

writers, always starting up in an unexpected place, censuring, praising, advising, dissuading on all manner of subjects with equal fervour and equal infelicity. We could forgive his roguery but confess ourselves less charitable towards his inconsistency—only look at him! we took up his paper on Tuesday, and thought that on one point at any rate we had him safe—namely, that he was anxious to see the Judges here placed on the same footing as in England; that footing being, that they hold their offices during good behaviour and are removable upon an address of both Houses of Parliament. We thought, we say, that when the *Herald* wrote that to this recommendation no one could object, it had adopted the principle, that the Judges ought to be responsible to the people instead of the Crown; and though we certainly felt a degree of compassion for this noble and constitutional principle, when we reflected upon the bad company it was likely to meet with in the mind of the writer who adopted it, we never expected to find it contradicted, at least in the self-same article. Judge, then, gentle reader, of our astonishment, when we read in the very same page the following: “As our Legislative Council are so anxious for the independence of the Judges, it is rather surprising that nothing should have been done for this purpose by local Legislation. Their honors are dependent upon the pleasure of the Legislative Council as well as upon that of the Executive Government. Ill health may require two or three year’s leave of absence; when the question of whole or of half salary will in great measure depend upon the estimation in which they are held by the Council. A similar cause may compel them to retire altogether from their public duties, when no retiring allowance can be secured to them without the will and pleasure of the Council.” On this we would observe first, that it is not in our opinion at all surprising that the Council, whose object it is to render the Judges responsible to them, should not commence operations by destroying the only hold which they have over them. The Council are neither so weak nor so wicked as to seek to erect a judicial despotism in this Colony. The Judges must be responsible to somebody, but that somebody should not be the Executive Government, but the representatives of the people. Secondly, we would remark that till the Council is permitted to fix the salaries of the Judges it will be vain, we should hope, to expect from it retiring pensions. The *Herald* seems to think, that because the British Government has imposed fetters upon us we ought to gild them, to wreath them with flowers, and to wear them as jauntily as possible. We think far otherwise. Let those who exacted a tribute from us to pay these Judges their working salaries, extort another for their retiring allowances. We are weaker and must submit. But let not us be guilty of the baseness and meanness counselled by the *Herald*, nor remedy any one of the inconveniences which the abuse of arbitrary power never fails to bring. The Home Government is quite sufficiently active in stripping the Council of the privileges with which it has invested it, without any assistance from the Council itself; nor can we agree with the *Herald*, that because the schedules have taken from us our cloak, we should therefore make them a present of our coat also. The influence which the Council possesses over the Judges is very small, but small as it is, it is better than none.

THE CHIEF JUSTICE AND THE ATTORNEYS.

It is true, we give law to hares and deer, because they be beasts of chase; but it was never accounted either cruelty or foul play to knock foxes and wolves on the head as they can be found, because they be beasts of prey.—*Mr. Saint-John’s Speech against the Earl of Stafford.*

A FEW days since, the Chief Justice informed the Court, from the Bench, that complaints had been made against an attorney, of such a character as to induce the Judges to write to the Attorney General, with the view that that officer would bring the matter forward in his official capacity. The Attorney-General had declined doing this, and His Honor stated, that the Judges themselves had, of their own motion, issued a rule nisi, calling upon the attorney in question to show cause why he should not be struck off the roll. The name of the gentleman complained against, was not mentioned, and until the return of the rule, the public were left under the impression, that some enormous piece of professional delinquency was about to be brought to light—as nothing less could be supposed to warrant, the extremely mysterious manner in which the Chief Justice’s announcement was made. On the return day of the rule, the Court was crowded by persons, anxious to hear the secret disclosed, and then it turned out that Mr. Fitzhardinge was the gentleman charged—and that the offence, was the lending of his privilege to a client, for the purpose of making costs. Mr. Windeyer appeared for Mr. Fitzhardinge, and made a very able and judicious speech in his defence, and the rule was the next day discharged. This is a very brief outline of the transaction. Those who wish to know more about it, may see it detailed at length in the columns of “the only daily journal in these Colonies.” The above is enough for our present purpose.

With the merits of this particular case, we have no desire to interfere. Mr. Fitzhardinge may have been justly or unjustly charged by their Honors—that is nothing to us, to the profession, or to the public. It is, however, of some consequence

to see whether this gentleman was, or was not, brought before the Court in a proper and constitutional manner. And, under all the circumstances, we feel no hesitation in saying that he was not. The Chief Justice, in pronouncing the judgment of the Court, undoubtedly quoted a great number of, what he termed authorities, to show that the course adopted was a correct one. But, with great respect for the high dignitaries by whom these precedents were created, we must be permitted to remark, that the mere dictum of one or two, or even twenty individual Judges, however eminent they may be, is insufficient, in our humble opinion, to establish beyond dispute, a practice which is opposed to the fundamental principles of justice, and which, if systematically persevered in, would speedily reduce the members of a learned and honourable profession, to a condition so abject and humiliating, that every independent and educated man would feel himself bound to withdraw from it in disgust. What, we ask, can possibly be more unjust than that the same individuals should act in the three-fold capacity of accuser, judge, and jury—a union of offices which, we undertake to say, under no possible conjunction of circumstances, be in accordance with the genius of the British constitution? Well, indeed, might Mr. Windeyer complain, as he did, in manly and straightforward language, that his client had no responsible accuser to whom he could look for redress, in the event of the charge turning out to be without foundation. We admit, with the Chief Justice, that it is of the highest consequence to society, that the practice of the law should be honourably conducted—but, he should recollect that it is of no less consequence, that the office of an Attorney should not be degraded. And, what can be a greater degradation to any man of spirit and position in society, than that he should be called upon summarily to explain his conduct to the satisfaction of a Judge, on the mere verbal accusation of any client, whether respectable or otherwise, who may, from ignorance or malice, think proper to complain against him? The Chief Justice, in defending this most improper practice said, that it had been long previously adopted by the Judges of the Court, but, if he had been candid enough to admit it, he would have said, that those Judges were himself and Mr. Justice Burton. This last arbitrary minded individual, we are aware, would have gone, and indeed did go, much further in this way than the Chief Justice himself. It was no uncommon thing for him to prejudge a matter, by declaring that such a one would be struck off the rolls; and, if it were necessary, a few instances might be mentioned which would rather surprise the admirers of this so-called upright and honest man. But as we enjoy the inestimable blessing of his absence, we will not rake up accusations behind his back, when he is not now here to rebut them. We can afford him this piece of forbearance, unless some of those who were so forward in bespattering him with their praise, should call upon us for further explanation.

Whether the Chief Justice is desirous of emulating the conduct of Mr. Justice Burton or not, we cannot say, but we do hope, if another case such as Mr. Fitzhardinge’s should arise, that the profession will meet together and shew their determination not to submit to the indignity without remonstrance and opposition.

THE DEVIL AND THE GOVERNOR.

A DRAMATIC SKETCH.

SCENE—An office. Governor discovered seated at a writing-table. Devil advances.

Governor (aside).—What fellow is this, whose footsteps rude On my private hours thus dares intrude, When doors are closed, and the desolate blast In the outward midnight is bellowing past? I hear the sentinel’s step below— How the deuce he got in, I should like to know. ’Tis an ill-looking hound!—that aspect hard With the sorrow of sin is deeply scarred; And the records of evil passion streak With their infinite lines that iron cheek— I’m really afraid for help to cry, For I shrink from the scowl of his glaring eye; And feel in his presence a sense of awe, Like a felon caught in the clutch of law,— Would I could summon my slaves together,— Where’s Riddell and Parker?—where’s Merewether? Yet he rather looks like a gentleman, too— I’ll speak to him first—what else can I do? His manners may please, though his look’s severe;— (Aloud) My honest fellow, what brings you here?

Devil.—Ha, ha! my old boy! how soft and mild! Why, you talk in the tone of a well-bred child. Cheer up, cheer up; dismiss alarm, My time is not come to do you harm. We’ve been friends too long to be quarrelling now, And I’m not the man for a foolish row. I doubt not my face is strange, but still You’ve borne me in deeds the best good will. Come, come, cheer up, don’t look so blue,— I’m a Governor, George, as well as you.

Governor.—The devil you are!

Devil.—..... The devil I am. ’Tis an ugly name in one’s mouth to cram; But ah! you sly dog! you guessed it well— I govern the vast domains of Hell. Why start at the word? since, by the same token, ’Tis not the first time you’ve heard it spoken.

Governor.—Dark prince of the deep! what want you here— Since mortals with you must meet in fear?

Devil.—I’ve come, my dear soul, for an hour or two, On passing events to chat with you; To render you thanks for the mischief you’re brewing For the state you oppress and the land you’re undoing; And also to offer—excuse my freedom— A few words of advice where you seem to need ’em.

Governor.—As for your praise, it might not flatter,— So let it pass, as it don’t much matter,— Sit down. And I hope you’ve taken tea— The hour for that meal being past with me; I’d offer you grog, but I sadly fear My cupboard is locked, and the key’s not here. My servants to roost, I believe, are fled, My aide-de-camp’s out, and my sec. in bed— Yet, now, I reflect, I can find you some— ’Tis a bottle of best imported rum, Just out of a batch that was seized in town— Oh, dear! how I miss that Hutchinson Brown; The keenest fellow in any nation Is he, for snuffing an information With the pounce of a cat, the eye of an eagle, And a nose for a job, that would honour a beagle; As for me, I don’t drink it, ’twas brought as a sample,— But do not be guided by my example,— You can suck from a bottle, as I suppose; Hold it well up, and take care of your nose.

Devil.—Pooh, pooh! such stuff mere children’s sport is, I now drink nothing but “aqua fortis;” How long I may do so, remains a question, For I’m told it exceedingly hurts digestion; And such is the general spread of sobriety, They’ve got up in Hell a Temperance Society: Now, I make it a rule—though much trouble it brings— To patronise all those sorts of things. A sober sinner is not the less A sinner for want of drunkenness; And they wrong me who say that I’m fond of riot,— I like those crimes best that are done in quiet.

Governor.—You talk rather boldly.

Devil.—..... Well, I’m wrong To trench on your prejudice, if it’s strong. Your pardon I heartily beg,—but stay, I’ve wandered from much I mean’t to say.

Governor.—Your advice, your advice,—’twere a shame to lose it, Though I need not take it unless I choose it.

Devil.—I grant you the praise you’ve fairly won By the deeds you do and the deeds you’ve done; I know that no causes corrupt the mind Like the chains by which tyrants have crushed mankind, That the blighting touch of a despot’s rod Kills in man’s spirit the breath of God. That the purpose he bade your race fulfil Is not for the meek slave’s fettered will; That the cherishing light of the holy skies Falls barren and vain upon servile eyes, That the weeds of evil will thrive there best, Where the fair shoots of nature are clipped and dressed; Yes, under those climes where the poisonous brood Of error is nursed by servitude,— Where souls are bowed by the weight they bear, Where their moral sky looks dark, and their air Is thick with the filth that bondage breeds, I scatter my foul and fertile seeds; Where most I am bent on man’s undoing, The tyrant assists my work of ruin; In New South Wales, as I plainly see, You’re carving out plentiful jobs for me. But forgive me for hinting your zeal is such That I’m only afraid you’ll do too much. I know this well. To subject mankind You must tickle before you attempt to bind; Nor lay on his shoulders the yoke, until Through his habits you’ve first enslaved his will. You’re too violent far,—you rush too madly At your favourite ends, and spoil them sadly. Already, I warn you, your system totters— They’re a nest of hornets these rascally Squatters, Especially when you would grasp their cash— Excuse me, George, but I think you’re rash.

Governor.—Rash! d—m it, rash!

Devil.—..... Don’t fly in a passion, In the higher circles ’tis not the fashion; And swearing besides, you must allow, Is neither polite nor useful now.

Governor.—Would you have me forego the rights of the Crown, To be laughed at all over this factious town? I’ll teach these Squatters to pay their rent, And don’t care one rush for their discontent; They’ve abused me in print, they’ve made orations, They’ve their papers and Pastoral Associations; To England they’ve sent their vile petitions— They’ve their agents in swarms like heathen missions; They’ve gone to the length of caricaturing— But I’ll show them the evil is past their curing.

Devil.—Come, come, be cool, or your aim you’ll miss, Your temper’s too hot for work like this; This people, I say, will submit the more readily If you’ve only the wit to grind them steadily. You’ve a snug little tyranny under your thumb— But manage it well, or down ’twill come. ’Twere a pity to peril this rich possession By a foolish rashness or indiscretion; Wentworth and Windeyer are troublesome chaps, And the Council’s a thorn in your side, perhaps; But let them grumble and growl their fill, You know very well their power is nil. Look at the schedules by which, ’tis clear, You handle a monstrous sum each year; Look at the patronage thrown in your gift, To give any fawning friend a lift. Didn’t you find a berth for Therry? What were his merits? Vast? Oh! very— When a fellow like that can be made a Judge, They may prate of their freedom, but I say “fudge.” Look at the power you have to draw On Stephen and Co., when you want a new law. Look at the lands that are unlocated, Where your droits of the Crown are so nicely created, Then calmly proceed, and with prudence act; “In the middle lies safety”—that’s a fact—

Subdue by degrees, and slowly oppress,
Or, I tell you, you'll get yourself into a mess.
While people petition, they'll find it "a sell,"
But don't push them too hard, they might rebel.

Governor.—Rebel! ha, ha! you're surely in joke;
Rebellion here—a mere puff of smoke.
What would the people of England say?
"A rebellion! how queer! in Botany Bay!
Pick-pockets, swindlers, thieves, and fobbers,
Cut-throats and burglars, and highway-robbers—
A mob that escaped the gallows at home—
'Tis worse than "the servile wars of Rome!"
A handful of troops would put them down,
And the higher classes would join the Crown.

Devil.—It might be so; but just mark, my friend—
Who come to be losers in the end?
No doubt there'd be fun well worth enjoying—
Burning and plundering, and destroying—
Fighting for towns not worth disputing—
Skirmishing, robbing, and rifle-shooting
From bushes and trees, and rocks for barriers,—
Murdering of post-boys, and plundering of carriers,
Storming of camps by midnight entries,
Driving off horses, and popping off sentries—
Seizures of stock for purposes royal,
Pressing of men to make them loyal.
Some heroes might fall in that petty strife,
Whom bondage had taught a contempt of life,—
Some patriots leading in civil storms,
Might dangle on gibbets their martyr forms;
Or exiled afar, to return no more,
Might bury their bones on a foreign shore.—
Proscribed by the tyrants they dared to brave,
And mocked by the people they fought to save;
But not in vain would they bear or bleed,
This land would have gained what most they need.
John Bull from his drowsy indifference waking,
Would give some of you despots a terrible shaking;
You'd be robbed of your berth and your reputation,
For causing your masters so much vexation—
And the people your chains so closely bind,
A tardy justice would ask and find.
Take my advice, I offer it cheap—
Why, as I live, the man's asleep!
George, George, your manners much want reforming,
But I'll give your nose a bit of a warming.
(*Tweaks his nose and vanishes.*)

Governor (waking up).—Was this but a dream? or was it real?
There's a pain in my nose, by no means ideal.
There might be some truth in what he told me—
This place seems getting too hot to hold me.
I can't remain here for ever, 'tis true,
But I'll leave my successor something to do;
If I can't turn the Squatters out of their stations,
I can ruin the scoundrels by proclamations:
So I'll write out a draft for one this minute—
And if it don't sting them, the devil's in it.

SYLVANUS.

King Nebuchadnezzar, having worshipped gold,
Grazing like other asses then was told;
We have an alchemist who combines his tastes,
Whose Midas touch to gold turns dreary wastes;
True, he contemns the outward form of brute,
Yet herbs to kingly food he doth transmute:
He crops no grass, but those who do, digest
Their gleanings but to swell his sovereign chest;
What needeth he compassion's kindly throes,
When others' yearnings yield the sum he owes?

QUEANBEYAN.

A meeting of the electors of this district was held at the Court-house, on Tuesday, the 6th instant, for the purpose of electing two new members for our District Council, in lieu of Messrs. Zouch and Powell, who retired by rotation.

The Warden (J. F. Murray, Esq.) stated the object of the meeting, and called upon the electors to nominate two gentlemen. Some delay occurred in consequence of the retiring members expressing a strong disinclination to be re-elected; while the electors, who evinced marked hostility to the system of District Councils, seemed equally determined if they were not re-elected, to elect no one else. At last Mr. Zouch, yielding to the solicitations of those around him, Captain Faunce and that gentleman were unanimously returned, and a vote of thanks having been passed to the Warden, he dissolved the meeting. Subsequently the electors and other inhabitants of the village assembled, and having placed Captain Faunce in the chair,

Mr. Charles Campbell addressed them, by saying that it would not be necessary for him to trespass long on their patience, as he had frequently, in addressing them on former occasions, gone over the serious objections to be urged against the District Councils, which the Government is attempting to force upon a reluctant people. The absurdity of incorporating the widely scattered inhabitants of an extensive, poor, and scarcely populated district, just as so many well-fed thriving tradesmen and artisans in a closely packed town,—the calling into existence twenty or thirty petty assemblies invested with the formidable power of taxing Her Majesty's subjects, instead of one Legislative Council—twenty instead of one House of Commons,—with their unnecessary machinery for the collection of taxes, involving an expense utterly disproportionate to the amount to be collected—their tendency to generate republican feelings and habits in this hitherto loyal dependency of Great Britain; and last, but not least, their bringing home to the very doors of quiet country folks not once in five or once in seven years, but once every year, all the petty intrigues, strife, and heartburnings, attendant upon a popular election; all these objections to the system, which were so obvious that it really seemed impossible to account for a minister's persisting in patronising the scheme, except on the assumption that the Council ought to derive an increase of power from dissension breaking out between the several petty taxing assemblies—all these objections had been repeatedly urged. He would only remark that, if possible, in his mind, they had been strengthened by the letter recently addressed by the Colonial Secretary to the Parramatta District Council. Entertaining these views, why did he not, it might be asked, come forward to support the suggestion so forcibly urged by a learned and honourable gentleman—viz., that the several District Councils should commit suicide in the way pointed out by Blackstone? Simply, because he considered such a course under their present circumstances, would be premature. The Councils

were not, it was well known, possessed of the requisite power to do the work which their author had carved out for them. They were innocuous as yet; but it might be that the omission in the Act of Parliament would be speedily supplied, and the Colonial Government be authorised to grant charters which would arm the Councils with the power of levying. In that case were the present Councils to resign their charters, fresh instruments of taxation might be picked up—not the gentry of the country but mean men, to whom the designation "Member of District Council," might be a temptation weighty enough to set them a taxing to the perfect satisfaction of their masters. No, let the present Council retain their charter until they were put in a position to act, and then, if the unanimous remonstrances of the whole wealth, respectability, and intelligence of the Colony, were disregarded by their rulers, then he would say their most judicious course would be to resign their charters. Mr. C. then moved the following resolution:—"That the electors of the district of Queanbeyan wish it to be made known to their fellow-colonists that they assembled this day to elect two new members of their District Council, not from any wish to perpetuate that body,—as in their opinion the present system of District Councils is not suited to the circumstances of the Colony; but to prevent the Governor from exercising the power which the 46th clause of the Act, 5 and 6 Victoria, cap. 76, gives His Excellency of nominating members in cases wherein they have not been elected by the people."

Henry Hall, Esq., J.P., seconded Mr. Campbell's motion. Our respected representative in the Legislative Council, T. A. Murray, Esq., then briefly stated his views. He would not there go to any great length into the subject, because he would probably have an opportunity of expressing his opinion in another place. We understood him to say, that he concurred in a great deal that had fallen from his friend Mr. Campbell, but still that he thought District Councils under certain modifications—if portions of the local revenue were placed at their disposal for the purpose of local improvements, and if they were permitted to elect their chairmen and to appoint their own officers—might be rendered very useful bodies; but constituted as they were at present, he could regard them only as a portion of that system of misrule and inattention to the wishes of the colonists and the welfare of the colony which had so blighted our prospects, retarded our progress, and scattered embarrassment and distress throughout Australia, and therefore he would employ every means in his power to prevent them from coming into operation. The meeting then separated, apparently pleased with the manner in which the election had terminated.

It is whispered, that an act of discourtesy on the part of the Governor, towards our Bench of Magistrates, has nearly deprived us of the valuable services of those gentlemen, most of whom ride eighteen miles to administer justice. One of the mounted police made a statement to the Bench, which was afterwards discovered to be false. The magistrates, in consequence, requested that he might be removed from the district, alleging that they could no longer repose confidence in him. The Governor, either distrusting their veracity or their discretion, sent for the depositions, &c., on which they had based their judgment, and pronouncing the whole matter much ado about nothing, intimated his determination to remove both the offending party and the chief constable! if he heard any thing more of it. Their Worships are indignant as well as surprised to find that "lying," which they had pronounced an act of moral turpitude should be so little thought of at head-quarters. It is believed that nothing prevents them from resigning, but the apprehension that in that case incompetent and disreputable men would be appointed J. P.'s for our luckless district.—*Herald.*

EUROPE.

REVENUES OF THE BISHOPS.

The Ecclesiastical Commissioners (consisting, for the greater part, of the high dignitaries of the Church) did not appear to much advantage in the discussion which took place in the House of Commons last week. It seems that, in 1835, a Commission was appointed to inquire into the State of the Church; in 1836, the Commissioners recommended that the incomes of the richer Archbishops and Bishops should be reduced to certain fixed amounts, and that the excess of revenue should be paid to the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, in order to augment the income of the poorer Bishops, and for the benefit of the Church.

The following table contains the proposals of the Commissioners in 1836:—

	Estimated Income.	Proposed Income.	Excess.
Canterbury.....	£17,000	£15,000	£2,000
London.....	12,200	10,000	2,000
Durham.....	17,800	8,000	9,800
Winchester.....	10,700	7,000	3,700
Ely.....	11,000	5,500	5,500
Worcester.....	6,500	5,000	1,500
St. Asaph.....	5,200	5,200	3,800
Bangor.....	3,800		
	£84,200	£55,700	£28,500

An Act of Parliament (6 and 7 W. 4, c. 77) was passed in 1836, for carrying these recommendations into effect, it being clearly the intention of Parliament and the public to limit the incomes of these eight Bishops to the sum of £55,700 per annum, and that the excess of income, whether it were £28,500 or a larger sum, should be paid to the use of the Church, and not to the families of the Bishops. It was, however, unfortunately enacted in sec. 12, that the details of the measure should be carried into effect by an order in council. When the order in council appeared, the Ecclesiastical Commissioners reversed the intention of Parliament, and declared that (instead of the eight Bishops receiving a fixed income of £55,700), the eight Bishops should only make a fixed annual payment of £28,500, thereby allowed them to put into their pockets any excess. This fraud on the Church was exposed by Mr. Elphinstone, in Parliament. To the surprise of the greater part of the House, he stated that he had reason to believe that the case of the Bishop of Durham, the present Bishop had on an average received (instead of £8000) not less than £10,000 per annum; and that in one year he had received nearly £20,000. Mr. Elphinstone also stated, that the Bishop of London had received very heavy fines, upwards of £50,000 since 1836, in addition to his £10,000 per annum. In order to have the matter cleared up, Mr. Elphinstone moved for a return of the incomes of the different Bishops since 1837. Sir James Graham, however, feeling ashamed of the transaction, declined to grant the return, and by means of a Government majority contrived to defeat the proposed inquiry. The matter cannot, however, be allowed to rest as it now stands—the interests of the Church itself require that the whole subject should be thoroughly investigated, and if the Ecclesiastical Commissioners have knowingly endeavoured to Defeat the object of the Legisla-

ture, it is full time that a change be made in the composition of the commission. We hope Mr. Elphinstone will bring the subject before the House at an early period next session.—*Morning Chronicle.*

THE BOURBONS.

The Duke d'Aumale has espoused at Naples the Princess Caroline of Salerno. The Princess Caroline is the cousin of the Duke de Bourdeaux. Thus the revolution of July, 1830, finds alliances even in the family of the Pretender. That fact ought to make the Legitimists reflect the more, as though the Duke d'Aumale finds an alliance even in the family of the Duke de Bourdeaux, the Duke de Bourdeaux cannot find an alliance anywhere, not even amongst the Royal houses which are hostile to the revolution of July. It is a singular fact, that the policy of Louis XIV., the policy of alliances between the members of the family of Bourbon, is at present realised in southern Europe. It is a Bourbon who reigns at Naples, the same who has allied himself to a Bourbon of the junior branch who reigns in France. Spain is about to return into the sphere of this family eminently French. Thus there are three European Royalties supported on this noble and antique base, and this is not the simple effect of chance. The King of the French, with that instinct and that genius peculiar to him, has admirably comprehended that the alliances of regenerated France ought to be of two kinds—on account of her past history, and by her position in Europe, France ought to form monarchical alliances; and by her ideas and her institutions, France ought to form liberal alliances. The King of the French has equally cultivated these two natural alliances; and whilst he fraternized at London with the constitutional Government which issued from the revolution of 1688, he concluded at Naples a monarchical alliance with the House of Bourbon. This is a judicious and a grand policy. It is the policy of Louis XIV. fitted to the revolution of 1789, and to the revolution of 1830. There are persons who have contested the possession of political genius to the King of the French. They should inquire, what is thought of the political genius of the duke of Orleans amongst the diplomatists of old Europe. There are other persons who contest the sincerely constitutional and liberal tendency of His Majesty Louis Philippe. They should see what the English people think of him—that is to say, the people who are the best judges of a liberal spirit and of constitutional tendencies.—*Le Globe.*

BRITISH AND FOREIGN RAILWAYS.

In Mr. Laing's paper appended to the evidence taken before the select committee on railways, there is a curious table, showing the rate of different items of expenditure per mile of railway upon some of the principal British and foreign lines. From this table we gather, that the parliamentary expenditure of the London and Birmingham, and London and South Western Companies, have been about £650 per mile; and of the Great Western and Manchester and Leeds, £1000 per mile; while the London and Birmingham (through its memorable campaign) cost, under this head, £300 per mile. There appears to be no corresponding item in the accounts of the Belgian and French railways. The "law charges, engineering, direction, &c.," have varied on English lines; but on all of them they have been enormously large. Thus the London and South Western Company have had to pay, under this item, £900 per mile; the Grand Junction, £1200; the Birmingham, £1500; the Manchester and Leeds, £1600; the Brighton, £1800; and the Great Western, no less an amount than £2500. Nice pickings here for the lawyers. It seems that the average per mile of the Belgian Railways under this head, is £430 per mile; and on the Paris and Rouen railways, £800. Under "land and compensation," the difference is equally remarkable. Thus the Newcastle and Carlisle Company, paid per mile, £2200; the Grand Junction, £300; the South Western, £4000; the Manchester and Leeds, £6150; and the Birmingham and the Great Western precisely the same—namely, £6300; while the Brighton paid no less than £8000 per mile. The average of the Paris and Rouen railway was £2300, and of the Belgian railways £2750. In "railway works and stations," the difference is greater still. For example, the Newcastle and Carlisle cost £12,000 per mile; the Grand Junction, £15,000; the South Western, £18,450; the Birmingham, £38,280; the Brighton, £38,000; the Great Western, 40,000; and beyond all the rest, the Manchester and Leeds, £44,000! The average of the Belgian railways is £10,600 per mile; and of the Paris and Rouen, £17,000. The "carrying establishment per mile" has been, on the Newcastle and Carlisle railway, £1300; Grand Junction, £2000; South Western, £2350; Birmingham and Brighton, £3000; Manchester and Leeds, £3600; while the Great Western has, in this item, far out-topped all—being £4800. The average of the Belgian railways is precisely the same as the cost, in this respect, of the South Western—namely, £2350; and of the Paris and Rouen railway, £2400.

CAPTAIN HUNT, OF THE "BASILISK."

The *Journal des Débats* contains an article condemning in strong terms the observations published in the *Océanie Française*, relative to Captain Hunt, of the *Basilisk*, "There is one circumstance stated in that journal," adds the *Journal des Débats*, "which, if it were true, would have the double inconvenience of not being conformable to any precedent with which we are acquainted, and, moreover, of exposing the French authorities at Tahiti to a species of ridicule which would attach in a certain degree to the Government at home. The commander of the *Basilisk* is accused, not of a want of respect to the authorities of the island, but to his own sovereign, the Queen of Great Britain. The *Océanie* announces gravely, that on the day of the anniversary of Queen Victoria, the French ships hoisted English colours, whilst their bands of music performed 'God save the Queen,' the Captain of the *Basilisk*, in the mean time, walking about in undress, as if to protest against the solemnity of the day. This unusual demonstration gives the English journals an opportunity of which they do not fail to seize hold. It is certain that the honour paid to the Queen of England at Papeiti were not rendered to her in any other French port, no more than similar honours to the King of the French in British ports. This sudden enthusiasm for the cordial understanding coinciding with certain unmeasured denunciations directed against the officers of the British navy, affords ridiculous contrast, and the English naturally consider it singular that foreigners should wish to show themselves more English than themselves, and force them to demonstrations of patriotism which do not suit their taste. It is well to be friendly to the British alliance, but that does not dispense with being logical, and it is perfectly useless to play 'God save the Queen' at the same time that you are doing all in your power to envenom the passions of the two nations. It would have been far better to have made fewer demonstrations in honour of Queen Victoria, and to have abstained from irritating attacks against British officers. Such conduct would have been more dignified, and infinitely more rational."