THE TOWN COUNCIL.

The monthly meeting of the Town Council was held on Wednesday morning, the only business being to approve the proceedings of the committees; the MAYOR in the chair.

On the reading of the minutes of the last meeting, Mr. I. SCHOFIELD revived his claim that the neutrals on his motion at the last meeting to petition in favour of Mr. Hume's motion should be reckoned with the minority, in favour of the motion. He grounded this upon Lord Denman's decision in the Braintree church rate case, where he held that the neutrals were to be reckoned as assenting to the motion....The TOWN CLERK reminded the Council that this matter had been fully discussed some time ago, when he quoted Lord Denman's judgment, and deduced from it the rule, that where business must be done by the Council—such, for instance, as the election of a Mayor—the neutrals must be considered as concurring in doing such business. But where the business was purely optional, as was the case with Mr. Schofield's motion, then those who did not vote must be regarded as voting against it. He did not say that it was free from doubt, but that was the best opinion he could form....Mr. TUCKER maintained that the majority who voted should always decide, and that the neutrals should not be claimed by either party....Mr. I. SCHOFIELD honoured the man who voted for him or against him, but he had the most profound contempt—(Laughter)—for such as could not make up their minds on a common sense question.... Mr. I. IRONSIDE did not entertain contempt for any man. Let Mr. Schofield vote as he chose. He might be so wise in his own conceit, as to think he always knew what was right, but they read that there was more hope of a fool than of a man wise in his own conceit. (Laughter.).. Ald. HALL shewed that the regulations applicable to votes at parish meetings did not apply here....Ald. WILKINSON said, Mr. Schofield had no right to claim all the neutrals, for if all must vote, as many neutrals were likely to go against him as for him....Ald. MARSH said, if any man was deserving of contempt in this matter, it was he who made the Council an arena for political discussion..... The TOWN CLERK said, the better rule would be, that gentlemen who did not wish to vote, should leave the room. That would remove all the difficulty......Mr. CRAWSHAW said, he had as conscientious reasons for not voting on the occasion referred to as Mr. Schofield for voting. Mr. Schofield might have a profound contempt for him, and in return he pitied him....The MAYOR concurred with the Town Clerk, that neutrals had better leave the room. As an instance of the absurdity involved by not voting, he referred to a case where a gentleman, by not voting, caused the loss of his own motion, for the success of which he was very anxious.—The motion for confirmation of the minutes was carried.

The minutes of the Watch Committee having been read, Mr. I. IRONSIDE moved their confirmation, and requested the attention of the Committee to the evasion of the law, as to the sale of potatoes by weight. This was chiefly by the hawkers, and caused many complaints from the shopkeepers. The law as to hawking was not strictly enforced as to the sale of perishable commodities, but he thought it might be against such as did not sell 20lb. to the peck. As to the police force, there was a general opinion that it was larger and more expensive than necessary. In these perilous times, when the brain of every thoughtful man was pressed with anxiety as to the means of maintaining his position, all who had any control over the public purse should consider the possibility of lightening the pressure. During the recent prevailing agitation among the masses, Sheffield had set an example worthy of imitation. Owing to the good sense and intelligence of the Magistrates, coupled with that of the inhabitants, that agitation had not been expensive. Perhaps there was no town of equal importance to Sheffield, of which so much could be said. This was an additional reason why they should examine, and if possible, reduce their expenses..Ald. HALL said, as to the weight of potatoes, all that the Watch Committee could do would not suffice to enforce it, if the buyers would not protect themselves. The hawking of vegetables prevailed because many poor people found it much more convenient to buy at their own doors, than to fetch them. The amount of the police force had been very carefully considered by the Committee, who would be very glad if they could see their way to reduce its amount, if they could maintain its efficiency.......The MAYOR remarked, that every means had been employed to give notice that potatoes must be sold by weight, not only by placards on the walls, but by notices delivered at the shops, and by personal notice to the hawkers. But in many cases the buyers had a prejudice in favour of buying by measure, rather than by weight. Several informations had been brought before him within these few weeks, in which this had been proved, and he had simply required the payment of costs, giving notice, however, that such leniency would not be continued. It would be some years before the public mind was disabused of the prejudice in favour of measures....Mr. I. SCHOFIELD remarked on the anomaly, in the Act of Parliament, that it required the sale by weight, without saying what weight. Hawking was a fertile source of imposition, in regard to fish and other articles, and he thought the Council should set its foot upon it and its face against it..... The MAYOR said, many of the hawkers of fish were sent out by the shopkeepers, to dispose of such as they could no longer offer in their shops....The TOWN CLERK said, a more singular case of blundering in an Act of Parliament, was furnished by Sir Geo. Rose's Act, which provided but one penalty, that of transportation for forging and erasing parish registers, and it provided that informers should be entitled to half the penalty. (Laughter.) The motion was carried.

In the minutes of the Health Committee, it appeared that Messrs. Naylor, Vickers, & Co., had been applied to in regard to the nuisance arising from Millsands goit.... The MAYOR said they had no more to do with the matter than the Council had....Mr. I. SCHOFIELD revived the subject discussed at the last meeting of the fees to be charged by medical gentlemen for inspecting and certifying nuisances.....Mr. J. W. SMITH objected to this as out of order.....The MAYOR said that it was merely repeating a former discussion; but as it bore upon the minutes, he could not object to it....Mr. SCHOFIELD read the costs in a case where it had been necessary to enforce the removal of a nuisance, and thought them too much. The items were, Mr. Boultbee and Mr. Walker, for inspecting and certifying, each one guinea; preparing certificate, 5s.; summons and copy, 3s.; Mr. Boultbee, for attending to give evidence, 10s. 6d.; Mr. Bramley, a guinea; magistrates order, 4s.; making £4. 5s. 6d. He thought this was too much....Mr. J. W. SMITH said this act would expire with the present session, and he regretted that the Mayor should have allowed this to go on; for it seemed they were to be kept till noon, even when there was nothing to do....Mr. CRAWSHAW said if the person who caused the nuisance had removed it when required, all this expense would have been avoided....The TOWN CLERK said the Health Committee took every means to induce persons to remove nuisances without resorting to law, and this had been the only case where they had done so.....Mr. W. THOMPSON confirmed this. Some cases had come before the Committee half a dozen times.....Mr. IRONSIDE reminded the Council that the charge of the medical gentlemen of a guinea had been approved by the Health Committee and by the Council; and though this was opposed to his own view, he had no more to say about it.—Carried.

The TOWN CLERK reminded the Council of the proceedings as to the Sheffield and Tinsley road. The surveyors of the townships had made a proposal to the River Dun and Canal Companies, that the road should be repaired by them on a guarantee being given by the Companies, that on the decision of the special case, they would pay such part of the cost as they might be found liable by law to pay.....The River Dun Company had now assented to the proposal on four conditions. The primary condition was—

"That an agreement be entered into betwixt Earl Fitzwilliam, the surveyors of the townships, the trustees of the Doncaster and Tinsley road, the Manchester, Sheffield, and Lincolnshire Railway Company, the Sheffield Canal Company, and the River Dun Company, by which all parties shall be bound to consent to an act being obtained next session for transferring the said Tinsley road (repaired as aforesaid) to the trustees of the said Doncaster and Tinsley road, and by which the said trustees shall ever after be bound to repair the same, they being at liberty to place a toll-gate to the west of Attercliffe, at which they shall be entitled to levy half a toll."

The second was—That the Dun Company would reduce the tonnage dues for coal on the Sheffield Canal, to ½d. per ton per mile; third, that the mode and cost of repairing the road should be approved by the engineer of the Dun Company; and the fourth, that this agreement should not prejudice the right of the Dun Company to appeal against the decision of the pending special appeal case, and should be subject to the approval of the South Yorkshire Company. A copy had been sent to Mr. Dixon, solicitor for the townships, but no answer had been received. The answer of Mr. Wake, solicitor to the Canal Company, was, that it had been laid before the Company, and they could not interfere. He added, that it seemed to be assumed the Company had power to make an arrangement as to the indictments pending against the surveyors of the townships, but such was not the case, as the Company had no share, directly or indirectly, in preferring those indictments... The MAYOR said, the proposition of the Dun Company was clogged with so many conditions, that it was ridiculous to hope anything from further negotiation....... Ald. HALL said, the public had lost all hope for justice, either from the companies or from the townships, and they had therefore taken the matter in hand, and raised a subscription to indict the townships. An application had been made by the townships to a judge in chambers, to remove the trial from the sessions to the assizes, and to defer it to next year. The latter part of the application was successfully resisted. A second effort had been made to postpone the trial, but it, too, had been without success, and it would now come on at the next assizes. These applications had convinced the parties who were prosecuting the indictments, that there was a disposition on the part of the townships to postpone the decision...This concluded the business of the meeting.

THE ADJOURNED INQUEST.

On Wednesday afternoon, the adjourned inquiry respecting the death of Thomas Greaves, of Love lane, was resumed before T. Badger, Esq., at the Town-Hall. The first witness called was

Mr. Wm. Jackson, surgeon, who assisted Mr. Pearson in making the *post mortem* examination. Mr. Pearson's evidence having been read over to the witness by the Coroner, he said, I concur in its correctness as to the appearances which the body of the deceased presented after death. There is no doubt but that the congested state of the brain, and the effusion of fluid in the cavity of the brain and at its base, as well as in the spinal canal, produced the death of the deceased. These effects might arise from the excessive use of spiritous liquors; the action of a narcotic poison; or, they might possibly arise from a peculiar state of the brain, arising from natural causes. If I am to take for granted Mr. Pearson's evidence as to the symptoms previous to death, and the statement he has given on oath, I should say that death arose from a narcotic poison. Connecting that statement with the appearances we found after death, we are justified in inferring that he died from the effects of a narcotic poison, but I cannot swear it was belladonna. If I had not been made acquainted with the symptoms during life, I should not have been able to have stated positively the precise cause of the death of the deceased. I never saw a fatal case before of poison from belladonna. I could not undertake to say what would be the minimum dose that would produce death. I have given belladonna extensively in practice, but I do not remember a case in which I could safely administer more than two grains. I think the friends of the deceased were very culpable in not sooner applying for medical aid, as it is probable that his life might have been saved. Belladonna, if taken in the evening, would be absorbed into the system before the next morning. The blackened state of the stomach of the deceased is a strong corroboration of the person having taken poison of a narcotic kind.....By Mr. Wheeler: From the mere examination of the brain alone, it would be impossible to say from what cause he died. In a large dose of belladonna, if good, death is certain. The action of belladonna is on the brain, and produces stupor, sleep, delirium, paralysis, loss of articulation. It is imbibed into the system, and acts on the brain, producing death. I have no doubt that, if called in at ten o'clock at night, I could have saved his life.

Mr. Henry Oakes, dispenser of the medicines at the Sheffield General Infirmary, examined: I have served an apprenticeship to a chemist and druggist. I did not hear Wm. Hudson, the porter, give directions to the deceased, or any one else, on Tuesday morning week, as to the application of belladonna. I did not see him put any in a box. The reason why the porter is allowed to give out medicines is, because there is more work than one man can do. On that morning, we had to deliver out medicines to eight or nine hundred persons. I consider additional help is necessary in the surgery. Our orders are, not to send any medicines without written or printed directions. I do not allow them to go out if I know it. It is not usual to send out belladonna in a box, when it is intended to use it as a plaster. If Hudson had given any directions to Greaves, or any other person, that morning, concerning the spreading of belladonna on a plaster, I should have heard him, and should have prevented him from doing so.....By Mr. Wheeler: If we have no printed labels for articles which are of a poisonous character, it is my duty to write them.

Mr. Joseph Law, surgeon to the Sheffield General Infirmary, said: Having heard the medical evidence, in which were detailed both the symptoms which preceded death, and the appearances which were observed on the *post mortem* examination, I am decidedly of opinion that the deceased did not die either from belladona, or from any other narcotico-acrid poison. I have not one word to say in justification of the manner in which this box, whether containing belladonna or not, was sent out from the Infirmary, and I should have disapproved of its being sent out, even accompanied by the fullest either written or printed directions. It was done contrary to a well-understood order, which I had given, and frequently repeated. If this be a case of poisoning by belladonna, the quantity given was only four grains. Now, there is not on record a case in which either four grains, or any other dose of the extract, produced death. I find, on looking into all the authorities I could, ending my research with "Taylor's work on Poisons," printed in 1848, only twenty reports of cases of poisoning by belladonna. These twenty reports include the fatal cases, and those in which recovery took place. In these reports, I find that the largest dose of the *extract* of belladonna taken was one ounce, and that the doses varied from that quantity downwards to very small doses; but where the doses were small, the symptoms were correspondingly trifling. There is not on record a fatal case of poisoning by the extract of belladonna, taken internally. As to the symptoms in the case of Thomas Greaves, the deceased, there was dilatation of the pupil, but there was no insensibility of the pupil spoken to, and dilatation without insensibility is not a sign of poisoning by belladonna. The first and prominent symptoms of poisoning by belladonna were all absent. There were no dryness of the mouth and gullet; no difficulty of swallowing; no tumefaction or redness of those parts; and, in the evidence of the medical witnesses, Mr. Pearson and Mr. Jackson, no mention is made of redness of the face, hands, or any other part of the body. Nausea, which is a very common symptom, is not spoken to. Vomiting is not nausea. Nausea, without vomiting, is a sign of poisoning by belladonna; but, in the case before us, there was vomiting without nausea, which is not a sign of poisoning by belladonna. There was not that gay, lively, or talkative delirium, which has characterised almost every case of poisoning by belladonna, whether the extract, the root, the leaves, or the berries, were taken. Instead of these symptoms, it is my medical opinion, that we had the symptoms, which indicated that kind of effusion in the ventricles of the brain and the spinal canal, which was sworn to. The first medical witness said there was serous effusion in the ventricles of the brain, and in the spinal canal; but Mr. Jackson said that it was found in these situations, and also at the base of the brain. But serous effusion, whether in any or all these situations, is no sign whatever of poisoning by belladonna. Serous effusion, in these situations, is quite sufficient to account for death, but there is no authority whatever for regarding it as a sign of poisoning by belladonna. There is one, and only one, case recorded, in which there was softening of the brain. The appearances, therefore, in the brain, were not those of poisoning by belladonna. The condition of the tubercula quadrigemina is pointed out by a high authority, (Flourens,) as being the part of the brain principally affected and the condition of this part of the brain has not been alluded to by either of the medical witnesses. We find a black patch, as big as the palm of the hand, on the upper part of the larger curvature of the stomach; and this black patch is sworn to as a black patch of incipient mortification. Now, M. Gauttier de Claubry had 180 cases of poisoning by the berries, but neither he, nor any other authority whatever, make any mention of mortification in any organ of the body, as one of the symptoms of poisoning by belladonna in any form. Neither of the medical gentlemen who have given evidence, have seen a case of poisoning by belladonna; and all medical facts and pathological principles oppose the belief that four grains of belladonna could, either in sixteen hours or any longer period, produce a patch of mortification on the stomach. I am quite aware that these authorities speak of rapid decomposition of the bodies killed with belladonna; but rapid decomposition of the whole body is neither mortification, nor in the remotest manner allied to mortification. A mortified patch of mucous membrane would not be black, unless it were dyed black by some extraneous body. In all the cases which I have witnessed, and they are not few, the colour was that of the secretions, — yellow, for instance, generally; sometimes grey, but never black; and I know that if the whole of the four grains swallowed had been applied to that part of the upper curvature of the stomach, and if not one atom had been mixed with the secretions generally, it could not possibly have blackened so large a surface. I consider that I ought to have had the opportunity of witnessing the *post mortem* examination of the deceased; and further, that I have a right to complain that that opportunity was not given to me. It is my opinion that a very small amount of mortification of the stomach—infinitely smaller than that sworn to in this case—would produce death, and that it is quite certain that this mortification was not produced by belladonna. Belladonna was sworn to by the first medical witness as a narcotic poison simply; not as a narcotico-acrid poison. Now it is by its acrid property only that it could produce any local effect whatever. John Bailey, the author of a very important monagraph on the medical use of bella donna, says, that in the early part of his medical career, he began by one grain, and gradually increased it to five; but subsequent experience taught him, that it was best to begin with three grains, and he adhered to that plan. The dead body of the deceased had none of the external appearances of poisoning by belladonna; no bleeding, for example, from the mouth, nose, and ears. I estimate the number of out-patients who receive medicine on a Tuesday at about 400 only. I think there is ample provision made for dispensing the medicines. I am quite of opinion that four grains of belladonna given to the deceased, who was labouring under a disease of the chest, would not produce death; and I am further of opinion, that in an old man, enfeebled, exhausted, and diseased, it would require a more powerful agency to produce serious organic læsions than in a young, vigorous, and healthy person. The lower the vital actions, the more difficult to produce active morbid action; and at the same time, I admit that the old enfeebled man would die under the production of more trifling organic læsions than would be required to kill the young and the vigorous subject. I believe the deceased died from natural causes, and not from the effect of any narcotico-acrid poison.

The Coroner, after carefully reading over and commenting on the evidence, said, it appeared from the statement of Mrs. Taylor, that the deceased had taken but a very small bit of the black stuff out of the box, (meaning the extract of belladonna,) and on being desired to show to the Jury how much he had taken, it appeared, from the opinion of Mr. Pearson, to be only about four grains. Now the dose for an adult varies from *one* to five grains; that the extract, when taken in large doses, produces all the symptoms of a powerful narcotic poison; but it is stated in Taylor and Guy's works on Medical Jurisprudence, that there have been very few instances known of this poison proving fatal, and that patients have recovered from very large doses. A case is published by Mr. Clayton, where a man took 40 grains of the extract, and recovered; and another case occurred at St. George's Hospital, under Sir B. Brodie, in which an ounce of the extract had been taken, and the person recovered. It is, therefore, pretty clear that it is a medicine, uncertain in its operation, and not so active a poison as its common name would imply, and is much less virulent than some of the other narcotico irritant poisons. Christison, in his able work, states, if the discovery is made in time, poisoning with belladonna is rarely fatal; for as the state first induced is *delirium*, not sopor, suspicion is soon excited, and emetics may be made to act before a sufficient quantity of the poison has been absorbed to prove fatal. In this instance, the quantity taken by the deceased being small, it did not produce that extravagant delirium common in these cases, but there were dilated pupils, and the other symptoms mentioned by the witnesses. Now, should not the friends of the deceased in this case, when they found the state in which he was, *soon after he had taken* the pill and the extract of belladonna, have *immediately* sent for a medical man, and not have waited till nine o'clock on the *following morning*, (when the patient was dying,) before they called in medical assistance? And should not the medical man *even then* have adopted prompt remedies, as his patient lived more than an hour *after* he saw him? The facts of the whole case are now before you in evidence, and if you are of opinion that the quantity of the extract of belladonna taken by Thomas Greaves produced his death,—and that the porter, William Hudson, in sending out that poisonous medicine *without proper printed or written directions*, shewed such negligence and disregard for human life, as will, in your judgment, render it necessary that this case should be sent before a higher tribunal, I am afraid it will be your duty to find him guilty of manslaughter,—it being clearly laid down, that if a party is guilty of negligence, and death results, the party guilty of that negligence is also guilty of manslaughter; but if you should be of a contrary opinion, you will have to say whether the deceased came to his death "accidentally from taking belladonna by mistake," or that he died from natural causes. I do, however, consider it my duty strongly to condemn the loose and dangerous way in which poisonous medicines have been permitted to be sent out from the Sheffield General Infirmary by Wm. Hudson, the porter, and to suggest to the proper authorities there, that, in future, the *porter* should *not* be permitted to give out any medicines, and that none should, on any account whatever, be sent out without full and proper written or printed directions. It also appears to me, that on account of the great number of patients at the Infirmary, that competent additional assistance should be immediately obtained properly to dispense the medicines prescribed. The Jury fully concurred with the Coroner in his remarks as to the loose manner in which medicines were sent from the Infirmary; and they recommended the instant dismissal of the porter from his situation.

The Jury, after retiring for some time, returned the following verdict:—"The Jury are of opinion that there is not sufficient evidence to satisfy them that the deceased has died from the fatal effects of belladonna, and they, therefore, return a verdict that he died from natural causes. The Jury, however, blamed the friends for not sooner calling in medical assistance."

TOWN HALL.

MONDAY & TUESDAY.—The Mayor and other Magistrates sat; but no business worth reporting came before them.

WEDNESDAY.—Before the MAYOR.

Thos. Noyland, a native of the Emerald Isle, was charged with ill treating three poneys, and likewise with being drunk. The case was proved by Mr. Richard Cockrill, the manager of the Adelphi Theatre, who saw him on Tuesday night, about eight o'clock, running the animals about in the cattle market, beating them unmercifully with the butt end of a whip, and pulling them violently by the tail. A crowd of youths assembled round the prisoner. Mr. Cockrill sent to the Town Hall, and an officer came and took the prisoner into custody. The poneys were likewise cared for, and locked up in Mr. Tune's stables. The prisoner had on his person £19. 6s. 6d...The Mayor fined him 2s. 6d. for each offence, and costs.

Wm. Graham, a youth about twelve years of age, whose parents reside in Pea croft, was charged with stealing polony from the house of Mrs. Hedgate, of Chapel street, Bridgehouses. The prisoner was seen by a boy, on Tuesday, to lift up the window of the complainant's house, and take out some polony, which he ran off with. It appears that he has been in custody several times, on charges of felony; but the seeds of crime have vegetated so luxuriantly, that punishment seems to have had no good effect.....The Mayor, with a view to his reformation, committed him for three months, under the Juvenile Offenders Act, during which time he will be placed at school.

ASSAULT, WITH ATTEMPT TO ROB.—*George Lockwood*, alias *Swimmer*, of Cannon street, and *Roe Crossland*, of Blue Boy street, were charged by Wm. Woodcock, brushmaker, with an attempt at highway robbery. The complainant stated that he was drinking at Mr. Littlewood's, the Wharncliffe Arms, Blind lane, up to four o'clock this morning. The prisoners also were there, and becoming, as he thought, too familiar with him, he left the house. When he had gone a few yards, he perceived he was followed, and when he had got into Smith street, they got him down, put a handkerchief over his mouth, and endeavoured to get his money. In the struggle which ensued, police-constable Maxwell came up, when the prisoner Lockwood, who was struggling with Woodcock, was secured. The other prisoner, also, was shortly after captured.....Mr. Raynor said he knew the prisoners well. They were very bad characters, and were continually prowling about for the purpose of plunder....The Mayor fined each of the prisoners 40s. for the assault, and in default of payment to be committed for two months.

THURSDAY.—Before H. WILKINSON, Esq.

Jos. Stones was charged with having in his possession a quantity of property of various kinds, belonging to Mr. George Eadon. On Tuesday night, the house of Mr. Eadon, in Tudor place, was robbed, and in consequence of suspicion falling upon the prisoner, his house was searched, when the property stolen from the house was not found, but a considerable quantity of other property, consisting of articles used by Mr. Eadon in his trade, was discovered. The prisoner had been in Mr. Eadon's employ for many years. For ten years past things have frequently been missed, but no detection has ensued until now.—The prisoner was remanded.

Wm. Joynes was charged by Bryce Ramskar, of Edward street, with robbing his garden. The prisoner is the apprentice of Ramskar, and went off early on Sunday morning, with two companions, to the garden at Hillfoot, which they robbed of a quantity of gooseberries and flowers.—The defendant was discharged, on his promise of amendment.

THE WAY TO THE COUNTY HOSPITAL.—A young man, named Henry Ward, from Leeds, was charged with wilful damage, by breaking the windows of Ann Dent. He had been turned out of the workhouse, and being in a dreadfully diseased state, he broke the windows, in order that he might be taken care of. He was therefore committed for a month to the House of Correction.

Elizabeth Williams had been given into custody as a disorderly, but was not produceable, as she had taken the liberty to tear her clothes to shreds, giving as a reason for it that she wanted new rigging.

John Cowley was charged with wilful damage to Mr. Bywater, of Kelvin Grove. Early on Tuesday morning week, Mr. Bywater heard a man scrambling up the side of his house, and threw water upon him from the chamber window. He dropped, and then with a companion pulled up two flags, and threw them into the cellar. A person who saw the transaction interposed, and with the assistance of Mr. Bywater, the defendant was taken. The repair of the damage had cost 9s. odd, which the defendant was ordered to pay with costs.

COURT-HOUSE, ROTHERHAM.

MONDAY.—Before T. B. BOSVILLE, Esq., J. C. ATHORPE, Esq., Rev. A. FULLERTON, and G. W. CHAMBERS, Esq.

An information was laid against Joseph Rabould, the landlord of the Rose and Thistle, Bridgegate, for keeping a disorderly beerhouse. Hudson proved, that at a quarter to twelve o'clock on the night of Saturday, the 1st inst., he found from 20 to 30 persons drinking, &c., in the defendant's house. There was fiddling, dancing, &c., going on at the same time. Mr. Whitfield, for the defendant, urged in extenuation that the persons found in the house composed a bridal party, who had met there because the happy couple had not been able to accommodate them at their own house. The defendant had occupied the house eight years, and this was the first time he had been summoned. Fined 5s., and 9s. 6d. costs.

Isaac Beavers was charged with absconding from the service of Joseph Shaw, boat owner, whom he had engaged to serve for a year. The defendant alleged that his master had assented to his leaving. On promising to return to his employment, he was discharged.

Mr. John Spencer, of Pea croft, Sheffield, preferred a charge against John Ashton and Saml. Parkin, of Masbro', labourers, for trespassing upon his land and committing damage. Mr. Spencer stated that he had brought this charge to shew parties that they could not trespass upon land with impunity. On Saturday week, the two defendants came over the fences, with a number of others, and fought a pitched battle in one of his fields at Masbro'. He had been greatly annoyed of late by parties trespassing upon the land, and in the hope of putting a stop to it he had laid this information.....The case was proved by John Brett, painter; and the Magistrates ordered the defendants to pay 18s. 6d. fine, and costs.

George Yates, drover, was charged with cruelly ill-treating an ox, in Rotherham market, on the 26th June. It was proved by a butcher named Joseph Furniss, that defendant was driving an ox in the market, and because the animal did not go just as he wished, he drove a spike, which he had at the end of an ash stick, into its side, until blood ran. On witness remonstrating with him, he was met with abuse. A witness named Thomas Ledger confirmed this.....The defendant admitted using the spike, and said it was better for the butchers' purpose that the cattle should be driven with a spike rather than with a stick. H had been a drover in Smithfield and other markets, and no person who had ever employed him could charge him with cruelty to an animal.—The Magistrates convicted [illegible] penalty of 40s., including costs, or in default, 1[illegible] imprisonment.

Godfrey Woolley, of Rotherham, moulder, charg[illegible]ith being drunk in Westgate on the 29th June, was ord[illegible] to pay 4s. 6d. costs.

Joseph Cross, a railway labourer, was charged wit[illegible]al-ing a quantity of onions, from the garden of Geo. [illegible]ott, of Wales. Mr. J. Badger appeared for the prose[illegible]on, and Mr. Whitfield for the prisoner. It appeare[illegible]hat Elliott is the occupier of a garden immediately ad[illegible]ng that of the Rev. Mr. Coward, at Wales. The pris[illegible] is one of the navvies employed on the Lincolnshire R[illegible]ay, which passes through Wales. Near twelve o'cl[illegible] Saturday night, a person named Raine, whose hous[illegible] the garden, was retiring to rest, when in consequence of a noise he heard, he looked out of the window, and saw two navvies in Mr. Coward's garden, and one stood near the wall outside. The two were handing to their companion one of their smocks, of which they had made a sack, and filled with vegetables. The two men then got out of the garden, and a fourth, whom Raine identified as the prisoner, jumped over the wall, and crossed from Mr. Coward's to Elliott's garden. Raine immediately dressed himself, and went in pursuit of the men. At the garden gate, he met Turner, the constable, who, it appeared, had just left Mr. Coward's house. Having got the assistance of Mr. Coward, they went along the road, and came up with three men, the centre of whom was the prisoner, and he was carrying a bundle containing onions, &c. A fourth man, who had the large bundle on his back, turned along a lane on the right, and escaped. Turner secured the prisoner, and Mr. Coward got from him the bundle. The prisoner resisted with great violence, and his companions endeavoured to rescue him. They were, however, beat off by Raine, who laid about him right and left with a broom-stick. Finding they could not effect the rescue alone, they went away to find a reinforcement of their friends; and in the meantime, Turner having thrown the prisoner on the ground, held him down until Mr. Coward went to his (Turner's) house for his handcuffs and staff, and Raine went to obtain the assistance of some neighbours. While they were absent, the navvies returned, and after a struggle in which both sides received some severe wounds, the prisoner was safely lodged in the house of the constable. It was found that a large onion bed in Mr. Elliott's garden had been half bared of the produce by the thieves; while in Mr. Coward's garden considerable depredation had also been committed.—The Bench considered the case clearly proved, and committed the prisoner for one month to hard labour.

Joseph Cross, the prisoner in the last case, was charged, along with a brother "navvie," Joseph Smith, with assaulting Mr. Turner, constable. It appeared that while Mr. Coward had gone for the handcuffs, and Mr. Raine for further assistance, the prisoner Cross endeavoured to get away, and while contending with him, Smith came up and struck him a severe blow over the side of the head. He succeeded, however, in maintaining his hold, and until they got about fifty yards down the road, when some other navvies came up. Raine and Mr. Coward returned at the same time, and Raine succeeded, by the use of his broom-stick, to keep the assailants at bay. The prisoner Cross at this time had the handcuffs on one hand, and turning upon the constable, he, with the other, struck him a violent blow over the eye. Turner succeeded in throwing him down, and in the scuffle, Cross received some severe contusions on the head. Smith was secured during the *mêlée*....For the defence, Mr. Whitfield contended that his clients were perfectly justified in the assault they had committed. They had not been seen to commit a felony, and Turner, therefore, apprehended them illegally, which they had the right to resist to the utmost....Mr. Badger, in reply, said Mr. Whitfield had misstated the law. Any constable who had reasonable ground to suppose that a felony had been committed, had a perfect right to apprehend the party suspected. He contended that the man, having been seen to enter the gardens, and being found in possession of vegetables similar to those which had been stolen from it, was a sufficient ground for the constable to apprehend the prisoner....Mr. Bosville said the doctrine which Mr. Whitfield had laid down was an exceedingly dangerous one, and so far from such being the law of the land, it was directly opposed to it. He convicted Cross in the penalty of 20s., or 14 days' imprisonment, and Smith in the penalty of 40s., or one month's imprisonment.

BIGAMY.—A respectably dressed female, named *Eliza Booth*, was charged with the offence of bigamy. Mr. Whitfield, for the prosecution, said the prisoner was charged with having married a man named Wadsworth, in 1846, her former husband, Geo. Booth, being then alive. Wadsworth, after being away from this country many years, came back in 1846. He had friends and connections in the neighbourhood of Rotherham, and came there to receive a sum of near £400, which had been left him. He then went up to London for the purpose of looking out for a public house. At a lodging house, to which he went, he was introduced to the prisoner, and from the representations made to him by the landlord of the house, was induced to marry her. She remained with him about six months, and having then got from him all his money, she absconded....Wm. Wadsworth, of Newbiggin, blacksmith, proved, that on the 18th September, 1846, the prisoner was married to him at St. Pancras Church, in London, in her maiden name of Lowe. He did not know until six months afterwards that she had another husband living....John Timms, police constable, proved apprehending the prisoner at Matlock, on Friday last, when she admitted the offence. He also produced a certificate of her marriage, at Worksop church, in March, 1837, to George Booth...Joseph Ryalls, proved, that he was present at the marriage of the prisoner to Booth, in 1837. Booth was still alive, and residing at Worksop. Witness saw him yesterday.....Mr. Bland produced a certificate of the prisoner's marriage, at St. Pancras church....The prisoner declined to say anything in her defence, and was committed to York for trial.

George Jarvis and John Jarvis, of Kimberworth, coal owners, were summoned by Samuel Bamforth, coal miner, for 26s. wages. The complainant failed to make out that any wages were due, and the case was dismissed.

HEMSWORTH PETTY SESSIONS.

THURSDAY.—Before B. B. PEGGE BURNELL and H. BOWDEN, Esqrs.

Richard Lawrence, farmer, of Killamarsh, was summoned by Patrick Glynagen, labourer, for £2. 4s. 2d., wages. Mr. Lawrence objected to the amount, as being too great, but the Magistrates ordered the amount to be paid, with costs.

ASSAULT AT ECKINGTON.—Wm. Marples, labourer, was charged by Joseph Hawley, of Eckington, sawyer, with an assault. The defendant did not appear, and was ordered to pay the costs.

ECKINGTON FEAST QUARRELS.—Joseph Batty, of Eckington, was charged with assaulting Sarah Harris, on Monday, the 26th ult. The complainant stated that she was with her husband at Eckington races. They were about to enter a tent, to get some refreshment, when the defendant's brother came up, and struck the complainant's husband. She interfered to prevent a row, when the defendant came and struck her violently over the breast, and under the ear. She fell in the dirt, and her bonnet, shawl, and dress, were spoiled. Her umbrella he broke in pieces. The defendant denied the assault charged against him.—The Magistrates, however, said the assault was proved to their satisfaction, and they considered it to have been a very disgraceful one. They ordered him to pay 24s., which included the damages and costs; and in default, to be committed to Derby for one month.

James Turner, of Beighton, for being drunk at Hackenthorpe, on Sunday morning week, was ordered to pay a fine of 5s. and costs.

TRESPASSING IN MOWING GRASS.—Joseph Lowcock, Saml. Bottom, Peter Jackson, and Wm. Hogg, were charged with trespassing in a field of mowing grass, in the occupation of Mr. Samuel Parker, at Dronfield, on Sunday morning, the 18th of June. Wm. Smith, a servant in the employ of Mr. Parker, stated that, in consequence of the damage which had been done to Mr. Parker's grass, he had instructions to watch the fields, and, about two o'clock on the Sunday morning in question, he was secreted in a hedge-bottom, when he saw the defendants, with several others, come into the field, (which is not near any foot-road,) of whom he recognised the four defendants. The rest ran away. No plea was set up in defence. The defendants were fined 1s. each and costs.

VIOLENT ASSAULT.—Joseph Lowcock, Samuel Bottom, and Wm. Hogg, were then charged with committing an assault on Wm. Smith. The case arose out of the last case. From Smith's evidence, it appeared that when he rose from the hedge-bottom, as he did not know Locock, he ran and caught him. They struggled together, when Lowcock called to his companions, who came to his assistance, and while Lowcock held Smith down, the others kicked him. His injuries were numerous, and of a very aggravated nature. Mr. Alderson, on behalf of Mr. Parker, prayed for a severe punishment, as every means had been taken by Mr. Parker to warn the parties from trespassing.—The Magistrates said it was necessary, in order to put a stop to proceedings like these, to deal severely with this case. The defendants were ordered to pay £1. 10s. 10d. each, or be imprisoned for one month.

William Smith, the witness in the last case, was then charged with drunkenness, by Paul Jackson, the father of one of the defendants in the case of trespass at Dronfield, on the 18th June. The Bench considered that the information had proceeded from a bad feeling. They therefore dismissed the case.

ASSAULT AT CRESSWELL.—Thomas Hinde, John Booth, John Wilcock, and Henry Wass, were charged with assaulting John Chapman and Benj. Hughes. It seems that the complainants, on Sunday, the 4th ult., were at a public-house at Cresswell, kept by Richard Thorpe. The defendants, Booth, Wilcock, and Hinde were also there. They (complainants) left the house at nine o'clock, and when outside, Wilcock, who had followed them, challenged Chapman to fight. Hughes would not allow him to do so, and the complainants proceeded on their way to Bolsover. The defendants followed them, and when they had proceeded about half a mile, they were violently assaulted by the defendants, and knocked down. While Chapman was on the ground, Hinde jumped on him, and said, "Let's murder him, while we have him." Wass was with the [illegible] of the defendants were ordered to pay 20s. 6d. each, including costs.

Joseph Bagshaw and Robert Bagshaw, of Scarcliffe, labourers, were charged with assaulting John Gascoigne, of Bolsover, sweep, on the 17th of June. The assault arose out of some ill-treatment which the complainant's son received from the defendants.....The Magistrates ordered the defendants to pay the expenses.

VIOLENT ASSAULT AT BARLBRO'.—George Ellis, Samuel Ellis, Thomas Ellis, William Hardwick, and George Wells, were charged with assaulting James Brown, publican, of [illegible] house on the Sunday night in question, and about eleven o'clock his house was cleared. On his going to close the door, Thomas Ellis caught him by the coat, and dragged him out on the causeway. He called for help, and the ostler immediately came to his assistance, and was also struck down and much abused by Thomas Ellis. After both had got into the house again, Charles Walker, the ostler, was sent for the constable. When he returned he was again struck down, and on Hibbert going to his assistance, he also was attacked by four of the defendants, and struck in the face....George Linley, who lived near the place, and was in the yard when Walker returned with the constable, heard Thos. Ellis say, "Here's the b—— who struck me," and immediately he and Hind fastened on Walker, got him down, and violently assaulted him. He also saw Samuel Ellis, Geo. Ellis, and Geo. Wells, assault the constable. He was positive as to the identity of the defendants, as he had been talking with them in the yard before the constable came....Hardwick was one of the party, but was not seen to take any part in the affray. The charge against him was abandoned. The Magistrates were of opinion that the case was fully proved. With regard to Ellis, the case was particularly bad. He had to £2. 6s. ½d.; Wells, £1; and the other two parties, 8s. 6d. each.

James Marples charged George Barker and Hannah Barker with breach of the peace, at Eckington. Both parties, (the complainant and defendants) were bound over in sureties of £10 each, to keep the peace for six months, and to divide the costs.

CONVICTION OF ERNEST JONES, AND SENTENCES ON THE LONDON CHARTISTS.

On Monday, in the Central Criminal Court, Ernest Jones was tried for sedition, being present at an unlawful assembly on the 4th of June, in Bonner's fields. The charge as to riot was withdrawn. The Attorney-General quoted the speech of Jones, to shew that it was not a discussion of the principles of the charter. In that speech Jones had thus referred to Sheffield, Bradford being at the time in a state of riot:—"Recollect one thing, gentlemen, that part of the West-Riding—namely, Leeds and Sheffield, which are torpid and apathetic; my duty will be to endeavour to get Leeds and Sheffield up to that mark at which Bradford and Halifax are now." The case for the prosecution being proved, Mr. Serjeant Wilkins addressed the Jury for the prisoner. He was found Guilty.

The defendant was immediately ordered into custody, and the Court was adjourned for an hour. At the expiration of that period the Learned Judge again took his seat on the bench, and the whole of the defendants who had been convicted, Fussell, Williams, Vernon, Sharpe, Looney, and Jones, were placed at the bar to receive sentence.

The Chief Justice, addressing them, said they had all been severally convicted of misdemeanor, some of them for sedition, and others for attending an illegal meeting and sedition, and Williams had, in addition, been convicted of riot, but in that case, as the person who was tried with him for an offence arising out of the same transaction was acquitted of the riot, which probably would have been the case with him if he had not pleaded guilty, the Attorney-General had requested that judgment might not be passed upon the count charging him with riot. The offences of the whole of them partook of one common character. Under pretence of exercising the most valuable right that an Englishman could possess, that of public discussion, they had made it a pretext for uttering seditious and inflammatory speeches, for the purpose of exciting disaffection in the minds of their hearers, and stirring them up to oppose the authorities of the country; and they would find, upon referring to the circumstances of each particular meeting, that at no one of them was any real or supposed grievance ever pointed out, and the only object appeared to be to assail the Government and the authorities of the country with violent and inflammatory epithets and abuse. They had by these proceedings put in jeopardy the valuable right and privilege of holding public meetings, for if they were allowed to be made the means of exciting the people to revolution, it was quite evident that public meetings must be done away with. It could not be borne that large numbers of people, many of them probably suffering distress and privation, should be brought together, and that they should be told by persons like the defendants that they were entitled to share in the wealth of the country, and that their interest would be advanced by overthrowing the Government of the country; for that was evidently the object and effect of all the addresses that had formed the subject of prosecution. They must all be well aware of the nature and tendency of what they did, and there could be no doubt that their object was to inspire terror and alarm. The meetings were evidently not convened for an honest purpose. There were continually imputing to the Government that it was the cause of all the misery in the country, and charging it with some abominable act, the nature of which was never stated, the object evidently being to excite and stir up the multitudes to overturn it, possibly with the expectation entertained by some of them, that the power would be transferred to their own hands; and God only knew how they would have exercised that power. The Learned Judge then briefly alluded to some of the facts, and said that the circumstance of several thousands of excited men being suddenly marched about the streets of the metropolis at midnight was calculated naturally to create the utmost terror and alarm; and it was quite clear that such things could not be permitted. The public mischief that had been done was very great, but it might have been much greater; and it was highly important that the law had been supported, and that it was now very well understood. He believed that they all knew well that they were offending against the law. One of them had not scrupled to recommend the horrible expedient of private assassination. (Fussell here exclaimed, "I deny it.") It was useless to deny it. The witnesses had deposed to the fact, and the Jury had given their opinion. The speeches of some of the others were equally bad; one of them talked of using steel pens, dipped in red ink; and another had deliberately recommended the murder of the police. They all appeared to be clever, shrewd men, and perfectly conscious of what they were doing, and there did not appear to be any ground for supposing that they were in distress, or that their circumstances had any share in inducing them to adopt these proceedings. They had all been defended most zealously and ably, and they must admit that their several cases had been fairly left to the Jury, and after a very careful consideration the Jury had declared them guilty. He had himself referred to different authorities with a view to guide him as to the punishment that ought to be pronounced. Sedition had seldom risen to the height it had in their cases, but it had always been punished very heavily, and and even in cases where only a single sentence had been proved the punishment had been very severe. He wished his duty would allow him to look at their cases in a favourable light, but he must confess that he saw no palliation for their offence. When he recollected the nature of that offence, its probable result, and that they were probably only deterred from exciting some desperate outbreak by the zeal and energy with which these proceedings were met by the Government and the respectable classes of the community, he felt that the public safety and a warning to others required him to pass a severe sentence. The Learned Judge then passed sentence upon Fussell, whom he ordered to be imprisoned upon the charge of sedition for two years, and for the unlawful assembling for three months; and he was, in addition, ordered to enter into his own recognizance in £100, with two sureties in £50 each, to keep the peace for five years. Williams, two years' imprisonment on the first count, one week on the second, and the same sureties as Fussell for three years.

Sharpe was then sentenced to two years for sedition, three months for the unlawful assembling, and find the same amount of sureties as the others to keep the peace for three years. Vernon to be imprisoned for two years, and find the same sureties as the others to keep the peace for three years. Looney was sentenced to two years' imprisonment upon the count of sedition, two months' for the unlawful assembling, and to find the same amount of sureties as the last defendant to keep the peace for two years.

Jones proceeded to make a long statement of his political views, declaring that he was a Chartist from conviction, that the Charter was the only thing that would save the country and relieve the middle classes from the burdens under which they laboured. He was going on at great length, when he was stopped by

The Chief Justice, who said that he did not sit there to discuss political questions with him. If he could suggest anything likely to induce him to reconsider his decision, he would willingly listen to him, but it was useless for him to enter into matters that were totally irrevalent. The Learned Judge then sentenced him to be imprisoned for two years; to find two sureties in £150 each, and to enter into his own recognizance in £200 to keep the peace for five years. When the sentence was pronounced, Jones addressed the Court and said, "I wish your Lordship good night, and may you sleep with the motto of the Charter round your neck, and no surrender."

Yesterday week, a Mrs. Davies, of Major street, Manchester, two days after the death of her husband, murdered her infant child by immersing it in a jug of water. She herself was missed, and it was supposed she had drowned herself in the canal which was searched in vain. On Sunday, however, her body was found in a large rain-water cask on the premises.

IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT.

HOUSE OF LORDS.

TUESDAY.—The Bishop of OXFORD moved the [illegible]eading of the Protection of Females Bill. [illegible] BROUGHAM and the other law Lords declared th[illegible] would be impossible by any legitimate enactment to [illegible]dy the undoubted evils against which this bill was di[illegible]d.

[illegible] Bishop of OXFORD, however, insisted on dividing th[illegible]use, when the numbers were—Contents, 21; non-co[illegible]ts, 28; majority against the bill, 7.

[illegible]he motion of Lord DENMAN, the Poor Law B[illegible] Bill was read a third time and passed.

[illegible]DNESDAY.—GROUP No. 4.—MANCHESTER, [illegible]IELD, AND LINCOLNSHIRE (Humber Ferries Im[illegible]ent at Hull and New Holland.)—Preamble proved, clauses agreed to, and bill ordered to be reported.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

MONDAY.—After various questions had been put to and answered by different Members of her Majesty's Government, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the whole House on the Sugar Duties, Mr. Bernal in the chair.

Mr. HUME repeated his argument that no alteration should be made in the sugar duties unless it would give relief to the West Indian colonies.

Lord G. BENTINCK then availed himself of the opportunity afforded him by the committee to explain at great length the views which he had propounded as chairman of the West India Committee.

Lord J. RUSSELL replied, and referred to the recommendation given to him by Mr. Gladstone on Friday night to save the revenue by increasing taxation during the present session. Now, he admitted, that if at the commencement of the next session the state of Europe should be so threatening as not to permit us to reduce our establishments, it would not do to go on another year without making the income of the country superior to its expenditure by increased taxation. But if pacific counsels should, as he hoped they would, prevail at that time, and if there were no danger to the preservation of peace both at home and abroad, he thought that we should be able to reduce our expenditure to our income by the exercise of a rigid and unsparing economy. He thought, however, that it would be unwise to come to any decision upon that point now. He concluded by recommending the Government scheme to the approbation and support of the committee.

Mr. GOULBURN supported the amendment, and the committee then divided. For the amendment, 124; against it, 180; majority against it, 56. The resolutions were then adopted.

TUESDAY.—At the morning sitting, the report on the sugar duties, after an amendment fixing the imposition of the duties on the 10th of July instead of the 5th, had been made in the resolutions, was agreed to, and leave was given to bring in a bill upon them.

The adjourned debate on the motion, that it be instruction to the committee on the Encumbered Estates (Ireland) Bill to extend its provisions to England and Scotland, was then resumed.

Mr. SADLER thought the bill was much better when it came from the Lords than it was after its recent amendments.

Sir J. GRAHAM took a different view of this bill from that taken by the last speaker. Every facility ought and must be given for the conversion of Irish estates into money, and the amendments of the Solicitor-General were calculated to give those facilities. He was most anxious to reunite to the soil of Ireland the Roman Catholic population of that country, as such a reunion would be one of the most efficacious means of insuring the safety of Ireland, and of forming and strengthening the bond of union between the two countries. He was anxious to see such a subdivision of land, now held by Protestant encumbered landlords, as would enable Roman Catholics of small capital to become purchasers of it. This measure would lead to such a subdivision, and therefore he should give it his cordial support, especially as it was sound in principle and did not work any violation of right.

Mr. DILLON BROWNE considered the measure well calculated to promote the prosperity of Ireland.

Sir J. WALSH warned the House that the sweeping transfer of estates which would result from this bill would disturb the whole security of law and property in Ireland.

Mr. OSBORNE maintained that Ireland owed a deep debt of gratitude to the Solicitor-General for having given his time and attention to this measure, and as a warm friend of Ireland gave it his earnest support.

Mr. H. HERBERT could not agree in the opinion that this measure was a bill of pains and penalties against the Irish landlords.

Mr. F. O'CONNOR also tendered his thanks to the Solicitor-General for this measure.

After some further discussion, in which Mr. S. CRAWFORD, Mr. D. CALLAGHAN, and Colonel DUNNE joined, Sir L. O'BRIEN withdrew his motion. The House then went into committe *pro formâ*, and immediately resumed. The further proceedings in the committee on this bill were adjourned till Thursday next.

In the evening sitting Mr. G. THOMPSON brought forward, for the thirtieth time, a motion connected with the late Rajah of Sattara, and concluded a long speech, in which he paid a high tribute to the private character of Lieutenant-Colonel Ovans, by moving that a select committee be appointed to inquire into his conduct "as British Political Resident at the Court of Sattara, and into the proceedings of the Bombay Government and the Court of Directors of the East India Company, in relation to certain charges preferred against that officer."

After a very protracted and tedious discussion, in which Mr. ELLIOTT, Mr. HUME, Sir J. HOGG, Mr. C. ANSTEY, Mr. H. BERKELEY, Sir E. COLERIDGE, Mr. URQUHART, and Sir H. WILLOUGHBY took part, the House divided, when the numbers were—For the motion, 8; against it, 77; majority against it, 69.

The other orders of the day were then disposed of, and the House adjourned.

WEDNESDAY.—SUNDAY TRADING (METROPOLIS) BILL.—On the motion for going into Committee on this bill, Mr. B. WALL then rose to move, as an amendment, that the House should resolve itself into a Committee that day six months. He objected to this bill, because he believed it unnecessary, and totally impossible for any practical measure to be carried out upon the subject.

Mr. HINDLEY was convinced that the feeling in the metropolis against Sunday trading was so great that an election of a metropolitan Member would in a great degree depend upon the support which he gave to such a bill as the present. He could not sufficiently impress upon the House the anxiety of tradesmen in the metropolis, who now, for the sake of a living, were slaves to the custom of opening their shops on a Sunday, as to the result of the debate in this House; and happy would they be if the bill should pass, and ultimately receive the royal assent.

Sir G. GREY thought that the object sought to be obtained by the bill would be better effected through the moral and religious feeling of the country than by any legislation of the House.—(Hear, hear.)

Sir E. N. BUXTON would not discuss the matter as a question of religion; but simply as one of public necessity. As the majority of the traders of London ought to be protected against the minority of their class who persist in trading on Sunday, and by competition caused their neighbours to do so, he considered this bill ought to pass.—(Hear, hear.)

The house divided, when there appeared—for going into Committee, 75; against it, 47; majority in favour of going into Committee, 28.

Mr. HINDLEY proposed to go into Committee *pro forma*, which was done, and the House having resumed, the Chairman reported accordingly, and the Committee re-appointed for Friday.

QUALIFICATION OF MEMBERS BILL.

Mr. MOFFATT, in moving the second reading of this bill, told the House that it involved no principle. It was notorious that many gentlemen had endeavoured to secure seats in the House to protect them from arrest—(Hear, hear)—and the simple object of this bill was to give to the creditors of such Hon. Gentlemen a remedy against the protection which the rules of the House threw around every gentleman who had a seat in it.

Mr. BERNAL challenged his Hon. Friend to name five Members out the whole number of which the House consisted, who had rendered themselves amenable to such a bill as this. On Mr. EWART's advice, Mr. MOFFATT withdrew the measure; but intimated that he should renew it early in the next session.

POLITICAL PROSECUTIONS.—REPORTERS OF THE PUBLIC PRESS.—In consequence of the Government having requested the reporters for certain local papers to give evidence regarding what was spoken at political meetings in the neighbourhood, a meeting of reporters connected with the Edinburgh press was held on Thursday week. It having been represented that several of their number had been cited to give evidence before the public prosecutor, in regard to some of the political meetings recently held in Edinburgh, the following resolutions were adopted on the subject:—1. That they view with dislike and apprehension any attempt to render their functions subservient to the public prosecutor in the criminating of persons for political offences. 2. That from the peculiarity of their professional position, the reporters of the public press conceive it to be entailing upon them great hardships and injustice to be compelled to bear evidence in such cases, as the facilities at present afforded them are given by public bodies and other parties solely for the purpose of enabling impartial reports to be made to the public through the press; and they are of opinion that to subject them to appear as witnesses in a court of law will lead them to be regarded as political spies, degrade their professional standing, impair their efficiency, and create a distrust of their presence at public meetings. [Nothing can be more unjust and improper than to employ newspaper reporters to give evidence. They have to attend meetings of all kinds in a neutral character, and that character cannot be destroyed without great detriment. If Government want reports, its proper course is to employ reporters of its own.

Image © THE BRITISH LIBRARY BOARD. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.