

Stamp Office
Mr. Beyer

[COUNTRY EDITION]

PRICE—IMMUTABLE, UNIVERSAL, ETERNAL!

MATHER AND MALMESBURY—THE POLICY OF CAIN!

For the liberty to know, to utter, and to argue freely according to conscience, above all liberties—*Minors*.

Another dreary debate on the MATHER-affair, another poor—this time supplied by the 'Upper Post,' that the mangy-looking 'lion' of the Museum was the worthy type and representative of the British character.

The discussion on Monday last in the House of Commons elicited nothing new, a certain observation of Lord MALMESBURY excepted. That observation was to the effect that 'had Mr. MATHER lived thirty years he would probably have been induced by the then prevailing sentiment of the day to have challenged his assailant, and although he (MALMESBURY) added that he did not blame Mr. MATHER for not having done so, it is plain that he would not have done so either if he had seen that gentleman pursuing the course of thirty years since. Had he so acted it is highly certain that he—a youth unacquainted with the use of arms—would have fallen an easy sacrifice to the well-trained ruffian whose trade is murder. His destruction would, however, have saved 'Lord' MALMESBURY a deal of trouble. Of course I do not use the 'noble lord' of desiring the death of young Mr. MATHER. I merely express the opinion that his 'champion' would have been glad to have escaped the trouble of interfering in the matter, and would have been much obliged to Mr. MATHER, he had sought justice through any means—but the office of 'Her Majesty's Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs.'

Mr. MATHER is blamed for having refused to accept an apology from his ruffian assailant; and for having insisted upon making the question at issue one of national honour. In both respects Mr. MATHER should be held blameless. 'Lord' MALMESBURY asserts that a full and frank apology had been offered to Mr. MATHER by the officer who had insulted him. Mr. MATHER, however, had not thought fit to accept this apology. To speak of Mr. MATHER as having been insulted when he was not merely insulted, but nearly murdered as well, is certainly taking things very far!

Well might the Premier congratulate their 'lords' on the calm and temperate tone in which they were discussing the subject! But the 'apology' which it is affirmed the Austrian was ready to tender, would have been in reality a second insult added to an unprovoked and brutal injury, for what says the Earl of Derby?—'There was a distinct declaration made on the part of the officers who committed the outrage that if Mr. MATHER would make a declaration that he intended to assist the officer, the officer would, in my terms he might desire, express his regret at having been betrayed into the action.' That is to say, if after suffering outrage and all but assassination, Mr. MATHER had been so base as to have made an apologetic explanation to the Austrian, the latter would have graciously responded by expressing 'his regret.' The British Prime Minister maintains that in this affair, from first to last, there has been no question of national insult or national indignity, and that the cutting down of an unarmed Englishman is not to be put in the same category as the 'pulling down of the consular flag,' which, had that occurred, the 'Earl' of Derby might have looked upon as provocation sufficient to justify the holding of the state employing the gravity partly responsible for the national insult. With all deference to the chief of the British Government, and with all respect for the national 'bit of bungling,' I must protest that I consider 'the pulling down of the consular flag' would have been a trivial offence compared with the assassin-like attempt to take the life of an unarmed Englishman. The pretence that the injury done to Mr. MATHER was a personal, not a national affair, is easily shattered. That the ruffian who struck and the ruffian who attempted to slay, both knew that they were assaulting an Englishman (in spite of DERBY and MALMESBURY's assertion to the contrary) is proved by their own declaration (true it is) that their victim on being struck in the face 'put himself in a boxing attitude.' If he did so, by that sign he was known to be an Englishman, and dereson FORSTNER can hit him down! By way of apology for the Austrian's conduct, we are told by his superiors that he acted according to the rules of the Imperial Service, which rules require, under pain of degradation and dismissal, that an officer on duty, if he suspects he is about to be struck, shall cut down the offender. The Austrian Government made those rules, and the Tuscan Government adopted an Austrian force subjected to the said rules, which, when put into force against a son of England, became thereby an outrage upon this country, and one which our Government was bound to resent by any and every means; and for which was bound to obtain redress of another character than the £222, which the Duke of CASTIGLIONE professes as a mark of the Imperial and Royal Highness of the said Duke.

I must again postpone comment on other questions connected with 'our foreign policy.' But a special feature last Monday's debate I must not pass over.

By way of excusing FORSTNER, it is urged that he mistook Mr. MATHER for an Italian; and one of the 'bold lords' added that 'the Austrian officers were in the habit of spurning the Italians out of their way as they spurned dogs.' Could words more forcibly depict that outrage to the Human Race, compared with which the particular attack upon Mr. MATHER was insignificant, implied in the brutal domination of Austria over Italy—an outrage contrived, in reality sanctioned, by the British Government! It is not enough to protest against 'British subjects' being treated like unto Italians; our duty to Humanity demands much more. The 'Daily News' observes that 'If Germans and Italians choose to be made objects of such sharp practice, that is no concern of ours'; but the executioners must first make sure that they live Germans and Italians to deal with. It is not true that the Germans and Italians so 'choose'—bear witness the barbadoes of Berlin, Vienna, Dresden, and Frankfort, the battle-fields of Baden, Hesse, coerced, and Schleswig-Holstein betrayed—bar witness the 'bloody protests' which, for thirty years past, almost year by year, has written in the life-stream of her noblest sons, at Naples, Milan, Rome, Venice, and a host of cities—fate and brave bear witness the multitude of heroes, martyrs, captives, and exiles belonging to both nations, who have died—and still dare—death, torture, and long protracted suffering, that they may redeem the homes of their fathers from slavery and sorrow. Hitherto the care failed—I will not say suffered in vain, for the care will testify to the contrary—because they have had to combat foreign and domestic oppression at the same time; because they have been overwhelmed by the crushing weight of the force at the command of combined tyrants; and, lastly, because the British Government and people have stood by in calm, cold, and criminal indifference, hinging the belief that that punishment and suffering of Italy, Germany, and other nations 'is no concern of ours,' and trying to shake the voice of conscience with the 'Cain-like demand, 'are we our brothers' keepers?' To allow the sowing down of Germans and Italians—not merely Germans but nations—and to be content so long a time as they are not assailed, is to share the crime of the executioners. To gable of 'Non Intervention,' to try peace, peace, while there is no peace, to allow perfidy, brigandage, and treacherous tyranny to beat the fairest portions of the earth, and riot in the blood and tears of myriads of our fellow creatures; at the while hating the power to arrest the march of crime, and destroy the power of the oppressors; at the while heedless of the dictates of duty, and careless of all save 'extended markets' for 'our exports'—to do thus, as a people, is to sow a crop of rebellion, which the future will ripen to a frightful harvest. To do thus is to invite aggression, insult, and wrong—which of the treatment of Mr. MATHER and other 'British subjects' is but a foretaste. O! for the hour of the men of the Commonwealth, to rouse us all people to a sense of their degradation and impending ruin.

Milton: then should'st be living at this hour
England hath need of thee: she is a fen
Or stagnant waters: altar, sword, and pen,
Fire, sword, the heroic wealth of hall and bower,
Have forthseth their ancient English dower.
Go: raise us up, virtue, freedom, power,
And give us hero-sirene, freedom, power.

L'AMI DU PEUPLE.

This is the first department. It should be labelled in the TOC with a snippet of its header or with the header of the first item

This is the dateline. It is separated from other content by double lines but should not be entered in the TOC as a decoration

Star of Freedom

VOL. I. NO. 8.

LONDON, SATURDAY, JUNE 26, 1852.

PRICE FOURPENCE-HALFPENNY,
or Four Shillings & Tenpence per Quarter.

Foreign and Colonial Intelligence.

FRANCE

Site of France—The Tyrant bearded—Bonaparte's Crimes—Strikes—Deposition of France—Artful Tragedy—The December Massacre—The new National Guard.

(From our own Correspondent)

PARIS, June 23.

Those unaccustomed to look beneath the surface will be likely enough to say that the existing regime is firmly established, and the people both happy and contented. The funds 'keep up,' and the simulating selfish money-grubbers are contented, and glory in the triumph of 'order.' The Monarchs are swayed it is true, but they are not quite so knowing as they take themselves to be. Notwithstanding their sympathies with the enemies of the people, the funds do not constitute an unerring 'political pulse.' Those who think so should remember that the funds rise on the eve of the 24th of February! But rumours now a noise mount. As, I say, appears would indicate that the throne of the tyrant Bonaparte is firmly fixed, whereas, it so states that by a very breath it may be overthrown. The stability of the existing government is *bosh*; as you would readily believe, could you witness the session produced on the people here by the debate on the Budget in the 'Corps Legislatif' last night.

The whole affair of the Orleans property (which was finally decided in favour of the government last week) had nothing like the effect on the public that this has had. I would much like to send you a full report of the discussion, but I know you would not have space for its insertion. Bonaparte was present during the debates (?), a fact which shows what could be accomplished if taken up by the King to give that the great mass of our own people have not yet learned, and that they will never have recourse to sophistry, to escape from the performance of a duty of support, or at least of relief.

You have been told that you cannot help the refugees until you have made a revolution in your own land, that you afford no shelter until you have first obtained your social and political rights. What a few have already done shows what could be accomplished if taken up by the King to give that the great mass of our own people have not yet learned, and that they will never have recourse to sophistry, to escape from the performance of a duty of support, or at least of relief.

To relieve and protect the refugees is a SACRED DUTY—indeed, the fulfilment of which is the word of *today*, and one to be spoken of in connection with a future conquest of political and social rights." While these rights were strenuously fought for, the unfortunate victims of European war might perish. Our continental brothers have struggled for political and social rights, not merely for themselves, but for mankind. Assist them then in their endeavour, since they have stood forward in our cause and battled under Humanity's banner. Obey the dictates of conscience, and treat with scorn those who would preach to you sensism and sophistry in place of the duties prescribed by justice and fraternity.

THORNTON LEIGH HUNT
WALTER COOPER, *etc.* Secretaries.

C. JOHN HENRY, *etc.*

Persons willing to add to the Committee, by taking out the name of G. Julian Harmer, 4, Brunswick-row, Queen's-square, Bloomsbury, London, to whom all letters are to be addressed.

The Committee will meet every Wednesday evening eight o'clock, in the coffee room of the Institution, John-street, Tottenham-court-road.

SUBSCRIPTIONS RECEIVED.

G. W. M. Reynolds ... 10 0 0

J. M. Ludlow ... 1 0 0

Joseph Mazzini ... 1 0 0

Mr. Truelove, 10a—Mr. Bradford, 1a—John Howlett, 1a—Henry Ross, 1a—Thornton Hunt, 2a—Mr. Plastow, 2a—C. F. Nicholls, 61—Henry Holycross, 1a—Isaac Wilson, 1a—Crook, 4a—A. Friend, 1a—Mr. Milford, 1a—J. T. Cooper, 2a—J. L. Clark, 1a—Augustus Piercy, 2a—John Arnott, 1a—A Few Friends, 2a—Sir J. Thompson, 1a—Mr. Arthur Dalkeith, 2a—J. Smith, Whitechapel, 1a—Thomas Aucrern, Dalkeith, 2a—J. Smith, Whitechapel, 1a—Mr. Barham, 1a—Messrs. Dowling, per II, Ross, 1a,

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

£. 0. 0.

OUR
PEN-AND-PAPER CHAMPS.

GENERAL SOWINSKI.

Sowinski (Joseph), born in Warsaw about the year 1783, having had an innate bent towards a military career, entered—after the ultimate partition of his country (1796), in default of a national army—the Prussian service, where he served with great distinction, both as a theoretically and practically accomplished artillery officer, and an intrepid soldier, in a battery of horse artillery, and was decorated with the Prussian military order, 'Sour le l'acire,' which, in those days at least, was most sparingly bestowed. Scarcely was a portion of his country, under the name of the Grand-Duchy of Warsaw, restored, and a national army organised, when the patriot Sowinski, after many difficulties and much delay, obtained at last the sought for resignation, and hastened to enter the national ranks as captain in a battery of horse artillery. He was soon promoted to the rank of major; and at the beginning of the Prussian campaign of 1812, he was appointed commander of two batteries of artillery. In this campaign he was decorated—in reward for his skill and gallantry—with the Polish military order, and that of the Legion of Honour. In the battle of Moissak he lost his right leg by a cannon ball. After having been operated upon, and obliged to remain in a hospital, he fell into the hands of the Muscovite army as prisoner of war. When, in 1813, the so-called Kingdom of Poland was patched up by the congress of Vienna, and a new Polish army organised, Sowinski returned from Russia, and was at once appointed director of the Arsenal of Construction, and afterwards director general of the material of Artillery, with the rank of lieutenant colonel. In 1821, when a school for educating officers of artillery and engineers was established, Sowinski was intrusted with its command. He was soon promoted to the rank of full colonel, and decorated by the Emperor of Russia with the St. Ann order of the 3rd class with diamonds, as a recognition of his able and most satisfactory guidance of the above-mentioned school, which latter decoration he however cast aside, when afterwards he was not compelled to bear it.

When, in 1830, the Polish revolution, and, in 1831, the war for national liberty and independence against Prussian oppression broke out, all the pupils entered the ranks of the army, and consequently the school was shut up. Our patriotic veteran, though supported only by one leg, unhesitatingly offered himself to participate in the active service. He accordingly, after having been promoted to the rank of major general, was entrusted with the command of the redoubt of Wola, being the key to the first line of fortifications around Warsaw. But also due to the treachery of the Polish 'Gororge,' viz., General Kruckowski, then generalissimo, and at the same time President of the Government, the redoubt, being neither sufficiently garrisoned with troops, nor armed with the indispensable number of pieces of ordnance (for, instead of twenty-five, only ten were placed on its ramparts), was carried by the Russians on the first day of their attack upon Warsaw, viz., the 6th September, 1831.

At sun-rise the storming column of the Russians, amounting to about 12,000 men, supported by a hundred guns, began the assault on the redoubt, and were thrice repulsed with considerable loss of life; but in that storm three pieces of ordnance were dismounted, so that only seven remained; and the commander of artillery and a great number of artillerymen were slain. Sowinski was then obliged to perform, besides his duty of Commander-in-Chief, those of surveying the artillery, nay, of pointing the guns; and when two more officers of artillery, and many men were killed, the artillery fire entirely ceased. From this moment the Russian columns for the fourth time approached, and their riflemen, sustained by the fire of a formidable artillery, entered the ditch, which was not even quite completed. The bloody contest had now lasted two hours, and the enemy twice escaladed the ramparts, and was twice repulsed into the ditch. At last, at nine o'clock A.M., when the ranks of the defenders were sadly thinned, the enemy, emboldened by the weak resistance, again escaladed the ramparts, and now a frightful struggle with the bayonet ensued; but the handful of defenders, reduced from 1,600 to less than 900, was obliged to yield, after a fight of three hours, to the superiority of twelve to one. It was already noon, when General Sowinski hearing a strong cannonade and musketry fire near the metropolis, thus addressed the garrison:—'Behold! our brethren struggle for our rescue. Let us make a new effort!' Meanwhile Sowinski, always at the guns of the main battery, though all the artillery-men were killed, employed those of the infantry to provide him with ammunition, and succeeded to sustain for some time the artillery fire from one gun, loading, pointing, and firing it himself entirely unaided. When at last the Russians began to enter the interior of the redoubt, Sowinski, with a musket in his hand, and followed by the infantry soldiers, endeavoured to repulse the enemy, but overwhelmed and surrounded by the Russians, when invited by one of their officers to surrender, was stabbed to death by them, upon discharging his musket at the Russian officer and killing him, saying, 'Such is the way of surrender for a true Pole fighting for his fatherland and liberty.'

Soon after three o'clock p.m., all tumult ceased, and a grave-like calm followed, only interrupted now and then by the throat-rattle of the dying men. The sanguinary struggle had lasted upwards of eight entire hours. Thus fell the Polish patriot, who, during the eight last hours of his life, displayed the greatest heroism, and an unprecedented activity, almost supernatural for a man deprived of a leg, which he, nineteen years before, on the same day of the month, lost at Moissak and Russia, and who can with justice be reckoned among the martyrs for national freedom and independence, of whom his martyr-nation has many beatitudes to produce.

Sowinski was a handsome man. His face, one of the few, exhibited the nobleness of his soul. He was five feet nine inches in height, well proportioned, his limbs symmetrical. His complexion was healthy; his hair originally black, became silver-white from the 22nd year of his age. He was charitable, benevolent, and just towards everybody. His superiors liked him a father. His amiability in private life gained him the hearts of all those who knew him; to be in his society was considered a real enjoyment. He was the most amiable of husbands, and his consort, a highly accomplished lady, who was the personification of kindness and loveliness, perfectly felicitous in her domestic life perfectly felicitous. Her unabated love for her husband brought upon her, after his death, the most atrocious persecution on the part of the Russian government, which regarded the mere fact of her being the widow of a patriot like Sowinski as high treason, and, therefore, upon mere suspicion or rather under the pretence of her having been in correspondence with a lady friend in exile, had he imprisoned twice in an old cloister, converted into state prison, where the unmerciful corporal punishment of her death we have not heard, but there can be hardly any doubt that she thus has found repose in the tomb.

Sowinski was a thorough Democrat, not only by words, but by deeds. Always ready to render a service to his fellow-creatures, and to assist suffering humanity; he also became a successful magnetised and many a person was indebted for the recovery of his impaired health (which no medical knowledge could restore) to his mesmeric exertions, to which he devoted all the spare-time of his many occupation grand him.

C. S.

"Poetry, pictorial representations, and even historical work descriptive of the events of 1830 and 1831, have made Sowinski famous before the entire church which was encompassed by the flames of the revolution. His name is still to be seen on the steps of the altar. This is not true, for he fell, as we have said, on the very spot where his presence was the most needed—namely on the ramparts. The story of his dying at the foot of the altar is very well known, but the sake of truth, and vindication of his heroism, we must repeat it. He fell on the ramparts of a fort, though perhaps not so poetical, is more dignified for a hero fighting for his country's liberty than in any hide-out or sanctuary ever known."

"She too, now rests the service of a nurse in a military hospital."

A few days ago, Sowinski, dressed in a uniform representing himself to be, and acting as, a police constable, Sowinski had acted in the Lower Town district, and often transacted police business with the fort, though he stated that he was of the P. division, and two ladies were lately sentenced, one to three and the other to four months' imprisonment on his evidence. All this time he was nothing but a discharged poorman. He stands revealed.

THE COUNTESS OF RUDOLSTADT.

This is the start of the 4th department

sue."]

SAND.

FRATERNITY,
pon what do you swear?
lich I see here."

o humanity."

etter of the gospel?"

ent I believe that it is

We are satisfied with your answer, and we accept the oath you have just taken. Now we are about to instruct you in your duties towards God and towards man. Learn the three words which are all the secret of our mysteries, and which are only revealed to the affiliated with so many delays and precautions. You will require some time to understand their whole extent. "Liberty, Equality, Fraternity," is the mysterious and profound formula of the words of the invisibles."

"That is, in fact, the mystery!"

It does not seem to you to be one; but examine the

state of societies by despotism, inequality, antagonism, it is

an education, an entire conversion, a total revo-

lution, and the moral self-denial of this triple

principle, Liberty, Equality, Fraternity. The small number

of eight million men who are possessed of power

against the millions of the poor, and the disparity

of wealth, they conduct is less shocking; and people

say form like the sun, and the use of that power.

We are not allowed ourselves to be deceived by these

rites of our symbolic temples. They think that these

rites are the puffed up, as formerly the chief of the holi-

est mysteries. But as they have not absolute power

over us, their conduct is less shocking; and people

say form like the sun, and the use of that power.

We are not allowed ourselves to be deceived by these

rites of our symbolic temples. They think that these

rites are the puffed up, as formerly the chief of the holi-

est mysteries. But as they have not absolute power

over us, their conduct is less shocking; and people

say form like the sun, and the use of that power.

We are not allowed ourselves to be deceived by these

rites of our symbolic temples. They think that these

rites are the puffed up, as formerly the chief of the holi-

est mysteries. But as they have not absolute power

over us, their conduct is less shocking; and people

say form like the sun, and the use of that power.

We are not allowed ourselves to be deceived by these

rites of our symbolic temples. They think that these

rites are the puffed up, as formerly the chief of the holi-

est mysteries. But as they have not absolute power

over us, their conduct is less shocking; and people

say form like the sun, and the use of that power.

We are not allowed ourselves to be deceived by these

rites of our symbolic temples. They think that these

rites are the puffed up, as formerly the chief of the holi-

est mysteries. But as they have not absolute power

over us, their conduct is less shocking; and people

say form like the sun, and the use of that power.

We are not allowed ourselves to be deceived by these

rites of our symbolic temples. They think that these

rites are the puffed up, as formerly the chief of the holi-

est mysteries. But as they have not absolute power

over us, their conduct is less shocking; and people

say form like the sun, and the use of that power.

We are not allowed ourselves to be deceived by these

rites of our symbolic temples. They think that these

rites are the puffed up, as formerly the chief of the holi-

est mysteries. But as they have not absolute power

over us, their conduct is less shocking; and people

say form like the sun, and the use of that power.

We are not allowed ourselves to be deceived by these

rites of our symbolic temples. They think that these

rites are the puffed up, as formerly the chief of the holi-

est mysteries. But as they have not absolute power

over us, their conduct is less shocking; and people

say form like the sun, and the use of that power.

We are not allowed ourselves to be deceived by these

rites of our symbolic temples. They think that these

rites are the puffed up, as formerly the chief of the holi-

est mysteries. But as they have not absolute power

over us, their conduct is less shocking; and people

say form like the sun, and the use of that power.

We are not allowed ourselves to be deceived by these

rites of our symbolic temples. They think that these

rites are the puffed up, as formerly the chief of the holi-

est mysteries. But as they have not absolute power

over us, their conduct is less shocking; and people

say form like the sun, and the use of that power.

We are not allowed ourselves to be deceived by these

rites of our symbolic temples. They think that these

rites are the puffed up, as formerly the chief of the holi-

est mysteries. But as they have not absolute power

over us, their conduct is less shocking; and people

say form like the sun, and the use of that power.

We are not allowed ourselves to be deceived by these

rites of our symbolic temples. They think that these

rites are the puffed up, as formerly the chief of the holi-

est mysteries. But as they have not absolute power

over us, their conduct is less shocking; and people

say form like the sun, and the use of that power.

We are not allowed ourselves to be deceived by these

rites of our symbolic temples. They think that these

rites are the puffed up, as formerly the chief of the holi-

est mysteries. But as they have not absolute power

over us, their conduct is less shocking; and people

say form like the sun, and the use of that power.

We are not allowed ourselves to be deceived by these

rites of our symbolic temples. They think that these

rites are the puffed up, as formerly the chief of the holi-

est mysteries. But as they have not absolute power

over us, their conduct is less shocking; and people

say form like the sun, and the use of that power.

We are not allowed ourselves to be deceived by these

rites of our symbolic temples. They think that these

rites are the puffed up, as formerly the chief of the holi-

est mysteries. But as they have not absolute power

over us, their conduct is less shocking; and people

say form like the sun, and the use of that power.

We are not allowed ourselves to be deceived by these

rites of our symbolic temples. They think that these

rites are the puffed up, as formerly the chief of the holi-

est mysteries. But as they have not absolute power

over us, their conduct is less shocking; and people

say form like the sun, and the use of that power.

We are not allowed ourselves to be deceived by these

rites of our symbolic temples. They think that these

rites are the puffed up, as formerly the chief of the holi-

est mysteries. But as they have not absolute power

over us, their conduct is less shocking; and people

NO. X.—LETTING IN A TORY.

To THE EDITOR OF THE STAR OF FREEDOM.
Sir.—Can you tell me where is the old heartiness of our working men? Look around me where I will, in place of that manly straightforwardness, which, notwithstanding its occasional rudeness, its prejudice, and its ignorance, was still a proof that they were honest and sound at core. I find an endeavour at policy which shows them to be tainted with Lord Derby's Whig Spirit of Compromise. From our friend 'Ion,' who writes amiable twaddle in the Leader, that leads no whither, who has accepted asseces as touter in ordinary to the 'Walmsley Incasables,' and who serves them from time to time with his most careful emasculations—from the 'free-thinking' and once free-speaking 'Ion' to the fooliest churlish 'Charlist,' who means only to 'take what can get,' on 'Ion's' recommendation. I see nothing but a cowardly unprincipled stooping to the in Whiggery, the abandoning right, the birthright of man, for any mess of political pottage which the many cooks whom the devil sends to seal our broth may think fit to set before us. One can understand in some men. They who of old opposed anything like treason, not from faith in principle, but merely from hot blood or bull-headedness, having lost all their wind by bawling for 'the whole hog,' may well know how farcical are their extravagances in the shabbiest of tamenesses. It was empty noise before, it is now 'propriety' now. But one would faint think his is not the case with all those who are now either quietly submitting to things as so blindingly themselves for the purposes of Whig Candidates. Any sophism serves them for justification, and the old cry of 'Letting in a Tory,' huddles them into the Whig traps as fast as if those traps were baited with the best salvation. Here is a sample of his bait, and a 'Charlist' working man has manufactured it. 'Young Stodge,' says he 'would have choked himself by cramming his whole dinner down his throat at once, if his good mother had not patted his back and brought his vitals up, and compelled him to take a small instalment at a time. Not overlooking the striking resemblance between the physical and the political digestion, let us contribute somewhat to amend this state of things, by looking out at the next election for a set of old wives or mothers to pat us on the back and prevent our choking.' Is it not enticing? Beautiful recommendation of expediency! Only the people must be considered as so many million Stodges, instead of only one Stodge; and what becomes then of the physical and political resemblance? Will the leaving out a million from the franchise prevent the choking of those admitted?—or are those 'to be left out, any more likely to choke than those who are come in?' But, then, between the Tory in the white-choker, and the Whig-Radical, who would save us from choking, what choice have we? None, perhaps. But is that any excuse for talking your Stodge-bousness? But I am not bound to take one side or the other? Not always; especially when the 'two sides' are really both on one side. If you see two rogues quarrelling together as to how they shall rob a house or divide it 'swag,' do you feel called upon then to 'take sides'? If two known rogues waylay them, and while the bolder one says—'Your money or your life,' the other shams a sudden regard for you in order, as you are well aware, that he may pick your pocket without having to share with his fellow, do you think your duty to take sides then? If you do, it is but in the principle of dividing them, to conquer both in turn. But they are not such fools as that. I find no reason to alter the opinion I expressed in my friend Fetherington's 'Old Fellow,' ten years ago, when the Whigs were to be supported as the friends of Free trade, and a dead set was made against the Tories the only enemies of freedom.

Free trade! The Tories may say the fame: 'Not a Whig in place of each Tory name, You'd find the effeminate in the same!' Which nobody deny. Give the Whig as well as the despicable hue; For the Tory lazier till then through! Who can deny. Tory and Whig—you may take your choice; Are brothers in mischief and malice both; The same in everything but the frost!

Whig and Tory are, in truth, but variations of the same. We should have no faith in either of them. The froth always sinks as soon as the election is over; and your Whig on the hustings is a Tory in. But even supposing that the same is not better to have the more squeezable despot? No, not at the price of showing ourselves also squeeze. Better the Tories in power, and we honest, at the most obliging of Whigs at the cost of our own consistency. You never vote for a Tory. Why? Because he is called a Tory? No; but because he opposes your principles. So does the Whig. And it is that particular amount of concession which approaches, but never reaches, your principles, should not make you less opponent. In this present calculation of the little bits needed, you forget altogether the only object for which the people should work,—not only possible and good of Government from the House of Commons, but the absolute overthrow of the existing system of privilege. Will the 'liberal' of the Whigs help you to that? They will tell you so. Of course, they will tell you 'nothing on the hustings.' Where there are fools there are always fool-catchers. But what have been its acts, 'the votes,' of these old chaff-throwers? Do you think that Graham, or Palmerston, or Russell, or Home, or Cobden, or any of the 'small fry' of Whiggery, whatever they may promise, will ever honestly help you to put an end to the present usurpation? But 'every little they yield is a step towards it.' Doubtless that is their real reason for yielding—smiles, they are so short-sighted that it is only your amazing cleverness which overreaches them. Let us keep steadily to our work; the enfranchisement of the whole people, the overthrow of the present state of privilege. As to any good to be got out of the present House of Commons, we might at well hope by fleecing the Hampshire hogs to make up for the scarcity of Australian wool. While we content ourselves with promises and little dolings on of quack salves; we give good reason to say—O the House! upon every question that concerns the people. You would then, men say to me, 'let the Tory in.' But even supposing that the same is not better to have the more squeezable despot? No, not at the price of showing ourselves also squeeze. Better the Tories in power, and we honest, at the most obliging of Whigs at the cost of our own consistency. You never vote for a Tory. Why? Because he is called a Tory? No; but because he opposes your principles. So does the Whig. And it is that particular amount of concession which approaches, but never reaches, your principles, should not make you less opponent. In this present calculation of the little bits needed, you forget altogether the only object for which the people should work,—not only possible and good of Government from the House of Commons, but the absolute overthrow of the existing system of privilege. Will the 'liberal' of the Whigs help you to that? They will tell you so. Of course, they will tell you 'nothing on the hustings.'

Where there are fools there are always fool-catchers. But what have been its acts, 'the votes,' of these old chaff-throwers? Do you think that Graham, or Palmerston, or Russell, or Home, or Cobden, or any of the 'small fry' of Whiggery, whatever they may promise, will ever honestly help you to put an end to the present usurpation? But 'every little they yield is a step towards it.'

Doubtless that is their real reason for yielding—smiles, they are so short-sighted that it is only your amazing cleverness which overreaches them. Let us keep steadily to our work; the enfranchisement of the whole people, the overthrow of the present state of privilege. As to any good to be got out of the present House of Commons, we might at well hope by fleecing the Hampshire hogs to make up for the scarcity of Australian wool. While we content ourselves with promises and little dolings on of quack salves; we give good reason to say—O the House!

upon every question that concerns the people. You would then, men say to me, 'let the Tory in.' But even supposing that the same is not better to have the more squeezable despot? No, not at the price of showing ourselves also squeeze. Better the Tories in power, and we honest, at the most obliging of Whigs at the cost of our own consistency. You never vote for a Tory. Why? Because he is called a Tory? No; but because he opposes your principles. So does the Whig. And it is that particular amount of concession which approaches, but never reaches, your principles, should not make you less opponent. In this present calculation of the little bits needed, you forget altogether the only object for which the people should work,—not only possible and good of Government from the House of Commons, but the absolute overthrow of the existing system of privilege. Will the 'liberal' of the Whigs help you to that? They will tell you so. Of course, they will tell you 'nothing on the hustings.'

Where there are fools there are always fool-catchers. But what have been its acts, 'the votes,' of these old chaff-throwers?

Do you think that Graham, or Palmerston, or Russell,

or Home, or Cobden, or any of the 'small fry'

of Whiggery, whatever they may promise, will ever honestly help you to put an end to the present usurpation? But 'every little they yield is a step towards it.'

Doubtless that is their real reason for yielding—smiles, they are so short-sighted that it is only your amazing cleverness which overreaches them. Let us keep steadily to our work; the enfranchisement of the whole people, the overthrow of the present state of privilege. As to any good to be got out of the present House of Commons, we might at well hope by fleecing the Hampshire hogs to make up for the scarcity of Australian wool. While we content ourselves with promises and little dolings on of quack salves; we give good reason to say—O the House!

upon every question that concerns the people. You would then, men say to me, 'let the Tory in.'

But even supposing that the same is not better to have the more squeezable despot? No, not at the price of showing ourselves also squeeze. Better the Tories in power, and we honest, at the most obliging of Whigs at the cost of our own consistency. You never vote for a Tory. Why? Because he is called a Tory? No; but because he opposes your principles. So does the Whig. And it is that particular amount of concession which approaches, but never reaches, your principles, should not make you less opponent. In this present calculation of the little bits needed, you forget altogether the only object for which the people should work,—not only possible and good of Government from the House of Commons, but the absolute overthrow of the existing system of privilege. Will the 'liberal' of the Whigs help you to that? They will tell you so. Of course, they will tell you 'nothing on the hustings.'

Where there are fools there are always fool-catchers. But what have been its acts, 'the votes,' of these old chaff-throwers?

Do you think that Graham, or Palmerston, or Russell,

or Home, or Cobden, or any of the 'small fry'

of Whiggery, whatever they may promise, will ever honestly help you to put an end to the present usurpation? But 'every little they yield is a step towards it.'

Doubtless that is their real reason for yielding—smiles, they are so short-sighted that it is only your amazing cleverness which overreaches them. Let us keep steadily to our work; the enfranchisement of the whole people, the overthrow of the present state of privilege. As to any good to be got out of the present House of Commons, we might at well hope by fleecing the Hampshire hogs to make up for the scarcity of Australian wool. While we content ourselves with promises and little dolings on of quack salves; we give good reason to say—O the House!

upon every question that concerns the people. You would then, men say to me, 'let the Tory in.'

But even supposing that the same is not better to have the more squeezable despot? No, not at the price of showing ourselves also squeeze. Better the Tories in power, and we honest, at the most obliging of Whigs at the cost of our own consistency. You never vote for a Tory. Why? Because he is called a Tory? No; but because he opposes your principles. So does the Whig. And it is that particular amount of concession which approaches, but never reaches, your principles, should not make you less opponent. In this present calculation of the little bits needed, you forget altogether the only object for which the people should work,—not only possible and good of Government from the House of Commons, but the absolute overthrow of the existing system of privilege. Will the 'liberal' of the Whigs help you to that? They will tell you so. Of course, they will tell you 'nothing on the hustings.'

Where there are fools there are always fool-catchers. But what have been its acts, 'the votes,' of these old chaff-throwers?

Do you think that Graham, or Palmerston, or Russell,

or Home, or Cobden, or any of the 'small fry'

of Whiggery, whatever they may promise, will ever honestly help you to put an end to the present usurpation? But 'every little they yield is a step towards it.'

Doubtless that is their real reason for yielding—smiles, they are so short-sighted that it is only your amazing cleverness which overreaches them. Let us keep steadily to our work; the enfranchisement of the whole people, the overthrow of the present state of privilege. As to any good to be got out of the present House of Commons, we might at well hope by fleecing the Hampshire hogs to make up for the scarcity of Australian wool. While we content ourselves with promises and little dolings on of quack salves; we give good reason to say—O the House!

upon every question that concerns the people. You would then, men say to me, 'let the Tory in.'

But even supposing that the same is not better to have the more squeezable despot? No, not at the price of showing ourselves also squeeze. Better the Tories in power, and we honest, at the most obliging of Whigs at the cost of our own consistency. You never vote for a Tory. Why? Because he is called a Tory? No; but because he opposes your principles. So does the Whig. And it is that particular amount of concession which approaches, but never reaches, your principles, should not make you less opponent. In this present calculation of the little bits needed, you forget altogether the only object for which the people should work,—not only possible and good of Government from the House of Commons, but the absolute overthrow of the existing system of privilege. Will the 'liberal' of the Whigs help you to that? They will tell you so. Of course, they will tell you 'nothing on the hustings.'

Where there are fools there are always fool-catchers. But what have been its acts, 'the votes,' of these old chaff-throwers?

Do you think that Graham, or Palmerston, or Russell,

or Home, or Cobden, or any of the 'small fry'

of Whiggery, whatever they may promise, will ever honestly help you to put an end to the present usurpation? But 'every little they yield is a step towards it.'

Doubtless that is their real reason for yielding—smiles, they are so short-sighted that it is only your amazing cleverness which overreaches them. Let us keep steadily to our work; the enfranchisement of the whole people, the overthrow of the present state of privilege. As to any good to be got out of the present House of Commons, we might at well hope by fleecing the Hampshire hogs to make up for the scarcity of Australian wool. While we content ourselves with promises and little dolings on of quack salves; we give good reason to say—O the House!

upon every question that concerns the people. You would then, men say to me, 'let the Tory in.'

But even supposing that the same is not better to have the more squeezable despot? No, not at the price of showing ourselves also squeeze. Better the Tories in power, and we honest, at the most obliging of Whigs at the cost of our own consistency. You never vote for a Tory. Why? Because he is called a Tory? No; but because he opposes your principles. So does the Whig. And it is that particular amount of concession which approaches, but never reaches, your principles, should not make you less opponent. In this present calculation of the little bits needed, you forget altogether the only object for which the people should work,—not only possible and good of Government from the House of Commons, but the absolute overthrow of the existing system of privilege. Will the 'liberal' of the Whigs help you to that? They will tell you so. Of course, they will tell you 'nothing on the hustings.'

Where there are fools there are always fool-catchers. But what have been its acts, 'the votes,' of these old chaff-throwers?

Do you think that Graham, or Palmerston, or Russell,

or Home, or Cobden, or any of the 'small fry'

of Whiggery, whatever they may promise, will ever honestly help you to put an end to the present usurpation? But 'every little they yield is a step towards it.'

Doubtless that is their real reason for yielding—smiles, they are so short-sighted that it is only your amazing cleverness which overreaches them. Let us keep steadily to our work; the enfranchisement of the whole people, the overthrow of the present state of privilege. As to any good to be got out of the present House of Commons, we might at well hope by fleecing the Hampshire hogs to make up for the scarcity of Australian wool. While we content ourselves with promises and little dolings on of quack salves; we give good reason to say—O the House!

upon every question that concerns the people. You would then, men say to me, 'let the Tory in.'

But even supposing that the same is not better to have the more squeezable despot? No, not at the price of showing ourselves also squeeze. Better the Tories in power, and we honest, at the most obliging of Whigs at the cost of our own consistency. You never vote for a Tory. Why? Because he is called a Tory? No; but because he opposes your principles. So does the Whig. And it is that particular amount of concession which approaches, but never reaches, your principles, should not make you less opponent. In this present calculation of the little bits needed, you forget altogether the only object for which the people should work,—not only possible and good of Government from the House of Commons, but the absolute overthrow of the existing system of privilege. Will the 'liberal' of the Whigs help you to that? They will tell you so. Of course, they will tell you 'nothing on the hustings.'

Where there are fools there are always fool-catchers. But what have been its acts, 'the votes,' of these old chaff-throwers?

Do you think that Graham, or Palmerston, or Russell,

or Home, or Cobden, or any of the 'small fry'

of Whiggery, whatever they may promise, will ever honestly help you to put an end to the present usurpation? But 'every little they yield is a step towards it.'

Doubtless that is their real reason for yielding—smiles, they are so short-sighted that it is only your amazing cleverness which overreaches them. Let us keep steadily to our work; the enfranchisement of the whole people, the overthrow of the present state of privilege. As to any good to be got out of the present House of Commons, we might at well hope by fleecing the Hampshire hogs to make up for the scarcity of Australian wool. While we content ourselves with promises and little dolings on of quack salves; we give good reason to say—O the House!

upon every question that concerns the people. You would then, men say to me, 'let the Tory in.'

But even supposing that the same is not better to have the more squeezable despot? No, not at the price of showing ourselves also squeeze. Better the Tories in power, and we honest, at the most obliging of Whigs at the cost of our own consistency. You never vote for a Tory. Why? Because he is called a Tory? No; but because he opposes your principles. So does the Whig. And it is that particular amount of concession which approaches, but never reaches, your principles, should not make you less opponent. In this present calculation of the little bits needed, you forget altogether the only object for which the people should work,—not only possible and good of Government from the House of Commons, but the absolute overthrow of the existing system of privilege. Will the 'liberal' of the Whigs help you to that? They will tell you so. Of course, they will tell you 'nothing on the hustings.'

Where there are fools there are always fool-catchers. But what have been its acts, 'the votes,' of these old chaff-throwers?

Do you think that Graham, or Palmerston, or Russell,

or Home, or Cobden, or any of the 'small fry'

of Whiggery, whatever they may promise, will ever honestly help you to put an end to the present usurpation? But 'every little they yield is a step towards it.'

Doubtless that is their real reason for yielding—smiles, they are so short-sighted that it is only your amazing cleverness which overreaches them. Let us keep steadily to our work; the enfranchisement of the whole people, the overthrow of the present state of privilege. As to any good to be got out of the present House of Commons, we might at well hope by fleecing the Hampshire hogs to make up for the scarcity of Australian wool. While we content ourselves with promises and little dolings on of quack salves; we give good reason to say—O the House!

upon every question that concerns the people. You would then, men say to me, 'let the Tory in.'

But even supposing that the same is not better to have the more squeezable despot? No, not at the price of showing ourselves also squeeze. Better the Tories in power, and we honest, at the most obliging of Whigs at the cost of our own consistency. You never vote for a Tory. Why? Because he is called a Tory? No; but because he opposes your principles. So does the Whig. And it is that particular amount of concession which approaches, but never reaches, your principles, should not make you less opponent. In this present calculation of the little bits needed, you forget altogether the only object for which the people should work,—not only possible and good of Government from the House of Commons, but the absolute overthrow of the existing system of privilege. Will the 'liberal' of the Whigs help you to that? They will tell you so. Of course, they will tell you 'nothing on the hustings.'

Where there are fools there are always fool-catchers. But what have been its acts, 'the votes,' of these old chaff-throwers?

Do you think that Graham, or Palmerston, or Russell,

or Home, or Cobden, or any of the 'small fry'

of Whiggery, whatever they may promise, will ever honestly help you to put an end to the present usurpation? But 'every little they yield is a step towards it.'

Doubtless that is their real reason for yielding—smiles, they are so short-sighted that it is only your amazing cleverness which overreaches them. Let us keep steadily to our work; the enfranchisement of the whole people, the overthrow of the present state of privilege. As to any good to be got out of the present House of Commons, we might at well hope by fleecing the Hampshire hogs to make up for the scarcity of Australian wool. While we content ourselves with promises and little dolings on of quack salves; we give good reason to say—O the House!

upon every question that concerns the people. You would then, men say to me, 'let the Tory in.'

But even supposing that the same is not better to have the more squeezable despot? No, not at the price of showing ourselves also squeeze. Better the Tories in power, and we honest, at the most obliging of Whigs at the cost of our own consistency. You never vote for a Tory. Why? Because he is called a Tory? No; but because he opposes your principles. So does the Whig. And it is that particular amount of concession which approaches, but never reaches, your principles, should not make you less opponent. In this present calculation of the little bits needed, you forget altogether the only object for which the people should work,—not only possible and good of Government

JUNE 26, 1852.

THE STAR OF FREEDOM.

attacks. A few days ago the Archbishops of CANTERBURY and others waited upon Lord Brougham to request that the government would not allow the New Crystal Palace to be opened on Sunday. Now there is something particularly disgusting in this attempt on the part of wealthy priests and aristocrats, who can seek the pure air of the country at pleasure, to deprive of the only few hours of healthful enjoyment it is in his power to obtain, the poor artisan who is all the week else confined to the stifling atmosphere of the workshop, or his still more unhealthy home.

We can respect the conscientious men; but for those who would follow, under pretence of religion, hatred and contempt: they are indeed driven forth from among us.

That we are subject to the attack only shows the more clearly, how far the encroachment of all, that of THE PEOPLE may for ever be hypocrites.

APPROACHING DISSOLUTION OF PARLIAMENT.

It has been 'positively affirmed' that Parliament will be prorogued on Thursday next, the 1st of July, and that the dissolution will take place the following day. The Ministerial organ names the 8th of July as the day of actual dissolution. It is likely that the Commons will have to adjourn for a day or two, to allow the Lords to finish their share of the Parliamentary tinkering. It may be considered certain that the dissolution will take place within ten or fourteen days from the present time. A few new candidates worthy of the people's confidence are coming forward, including Mr. WILLIAM CONNINGHAM, the well known and untiring advocate of political and social reform. We earnestly hope he will take the place of Mr. LUSHINGTON in the representation of Westminster, and shall be no way sorry should he owe his seat to the casting of that shrewd Radical LUCY EVANS. We are happy to learn that in Finsbury there is every probability of again placing Mr. T. S. DUNCOMBE at the head of the poll. We rejoice that the prospect of Mr. WILLIAM NEWTON's election for the Tower Hamlets every day becomes more hopeful. Notwithstanding certain short-comings and mistakes, Mr. G. THOMPSON is by far the best of the remaining candidates, and we hope, will be returned with Mr. NEWTON. It is to be desired that Mr. WILLIAM WILLIAMS may again sit for Lambeth. In the Borough of Southwark Mr. ARSEY PELLATT will be a good exchange for Alderman HUMPHREY. As regards the country constituencies, we can only notice that Hull promises to elect as one of her representatives 'Viscount' GODERICK. If the promise be realised, no election will give more general satisfaction. In politics 'Lord' GODERICK is a progressive reformer of the best school; better still, he has studied the social condition of the people, and is earnestly desirous of bringing the action of the Legislature to bear upon the great work of Social Reform. If for no other reason, the interest he has taken in the unhappy fate of the Refugees, would be sufficient for us to wish him 'good speed.' His humanity and sincere devotion to the cause of the wronged of all classes, creeds, and climes, must command the sympathy of those who love justice and freedom—of those who desire to inaugurate a happier future for our

country.

We return to our 'intelligent foreigner,' whom we suppose to have his knowledge of the British Constitution from our great authorities. There he is with Blackstone's 'Commentaries' before him, reading it with the only few hours of healthful enjoyment it is in his power to obtain, the poor artisan who is all the week else confined to the stifling atmosphere of the workshop, or his still more unhealthy home.

Notice that this item is cont. from previous page

to the qualifications of the electors. The true reason for requiring any qualification, with regard to property in voters, is, to exclude such persons as are in so mean a situation to have no voice in the state. These persons had votes, they were entitled to dispose of them, and in some cases, as in others, it would give a great, an artful, and a wealthy man a large influence in elections than is consistent with general liberty. It is probable that every man would give his voice freely, and that every voter in the community, however poor, would have a vote in electing those delegates, to whose charge is committed the disposal of his property, his liberty, and his life.

The teaching of Blackstone, as applied to the practices of this country, will prove that Englishmen are not freemen. Tens of thousands of persons are not at any way represented in the British House of Commons; and not any branch of the legislative power resides in the whole body of the people; and if such as persons as 'have no will of their own' were excluded from voting at the forthcoming election, thousands of the present electors would be disfranchised; and if all those who would vote uncontrolled by undue influence had votes, not a few who are now non-electors would be enfranchised. If it be inconsistent with 'general liberty' for a great, an artful and a wealthy man, to exercise a powerful influence in elections, there is in England much, very much such inconsistency.

According to the theory of the British Constitution, all interests should be represented in the Parliament. Where, we ask, are the representatives of labour? Let them be named. To us they are unknown. Yet the labourer has property, liberty and life at stake; but in the disposal thereof he has o'er his seat to the casting of that shrewd Radical LUCY EVANS.

We are happy to learn that in Finsbury there is

every probability of again placing Mr. T. S. DUNCOMBE at the head of the poll. We rejoice that the

prospect of Mr. WILLIAM NEWTON's election for the Tower Hamlets every day becomes more hopeful.

Notwithstanding certain short-comings and mistakes, Mr. G. THOMPSON is by far the best of the remaining candidates, and we hope, will be returned with Mr. NEWTON.

It is to be desired that Mr. WILLIAM WILLIAMS may again sit for Lambeth.

In the Borough of Southwark Mr. ARSEY PELLATT will be a good exchange for Alderman HUMPHREY.

As regards the country constituencies, we can only notice

that Hull promises to elect as one of her representatives 'Viscount' GODERICK.

If the promise be realised, no election will give more general satisfaction.

In politics 'Lord' GODERICK is a progressive reformer of the best school;

better still, he has studied the social condition of the people,

and is earnestly desirous of bringing the action of the Legislature to bear upon the great work of Social Reform.

If for no other reason, the interest he has taken in the unhappy fate of the Refugees, would be sufficient for us to wish him 'good speed.'

His humanity and sincere devotion to the cause of the wronged of all classes, creeds, and climes, must command the sympathy of those who love justice and freedom—of those who desire to inaugurate a happier future for our

country.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE STAR OF FREEDOM.

SIR.—The Theory of the British Constitution and the Practice of British Citizens are essentially different things. We can fancy that most critical person, of whom we often hear, 'an intelligent foreigner,' debating with much reverence on the 'British Constitution.' There he is reading from the pages of De Lolme, 'That, if any person gives, or promises to give, any money, employment, or reward to any voter, in order to influence his vote, he, as well as the voter himself, shall be condemned to pay a fine of five hundred pounds, and for ever disabled from voting and holding any office in any corporation.' Who, on reading anything so pure as that, could believe it to be possible that the Cocks of this country know the monied price of almost every borough? How could the 'intelligent foreigner' infer that so heavy a penalty as is set forth above, should prove to be practically a mere fiction, that bribery was the rule, and purity at elections the exception? Would not the 'intelligent foreigner' be guilty, with virtuous and innocent indignation, that even the Queen's Ministers could condone to hold certain boroughs, such as Harwich, in their own immediate possession, to be represented during a Whig Administration by a Hobhouse, and, under the Derby and Disraeli ascendancy, by a Kelly. Such, nevertheless, are the facts. Facts almost too notorious to arrest attention. How many members of the present House of Commons would be re-elected at the General Election, if their disqualification was established by the test of having given, or promised to give, 'any money, employment, or reward to any voter, in order to influence his vote.' They would be so few that we cannot name them; yet, according to De Lolme, all such acts are opposed to the British Constitution; but the British House of Commons exists, and its members are elected by practices opposed to the Theory of Constitution which they form an important part.

Again, the 'intelligent foreigner' reads, 'There is more been established that no Lord of Parliament, or Lord Lieutenant of a county, has any right to interfere in the elections of members; that any officer of the Excise, Customs, &c., who shall presume to interfere in elections, by influencing any voter to give or withhold his vote, shall forfeit one hundred pounds, and be disabled to hold any office. How striking is the contrast—'it moreover the practice of the Lords of Parliament and Lord Lieutenants of counties, through the medium of their land agents and other servants, to influence elections by every means in their power, to threaten, intimidate and bribe, frequently too, for the express purpose of returning members of their own families to serve in Leagues, for the express purpose of accomplishing their own ends by every possible means at the command of a few men in Manchester form themselves into a association, and by extraordinary exertions on the part they succeed in influencing all the elections in England.

A section of the Roman Catholics of Ireland unit in one body as a Catholic Defence Association, an they exhort their fellow-citizens to return to Parliament:—'Those who, regardless of family ties, being neither Whigs nor Tories, will unite, as one man, to oppose any Government, by whatever name it may be called, which refuses justice to Catholics, and to support my Government, by whatever name it may be called, which will concede it: "Justice to Catholics in such case meaning a giving up of deliberate judgment on all purely secular matters, to secure a triumph to a religious sect."

Of course it would be impossible for the Catholic of Ireland not to have a counterpart in England an in Scotland. A 'Catholic Defence Association' be gets a 'Protestant Alliance,' the members of which in their real make every interest subservient to Protestantism. And much Protestantism it is! as intense, as bigoted, as illiberal, as Roman Catholicism itself. The Protestant Alliance are warm zealots and busy themselves in matters they had much better let alone. Just now they are striving with might and main to prevent the re-election of Mr. Schlesfield for Birmingham. It would be well for the clerical canvassers who at this time are so busy in Birmingham, to go home and say their prayers, a that they may become more tolerant in all that relate to the affairs of others, and less overbearing in the discharge of their clerical duties.

Amidst this systematic array of organised factional purity at elections is an apostle as a per-

son's conscience; and De Lolme's theory of the

required the sanction of the men of these districts to give

The West Riding Delegates Meeting, which was held at Bradford on the 15th of June, was the largest and most important that was ever held in that district, and the decision which it gave showed it is still true to its character—prepared to defend the right and oppose the wrong.

As there was an apparent sanction given to the calling of

the Conference by the West Riding Delegates, I deem it

my duty to lay before you a true statement of the facts of

what happened at the meeting, and the decision

which it gave to the Chartists.

Mr. Jones was the first and only man that moved the

subject of calling a Conference. Though not a single voter

had thought of it, through misrepresentation and falsehood,

had aroused a spirit of jealousy and doubt in the minds of

those who were under his influence, and it was at his individual

instruction that the motion was taken up. Acting under

the instructions of Mr. Jones, the chairman of the Conference ordered a West Riding Delegate Meeting for February 1, and the purpose of taking this subject into consideration.

Delegates attended that meeting from Bradford, Halifax, Huddersfield, Keighley, Todmorden, Bingley, and Midgley; it was moved that Cockfosters, of Halifax, take the chair, which he refused to do unless he was allowed the privilege of moving, or seconding any resolution; and of having a vote equal to that of the chairman. He was told that the votes granted to him were foolish and unwise, and that he was not in possession of the necessary material for such a purpose, or, if he is, has wilfully kept them back. I am endeavour, next week, to supply the deficiency for him.

Christopher Stackley.

Required the sanction of the men of these districts to give

The West Riding Delegates Meeting, which was held at Bradford on the 15th of June, was the largest and most im-

portant that was ever held in that district, and the decision

which it gave showed it is still true to its character—pre-

pared to defend the right and oppose the wrong.

As there was an apparent sanction given to the calling of

the Conference by the West Riding Delegates, I deem it

my duty to lay before you a true statement of the facts of

what happened at the meeting, and the decision

which it gave to the Chartists.

Mr. Jones was the first and only man that moved the

subject of calling a Conference. Though not a single voter

had thought of it, through misrepresentation and falsehood,

had aroused a spirit of jealousy and doubt in the minds of

those who were under his influence, and it was at his individual

instruction that the motion was taken up. Acting under

the instructions of Mr. Jones, the chairman of the Conference

ordered a West Riding Delegate Meeting for February 1,

and the purpose of taking this subject into considera-

tion.

Delegates attended that meeting from Bradford, Halifax,

Huddersfield, Keighley, Todmorden, Bingley, and Midgley;

it was moved that Cockfosters, of Halifax, take the chair,

which he refused to do unless he was allowed the privilege of

moving, or seconding any resolution; and of having a

vote equal to that of the chairman.

He was told that the votes granted to him were foolish and

unwise, and that he was not in possession of the necessary

material for such a purpose, or, if he is, has wilfully kept them

back. I am endeavour, next week, to supply the deficiency for him.

Christopher Stackley.

Required the sanction of the men of these districts to give

The West Riding Delegates Meeting, which was held at Bradford on the 15th of June, was the largest and most im-

portant that was ever held in that district, and the decision

which it gave showed it is still true to its character—pre-

pared to defend the right and oppose the wrong.

As there was an apparent sanction given to the calling of

the Conference by the West Riding Delegates, I deem it

my duty to lay before you a true statement of the facts of

what happened at the meeting, and the decision

which it gave to the Chartists.

Mr. Jones was the first and only man that moved the

subject of calling a Conference. Though not a single voter

had thought of it, through misrepresentation and falsehood,

had aroused a spirit of jealousy and doubt in the minds of

those who were under his influence, and it was at his individual

instruction that the motion was taken up. Acting under

the instructions of Mr. Jones, the chairman of the Conference

ordered a West Riding Delegate Meeting for February 1,

and the purpose of taking this subject into considera-

tion.

Delegates attended that meeting from Bradford, Halifax,

Huddersfield, Keighley, Todmorden, Bingley, and Midgley;

it was moved that Cockfosters, of Halifax, take the chair,

which he refused to do unless he was allowed the privilege of

moving, or seconding any resolution; and of having a

vote equal to that of the chairman.

He was told that the votes granted to him were foolish and

unwise, and that he was not in possession of the necessary

material for such a purpose, or, if he is, has wilfully kept them

back. I am endeavour, next week, to supply the deficiency for him.

Christopher Stackley.

Required the sanction of the men of these districts to give

The West Riding Delegates Meeting, which was held at Bradford on the 15th of June, was the largest and most im-

portant that was ever held in that district, and the decision

which it gave showed it is still true to its character—pre-

pared to defend the right and oppose the wrong.

As there was an apparent sanction given to the calling of

the Conference by the West Riding Delegates, I deem it

my duty to lay before you a true statement of the facts of

what happened at the meeting, and the decision

which it gave to the Chartists.

Mr. Jones was the first and only man that moved the

subject of calling a Conference. Though not a single voter

Trades' Intelligence.

The Secretaries of Trade Unions and other bodies associated to protect and advance the interests of Labour, will oblige by forwarding reports of Trades' Meetings, Strikes, and other information affecting the social position of the Working Classes.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF UNITED TRADES.

250, Tottenham-court-road, London.

"IT IS JUSTICE."

"It was possible for the working classes, by combining among themselves, to raise, or keep up the general rate of wages; it need hardly be said that this would be a thing not to be punished, but to be welcomed and rejoiced at."—*STAR OF FREEDOM.*

The most remarkable and important cases of disputes between labour and capital that have occurred since the Grand Consolidated Trades' Union of Great Britain in 1842, have unquestionably been the recent ones of the Wolverhampton Tin-plate Workers, and the Amalgamated Society of Engineers. But there is this remarkable and important feature which distinguishes these latter cases from the former—that, whereas, the great strike of the tailors of that period was a pure act of aggression, without any previously attempted negotiation, or adequate notice, the recent cases were strictly of a defensive and conservative character, and distinguished throughout a long and pains-taking negotiation, by an entire absence of those irritating and repulsive circumstances, which have been heretofore the usual concomitants of labour's contentions with capital. In both these instances, the concessions sought were indisputably just and reasonable: were acknowledged so by influential and impartial judges; yet, nevertheless, they were claimed less as matters of right than of favour. This novel and improved mode of procedure by working men caused evident surprise and perplexity to the 'lords of capital.' They found themselves placed on the horns of a dilemma, either to refuse claims, which by their self-evident reasonableness and justice, they could not with any decency reject, or to surrender upon the altar of equity, usurped powers and advantages to which they had not a shadow of an equitable claim, although long enjoyed by them, to their own aggrandisement, at the expense of the rights, and by the manifest and direct injury of their workmen and their families. That men of high standing, of reputed honour and character, who they would pretend, form the chief elements in that commercial pedestal upon which is raised the proud fabric of England's glory and greatness; that such men should of these two alternatives choose the meanest and the basest, can only be attributed to the insidious influence which the withering avarice of trade has upon the morals and characters of those within its influence. The aphorism of the camel and the needle's eye is strictly and logically true. If we may judge of their philosophy by their actions, we may suppose they adopted the reasoning of the noble poet, the hon. member for Colchester, which, to suit the occasion we thus paraphrase:—

Let law and right, morals and honour die.

But, oh! preserve to us our class monopoly.

Yes, when the new and improved tactics of union placed them in this difficult and unforeseen position, they came to the determination to pitch all the chivalric feeling of their order to the winds, and to adopt the ill-omened motto of the late Duke of Newcastle, 'I have a right to do as I like with my own.' And they followed out their magnanimous policy with a vigour and gallant disregard to all moral results, which led to an ultimate and dearly-bought triumph. In the Wolverhampton case it was pursued in strict accordance with the mental and moral peculiarities of the prime mover in a spirit of the most intense meanness, by the most unscrupulous disregard of the character of the means or agents by which the end desired, or a conviction could be accomplished. The Union was to be destroyed, *per se ut nefas*—by fair means or foul; and verily, the latter were not wanting. The heroes of Bucklebury carried their measures in another fashion. Their's was the true Napoleonic *coup d'état*. They considered that desperate diseases required desperate remedies, and like their notorious prototype, believed that the end would, in the estimation of their public, justify the means, however unusual and despotic. The history of these struggles—the despotic use of the power which union and capital gave to the employers—the unscrupulous efforts of the press, which should be the guardian and champion of right and humanity, to mislead public opinion and the temporary triumph of might over right—are too recent and too well-known to need further comment; and we only now allude to these recent occurrences to connect them as parts of a systematic policy by which all future attempts by labour, to protect its rights, will be certainly defeated, unless a corresponding change of system and policy is adopted by the working classes. The same spirit, differing only in its mode of manifestation, is to be observed in the recent proceedings of the Silk Trade of Macclesfield, as reported in our last communication. The operatives there, desirous of some more efficient and less obnoxious mode of settling Trades' disputes, and strikes and turnouts, established a Labour Board, consisting of one-half employers and one-half employed, with the consent and co-operation of the employers, and with (we believe) one of the latter as President. It is difficult to conceive an arrangement more equitable, or better calculated to secure substantial justice to either party that this, if its awards were honestly and honourably carried out. For two or three years it worked with great satisfaction to both masters and workmen. Many old grievances were redressed; petty encroachments—the usual advanced guard of more serious innovations—were prevented; the competitive avarice of the employers, which, like jealousy, 'grows with what it feeds on,' was kept within reasonable limits; prices and wages were prevented from sudden and unseasonable fluctuations; and the manufacturing operations of the district went on harmoniously, and consequently satisfactorily, and no doubt beneficially to the history of the town. But there was one thing wanting to complete and crown this greatly improved system—a something which should render the awards of this fairly constituted Trades' jury binding upon the honour and consciences of the respective parties. It has been proved, time out of mind, that principle stands no chance when brought into contact with interest. Pledge and promises appear, by the canons of the commercial code of morality, to be things made only to be broken and disregarded upon the first favourable emergency. The recent events in Wolverhampton, Oldham, and Macclesfield, prove incontestably that the sound and even promises of these traps of Trade are like 'diseas' on the deceptive and worthless. They have been proved to have been made and entered on for the avowed purposes of deception—to answl and cajole the credulous simplicity of unsuspecting delegates. What a dangerous example! What a horrible state of moral anarchy shall we be driven into, if this bad example prove contagious, and all the arrangements and dealings between labour and capital are in future to depend upon this faithless and rotten foundation. The Massrs. Brocklehurst, to suit their momentary interests, unhesitatingly ignore the award of the arbitrators they had themselves assisted to appoint. They also assumed 'the right to do as they liked with their own,' irrespective, of course, of the rights of others. And the excellent system of the Macclesfield Board of Trade is broken up, and all the glorious anarchy and immorality of the strike system restored to full and vigorous activity, and, as a natural consequence, conspiracies, indictments, convictions and imprisonments of honest and innocent men loom in the distance. Let us must be protected from the dishonest, avaricious and tradesmen to ponder the master, to contemplate steadily and prejudicially the future which awaits them.

The policy we have here pointed to, and which has been so successful, will be the capitalist policy of the future, and as they are, the workmen are powerless for resistance.

June 17, 1852. WILLIAM PEET, Secretary.

MEETING OF MINERS.

At a meeting of the Leiston Colliery miners, at which delegations attended from West Cransington and old Cransington Collieries, the following resolutions were adopted:—That to ensure the greatest possible amount of safety to the lives of the miners, the currents of atmospheric air should be ample and sufficient to carry off all the deleterious and noxious gases given out by the mine; that to depend upon safety lamps is fallacious, seeing there has been more lives lost since their introduction than before; That a sufficient number of Inspectors and Sub-Inspectors ought to be appointed to visit and examine the mines (es-

specially those which make the most fire-damp), at least once yearly, so that they may be enabled to point out the dangers existing, and thereby prevent such frequent loss of life by a timely removal of the cause. That at the opinion of this meeting the efforts made by the Inspector of Mines for this purpose have been partial, this is the 12th dept.

explosions, calculated to the evidence cases, which the managers have agreed to bring up sitting to come into the causes of those sad and fearful disasters which disgrace the page of history of the nineteenth century.

A petition is being signed by the Lancashire miners based on a resolution of a like nature.

Yours, &c., M. JUDE.
S.—An inquest was held on the bodies of the two men who were killed by a boiler explosion at Spital Colliery. The evidence went to show that had a valve been fixed to indicate danger, &c., the calamity, in probability, would not have happened. The engineer said that there was such an instrument ready on the boiler, but that it never had been fixed, for which neglect a reward could be given. The verdict was, 'Accidental death.' Such is 'Crown's Quest Law.'

Co-operative Chronicle.

We shall be glad to receive Reports of Progress from Managers or Secretaries of Co-operative Associations and Stores, in England, Ireland, Scotland and Wales.

CO-OPERATIVE STORE, Bradford, June 22.—Since our last report was published we have held regular monthly meetings, at which we have discussed and revised our rules of procedure as far as possible, considering the obstacles which still present us from enrolling ourselves under the law; and saw that a Bill has passed the House of Lords "for the regulating trading societies," we hope to be amongst those whom it is intended to benefit. We have also had a district meeting, and formed an union called the Northern Union, at which Messrs. Hole, Green, and Stoth, were requested to draw up a "Constitution," which will be submitted to an adjourned meeting on Sunday, the object of the Society being to make joint purchases, and have all the advantages of the wholesale market. We have also engaged a traveller in the staff trade Mr. Sutcliffe, who will, as soon as possible, visit different stores with samples and patterns of Bradford goods, and from our present position, we flattered ourselves able to supply Alpaca, Lustres, Orleans, Paramates, robes, &c., at such prices as cannot fail to satisfy all who desire to see the principles of Co-operation at first hand. Our half yearly meeting will take place at the end of the month, and our balance sheet will show to the world our principles are not only just but practicable.—JOSEPH UNION.

OPERATIVE LEAGUE.—The fifth meeting of this was held on Tuesday. Mr. Smith read a paper on "Trade as the only safe and sure means of introducing our country to the world," by giving her the national education by schools for the poor. A discussion ensued, in which Messrs. Nicholls, Owen, R. Cooper, Lloyd Jones, Nash, and Hart took after which the meeting adjourned.

MR. W. NEWTON AND THE TOWER HAMLETS ELECTION.

GREAT MEETING IN BONNER'S FIELDS.

On Monday evening last an open air meeting of the electors and non-electors was held in Bonner's-fields, to express sentiments of Mr. W. Newton. At an early hour it was assembled, and at about half-past six the proceedings commenced by Mr. W. Davies being called to the chair. MR. DAVIES said, that in this case the interests of the shopkeepers and the working man were identical, and were their imperative duty to hold jointly together to ensure the return of Mr. Newton. (Cheers.) He begged to introduce Mr. Newton to the meeting. Mr. NEWTON then stepped forward, and was met with cheers. He said, those who were working to secure a return did not seek to carry people with them by noise, but by argument. The only way in which the working class can be made powerful is by their continual discussion of questions of social reform, by which they will gain knowledge and power. Political reform is a question affecting the interests of all classes; and men should speak singly and say how much they were for, so that others might know whom to select. V. C., then, was in favour of Man Suffrage, and all those other measures necessary to correct when gained. Political reform will remove those which maintain a State Church, which exists without a affection of the people. But we want more than a reformation of Church and State; we want great social reform, and political power and intelligence will bring those reforms. It is not scandalous that a government should remain away months in discussing a measure they have not yet insisted upon—the "Palmer aggression" act—instead of attending to the wants of the people? Instead of such an act being passed, we should have had an act which would place to all religions an of equality. He would repeat, and would support a national education, it must be supposed that he advocated centralisation. The elector would support was one which could be controlled by the local authorities. The system of W. J. Fox was the sufficient, and that he would ever advocate. Let us give education to the working classes. The same spirit, differing only in its mode of manifestation, is to be observed in the recent proceedings of the Silk Trade of Macclesfield, as reported in our last communication. The operatives there, desirous of some more efficient and less obnoxious mode of settling Trades' disputes, and strikes and turnouts, established a Labour Board, consisting of one-half employers and one-half employed, with the consent and co-operation of the employers, and with (we believe) one of the latter as President. It is difficult to conceive an arrangement more equitable, or better calculated to secure substantial justice to either party that this, if its awards were honestly and honourably carried out. For two or three years it worked with great satisfaction to both masters and workmen. Many old grievances were redressed; petty encroachments—the usual advanced guard of more serious innovations—were prevented; the competitive avarice of the employers, which, like jealousy, 'grows with what it feeds on,' was kept within reasonable limits; prices and wages were prevented from sudden and unseasonable fluctuations; and the manufacturing operations of the district went on harmoniously, and consequently satisfactorily, and no doubt beneficially to the history of the town. But there was one thing wanting to complete and crown this greatly improved system—a something which should render the awards of this fairly constituted Trades' jury binding upon the honour and consciences of the respective parties. It has been proved, time out of mind, that principle stands no chance when brought into contact with interest. Pledge and promises appear, by the canons of the commercial code of morality, to be things made only to be broken and disregarded upon the first favourable emergency. The recent events in Wolverhampton, Oldham, and Macclesfield, prove incontestably that the sound and even promises of these traps of Trade are like 'diseas' on the deceptive and worthless. They have been proved to have been made and entered on for the avowed purposes of deception—to answl and cajole the credulous simplicity of unsuspecting delegates. What a dangerous example! What a horrible state of moral anarchy shall we be driven into, if this bad example prove contagious, and all the arrangements and dealings between labour and capital are in future to depend upon this faithless and rotten foundation. The Massrs. Brocklehurst, to suit their momentary interests, unhesitatingly ignore the award of the arbitrators they had themselves assisted to appoint. They also assumed 'the right to do as they liked with their own,' irrespective, of course, of the rights of others. And the excellent system of the Macclesfield Board of Trade is broken up, and all the glorious anarchy and immorality of the strike system restored to full and vigorous activity, and, as a natural consequence, conspiracies, indictments, convictions and imprisonments of honest and innocent men loom in the distance. Let us must be protected from the dishonest, avaricious and tradesmen to ponder the master, to contemplate steadily and prejudicially the future which awaits them.

The policy we have here pointed to, and which has been

so successful, will be the capitalist policy of the future, and as they are, the workmen are powerless for resistance.

June 17, 1852. WILLIAM PEET, Secretary.

THE STAR OF FREEDOM.

THE COURT OF QUEEN'S BENCH.—MONDAY.

THE QUEEN v. NEWMAN.

CRIMINAL INFORMATION.

This was a criminal information filed by Dr. Giacinto, a Catholic priest against John Henry Newman, D.D., a Roman Catholic priest. The information charged the defendant with composing and publishing a libel on the said Giacinto.

The defendant pleaded first not guilty, upon which issue was joined; secondly, he pleaded that his publication was for the public benefit, and that its publication was for the public benefit.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL, for the defendant, Mr. Addison, and Mr. Baddeley, for the plaintiff.

Mr. ELLES having opened the pleading,

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL called the witness to the jury.

This was a criminal information filed by Dr. Giacinto against John Henry Newman, D.D., a Roman Catholic priest. The information charged the defendant with composing and publishing a libel on the said Giacinto.

The defendant pleaded first not guilty, upon which issue was joined; secondly, he pleaded that his publication was for the public benefit, and that its publication was for the public benefit.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL, for the defendant, Mr. Addison, and Mr. Baddeley, for the plaintiff.

Mr. ELLES having opened the pleading,

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL called the witness to the jury.

This was a criminal information filed by Dr. Giacinto against John Henry Newman, D.D., a Roman Catholic priest. The information charged the defendant with composing and publishing a libel on the said Giacinto.

The defendant pleaded first not guilty, upon which issue was joined; secondly, he pleaded that his publication was for the public benefit, and that its publication was for the public benefit.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL, for the defendant, Mr. Addison, and Mr. Baddeley, for the plaintiff.

Mr. ELLES having opened the pleading,

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL called the witness to the jury.

This was a criminal information filed by Dr. Giacinto against John Henry Newman, D.D., a Roman Catholic priest. The information charged the defendant with composing and publishing a libel on the said Giacinto.

The defendant pleaded first not guilty, upon which issue was joined; secondly, he pleaded that his publication was for the public benefit, and that its publication was for the public benefit.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL, for the defendant, Mr. Addison, and Mr. Baddeley, for the plaintiff.

Mr. ELLES having opened the pleading,

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL called the witness to the jury.

This was a criminal information filed by Dr. Giacinto against John Henry Newman, D.D., a Roman Catholic priest. The information charged the defendant with composing and publishing a libel on the said Giacinto.

The defendant pleaded first not guilty, upon which issue was joined; secondly, he pleaded that his publication was for the public benefit, and that its publication was for the public benefit.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL, for the defendant, Mr. Addison, and Mr. Baddeley, for the plaintiff.

Mr. ELLES having opened the pleading,

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL called the witness to the jury.

This was a criminal information filed by Dr. Giacinto against John Henry Newman, D.D., a Roman Catholic priest. The information charged the defendant with composing and publishing a libel on the said Giacinto.

The defendant pleaded first not guilty, upon which issue was joined; secondly, he pleaded that his publication was for the public benefit, and that its publication was for the public benefit.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL, for the defendant, Mr. Addison, and Mr. Baddeley, for the plaintiff.

Mr. ELLES having opened the pleading,

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL called the witness to the jury.

This was a criminal information filed by Dr. Giacinto against John Henry Newman, D.D., a Roman Catholic priest. The information charged the defendant with composing and publishing a libel on the said Giacinto.

The defendant pleaded first not guilty, upon which issue was joined; secondly, he pleaded that his publication was for the public benefit, and that its publication was for the public benefit.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL, for the defendant, Mr. Addison, and Mr. Baddeley, for the plaintiff.

Mr. ELLES having opened the pleading,

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL called the witness to the jury.

This was a criminal information filed by Dr. Giacinto against John Henry Newman, D.D., a Roman Catholic priest. The information charged the defendant with composing and publishing a libel on the said Giacinto.

The defendant pleaded first not guilty, upon which issue was joined; secondly, he pleaded that his publication was for the public benefit, and that its publication was for the public benefit.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL, for the defendant, Mr. Addison, and Mr. Baddeley, for the plaintiff.

Mr. ELLES having opened the pleading,

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL called the witness to the jury.

This was a criminal information filed by Dr. Giacinto against John Henry Newman, D.D., a Roman Catholic priest. The information charged the defendant with composing and publishing a libel on the said Giacinto.

The defendant pleaded first not guilty, upon which issue was joined; secondly, he pleaded that his publication was for the public benefit, and that its publication was for the public benefit.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL, for the defendant, Mr. Addison, and Mr. Baddeley, for the plaintiff.

Mr. ELLES having opened the pleading,

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL called the witness to the jury.

This was a criminal information filed by Dr. Giacinto against John Henry Newman, D.D., a Roman Catholic priest. The information charged the defendant with composing and publishing a libel on the said Giacinto.

The defendant pleaded first not guilty, upon which issue was joined; secondly, he pleaded that his publication was for the public benefit, and that its publication was for the public benefit.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL, for the defendant, Mr. Addison, and Mr. Baddeley, for the plaintiff.

Mr. ELLES having opened the pleading,

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL called the witness to the jury.

This was a criminal information filed by Dr. Giacinto against John Henry Newman, D.D., a Roman Catholic priest. The information charged the defendant with composing and publishing a libel on the said Giacinto.

The defendant pleaded first not guilty, upon which issue was joined; secondly, he pleaded that his publication was for the public benefit, and that its publication was for the public benefit.

confirmed the evidence of the last witness.
Rev. GEORGE HARDFIELD, examined by Sergeant ICE, said, I am acquainted with Dr. Achilli, who, on the 1st of July, was appointed Italian theological teacher, and on the 11th of December arrived to take up his appointment. Before his arrival a person named Leonini, of the other Societies—members of the college, and several Professors, Corzzi was called on to state the nature of his accusations against these priests:

Sergeant WILKIN.—What were they?

Rev. GEORGE HARDFIELD, examined by Sergeant ICE.—One of the two Leonini was charged with having committed adultery in the house with a Maltese servant. The servant had brought letters frequently to the house. The other was accused of sleeping out of the house, and having frequent connexion with prostitutes. Dr. Achilli had lived with these men in Malta in the early part of the year 1811, and he had been in England, and for the time he had not to be proved.

Rev. ALEXANDER WATT, formerly clerical secretary to the Maltese College, the Earl of Shaftesbury, and Dr. HARDFIELD, corroborated the evidence of the preceding witness.

MARIE HARRIS, an ordinary-looking servant-maid, living at Kensington, said.—In 1810, about two years ago, I was a servant in a house in Northumberland-street, Strand, where I used to take a room at eleven o'clock, and found Mr. Castellini making carpets for the drawing-room. Dr. Achilli arrived shortly after in a cab. He told me to put the house to rights, and to make the best of it, as the things I had come. I saw about dinner, and Dr. Achilli was in and out of the kitchen all day. There was no blind to the kitchen window, so I took the table-cover, and with the curtains was covering it up.

COUNSEL.—What happened then?

MARIE HARRIS.—He took very improper liberties with me. There was no one in the house but ourselves, for Castellini had gone away. He put his hand round my waist, and would have done so in other places, but I prevented him. (Laughter.)

COUNSEL.—Did he do anything else?

MARIE HARRIS.—He kissed me, and I got away from him into the back staircase; he followed me, and I told him what I had been through; he left me; and I got into a month's imprisonment. He then again made attempts to get his arms round my neck and waist, and to kiss me, towards he went out, and came home about twelve o'clock, sleeping next room to me, but nothing took place, I made several attempts to take liberties with me, kissing when I was not aware of it, before his wife came home, and Dr. Achilli was in, and also my aunt, Mrs. Cadogan. I was still did not take further liberties with me after he came back. I never spoke to him again. The next evening after seeing Dr. Achilli asked me if I liked bed, and if I wished for a bedfellow? I left before the month was out.

JANE LEGGE, rather a country-looking girl, said—I was the service of Dr. Achilli about seven or eight months, and left about a month ago. I was servant of all work to Mrs. Castellini. She gave me any freedom I wanted. (Laughter.) Did he take any familiarities with you?

MARIE HARRIS.—Yes, about two months after I went there.

COUNSEL.—What did he do?

MARIE HARRIS.—I gave notice to leave, and he asked me to stop, which I did. He had kissed me two or three times then. A day or two after he took liberties with me in my mistress' service. He had connexion with me once, but I can't say how often.

MARIE HARRIS.—You became in the family way?

MARIE HARRIS.—Yes, I stayed four months after that, and I took another situation. I gave notice three times, my mistress asked me to stay, and then at last she gave notice. She gave me a very good character. I could stay in my place, being ill, and was confined on the 5th of November. The child died, and I for a long time had no connexion. I saw Dr. Achilli about two weeks before I came back, but I did not speak to him. He came back, and if I wished for a bedfellow? I left before the month was out.

JANE LEGGE, rather a country-looking girl, said—I was the service of Dr. Achilli about seven or eight months, and left about a month ago. I was servant of all work to Mrs. Castellini. Did he take any familiarities with you?

MARIE HARRIS.—Yes, I told him that I was subpoenaed, and he said, "I'll go to see you." I told him a week afterwards, and he said that "I'll be to see the door in the face if those who came to subpoena me." My sister said, "I tell the truth if I went." I have not spoken to him since.

THE SOLICITOR-GENERAL.—Was he not put there to connive at you?

MARIE HARRIS.—No; he did not want to be seen, and he went (Laughter.)

THE SOLICITOR-GENERAL.—How many men came to see you while he was in Dr. Achilli's service?

MARIE HARRIS.—I am not obliged to answer that question. (Laughter.) I used to have a young man calling to see me, and there was another. (Much laughter.)

THE SOLICITOR-GENERAL.—That is four that you had connexion with?

MARIE HARRIS.—I never told you that the two friends who came to see me had anything improper to do with me, (Laughter.)

THE SOLICITOR-GENERAL.—Do you know the father of your son?

MARIE HARRIS.—No Sir. Mrs. Achilli found fault about the man who came to see me, but no other, and she saw something wrong with me. I never said anything to her, except Dr. Achilli taking improper liberties with me.

SIR A. COCKBURN.—You say you can't tell who was the child?

MARIE HARRIS.—I could not swear it.

SIR A. COCKBURN.—Why?

MARIE HARRIS.—Because I knew Mr. Augustini.

SIR A. COCKBURN.—Had any one else?

MARIE HARRIS.—(After a pause.)—I would not like to swear about the father of the child. Mr. Augustini had connexion with me soon after I went to service, and before Dr. Achilli.

THE SOLICITOR-GENERAL.—Was he not put there to connive at you?

MARIE HARRIS.—No; he did not want to be seen, and he went (Laughter.)

THE SOLICITOR-GENERAL.—How many men came to see you while he was in Dr. Achilli's service?

MARIE HARRIS.—I am not obliged to answer that question. (Laughter.) I used to have a young man calling to see me, and there was another. (Much laughter.)

THE SOLICITOR-GENERAL.—That is four that you had connexion with?

MARIE HARRIS.—I never told you that the two friends who came to see me had anything improper to do with me, (Laughter.)

THE SOLICITOR-GENERAL.—Do you know the father of your son?

MARIE HARRIS.—No Sir. Mrs. Achilli found fault about the man who came to see me, but no other, and she saw something wrong with me. I never said anything to her, except Dr. Achilli taking improper liberties with me.

SIR A. COCKBURN.—You say you can't tell who was the child?

MARIE HARRIS.—I could not swear it.

SIR A. COCKBURN.—Why?

MARIE HARRIS.—Because I knew Mr. Augustini.

SIR A. COCKBURN.—Had any one else?

MARIE HARRIS.—(After a pause.)—I would not like to swear about the father of the child. Mr. Augustini had connexion with me soon after I went to service, and before Dr. Achilli.

THE SOLICITOR-GENERAL.—Was he not put there to connive at you?

MARIE HARRIS.—No; he did not want to be seen, and he went (Laughter.)

THE SOLICITOR-GENERAL.—How many men came to see you while he was in Dr. Achilli's service?

MARIE HARRIS.—I am not obliged to answer that question. (Laughter.) I used to have a young man calling to see me, and there was another. (Much laughter.)

THE SOLICITOR-GENERAL.—That is four that you had connexion with?

MARIE HARRIS.—I never told you that the two friends who came to see me had anything improper to do with me, (Laughter.)

THE SOLICITOR-GENERAL.—Do you know the father of your son?

MARIE HARRIS.—No Sir. Mrs. Achilli found fault about the man who came to see me, but no other, and she saw something wrong with me. I never said anything to her, except Dr. Achilli taking improper liberties with me.

SIR A. COCKBURN.—You say you can't tell who was the child?

MARIE HARRIS.—I could not swear it.

SIR A. COCKBURN.—Why?

MARIE HARRIS.—Because I knew Mr. Augustini.

SIR A. COCKBURN.—Had any one else?

MARIE HARRIS.—(After a pause.)—I would not like to swear about the father of the child. Mr. Augustini had connexion with me soon after I went to service, and before Dr. Achilli.

THE SOLICITOR-GENERAL.—Was he not put there to connive at you?

MARIE HARRIS.—No; he did not want to be seen, and he went (Laughter.)

THE SOLICITOR-GENERAL.—How many men came to see you while he was in Dr. Achilli's service?

MARIE HARRIS.—I am not obliged to answer that question. (Laughter.) I used to have a young man calling to see me, and there was another. (Much laughter.)

THE SOLICITOR-GENERAL.—That is four that you had connexion with?

MARIE HARRIS.—I never told you that the two friends who came to see me had anything improper to do with me, (Laughter.)

THE SOLICITOR-GENERAL.—Do you know the father of your son?

MARIE HARRIS.—No Sir. Mrs. Achilli found fault about the man who came to see me, but no other, and she saw something wrong with me. I never said anything to her, except Dr. Achilli taking improper liberties with me.

SIR A. COCKBURN.—You say you can't tell who was the child?

MARIE HARRIS.—I could not swear it.

SIR A. COCKBURN.—Why?

MARIE HARRIS.—Because I knew Mr. Augustini.

SIR A. COCKBURN.—Had any one else?

MARIE HARRIS.—(After a pause.)—I would not like to swear about the father of the child. Mr. Augustini had connexion with me soon after I went to service, and before Dr. Achilli.

THE SOLICITOR-GENERAL.—Was he not put there to connive at you?

MARIE HARRIS.—No; he did not want to be seen, and he went (Laughter.)

THE SOLICITOR-GENERAL.—How many men came to see you while he was in Dr. Achilli's service?

MARIE HARRIS.—I am not obliged to answer that question. (Laughter.) I used to have a young man calling to see me, and there was another. (Much laughter.)

THE SOLICITOR-GENERAL.—That is four that you had connexion with?

MARIE HARRIS.—I never told you that the two friends who came to see me had anything improper to do with me, (Laughter.)

THE SOLICITOR-GENERAL.—Do you know the father of your son?

MARIE HARRIS.—No Sir. Mrs. Achilli found fault about the man who came to see me, but no other, and she saw something wrong with me. I never said anything to her, except Dr. Achilli taking improper liberties with me.

SIR A. COCKBURN.—You say you can't tell who was the child?

MARIE HARRIS.—I could not swear it.

SIR A. COCKBURN.—Why?

MARIE HARRIS.—Because I knew Mr. Augustini.

SIR A. COCKBURN.—Had any one else?

MARIE HARRIS.—(After a pause.)—I would not like to swear about the father of the child. Mr. Augustini had connexion with me soon after I went to service, and before Dr. Achilli.

THE SOLICITOR-GENERAL.—Was he not put there to connive at you?

MARIE HARRIS.—No; he did not want to be seen, and he went (Laughter.)

THE SOLICITOR-GENERAL.—How many men came to see you while he was in Dr. Achilli's service?

MARIE HARRIS.—I am not obliged to answer that question. (Laughter.) I used to have a young man calling to see me, and there was another. (Much laughter.)

THE SOLICITOR-GENERAL.—That is four that you had connexion with?

MARIE HARRIS.—I never told you that the two friends who came to see me had anything improper to do with me, (Laughter.)

THE SOLICITOR-GENERAL.—Do you know the father of your son?

MARIE HARRIS.—No Sir. Mrs. Achilli found fault about the man who came to see me, but no other, and she saw something wrong with me. I never said anything to her, except Dr. Achilli taking improper liberties with me.

SIR A. COCKBURN.—You say you can't tell who was the child?

MARIE HARRIS.—I could not swear it.

SIR A. COCKBURN.—Why?

MARIE HARRIS.—Because I knew Mr. Augustini.

SIR A. COCKBURN.—Had any one else?

MARIE HARRIS.—(After a pause.)—I would not like to swear about the father of the child. Mr. Augustini had connexion with me soon after I went to service, and before Dr. Achilli.

THE SOLICITOR-GENERAL.—Was he not put there to connive at you?

MARIE HARRIS.—No; he did not want to be seen, and he went (Laughter.)

THE SOLICITOR-GENERAL.—How many men came to see you while he was in Dr. Achilli's service?

MARIE HARRIS.—I am not obliged to answer that question. (Laughter.) I used to have a young man calling to see me, and there was another. (Much laughter.)

THE SOLICITOR-GENERAL.—That is four that you had connexion with?

MARIE HARRIS.—I never told you that the two friends who came to see me had anything improper to do with me, (Laughter.)

THE SOLICITOR-GENERAL.—Do you know the father of your son?

MARIE HARRIS.—No Sir. Mrs. Achilli found fault about the man who came to see me, but no other, and she saw something wrong with me. I never said anything to her, except Dr. Achilli taking improper liberties with me.

SIR A. COCKBURN.—You say you can't tell who was the child?

MARIE HARRIS.—I could not swear it.

SIR A. COCKBURN.—Why?

MARIE HARRIS.—Because I knew Mr. Augustini.

SIR A. COCKBURN.—Had any one else?

MARIE HARRIS.—(After a pause.)—I would not like to swear about the father of the child. Mr. Augustini had connexion with me soon after I went to service, and before Dr. Achilli.

THE SOLICITOR-GENERAL.—Was he not put there to connive at you?

MARIE HARRIS.—No; he did not want to be seen, and he went (Laughter.)

THE SOLICITOR-GENERAL.—How many men came to see you while he was in Dr. Achilli's service?

MARIE HARRIS.—I am not obliged to answer that question. (Laughter.) I used to have a young man calling to see me, and there was another. (Much laughter.)

THE SOLICITOR-GENERAL.—That is four that you had connexion with?

MARIE HARRIS.—I never told you that the two friends who came to see me had anything improper to do with me, (Laughter.)

THE SOLICITOR-GENERAL.—Do you know the father of your son?

istence, and without crime. The whole system was a discredit and disgrace to people owning the name of Englishmen. All regular government had been suspended, and violence and lawlessness had been established throughout the Islands. He hoped when parliament met again they would meet under different auspices. It was in May that they had not yet moved for papers on this subject; but they should be much amply presented. Unless he might be allowed to bring the subject forward, he was sorry he was precluded by circumstances from doing more than entering his protest against the system now pursued in the Ionian Islands.

Sir J. PARKER said with respect to the petition from the inhabitants of New South Wales, the house must feel that it involved subjects of too much importance and magnitude to be lightly and incidentally discussed. Although he believed that all the allegations it contained could not be borne out, the petition would receive the respectful attention of her Majesty's government, with every disposition to concede to the colonists their fair rights, consistently with the relation between the mother country and its colonies. In the course of the session he had introduced a bill for the cessation of the management of waste lands and the casual revenues from minerals. In the New Zealand Bill the management of waste lands had been conceded to the colony, and her Majesty's government had already relinquished the Australian colonies' the management, arrangement, distribution, and expenditure of the revenue. Sir John lamented that a high price of indifference and inattention, should be subjected to those incidental attacks. One charge made against Sir Henry Ward was as to his conduct towards the press in the Ionian Islands. He hoped the house would, in justice to that public officer, allow him to read an extract from a portion of that press. It was a translation from the "Riga," a Zante paper, and was an article, or a specimen of articles, for which Pizarro was banished.

"The ferocious and insane Ward, the image and type of Turkish cruelty and villainy, after shamelessly treasuring the heroic soil of Cophalan, stained in all its hellish purity with remorse of conscience, inflamed with the fever of vengeance, and showing in his dark and hangman face that savage and brutal brutality which his colleagues have displayed in India and other places, through his influence, has been held up to demand. But how is this? While we are at liberty to express our wishes as to our fate, while, through our representatives, we possess a sovereign will, may we not freely utter our opinion that we do not desire you for our protector, that we do not wish to be governed by you, for we have another national position, and we seek another political destiny?—and, according to the inalienable rights of nations? How are we not masters to send you whence you come, miserable being! who for our misfortunes have troubled this land of paradise and made a hell, and a source of death and tears?"

"Bear, bear," from Mr. Hume, whose cheer excited much laughter. Having such spirits to deal with, come not to us, he observed, should be made to Sir II. Ward for the pains to which he resorted.

After some further conversation the bill was read a third time and passed.

The house then went again into committee upon the Metropolitan Burial Bill, the clauses of which were discussed during the remainder of the sitting.

THE QUESTION OF PEACE.—In the evening, in reply to a question put by Mr. Milnes,

Sir J. STUART gave details of the case of a coloured man named Peter, an artificer seaman, who had, with British protection, who, on the vessel being compelled by distress to put into the harbour of Charleston, in the United States, had been cast into the common gaol, and was detained there under the slave law of South Carolina. The most energetic remonstrances had been addressed to the United States Government on this point by the public, and the government, and relaxations had already taken place in the laws of South Carolina; so that there was every hope the influence of public opinion would ultimately do away with all laws of this nature, and remove from one of the most enlightened nations of the world one of the greatest degradations that could be fixed on a civilized country.

VALUATION (IRELAND) BILL.—After some opposition, the house went into Committee on this bill, the clauses of which were agreed to.

The Nisi Prius Officers Bill, the Common Law Procedure Bill (with further amendments), and the Master in Chancery Abolition Bill, were each read a third time and passed.

Other bills were advanced a stage, and the house adjourned at a quarter past one o'clock.

WEDNESDAY, June 23.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.—CLOTHES, CLOTHING, &c.—SPECIAL ACTION.—Mr. GIBSON moved, in committee of the whole house, for leave to bring in a second bill to enable the Church of England in the colonies to meet in synod for the purposes of ecclesiastical government; his object was to make such changes as would meet some of the minor objections to the previous bill (which was opposed by government), and to have it printed in the corrected form, and sent to the colored preparatory to legislation in a future parliament.

An objection was taken on a point of order whether a bill for the same object being before the house, it was competent to move a resolution in committee for the purpose of getting amendments into the bill instead of inserting them in the usual way, but the question was ruled in Mr. Gladstone's favour.

Secretary of J. J. PAKINGTON, complained of the course taken by Mr. Gladstone in bringing in his bill. He repeated his objections to the measure.

Mr. HORNSBY described the bill as a revolutionary bill, intended to introduce ecclesiastical tyranny into the colonies, and reminded the house that it was brought forward by the organ of a dangerous and encroaching party in the church.

Sir W. P. Wood felt that the object or tendency of the measure was ecclesiastical tyranny. On the contrary, it proposed to give greater freedom of action, and to extend the power of the laity.

Mr. BURKE spoke against the bill, and after a few words of mutual explanation between Mr. Gladstone and Sir J. Pakington, the resolution was agreed to.

The General Board of Health Bill passed through Committee.

The Friendly Society, the Patent Law Amendment, the Copyright (Ireland), the Encumbered Estates (Ireland), the District Unions (Ireland), the Encumbered Estates (Ireland), Bills were read a third time and passed.

The Authors of Upper Schools—Lord JOCHEM, in moving for papers relating to a charge preferred against Mrs. Ali Moorad, Author of Upper Schools, of having made fraudulent alterations in the treaty of Nownoor, concluded between him and the late Mr. Roostoon Khan, entered at length into details which, in his opinion, bore upon the conduct of the rulers of Schools, once the faithful allies of the British, and now the enemies of a foreign land. He moved for these documents, he said, on behalf of the ex-Ashers, believing that the masters which had been brought to light with reference to the conduct of Ali Moorad Khan placed at the disposal of the government means of repairing the injury done to those schools.

Sir J. INCLOSURE felt it to be an honour and a privilege to second the motion, believing this to be a case of great oppression.

Mr. BAILLIE was about to state the views of the Indian government respecting the ex-Ashers, when it being on the verge of six o'clock, at the suggestion of Mr. Horries, the debate was adjourned till the following day.

The house then adjourned.

THURSDAY, June 24.

HOUSE OF LORDS.—THE LORD CHANCELLOR took his seat on the woolsack at five o'clock.

The Earl Dene said that it was the intention of the government to rescind the minute of 1840, which permits the admittance of chancery and other articles with coffee; at the same time, instructions would be given to the Excise not to press for penalties where these articles were kept in separate packets, and marked as being what they really were.

The Apparition and other bills were read a second time, and others were passed.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.—THE SPEAKER took the chair at a quarter past one o'clock.

Mr. MORRIS' BILLS.—On the motion of Lord John Manners, the Bill was recommended, for the purpose of introducing some new clauses and amendments.

VALUATION (IRELAND) BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

WOODS, FORESTS, AND LAND REVENUES BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

SECRETARY OF HUMBERS OFFICE ABOLITION BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

BISHOPRIC OF QUERETARO BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

COLONIAL BISHOPS BILL.—This Bill was read a third time and passed.

BISHOPRIC OF CHRISTCHURCH (NEW ZEALAND) BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR IRELAND BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR IRISH AFFAIRS BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA BILL.—This Bill was considered and agreed to, and ordered to be read a third time, and passed.

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR IRELAND BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR IRISH AFFAIRS BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR IRELAND BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR IRISH AFFAIRS BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR IRELAND BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR IRISH AFFAIRS BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR IRELAND BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR IRISH AFFAIRS BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR IRELAND BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR IRISH AFFAIRS BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR IRELAND BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR IRISH AFFAIRS BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR IRELAND BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR IRISH AFFAIRS BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR IRELAND BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR IRISH AFFAIRS BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR IRELAND BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR IRISH AFFAIRS BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR IRELAND BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR IRISH AFFAIRS BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR IRELAND BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR IRISH AFFAIRS BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR IRELAND BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR IRISH AFFAIRS BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR IRELAND BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR IRISH AFFAIRS BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR IRELAND BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR IRISH AFFAIRS BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR IRELAND BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR IRISH AFFAIRS BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR IRELAND BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR IRISH AFFAIRS BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR IRELAND BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR IRISH AFFAIRS BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR IRELAND BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR IRISH AFFAIRS BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR IRELAND BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR IRISH AFFAIRS BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR IRELAND BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR IRISH AFFAIRS BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR IRELAND BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR IRISH AFFAIRS BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR IRELAND BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR IRISH AFFAIRS BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR IRELAND BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR IRISH AFFAIRS BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR INDIA BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR IRELAND BILL.—This Bill was read a third time, and passed.

SECRETARY OF STATE FOR IRISH AFFAIRS BILL.</