMBERS OF THE CORPORATION.

Alderman WIRE moved—"That it be the duty of the Town Clerk to make such inquiries as may be necessary to ascertain whether any members of this Court, or of the Court of Common Council, have become disqualified under the 9th section of the 12th and 13th Vic., c. 94, s. 9, and that he do from time to time forthwith lay the names of such members before this Court."

Alderman HUMPHERY seconded the motion.

The TOWN CLERK read the clause in the act referred to in the motion as follows:—"And be it enacted that if any person holding the office of alderman or common councillor for the City of London shall declare himself or shall be declared bankrupt or insolvent, or shall apply to take, or shall take, the benefit of any act for the relief of insolvent debtors, or shall make any composition with his creditors, or shall altogether absent himself from his duty for more than six calendar months consecutively unless prevented by illness or other reasonable cause, or shall be convicted of fraud, or of any crime, then and in every or any such case such person shall thereupon immediately become disqualified, and shall cease to hold the office of alderman or common councilman as the case may be, and the Court of Mayor and Aldermen of the City of London shall thereupon forthwith adjudge the said office to be vacant," &c.

Alderman SIDNEY said it was well known that there were several members of the Court of Common Council who came within the provisions of the act. He feared, however, that when the learned Town Clerk had to report upon the subject, he would find it extremely difficult where to draw the line. A member of their own Court—an upright, honourable, and universally esteemed man—had recently been convicted of a misdemeanour for having erected a pier in the river after he had obtained permission of the corporation to do so. (Hear, hear.)

Alderman HUMPHERY—The facts of the case alluded to by my friend Alderman Sidney are simply these:—Alderman Cubitt came and asked the corporation to allow him to build a pier for the convenience of passengers opposite Greenwich. The corporation gave him a license, for which he paid, to erect that pier; and he then did not erect it till he had obtained the sanction of the Admiralty to his project. (Hear, hear.) The Greenwich watermen, finding that the pier interfered with their ferrying passengers, took legal proceedings against him, alleging it to be a nuisance. The Court of Conservancy, of which I am a member, had the matter before them, and we gave evidence that we thought it was not only not a nuisance, but that it was a very great convenience to the public. (Hear, hear.) Lord Campbell, in summing up, told the jury that if Alderman Cubitt had had the sanction of the Court of Conservancy to erect the pier, there would have been an end to the case. Alderman Cubitt has had to defend himself in that prosecution at a cost of £500, in addition to which the pier cost him about £1,200. To suggest for a moment that Alderman Cubitt's case came within the meaning of the Act of Parliament in question is simply absurd. (Hear, hear.)

Sir P. LAURIE said it was ridiculous to suppose that the Act of Parliament was ever intended to apply to such a case as that which had been brought before the Court. If there were one man more honourable than another connected with the corporation it was his friend Alderman Cubitt. (Hear, hear.)

While some conversation was proceeding among the law officers across the table,

Alderman CUBITT came into court and said—I understand that previous to my entering the court it has been stated that I am under the bann of a verdict of the Court of Queen's Bench. I am sorry to say that it is so. I, as your lordship and the Court are probably aware, am interested in about a mile of river frontage at the Isle of Dogs. It was of great importance to the locality that there should be a pier there. I applied to the corporation as conservators of the river to know if the pier might be placed there; they sent their officers to examine the spot, and under certain restrictions and regulations they granted me a license to erect a pier. They sent, as it was their duty to do under the convention with the Government, to inform them of the license they had granted me, and Mr. Gore, on behalf of the Government, said that he should send down a proper engineer to see whether the pier would conduce to the public convenience, and be in no way objectionable. In the course of a few weeks I received a letter from Mr. Gore to say that they had sent down, that their officer had reported favourably, and that the pier might be put up. (Hear, hear.) Under these circumstances I erected the pier, at a cost of £1,200 or £1,400, never dreaming that the Corporation of London had not the power to grant me that license which they did grant me. (Hear, hear.) I have had to defend a prosecution as a criminal in the Court of Queen's Bench, at a cost of £500, and there is a verdict against me. What is to be the result of it I do not know—(laughter)—but I hope that the Court will believe and feel that I am really not liable to any moral imputation. (Loud cries of "Hear, hear.") I have acted under the authority of the corporation, believing that they had the power to grant me the license to erect the pier.

The motion was carried unanimously, and the Town Clerk was directed to report at the next Court whether there were any members of the corporation to whom the provisions of the 13 & 14 Vic., cap. 94, sec. 9, applied.

THE LONDON GENERAL OMNIBUS COMPANY.

Alderman WILSON presented a petition from Mr. James Willing on behalf of this company, praying for a standing for their Westminster omnibuses at St. Mary Woolnoth Church.

The petition was referred to the General Purposes Committee.

Alderman WIRE brought up a report from the General Purposes Committee, recommending that J. and D. Forester, the officers, should be allowed retiring pensions of £150 per annum each.

Adjourned.

CITY COMMISSION OF SEWERS.

A Court was held on Tuesday for the despatch of public business—Mr. Deputy Christie occupying the chair.

THE SANITARY CONDITION OF THE CITY.

Dr. LETHEBY, the medical officer, reported on the state of 138 houses that had been inspected during the week, and he presented a list of 36 places that required sanitary improvement. He also brought under the notice of the commissioners the overcrowded state of some of the houses in Elliott's-court, Old Bailey, St. John's-court, Smithfield, Crown-court, Trinity-lane, and Pennyfather's-rents, Huggin-lane.

The mortality table for the week shows a large increase in the proportion of deaths, the total number being 72. In the corresponding week of last year it was 63, and in that of the year before it was 62. The chief causes of death, however, were not diseases of an acute or epidemic character. Of all the zymotic class, for example, there was but one death from fever, 1 from erysipelas, 3 from hooping cough, 1 from croup, and 3 from diarrhœa. The last of these occurred in the workhouse of the East and West London unions. Of the diseases of respiration there were 12 from bronchitis, 11 from phthisis, 3 from pneumonia, and 2 from asthma. The ages at which the deaths occurred were as follow:—12 among infants of less than 5 years of age, 6 between the ages of 5 and 20, 10 between 20 and 40, 24 between 40 and 60, and 20 at 60 and upwards.

The Court, after transacting some routine business, adjourned.

FIELD-LANE RAGGED SCHOOL.

Yesterday evening a public meeting of the friends and supporters of the Field-lane Ragged School was held in the school-room, Victoria-street, Holborn-hill, for the purpose of witnessing the distribution of prizes to those boys and girls, 109 in number, who had, subsequently to leaving the school, conducted themselves honestly and respectably to the satisfaction of their employers for 12 months and upwards in these situations which the committee of management had obtained for them. The Lord Mayor presided, and, in opening the proceedings, dwelt upon the advantages of the ragged school system. It was especially gratifying to consider that they were then assembled to reward the good conduct of more than 100 boys and young women who had been rescued from the contaminating influences which prevailed among the lowest classes in society, and placed in a position in which they might not only gain credit for themselves, but also work out in honourable industry their obligation to society. The locality in which they were assembled had been, some years ago, as doubtless they all knew, the most dangerous in the metropolis to civilised society. There was not a crime committed but the criminal was to be found in Field-lane. It was therefore a locality that required in it the establishment of such an institution as a ragged school, the beneficial effects of which they were about to have presented to them in the persons of those whose good conduct was about to be alluded to.

The secretary, Mr. S. TAWELL then read a statement explanatory of the objects of the meeting, and giving the following facts with respect to the boys and girls to be rewarded:—They varied in age from 12 to 17 years, and had been for at least six months pupils of the ragged school before going into employment. There were 19 girls and 40 boys to receive a card of good conduct, signed by the Earl of Shaftesbury, and a money prize of 10s. each; 9 girls and 29 boys were to receive a similar card, and 2s. 6d. each; and 12 other candidates were to receive 2s. 6d. each, without a card. Of the females, twelve had been 12 months, fifteen from 12 to 24 months, and eleven from 24 to 73 months in the same situations. Of the boys, 23 had been 12 months, 32 from 12 to 24 months, and 19 from 24 to 53 months in their situations. Those who received the 2s. 6d. prizes this year, obtained the 10s. prizes last year.

After the reading of this statement, the candidates were presented one by one to the Lord Mayor, who presented them with their prizes, giving each a copy of the Holy Scriptures, with a cordial shake of the hand, begging them to remember that it was by honest conduct they had entitled themselves to be so saluted by one placed in the elevated position of chief magistrate of the City of London.

The meeting was subsequently addressed by the Rev. Mr. Paxton Hood, Mr. Joseph Payne, Mr. Doyle, and other friends of the Ragged School movement, and the proceedings terminated in the usual manner.

HOLLOWAY'S OINTMENT AND PILLS AN UNPARALLELED CURE FOR BAD LEGS.—F. Bird, gardener, 50, George's grove, Holloway, was afflicted 20 years with a bad leg, caused by a blow on the shin, which ultimately formed itself into an angry wound; he consulted several medical men, tried almost everything recommended him by sympathising friends without effect; as a last resource he determined to give Holloway's Ointment a trial, and after persevering for a few months was completely cured, and now enjoys the best of health.—Sold by all medicine vendors throughout the world; at Professor Holloway's establishments, 244, Strand, London, and 80, Maiden-lane, New York; by A. Stampa, Constantinople; A. Guidicy, Smyrna; and E. Muir, Malta.

LAW AMENDMENT SOCIETY.

On Monday a general meeting of the members of this society was held at their rooms, No. 3, Waterloo-place—Lord Brougham in the chair.

The minutes of the last meeting having been read and confirmed,

Mr. EDGAR brought forward a lengthy report of the special committee on professional remuneration, which commenced by observing that the mode in which attorneys and solicitors are remunerated for their services has been long felt to be a grievance, both by the profession and the public—those services, often of a highly intellectual and responsible character, being estimated according to a mere mechanical standard. In all departments of legal practice there are certain fixed scales applicable to the mere external forms in which the labour of attorneys and solicitors appears, but having no reference to the mere amount of labour undergone, or to the extent of the responsibility incurred. No matter what labour, skill, or experience may be necessary to bring matters into a certain external form, such external form alone ascertains the remuneration—the attorney being prohibited from receiving any higher remuneration, however inadequate it may be, than that laid down by a particular scale. After tracing the origin and progress of the present system, which was based on the principle of protecting the client against the attorney and solicitor, the report went on to cite the opinions of Lord Brougham, Lord Langdale, Lord Lyndhurst, and other eminent authorities, all of whom had expressed themselves strongly in favour of an alteration in the present mode of professional remuneration. The natural result had been that, as legal practitioners must be remunerated for their services, they are driven in cases where the scales do not afford proper recompense for the real and necessary work to do that which is unnecessary, but which the scales allow them to charge for, and to charge at the highest rate which the scales will permit for work that is merely formal and mechanical. The most skilful and experienced practitioner is consequently paid on the same scale as the least skilful and least experienced; and the greatest of all services by which litigation is prevented are either almost unremunerated, or remunerated without any reference to the importance of the object effected. The position in which the profession were placed in reference to amendments in the law was most unfair; this being particularly felt in the case of the proposed alteration in the law with reference to the transfer of land, any popular scheme for which must necessarily limit the emoluments of the profession if the present system of remuneration is to continue. It was also owing in a great measure to the adherence to the present system that the same simplicity in procedure and the same speediness were not extended to cases where large sums were in question as in those where the sums claimed were small. Amend the law as we may, so long as the present system of professional remuneration remains, the public will never enjoy the full advantage of whatever improvements may be introduced. The public also suffered from the fact that, under the present system, a lawyer is only employed in the last extremity, thus often rendering a long and expensive litigation necessary which might have been rendered unnecessary by having recourse to him at an early period, but which the fear of incurring expense alone prevented. No rule of justice can be clearer than that if a man is to be recompensed for his labours, those labours should be fairly estimated, and their value deduced from their real character and results. But the radical objection, in an economical point of view, to the present system is derived from its interference with the natural relations between employer and employed, and thereby doing away with the sound and useful principle of competition. The report suggested the following resolutions:—"1. That in the case of payment for professional services there is no reason for departing from the ordinary principle of the remuneration of labour as a matter to be settled between employer and employed. 2. That the system of imposing uniform fixed scales of legal remuneration is an infraction of the above principle. 3. That in settling the amount of remuneration for legal services, consideration should be given to any special agreement which may have been entered into by competent parties. 4. That where no special agreement has been entered into, or where the agreement does not fully determine the sum total of remuneration, or where the question of the fairness of the contract as between the parties is under consideration, there should be a proper board for deciding as to the amount of remuneration, such board being possessed of great discretionary powers as to the fairness of contracts, and the real value of services rendered, and being so selected as to ensure the confidence of the public and the profession. 5. That in such cases, for the guidance of the public and the convenience of the profession, there should be a scale of charges, and that such scale should be constructed at a rate higher than what is ordinarily charged, so as practically to induce an agreement to be made between the parties at the commencement of every employment, it not being obligatory on the board, however, to allow the full charges fixed by the scale, the same being treated as a maximum allowance only. 6. That to secure, as far as possible, the due influence of mercantile views on the taxation of costs, the board should be composed of persons acquainted with accounts and the usages of commerce, as well as of men practically conversant with the details of a solicitor's business. 7. That the scales should not be permitted to emanate, as at present, solely from legal authorities, but should partly proceed from commercial sources: and that such scales should be fixed by some authority independent of the board. 8. That such board should have a primary jurisdiction in all cases, and that, where local taxation might take place, an appeal to the board should be allowed. 9. That to secure as much as possible uniform practice throughout the country, all bills of costs taxed by the different local authorities should be transmitted to the board, and be annually reported on to Parliament. 10. That inasmuch as the expense of legal proceedings arises to a considerable extent from the inefficiency of courts, and from the rules of practice followed therein, the annual report so to be made should embrace the nature of the causes, the duration of each suit, and of its different stages, and as far as the same could be discovered, how far the time occupied in the different stages was unavoidable." In moving the adoption of this report, the learned gentleman explained that a concurrence in his motion would not pledge the society to the adoption of the resolutions, and then proceeded to show that the present system of remuneration, instituted when attorneys and solicitors were looked upon rather as officers of the court than as members of a learned profession, was inimical to the sound principles of political economy, and was productive of injurious effects both to the profession and to the public.

Mr. SYMMONDS said that, as a general rule, the solicitors and attorneys had given up their agency business for litigious practice. They were now more lawyers than men of business; and so far did they lack business habits that there were very many of them who had no muniment rooms for the care of the valuable documents, such as title-deeds, entrusted to their care, and in some offices they might be seen lying in confusion about the rooms.

Lord BROUGHAM said he hoped that such was the exception.

Mr. LAURENCE defended the profession from the charge of negligence, and rejoiced that they were now better lawyers than heretofore, and able to meet the barristers upon equal terms. He was opposed to any change in the present system of remuneration as he considered the public had sufficient protection in the taxing system, as the character of each office was known to the taxing officer, and he dealt with the bills accordingly.

The discussion was continued by Mr. Allen, Mr. Hastings, Mr. Trower, Mr. Smith, &c., and finally adjourned, to give Mr. Field, and other gentlemen who take an interest in the subject, an opportunity of favouring the society with their views upon it.

The meeting then separated.

THE WALLACE NATIONAL MONUMENT.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE MORNING POST.

SIR,—When the design for a monument commemorative of Scotland's magnanimous patriot, the renowned Sir William Wallace, was brought before the public, it was received with gratifying approval, and the Scottish fervour burned with desire to contribute more or less to so grand an object. The subscriptions having to come from all quarters of the globe, time was required to allow all to bring their stone to the cairn that should impressively speak to the most distant years. No obelisk was contemplated, no symbolical lion, no statue of a man of whose likeness no more is known than of Samson, but something worthy of the redoubted hero and the country whose independence he regained, and left a glorious legacy when he paid the price of martyrdom for his conquest.

After the collection of some thousand pounds, it is matter of surprise and regret to those who indulged in loftier ideas than a repetition of commonplace memorials to find that it is proposed, at least by the committee at Glasgow, to call for plans! What unthinking haste! A repetition of precipitancy which, in other instances, has led to an abandonment or abortion of the original design, subjecting the Scots to just reproach for rashly undertaking objects which they are obliged to leave undone. Instances may be spared, but it would be heart-grievous to those who have taken so warm an interest in this noble enterprise to find it prematurely stopped; for a call for plans is presumptive of the completion of subscriptions, and an architect must know the amount to be expended before he can furnish the design. It is sincerely to be hoped that this resolution may be given up, as the most injurious to the increase of subscriptions and as prospective of what a few thousands can only effect. Why such haste? Is this national movement to end in a paltry job? Collections are still to come in from many parts where Scotsmen yearn to join their patriotic efforts with those of their countrymen at home, and patriotism being a virtue among all nations, others than Scotsmen can join in the generous indulgence of admiration for so great a character. London itself has yet much to do, and the innumerable natives of the north who nestle so comfortably in the wondrous Babylon of 1858 could readily supply an ample amount, anxious as they cannot but feel, rich and poor, to have a hand in the monument to the ever renowned Sir William wight. There is or was a committee in London, but its operations elude observation. Surely this is not a case wherein to do good by stealth. If in practical existence, the gentlemen comprising it do wrong to themselves, for subscriptions will be sent hence to Scotland, and their exertions will make but a pitiful figure in the list of contributors. What tact and activity is seen in so many other cases of subscriptions, where so much is done for objects of comparatively little importance. More exertion might be expected from the Caledonian spirit in a field so peculiarly their own.—Yours truly,

I send my name and address. * * *

EXTRAORDINARY DISCLOSURES.

At the Salford police-court, on Tuesday, before Mr. Trafford and the Mayor, some extraordinary revelations were made in reference to the mode of business adopted by a certain number of persons known as "The Long Firm," who carry on what Mr. Trafford aptly termed "a system of rascality," which consists in ordering goods from unsuspecting tradesmen at a distance, under an assumed name, and promising payment on delivery at a certain address, which is seldom the place at which the writer of the order locates himself. The promise of payment, of course, is only made to be broken; and the goods, when received, are sold, or pawned, or otherwise disposed of, below their real value, by members of the "firm," some of whom profess the trade of brokers, and others that of auctioneers.

The case in which these disclosures were made was one of assault, in which a young woman named Emma Bramley charged Thomas Carruthers, whom she alleged to be a member of "The Long Firm," with striking her on Saturday night, at the Rainbow Inn, Chapel-street, where the members of the firm are in the habit of meeting.

The complainant, who stated that she lived with a man named Broadbent, said that the defendant and Broadbent were fighting on Saturday night in the Rainbow Inn, in consequence of a dispute about the payment of a commission upon shawls which the defendant had sold for Broadbent, and when she endeavoured to part them, the defendant struck her on the left eye.

In reply to Mr. Trafford, the complainant said that Broadbent was a commission agent, and got his living by buying and selling anything, but was not a member of "The Long Firm." She had lived seven or eight years with a man named Joseph, who was a member of "The Long Firm." The defendant was a partner with Joseph, and he sold the goods obtained.

On being asked whether she had written for goods, complainant said she never did.

Mr. Trafford—You said something yesterday about Mr. Smith, and some files in a place in Greenwood-street; who was the tenant of that place?

Complainant—Mr. Broadbent had a warehouse in Sugar-lane, Greenwood-street.

Defendant—I believe letters were stopped in the name of Broadbent, Blackburn, and Smith.

The complainant was then allowed to ask the defendant the following questions, to which he replied:—Did Mr. Whitmore, *alias* Smith, ever write for a dog in your name? No.—Did not you and Whitmore brag that you had "bested" Mr. Joseph out of it? No. ["Bested" was said to mean "getting the best of him."]—Did not you sell it for 25s. I did not sell it at all; it was sold by auction.—Did you ever write for any stuffed birds?—Yes. Did Inspector Buckley, of the Manchester detective police speak to you about them, and did you tell him you should pay for them when you got them? Yes.—What else did you say to him? I said I had been so disgusted in the matter that I would have nothing to do with it again, and that I had started in the book trade, and had been travelling in it ever since.—Did you not say you had washed your hands of "the School" (another name for the "The Long Firm)? Yes.

The complainant then said in reply to Mr. Trafford that at the time she lived with Broadbent and Joseph she knew that they got their living by writing for goods. She was compelled to go to the railway for goods, or she would have been ill-used.

Mr. Taylor (chief-constable)—Where is that last cargo of slates from Wales?

Complainant—I don't know.

John Burkill, having given evidence as to the assault, said, in reply to questions from the bench, that the Rainbow was a place where the members of "The Long Firm" met sometimes casually. He was clerk to a man named Buxton, and acted at sales for him as auctioneer's assistant and porter.

In reply to the complainant, this witness said that he never sold any files for Smith, *alias* Whitmore; and he did not know that two lots of files had been delivered at the Rainbow for Smith. A raffle took place at the Rainbow before the assault.

A witness having given some evidence as to the assault only, the defendant, on his behalf, called Whitmore, *alias* Smith, but he did not answer.

Mr. Trafford suggested that he now went by another name.

Complainant—I think he is called "E. Roberts" now. (Laughter.)

Broadbent was then called, and having been examined by the defendant in reference to the transaction of the shawls, stated, in reply to the bench, that he obtained the shawls from his uncle, who manufactured them, and it was his own business whether or not he should send the money when they were sold. People sometimes dealt in promises, but the shawls were not so obtained. In reply to the defendant, the witness said he had a warehouse in Sugar-lane, Greenwood-street, but all his letters were not delivered there by the Post-office authorities. He had gone to the Post-office, and demanded letters in the name of J. W. Smith, and represented that Smith was a friend of his brother in London, which he really was. He showed a letter from Liverpool to the Post-office authorities in Manchester, to show that J. W. Smith was a merchant residing in Liverpool, and was frequently "backwards and forwards" between Manchester and Liverpool. His place in Sugar-lane was his own, jointly with a man, named Clough, who travelled for drysalters.

Mr. Trafford—Do you mean slates?

Witness—I don't know, I never saw him have any.

Mr. Trafford—Who deals in dogs?

Witness—Carruthers.

Mr. Trafford—Where did the dog come from?

Witness—I don't know; I heard that Carruthers and Whitmore had "bested" Mr. Joseph out of the dog.

The defendant said he wrote for the dog, believing that a gentleman would buy it. While, however, he was engaged one day, it was sold at Buxton's. He tried to get it back but could not, consequently it had neither been returned to its owner nor paid for, but when he was better off than now he intended to pay for it.

Mr. Taylor said the police had intercepted two dogs which had been sent from Kent, and were of the value of £20.

Mr. Trafford—We have been told something about a pig.

Complainant—That was Mr. Joseph and Mr. Whitmore.

Mr. Trafford—They had files and slates too?

Complainant—Yes; anything they could get.

Mr. Taylor—There have been a boat, a ship's cooking apparatus of the value of £100, ploughs, harrows, and other farm implements, &c., obtained in this way.

The witness said he had nothing to do with these articles, but he had seen them in Buxton's yard.

The defendant said he had not heard of these before.

The witness, in reply to the defendant, denied receiving letters or cider in the name of Blackburn. He admitted having been taken to Chepstow about some cider. He was taken before the magistrates there, for receiving the goods improperly, but they discharged him. The cider was brought and delivered on his premises, and he paid the person who brought it. He denied having received letters in Eliza Ann-street, Manchester, in the name of Blackburn. After the time when he could not get his letters in Greenwood-street, he took a place in Moore-street, Manchester, in company with another person, and there he received some hair felt. He bought it in Manchester. He had received a letter from Burben and Co., of Belfast, but did not know whether the felt originally came from them. The felt first reached him in Greenwood-street, and he took it to Moore-street with him.

The defendant said he should not have brought these matters before the Court, only to show that he was not mixed up in them. He knew he was "bad enough," but he never wrote for goods in a false name, and had no aliases.

Mr. Taylor having asked where some scythes had come from, the complainant said they were taken to the County Court Tavern, before they went to the Rainbow.

Mr. Taylor said that Whitmore had obtained some wine, and he had intercepted a few bottles.

The witness said he believed the wine came from Ulverstone.

Mr. Trafford said he had heard a great many criminal cases, but he never heard one which showed such a system of rascality as this one. It appeared that there were a number of people in the country who were ready to deal in anything they could get by means of fraud. It was a horrible system, for the unfortunate persons from whom goods were obtained never got a penny for them; and men had often stood in the dock, and been imprisoned, without being half as guilty as those who obtained goods in this way. He hoped this exposure would be the means of making tradesmen very cautious in parting with their goods.

The defendant said he never obtained anything but the dog.

Mr. Trafford said he had often heard of the system, but never before believed there was so much rascality in it. With regard to the assault, he should fine the defendant 10s. and costs, or a month's imprisonment.

The defendant asked for time to pay.

Mr. Trafford—No. Miss Bramley has told us the value of promises of payment, and we shall keep you till you pay. We do not give credit here. (Laughter.)

The money was paid.

[In reference to this case, we have had handed to us the following list of *aliases* under which the man Joseph, above mentioned, is said to carry on his business:—J. P. Thomas, Hodgson-street; J. T. Prosser, Mary-street; T. P. Joseph, Broughton-road; J. Poyntington, King-street; J. W. Walker, Walker-street; A. H. Trimmer, Barlow-street; T. W. Thompson, Cross-street; T. G. Thompson, Hardman-street; and — Millerson, Hardman-street. The man Whitmore's *aliases* are stated to be J. W. Smith, Greenwood-street; and Robert's and Co., Byron's-court, St. Mary's-gate.]—*Manchester Guardian.*

A MEMBER OF A CRICKET CLUB REFUSING TO PAY HIS SUBSCRIPTION.—At the Manchester County Court, on Monday, before Mr. R. B. Brandt, judge, Ephraim Sparrow was sued by the Cheetham-hill Cricket Club, of which he was a member, for the recovery of £1 1s., a year's subscription. The question whether such a club can recover has often been discussed, and the Broughton Cricket Club, having some time since brought a similar action, lost it; but they did not take the same grounds as were taken in the present case. The defendant had been a member of the Cheetham-hill Club two years, and in the first year he paid his subscription, which was due in advance on the 1st January. In the second year, however, he refused to pay his subscription, although occasionally sitting on the committee; his objection being that he had left the neighbourhood and did not consider himself a member. By the 14th rule of the club it was provided that any person desirous of withdrawing should give a written notice to that effect to the secretary before the 1st of January; and, having done so, he should be considered to cease membership at the end of the year. The defendant, however, had not given any such notice. Mr. Brandt gave judgment for the plaintiffs, with costs. The defendant objected to pay the costs, on which his Honour reminded him that "the giblets always went with the goose."—*Manchester Guardian.*

Image © THE BRITISH LIBRARY BOARD. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.