

Some Notices and Letters Appearing  
in the Times and Mentioning  
Edward Garnet Man



**Court Circular.**

BUCKINGHAM PALACE, DEC. 9.

His Majesty The King, accompanied by His Majesty The King of Norway, and attended by Lord Knollys, the Hon. Henry Stonor, Major F. Ponsonby, and the Hon. John Ward, arrived at the Palace this morning from Sandringham.

Kaptein Krag was in attendance upon The King of Norway.

.....and among other activities listed for December 1907.....

Mr. Asquith, M.P., speaks at Nottingham to-day for the Free Trade Union; Mr. Llewelyn speaks at Mark (Somerset), Mr. Mann at Wragby, Mr. McAuslane at West Marylebone, Mr. Pincham at Rockingham Forest, Mr. Mackenzie at Geddington, Captain Boyd Carpenter at Dewsbury, Mr. Easten at Wrotham-heath, and Major Davenport at Gravesend for the Primrose League; Mr. E. Garnet Man speaks at Lympe, Kent, and Mr. Harold Smith at Southport, Lancashire, for the United Club; Mr. J. A. Slater lectures, under the auspices of the Constitutional Club, on "Socialism and Its Perils" at the Epsom Conservative Club; Mr. F. Barry speaks at

1904

**ECCLESIASTICAL INTELLIGENCE.**

The Bishop of Winchester has nominated the following to serve on the Diocesan Lay Readers' Board, and they have signified their willingness to do so:—The Bishop of Southampton (chairman), the Archdeacon of Winchester, Canon Valpy, Mr. S. Bostock, Mr. Lionel Herbert, Mr. E. Garnet Man, Mr. W. H. Myers, M.P., Mr. M. J. Rendall, of Winchester College, and the Rev. A. E. Daldy (secretary).

April 1905

"Bengal Civilian" writes:—"The dangers of relying on the memory or on recollections of events which occurred 40 or 50 years ago, without reference to history or to the correspondence of the time, are clearly shown in the letter of Mr. E. Garnet Man, which appeared in your issue of March 16. This gentleman, in alluding to the disastrous retreat from Arrah, when our first attempt to relieve the heroic garrison failed, tells us that he was in the neighbourhood at the time—July, 1857—and then he mentions two gallant actions, the particulars of which he had from 'an eye-witness' 'two days afterwards.' Briefly stated, your correspondent credits the late Mr. Ross Mangles, V.C., not only with the fine feat of carrying a wounded soldier on his back for three or four miles under fire till he rejoined his own party, but also with cutting the rope or hawser of a boat and enabling the retreating party to steer it across a river and get away. Your correspondent has mixed up two different incidents. Mr. Ross Mangles certainly carried the wounded soldier. It was Mr. W. F. McDonell who cut the rope, held the boat, and saved the lives of more than 30 Englishmen. Both feats are described at length by Kaye, in his best style (vide that historian's 'History of the Sepoy War,' vol. III., pages 117 to 121). The coveted distinction of the V.C. has never been more nobly earned by two civilians. My friend Mr. Ross Mangles has followed his brother civilian to the grave, but I feel certain that it would have distressed him had he, in his lifetime, been credited with the heroic act of his colleague. Kaye gives the particulars of the boat incident in a letter written at the time by an officer of the Sixtieth Rifles (see note on page 121, vol. III.). He witnessed the deed."



## Court Circular.

BUCKINGHAM PALACE, FEB. 18.

His Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught visited His Majesty The King this morning.

His Excellency Count Benckendorff (Russian Ambassador) and Viscount Esher had audiences of His Majesty to-day.

Lady Curzon of Kedleston had the honour of being received by Her Majesty The Queen this afternoon.

... and among other activities listed is ....

Sir Charles Wyndham has promised to preside at the festival dinner to be held at the Hotel Cecil on Friday, April 22, on the occasion of the centenary of the Royal London Ophthalmic Hospital (Moorfields Eye Hospital), City-road, E.C.

Mr. E. Garnet Man, of the United Club, speaks at Great Bookham to-day.

The Oxford dinner of the Eighty and Russell Clubs is fixed for Saturday, March 12. Mr. Buxton.

January 1907



## Court Circular.

BUCKINGHAM PALACE, JAN. 9.

Their Royal Highnesses the Duke and Duchess of Connaught and Princess Victoria Patricia of Connaught were invited to luncheon with the King to-day.

The Lord Mayor attended in state yesterday the Court of the Butchers' Company at Butchers'-hall, Bartholomew-close, and was presented with the freedom and livery of the Company. Mr. J. Gurney Randall, the Master, subsequently presided over a luncheon, at which the Lord Mayor was the principal guest. Among others present were Mr. Sheriff W. H. Dunn, Mr. James Killby (Deputy-Master), Alderman Sir Henry Knight, Mr. H. T. Pitt, Mr. W. Whittome, Mr. C. Game, Mr. W. Cooper, Mr. P. J. Rutland, Mr. J. Blofeld, Mr. T. R. Treloar, Mr. G. Evans (Master of the Joiners' Company), Mr. W. Haydon, Alderman Sir John Bell, Captain H. C. Martin, R.N., Mr. C. H. Dewey, Mr. T. Hastings Miller, Mr. George Herbert (Renter Assistant), Mr. T. J. Parker, Mr. W. H. Comfort, Mr. E. Garnet Man, Mr. Edmund Dean, Mr. J. Hill, and Mr. H. J. V. Philpott (clerk). After the loyal toasts had been honoured, Mr. J. Hill proposed the toast of "The New Liveryman," and spoke of the pleasure it afforded the Company to honour the Lord Mayor, who was a representative of their ward. The Butchers' Company was closely connected in the trade, and the Lord Mayor had always been ready to associate himself with the interests of the Company, whether those interests were connected with business or charitable objects. The Lord Mayor, in reply, expressed his appreciation of the honour which had been conferred upon him, and then proposed the toast of "The Worshipful Company of Butchers and the Master." The Master responded. The toast of "The Visitors" was given by Mr. Haydon, and replied to by Sir Henry Knight.

July 1904



## Court Circular.

BUCKINGHAM PALACE, JULY 2.

His Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught visited His Majesty the King this morning.

His Majesty this morning received a Deputation from the Municipality of Paris, consisting of Monsieur Deville, President of the Municipal Council during His Majesty's recent visit to Paris, and Monsieur Bellan, Syndic of the Council, with an Album commemorating His Majesty's visit, which was presented to the King.

Mr. E. Garnet Man, of the United Club, speaks at Walton, Surrey, and Mr. G. W. F. Robbins at Pirbright to-day.

September 13 1900

## THE CHURCH REFORM LEAGUE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

Sir,—I have just read in *The Times* of September 4 two letters under the above heading, signed J. J. Lias and B. Garnet Man, both in reply to Mr. Radcliffe Cooke's letter in your issue of August 31.

If it is not too late, with your permission I should like to say a few words upon what is to many people the main point in each of these two letters—viz., "the rights of the laity."

The Rev. J. J. Lias writes:—

"I can assure him (Mr. Cooke) as a member of the council of the league (C.R.L.) that we are one and all desirous, in all good faith, of giving the laity their full rights in the self-government we wish to obtain for the Church. We do not wish to go a step beyond the system already in existence in the Established Church of Scotland, and Scotland can hardly be described as a priest-ridden country."

From time to time I have received various communications from the Church Reform League—in common, I take it, with many of my clerical brethren—inviting me to join their ranks. After careful study of the papers sent to me, the one and only conclusion at which I have been able to arrive is that the league itself, with all its promises and proposals, is only a red herring drawn across the trail in order to prevent, if possible, any legislation of a serious nature intended to arrest the downward progress of the Church of England.

Mr. Lias, as a member of the council, declares that the league "desires in all good faith to give the laity their full rights in the self-government we wish to obtain for the Church." Your other correspondent, Mr. Man, speaks of giving "the laity such a representation as the league desires." (Italics mine.)

These statements when compared and contrasted with the printed declarations sent out to invite the clergy (and I presume laymen also) to join the league are clearly seen to mean something quite different from their surface appearance.

I am away from home and cannot, therefore, quote *ipse dixit*, but in one important circular I received embodying the aims and objects of the Church Reform League it was distinctly and emphatically laid down that the laity were to have an equal voice in everything save and except in matters spiritual. (Italics mine.) "Their full rights," says Mr. Lias; "give to the laity such a representation as the league desires," frankly declares Mr. Man. Frolics! And there's the rub. "Their full rights,"

rights to be money-collecting machines, for Church and school purposes. "Their full rights" to do yeoman work in all things necessary to the material wellbeing of the Church, but no meddling with things spiritual. When it comes to the laity having any part in such questions as doctrine or ritual, then at once it becomes a cry of "Hands off!"

This, to quote Mr. Man's words, is lay representation "such as the league desires," on its own showing; all spiritual questions and matters to be dealt with by "spiritual persons" alone—that is, by the clergy.

As I understand the matter, this is a very different thing from the "rights of the laity" in the Established Church of Scotland, to which Mr. Lias refers.

It was on account mainly of this formidable and, I conceive, fatal declaration of the policy of the Church Reform League that I for one have declined all invitations to join its ranks. There are other reasons into which I need not enter, but absent which the Rev. J. J. Lias must pardon me for saying I have much sympathy with the remark of "the venerable peer" to whom he alludes in his letter who told him "that in joining this Church Reform League he was the dupe of men more long-headed than himself."

To the Protestant mind, whether cleric or lay, the contemplation of the list of names of those who have joined or who officer the Church Reform League, together with its productions, is quite sufficient as a warning to keep clear of what many of us hold to be a specious association, no matter who the Bishops may be who are set forth to us as decoy figureheads. "Surely in vain the net is spread in the sight of any bird." There is, unhappily, too much need for reform in the Church of England, but God forbid that it should be on the lines of the Church Reform League.

I am, Sir, yours faithfully,

THEODORE A. HOWARD (Vicar of St. Matthew's,  
Toxteth, Liverpool).

Dalry, Sept. 7.

THE UNITED CLUB.

Mr. J. G. Butcher, K.C., M.P., presided on Tuesday night over a sessional dinner of the United Club at the Criterion Restaurant. Among those present were Lord Raglan, the Earl of Denbigh, Sir J. Dorington, M.P., Colonel T. M. Sandys, M.P., Lieutenant-Colonel E. Tufnell, M.P., the Hon. Ivor Guest, M.P., Mr. J. F. Remnant, M.P., Mr. A. Griffith-Boscawen, M.P., the Hon. T. F. Fremantle, Mr. H. Lush-Wilson, K.C., Mr. A. R. Ingpen, K.C., Mr. Lewis Edmunds, K.C., Mr. J. R. Cousins, Mr. A. A. Bethune, Mr. H. Barnston, Mr. E. Garnet Nash, Mr. G. F. Mortimer, Mr. Hugh Chisholm, Colonel Boxall, C.B., and Mr. W. W. Grant-ham (hon. secretary). The subject of the discussion after dinner was "The Army required for the British Empire."

LORD RAGLAN, in opening the discussion, said that the first thing we ought to do was to make up our minds what sort of army we wanted. We must first ascertain what were the dangers which threatened the British Empire, then what amount and what sort of armed force we required for the defence of the Empire, and next how that force should be raised and trained. The question as to the dangers which threatened the Empire concerned foreign policy, that as to the sort of armed force which we required for the defence of the Empire had to do with military policy, and the question how that force should be raised and trained was the subject of financial policy. We invariably started, however, either with the financial aspect, which was the tail of the whole question, or with the military aspect, which was the middle. There were four specific purposes for which our naval and military forces were required. The first was the ordinary garrison duty of the Empire. Then there must be a force ready for the little wars which were constantly being waged in some part of the Empire. Next there must be a force to send forth for a great war such as that in South Africa, or if a European war broke out we must be able to send a force sufficient to make a respectable show. The fourth class of war was a war which would be an absolute life or death struggle for the existence of the Empire. That life or death struggle could only come about through a maritime war. We must be prepared to lose in certain places locally and temporarily the command of the sea, and even in certain circumstances, for a short time, the command of the Channel. We must, therefore, have a sufficient force to free us from the obligation of tying our fleet to home waters. The scheme of the Government had been adversely criticized, as Mr. Balfour had said, largely owing to the use of the word "army corps." There was no particular virtue in the term "army corps." He rather objected to it himself. It was the sort of foreign word which he hated. (Laughter.) He thought, however, that the Government scheme would provide for the garrisons in a more satisfactory way than they had ever been provided for before. He thought we should be enabled for the first time to have an equilibrium between the battalions abroad and the battalions at home, and that would be a very great gain. The arrangements as to the Army reserve would make the necessary provision for the little wars. The scheme provided a very slight addition to the number of Regular forces of the Crown, but he hoped the terms offered would give an increase to the Militia. In the case of a life or death struggle for the existence of the Empire, the first burden of that struggle would fall upon the Navy, and as the Navy was fortunate or not so would the turn of the war be. In such times every able-bodied man must turn out, whether he was a Regular, a Militiaman, or a Volunteer; but the Government scheme proposed to give a more thorough and practical training to all the Auxiliary forces, who were worthy of the greatest attention we could pay them. The financial question was a very important one. We must have an army and a navy somehow. If we did not get recruits at the present rates of pay we must pay the men more. More than that, the question of compulsory service arose. He did not say we were coming tomorrow morning to compulsory service, but he did say that we ought not to sit down and say that compulsory service was impossible and un-English, and that if we could not get the men without it we would do without any army at all. (Cheers.)

LORD DENBIGH said that at the present moment the Volunteers must be considered to be on their trial. If they arrived at a certain standard of efficiency, no doubt we should be justified in putting them in the position they would like to occupy, but we had to provide a sufficient force for the maintenance of our foreign relations and for the provision of a force at home able to act in an emergency, and if we could not get that force in one way we should be obliged to get it in another.

Colonel Tufnell, M.P., Mr. Griffith-Boscawen, M.P., Captain James, and Colonel Boxall also took part in the discussion.

(Sittings at Nisi Prius, before Mr. BARON HUDDLESTON and a Common Jury.)

SQUIRES V. STURMAN.

Mr. Garnet Man and Mr. Morton Brown were counsel for the plaintiff; Mr. Jarvis and Mr. Prankerd for the defendant.

This was a somewhat curious case. It was an action for a breach of contract and to recover damages for the wrongful dismissal of the plaintiff's daughter, Miss Florence Squires, £15 premium, paid and £12 10s. six months' salary. The defendant denied the dismissal, said that if he did contract with the plaintiff, Miss Squires absented herself without reasonable cause from her employment, misconducted herself, and refused to obey his lawful orders, which justified him in dismissing her, and he counter-claimed for a false and fraudulent misrepresentation by the plaintiff that her daughter was competent to fulfil the duties of assistant-secretary, and for £3 16s. 4d. for necessaries, tea, ale, &c., supplied to Miss Squires while at his establishment, and this the plaintiff admitted to be due. The plaintiff is a widow lady, lately residing at Dalston, and she said she saw an advertisement in April, 1880, for an assistant-secretary at the defendant's ladies' school, then carried on at 44, Ennis-road, Finsbury, by Dr. and Mrs. Sturman. The salary was to be £25 a year, increasing £5 half-yearly up to £30. She accordingly called with her daughter, and offered a trial of the girl, then 16 years old; but this was declined and her services were accepted. She paid £15 premium and got a receipt with a note at the bottom that the service was to be for not less than two years. In August she saw another advertisement for another secretary; and she called on Mrs. Sturman to ask what this meant, and if they wished to turn her daughter off. But she was informed that there was plenty of work for two secretaries. Her daughter's salary was to be paid quarterly, and the girl left on October 15 after receiving a note on the 14th headed "Important notice to Miss Florence Squires," which had upset her greatly and caused her to go home for that day. She, however, returned next morning when Dr. Sturman dismissed her. She had not been paid either the premium or the salary, and this writ was issued on October 23, 1880.

In cross-examination, the witness said she had not told the defendant her daughter was in the 1st class at the Haberdashers' School, or that she had only just left school; her daughter had said she hoped she was sure of her spelling. There might have been complaints about the spelling, and about her having mislaid a register of pupils' addresses, just before the end of the vacation, when it was necessary to summon the pupils back.

Miss Florence Squires was called and corroborated these facts. She had been dismissed by a note on the 15th of October. The "notice" ran:—"So much work being practically spoiled through your wilful carelessness and negligence, you are requested to give your thoughts to the business in hand and not dream, &c., while writing &c. I shall charge you for all the work you have spoiled and destroyed. -E. Albert Sturman."

Miss Florence Squires was called and corroborated these facts. She had been dismissed by a note on the 15th of October. The "notice" ran:—"So much work being practically spoiled through your wilful carelessness and negligence, you are requested to give your thoughts to the business in hand and not dream, &c., while writing &c. I shall charge you for all the work you have spoiled and destroyed. -E. Albert Sturman."

Cross-examined,—Miss Squires admitted there had been complaints as to her spelling and that she had spoiled many sheets of "headed" note-paper. She was confronted with several sheets of a library catalogue in which the following errors occurred—"calender" and "callender," for "calendar," "directorys" for "directories," "abroard" for "abroad," "mannel" for "manual," "miscellanous" for "miscellaneous" and "Yorkshire Duddin," for "Yorkshire Pudding." But this, his Lordship said, might arise from the vagueness of the initial letter on the book itself. Mrs. Sturman had said she thought she ought to receive back either the premium, or her six months' salary.

This closed the plaintiff's case, and Mr. JARVIS having opened the defence, called Dr. Sturman. He said he had been assured that Miss Squires could write and spell well and had been in the 1st class at the Haberdashers' School. She gave him a great deal of trouble, and nothing was properly done. She could not write straight, and he had taught her pot-hooks and hangers, and she improved very much. He had cautioned her about mislaying the book of addresses, which was found in a desk which he never used.

To his LORDSHIP.—He had never complained of her to her mother about this, and he never intended to discharge her. Her inattention was not enough to warrant him in his dismissing her. He had never suggested it, because he could teach her. There was no misconduct on her part, and he would take her back if she would apologize for rudeness to his wife.

Mrs. Sturman was called and said her husband had not wished to dismiss Miss Squires, but had told her after absenting herself without leave she had better fetch her mother, and come to some amicable arrangement. She had not kept the letter which contained this proposal. She did not wish to discharge her, though her conduct might have justified her in so doing. Asked by his Lordship to specify what this was, witness said Miss Squires had refused to come into the schoolroom on several occasions; once she had broken her watch glass by sitting on it, and having left the room, could not be induced to return to it again. She would not go into the algebra class when told, or bring a basin of paste when ordered to do so. She had complained four times to the plaintiff about her daughter.

Jane Turner, a servant girl, described the giving of the "notice" on October 14. The plaintiff's daughter when offered the key of her office by the witness, had said "I don't want it; I'm going away, and shan't come back." Dr. Sturman had read the notice to her, witness saying it would make Miss Squires more cautious. Miss Squires spoilt a good deal of paper. She had not been dismissed, though if she had it would not be more than, in her (witness's) opinion, she deserved. She was on friendly terms with Miss Squires.

Mrs. Squires and her daughter were then recalled to contradict the defendant and his wife on the points as to the complaints and dismissal.

After the addresses of counsel,

MR. BARON HIDDLESTON summed up. The learned Baron said the case was not without difficulties, and both counsel had ignored the issues and the pleadings, which he would endeavour to lay before the jury clearly. His lordship then briefly sketched the history of the case, saying the charge of carelessness and bad spelling against Miss Squires seemed comparatively trifling, and misconduct there was none. He dared say there was some discontent at her incompetency; but was the "important notice" written with the object of getting her to go of her own accord, and so relieve the defendant of liability? Why read it to the servant girl, who was evidently a warm partisan? The following were the questions he should leave to the jury:

—1. Was there a contract with the plaintiff by the defendant, as proved by the receipt of £15 premium?

Answer.—Yes.

2. Did the defendant dismiss Miss Squires?—Yes.

3. If he did, then, according to the words of the pleadings, did she absent herself without reasonable cause and refuse to perform her duties?—No.

4. Did Miss Squires misconduct herself, refusing to obey the defendant's lawful orders? If she did he would be perfectly justified in discharging her.—No.

As to the counter-claim, did the plaintiff falsely and fraudulently represent that her daughter was competent to fulfil the office of assistant secretary?—No.

Then as to damages the jury ought to be careful; the plaintiff was entitled to reasonable damages for her daughter being dismissed so early in a two years' engagement. It would not be right to give her the whole £60, as if she had served her full time. They would give her such

temperate damages as they thought fit, being guided by the likelihood of her getting another situation.

The jury found £52 10s. damages; but

Mr. JARVIS pointed out this was more than the sum claimed. Thereupon

His LORDSHIP said he would amend the claim; but perhaps the jury had better give £50, the sum named on the writ, which they accordingly did. The learned Baron then entered a verdict and judgment for the plaintiff on the claim for £50 and for the plaintiff on the first part of the counter-claim as to the false representation; as to the latter part of it for necessaries, &c., a verdict and judgment for the defendant for £3 16s. 4d.

### WOOLWICH DISCHARGES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

Sir,—The Woolwich meeting on Thursday last protesting against the War Office regulation discharging lads from the Arsenal at the age of 21 was crowded by a large number of relatives interested in the question. It was stated that 500 were immediately and 2,000 would be ultimately affected. Mr. Hart, the chairman, said that many were the only support of their parents and once discharged, with unemployment so prevalent, they would have no chance of getting work.

I happened to be at Woolwich shortly after the discharge of the workmen from the Arsenal and Government works last year. The thousands of skilled mechanics then turned adrift had gone to seek work elsewhere, leaving their wives and families to stay at Woolwich until they could send for them. One woman told me how her husband was tramping the country to find work. Until his discharge they had been living in comparative comfort. They had been able to buy their cottage, but now were unable to sell it as the population had so decreased and there were no buyers. Starvation stared them in the face. These discharges have occurred in all the Government centres of industry. Thousands have been thrown out of work since the advent of the present Government to power. When it is considered that if an ironclad costs one million in building, £800,000 is spent on labour, an idea may be formed of the loss to working men the present policy has caused.

More than 30,000 have been discharged from the Army; these are forced to seek work elsewhere, to the detriment of those already at work.

The Government plea that these reductions have been made to reduce taxation is a false one. Is it not wiser to spend our money on the Navy and the Army, which is really money spent as an insurance, rather than on relief works for the unemployed?—schemes which are too often merely makeshifts to disguise the fact of the whole being nothing but charity in disguise.

Taking the average of five to each family, and not counting military discharges, it may be calculated that over 150,000 have been thrown into poverty by official false economy. The remark of a labourer seeking employment when asked "what he thought of old-age pensions" is instructive. He replied, "As work is getting scarcer, in a few years all the labourers will have died from starvation before they get to the right age."

Yours faithfully,

E. GARNET MAN.

Sandgate, Sept. 14.

THE REPRESENTATION OF THE CITY OF LONDON.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

Sir,—The action of the signatories to the letter of requisition forwarded by Lord Avebury to Lord Curzon of Kedleston raises a question of some importance to the interests of the Corporation of London.

There has existed for many years a tacit understanding that the Conservative party, in choosing their candidates, would select one representative of the banking and mercantile interests and another representing the separate interests of the Corporation. The many attacks which in the past have been made upon the Corporation, and which may not improbably be renewed in the new Parliament, render such an arrangement both necessary and desirable, the interests of the Corporation being quite separate and distinct from those of the banking interest.

It has been usual to nominate a member of the Court of Aldermen; but at the present time there is no member of that body who was willing to come forward, it being, of course, a condition precedent that he should be a member of the Conservative party. Under these circumstances, the Court of Aldermen selected Sir Edward Clarke as being the person best qualified to defend the interests of the Corporation in the House of Commons. In the same way Mr. Alban Gibbs has hitherto represented the banking and mercantile interest, and has been adopted as the other Conservative candidate.

Any departure from the tacit arrangement which has existed so long and worked so well may not improbably result in the loss of at least one seat, and the return of an avowed supporter of Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman.

Is it possible that any Conservative elector of the City can desire such a result?

However much we may differ from the views of Sir Edward Clarke on the Boer war, he is free from imputing to our soldiers the adoption of "methods of barbarism," or of desiring, with Mr. John Ellis, the Under-Secretary for India, "a stream of facts" to establish that charge.

I am glad to say that only six of the 52 names published as signatories to Lord Curzon's requisition are members of the City Conservative Association, and I am delighted to know that his lordship was not willing to lend the support of his great name to such a very evident Radical move.

I am, Sir, yours truly,  
W. F. TRELOAR.

69, Ludgate-hill, E.C., Dec. 22.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

Sir,—Mr. Faithfull Begg's letter in your issue of the 18th regarding Sir Edward Clarke has caused some surprise amongst his friends in the City.

When Sir Edward's name was first suggested I, with others, sounded the feeling amongst the liverymen with regard to his candidature, and the result was quite different to that obtained by Mr. Begg. There was a unanimous feeling in his favour.

There is an impression prevailing that personal and not political feeling pervades amongst a few of his supporters. Whether such impression be correct or otherwise I know not, but it is an influence in his favour.

Yours faithfully,  
E. GARNET MAN.

Hythe, Dec. 21.

MANCHESTER SHIP CANAL.—The monthly approximate traffic return for November shows that the receipts were £38,850—an increase of £1,429. The total for the 11 months was £398,806—an increase of £23,762.

MASKELYNE AND DEVAULT'S MYSTERIES.—The Christmas programme which Messrs. Maskelyne and Devault presented yesterday afternoon and evening at St. George's-hall will be found to be as good an entertainment as any which is offered to the public at this season of the year, as crowded and appreciative audiences bore witness. Many will not be sorry that some of their old favourites, like "The Mascot Moth" and "The Burmese Gong," have not disappeared from the programme; but these sketches appear in a new guise, with the addition of numerous fresh illusions and tricks. In the new version of "The Mascot Moth," for instance, the renowned Indian mango trick is now to be seen. For the uninitiated it may be said that a big wooden bowl is brought on to the stage, filled with sand, some seeds scattered thereon, and it is then covered with a cloth. After a few passes the cloth is withdrawn to show that the seeds have already become lusty plants; the bowl is covered again, and when uncovered a full-grown shrub is disclosed on which flowers are blooming, flowers, be it said, which are plucked and handed round to the audience, who found them real, and were completely mystified. As to the main illusion of this playlet, the woman-moth which floats in the air and eludes capture by suddenly vanishing, the most interesting point in that scene of the lamps are lowered, the disappearance taking place in the full glare of the stage lights. The same is to be said of a new trick, called the crystal vases, which is introduced in "The Burmese Gong." Despite the strong light which plays upon the acts of the conjurer, the audience are unable to perceive how it is that when two of the three vases are half filled respectively with port wine and milk, and their contents then poured pell-mell into the third, which had hitherto been empty, the milk and port, at the stroke of the gong, are found again in the original vases, while the vase in which they were mixed contains nothing but a fog which a moment before was being wafted by the magician. The illusion of the screen in this piece was received with enthusiasm; the screen is a very small one, it is shown to conceal nothing, no trapdoors seem possible, yet there are drawn from behind it first a number of ordinary Japanese lanterns, and then an enormous lantern, which drops to the ground and discloses within a Burmese lady. Mr. Devault showed himself a worthy successor of Robert Houdin, and other prestidigitateurs of the past. Among other highly successful feats was that of the target, in which a member of the audience fires, whereupon the target disappears in flames, in the midst of which appears a bird, which, unlike the Phoenix of old, flutters in a cage. Mr. Devault's exhibition of "mental magnetism" with his sister, Miss Devi Devault, was one of the most interesting items. For the rest, there is "The Enchanted Hive," described as "a perplexing playlet," as, indeed, it is; Mr. Tsumoto, a Japanese Blondin, who performs marvellous feats on wire and rope, and to whom the perpendicular rope presents no more difficulty than the horizontal; and some amusing animated photographs and shadow pantomime. Performances will be given daily at 3 and 8.

HOBELICK'S MALTED MILK consists of the sweet cow's milk in combination with the nutritive extracts of cereals. It can be given from the earliest stages of childhood. It removes the danger of scorbatic affections, and is in every respect a sanitary food. It is the best form of milk for adults who need nourishment of this kind. Of all chemicals, it is the best and the most palatable. Free sample sent for two stamps to cover postage by Hobelick's Food Company, 1, Finsbury-road, London, E.C. LADY.

SOME ELECTION EXPERIENCES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

Sir,—In your issue of August 8 you were good enough to publish my experiences at Walsall. The impression obtained there that the Liberationist minute was hardly fair to the clergy was further intensified by my subsequent experience with the electors in South Derbyshire and Berwick.

I arrived at Derby on the Sunday after Sir William Harcourt's defeat, and was informed by a Nonconformist minister that he was told that the London brewers had sent down a train laden with beer, which was distributed with a free hand (which is absurd), and that on the day of the election the town was in a disgraceful state of drunkenness. This tale was repeated more than once, but against the charge of general drunkenness I hear there appeared a statement from the chief constable, to the effect that there were only three men in the lock-up on the day of the election, and that the town was remarkably sober. The main reason for Sir William Harcourt's rejection was generally asserted to be the fact that a large majority of railway and other employes were disgusted at the Commons throwing out the Lords' Amendment to the Liability Bill, and interfering with their liberty in the Railway Servants Bill. They therefore sided with the House of Lords in the controversy. This alone would suffice to sweep away his former majority, and there was no alliance between Bung and the parson here.

In South Derbyshire Mr. Gretton had to remove a majority of over 1,200, and his attempt was considered hopeless. I travelled through the hotbed of Radicalism in this division, Swadlincote and Church-Gresley. Here I found the miners in a wretched plight. They were making but two days a week and could hardly keep body and soul together. Trade had left them—some attributed their evil plight to the strikes, some that bad trade had flooded the mines with agricultural labourers driven from the farms. I found but little abuse of the masters; many were spoken of very highly, particularly Hall and Drage. Moving freely amongst them, I received no discourtesy. They seemed to have a distrust of Radical promises made by the friends of Mr. Broad, the sitting member, and which had never been performed. As the bills' announced that Sir William Harcourt would address the miners on Gresley-common, I waited to hear him, but at 3 p.m. a landau drove up with the Radical candidate and his wife, followed by a wagonette containing some gentlemen, one of whom informed the crowd that the fatigues of the Derby election had acted upon Sir W. Harcourt, at his advanced age, in such a manner as to compel him to seek repose.

A Nonconformist minister, with others, addressed the meeting. They abused the officers of the Army, the House of Lords, and the Church, but avoided carefully all reference to Home Rule. Unfortunately for them, four gentlemen, sent from Manchester by the Irish Union, appeared and commenced distributing leaflets against Home Rule. This seemed to exasperate the speaker, and, goaded on by his words, the crowd hustled, dragged, and assaulted, not only the four gentlemen, but also Mr. Gretton's local agent, who had to flee for his life and to seek police protection. In only one instance in this division did I hear of any Established Church minister taking active part in the elections, while I attribute the attack above mentioned and a subsequent attack made on Mr. Gretton and myself, when we were stoned and hustled and our meeting broken up at Church Gresley and Swadlincote, entirely to the inflammatory harangues of the Nonconformist minister aforesaid. A lurking distrust of the mining agents (who were all Radicals, and who by advising strikes had driven trade elsewhere), disgust at bad trade, at interference "all over the shop," as one miner graphically put it, was the groundwork upon which a majority of over 1,200 for Mr. Broad was turned into a majority of over 800 for Mr. Gretton. I left Derby before the declaration of the poll, and arrived at Alnwick in the evening. Here a different state of affairs existed. The miners were working full time, and did not appear to have any special grievance.

From what I gathered they were not favourable to the proposed Eight Hours Bill. One said, "It takes us sometimes an hour to get from bank to bank, and when a mine is once started the works can't be shut off in a moment." This eight hours arrangement "won't help us." It seems that where there is a foreign export trade the eight-hour clause is not so popular. It is

## TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

Sir,—In your issue of August 1 you publish a minute of the Liberation Society in which is recorded the following :—

“The unprecedented exertions of those engaged in the production of intoxicating liquors, aided by the supporters of national establishments of religion . . . have destroyed the majority in favour of religious equality,” &c.

As one actively engaged in speaking and canvassing at Walsall, South Derby, and Alnwick, and in close contact with the electors of those districts, might I be allowed to question in your columns the accuracy of the impression under which the framers of that minute appear to be labouring?

I can rely on no better *data* than the result of conversations between myself and the poorer class of electors with whom only my intercourse was held. I have no hesitation in recording that the “parson and beer” had not so much to do with the result as the framers of the minute would appear to presume. At Walsall there was a publichouse said to be the stronghold of Radicalism, and I spent some time in it.

The landlord was a strong supporter of Sir Arthur Hayter, and when I entered nothing but politics were being discussed. One man was hotly abused for being a turncoat and supporting the Conservatives, as he had always voted before with the Radicals. But his retort was, “England for the English.” He was not going to stand 80 Irish members coming over here to be in our Parliament, while we had nothing to do with theirs. One was asked the landlord when his house was going to be shut up without compensation. The answer was, the Liberals would never touch him. The chances of the rival candidates were talked over; one man stated that Sir A. Hayter had never been in the borough since he was elected, while Mr. Gedge had been with them weekly for 18 months.

I attended a Separatist meeting which was addressed by a local Nonconformist minister. I noticed at all these meetings Home Rule was tabooed. This gentleman confined himself to the Local Veto, and shortly put it thus :—“My intelligent friends and brother workers, the Liberals do not want to stop your beer. We only give each of you the key of the cellar, so that you may drink or not as you like.” This statement was received with loud cheers; a voice from the crowd cried, “but you give to two who don't want to drink a key each, while you don't give a key to a third who likes his glass of beer.” This remark was hooted down.

It was pitiable to hear the complaints of short work amongst the miners. The Church or beer question did not appear to affect them. Their only anxiety was to keep their families from want, which was staring them in the face. At the last election promises had been made that if Sir A. Hayter were elected they would get better wages, instead of which times were getting harder. They had heard that their mining agent had received about £18 for speaking for the Liberals, and had boasted at a meeting that he would bring his miners “up in a lump to vote for Hayter.” This appears to have offended them, and they voted accordingly.

The Walsall election was not won by a coalition between “Bung and the Church.” It was won because there was a general disgust with the whole Separatist programme—with promises broken; a general feeling against Home Rule; a feeling that it was unfair to ruin a poor man's trade and not give him compensation; a feeling, fostered by the Roman Catholic priesthood, that it was unjust to ruin voluntary schools; and last, and most important, Mr. Gedge's careful and judicial candidature. For 18 months before the election he had held conversational ward meetings in which he conversed with the electors, who were all invited, and he thoroughly ventilated the various political questions at issue. The organization at the head office under Mr. Middleton was also superb. A long placard was published by the Separatists on the Friday before the election charging Mr. Gedge with having voted against the good of the people in 18 different Parliamentary divisions. It was most important to have this placard answered before the following Tuesday. I was asked to take it to London to the head office to have all Mr. Gedge's votes looked up, and all the *data* obtained from Hansard, ranging as it did through some years; this involved immense labour. But, although Mr. Middleton was engaged with many other elections, the machinery of the office was in such good order that by Saturday night a full *procès* of his votes was en route to Walsall, and a placard from his agent on Monday triumphantly refuted the placard upon which the Separatists had relied as their last *coup*. Thus was the election won.

Yours faithfully,

E. GARNET MAN.

BURMAH, CHINA, AND DACOITIES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

Sir,—The present Ministry have carried out in a businesslike manner the policy suggested by Sir Arthur Phayre seven days before his death. He then wrote—“There is now nothing to be done but to annex Upper Burmah. We must not allow our French friends to have a tip of their little finger in our pie.” Sir Arthur Phayre moulded British Burmah into shape and rough hewed what Sir Ashley Eden afterwards polished.

There are some Anglo-Burmans who fear that annexation will give us greater frontier responsibilities. At the worst we can only have China as our neighbour on the one hand, and Siam and the Shan States on the other.

The former has been thrown into our arms by the action of the French in Tonquin, and the virtual annexation of Cambodia by the same power during the late Liberal Administration has further cemented our understanding with Siam. But Siam has formed our frontier on the Moulmein side for many years, and no complications need be expected from that quarter.

We have only China and the Shan States to deal with. It is true that Chinese troops have taken Bhamo two or three times, but the Burmese have always retaken it. Whenever there was a strong Governor at Yunnan and the Burmese looted near the borders he would send a rabble to capture the place, and then the compliment would be soon repaid by the Burmese. But this action never necessarily involved a war between Burmah and China. A regiment stationed at Bhamo would guard that frontier and keep the road open towards Momein. One of your correspondents asserts that Burmah has paid tribute to China, and consequently we should hand over Bhamo to that power. But although I recollect the Chinese Embassy arriving at Mandalay, I never heard it whispered that they came with any other intent than that of interchanging presents, and I think the Burmese would have repudiated any idea of their King being tributary to China. Again, if we wish to open the trade route we shall have to guard the road for about 40 miles between Bhamo and the Chinese frontier; for it is in that portion that caravans are often plundered by the Kachyens. This tribe resembles the Highlanders of years ago. There might be a frontier line easily defined without our resigning our hold on Bhamo, and which might be drawn satisfactorily to China.

The Kachyens have gradually worked south, driving the Shans before them, who in their turn seem to have driven the Burmese; so that Upper Burmah at present has a large population of hardy Shans, who do the manual labour that the Burmese despise.

The majority of the Shan States were formerly tributary to the King of Burmah, but it was lately reported that the weak rule of Thebaw had encouraged them to throw off the yoke. If they were for so long a time passive under the Burmese, why should they be different under the stronger grasp of the British?

It is remarkable that the Burmese have offered no organized resistance to the English since Thebaw's dethronement. If the nation as a whole were inimical, General Prendergast's force would have been engaged in fighting armies directed against the British instead of having to detach troops to protect Burmese villages and hunt down dacoits. We hear of nothing but dacoits plundering their own countrymen, and not marching against the English. It is true that now reports are circulated that some thousands of men are being collected under two rival princes to attack the British. But those acquainted with Eastern nations will take with great reserve information, as to numbers. Thousands dwindle to tens under investigation, and your correspondent's admirable picture of the Burmese children playing at the feet of the British soldier gives a better idea of the feeling of the Burmese towards the English than any reports of large armies being collected can convey. A country peopled by such as the Burmese suddenly deprived of all safeguards against robbery and violence naturally becomes a prey to the lawless, who seek the opportunity to plunder, and we may expect for the next two years to hear of large bands parading the country. But so it was in British Burmah after annexation, and dacoity is still prevalent there.

Colonel Street's action in shooting a number of dacoits in British Burmah will act as a deterrent to dacoity. It will be a mistake to hand over the rule of British Burmah too soon to the civil power. Soldier administrators are necessary under the circumstances, and martial law requisite. In the end it is more merciful than a refined

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

Sir,—As a local secretary for the Soldiers' and Sailors' Help Society my duty is to try and find work for those who have been discharged with good characters, but lately all my endeavours have been frustrated by the answers from employers, "We cannot help you, for the Insurance Bill will make it impossible." A bootmaker told me that he calculated it would impose a tax on him of nearly £18 per annum, and a local builder calculated it would mulct him in nearly £30 per annum. These men were both in a small way of business. The builder stated that in the winter to keep his men employed he used to give them three to four days a week, but now instead of entertaining my application for another workman to be placed on his staff, he was thinking of curtailing his present number. I merely state the result of my endeavours. Whether they were justified in their conclusions I leave to others to argue.

Yours faithfully,

**E. GARNET MAN**, Local Secretary Soldiers' and Sailors' Help Society, Sandgate, Kent.  
Sandgate, July 24.

THE VOLUNTEER AMBULANCE CORPS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

Sir,—As one of the public who witnessed the good service done by the Volunteer Ambulance Corps during the procession yesterday, I would ask space in your columns to mention it. About six men with a stretcher took up their position between some lamp posts facing Westminster-bridge and hung out their Red Cross flag. At first there was some banter about their holiday playing, but as the crowd increased and an immense stream of people became wedged from one end of the bridge to the other their services were needed incessantly. Many times the crowd attempted to break through, and a second squadron of Guards had to be sent for to aid the endeavours of the police to keep the surging mass back. As some of those in it fainted or were hurt these useful amateurs rescued and carried them to their improvised hospital, where they were all attended to by the assistant surgeon in charge. The smartness of the men and the scientific manner in which they handled the patients repeatedly called forth the applause of the crowd.

Probably many a life was saved by their timely aid, and a good deal of suffering alleviated. As cheer after cheer broke forth at every fresh display of their energy and care they must have felt their good services were appreciated, and, presuming them to be a fair specimen of their brethren, the country can be congratulated upon the Volunteer system having evolved such an able, active, and intelligent body of men.

Yours faithfully,

Temple, E.C., June 22.

**E. GARNET MAN.**

---

*ADMINISTRATION IN BURMAH.*

---

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

Sir,—The charges made against Captain Adamson, the Deputy Commissioner of Mandalay, mentioned in your report of questions asked in the House of Commons on the 4th inst., afford but another instance of the ignorance displayed by members of the House on matters affecting far off countries.

Great stress appears to be laid on the fact that he tried a case in his private house. His private house is probably a thatched hut, which is used as a court in the daytime and a sleeping room at night. District officers in the East have often to try cases on the spot, where the offence was committed. There is no accommodation set apart for a court, and justice can be as fairly and well administered under a tree, in a hut, or on the side of a hedge as in the palatial buildings in Europe. Captain Adamson's task has been a most difficult one. He has had to combat against the mistakes made by those in power since the annexation. That annexation was undertaken with the general concurrence of the bulk of the people. But no allowance was made for the risk of allowing a number of unscrupulous men, hangers on of the Court and the different Governors of the districts, and a disbanded army to wander loose about the country without subsistence. We too soon attempted to govern by means of the civil power and the police, instead of by martial law and the military. No allowance was made for the sudden change from the merciless Burmese penal code to the more civilized punishments under our procedure, and we drafted a half-drilled or newly recruited police to keep down dacoities, which wanted to be stamped out by a military organization. We are now paying the penalty of our mistakes. It is but natural that in a change of Government lawless spirits should seek their opportunity. The bulk of the people will follow those they think the strongest. If they have an idea the dacoits are getting the upper hand they will join them, for very peace and quiet. Severity in the first instance is more merciful than a shilly-shallying, weak administration, which by its very dilatoriness offers incentives to crime.

Captain Adamson's record of good and tried service for many years deserves that some confidence should be placed in him, even by those who do not know him. I do know him, and the fact that he heard a case in his private house (a hut) and gave a judgment to which there was no appeal would, even if corroborated, not shake my trust in his honest and fearless administration of justice in its true sense.

Yours faithfully,

Temple.

E. GARNET MAN.

---

**BURMAH.**

**TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.**

Sir,—Mr. Chan Toon's letters on Burmah strikingly illustrate one phase of Burmese feeling—their intense pride. He only endorses that which all who know Burmah must admit. The Burmese, as a rule, hate and despise the natives of India, and, while they appear to have something in common with Europeans, they look down upon Eastern nations. It is to be regretted that the pacification of Burmah was so soon placed in the hands of a hastily levied and therefore badly drilled and incompetent police.

The natives of India lack that independence of character and geniality which characterize the Burmese. During a lengthened stay in both India and Burmah, while in the former country I saw and heard of many instances of natives of India being beaten or assaulted by Europeans; I never saw or heard of a case of a European maltreating a Burman. The latter is a type of what I gather the Scotch were some 200 years ago.

Mr. Chan Toon's brilliant career hitherto gives his words weight, as he enjoys the advantages of the education of an English prizeman, with the intimate knowledge of Burmah acquired by his Burmese birth. I presume that when he referred to Indian officers "as one of the great evils of governing Burmah" he did not allude to those who had served in Burmah from early in their career.

Sir Arthur Phayre, Generals Fytche, Davies, Duncan, and many others went young to Burmah, and their names are now household words with the Burmese. But he is correct if he infers that experience of the natives of India is useless when an officer is brought into contact with or has to govern natives of Burmah.

Your correspondent's assertion that India is the milch cow for Burmah is incorrect. Before the annexation Burmah was the milch cow for India. Of course, the expenses of annexation have now to be taken into account. But so it was when Lower Burmah was annexed. Immediately the country becomes settled Burmah will be the milch cow again, as she has been in the past.

The Straits Settlements were once under Indian government. The change does not seem to have retarded their prosperity.

Yours faithfully,

Temple, Aug. 28.

E. GARNET MAN.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

Sir,—As one of the original members on the council of the Church Reform League, I wish to correct a misapprehension under which Mr. Radcliffe Cooke labours regarding the objects of the league.

In his letter of the 31st ult., he writes that the league desires "the reintroduction of the ecclesiastical element into the Courts of law, and to take away from Parliament the control over ecclesiastical matters."

I joined the league because I thought it a means by which a gross anomaly might be remedied. Mr. Cooke writes that "Parliament represents the laity," but he omits to state that Parliament also represents the most deadly enemies of the Anglican Church. His statement might have held good when all members were of her persuasion, but now Romanists and Nonconformists have equal power with her lay members to legislate for her or against her. Is not this an anomaly? Is there any other religious body that would allow it? Moreover, I have read in a report of the Liberation Society that "the time of the House of Commons should not be taken up with attempts to reform the Church!" So the poor Church lies at the feet of her enemies.

The great object of the league is to remove the anomaly of other than Churchmen having a voice in her legislation—a voice which has been raised against her welfare whenever opportunity has offered.

Give to the laity such a representation as the league desires and such a scandal would be no more.

I agree with Mr. Cooke that the comparison of the conditions of life is much more favourable in Protestant than in Roman Catholic countries, for there seems to be a blight pervading those over which the latter religion is dominant. Also that 90 per cent. of English laymen are staunchly Protestant. It is for these very reasons that I wish success to the Reform League, for it will help to counteract the insidious approach of Papal dominion, aided as the league would be by a majority of 90 per cent. of staunch Protestant laymen, who would have a voice in the government of their own Protestant Church.

I beg to remain your obedient servant,

E. GARNET MAN.

Walton-on-Thames, Sept. 2.

LIVERPOOL SHIPOWNERS AND THE PRICE OF COAL.—At a general meeting, yesterday, of the Liverpool Steamship Owners' Association it was resolved that the rise in the price of coal renders necessary an increase in current rates all round.

**THE VICTORIA CROSS GIVEN TO  
CIVILIANS.**

TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

Sir,—“Bengal Civilian,” in his laudable desire to give the credit justly due to McDonell for his gallant action in cutting the rope of the last boat in the disastrous Arrah retreat, has unwittingly mixed up two incidents.

He assumes that the boat in which Mangles placed his wounded soldier, and to which I referred, was the same boat whose painter McDonell so gallantly cut. In this he erred. The incidents occurred on two different boats, of which McDonell's was the last. The word “cut” which he attributes to me does not appear in my letter.

Mr. Haggard's quotation from Kaye, in his letter of the 24th inst., supports my contention as to there being more boats than one.

Such being the case, the details of the one incident do not affect those of the other. They are both separate. I knew McDonell well. He was a splendid rider, and I have often ridden against him as a “light weight.” I would be the last to wish to depreciate his most noble heroism. Both richly deserved the honour they obtained, and the deeds of both shine in “the blazing scroll of fame” with equal lustre.

Yours faithfully, E. GARNET MAN.

**PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION SOCIETY.**

Circulars have been issued to those whose names appear on the list of members of the Proportional Representation Society stating that it has been decided to revive the society, and that Mr. Leonard Courtney will give an address on “Real Representation” at 8 p.m. on May 4, at a meeting in Essex-hall, promoted by the New Reform Club, Lord Avebury presiding.

At CROYDON, Mr. FREDERICK BENNETT, a stockbroker, of 21, Birch-lane, City, and living at Wallington, was summoned by Inspector Turpin for having on the 11th inst. travelled in a certain carriage on the London, Brighton, and South Coast Railway without having previously paid his fare and with intent to avoid payment thereof. Mr. Brewer appeared for the prosecution; and Mr. E. Garnet Man, barrister, defended. Cuthbert Clarke, booking clerk at Wallington Station, deposed that he had known the defendant as a first-class season-ticket holder, but his ticket expired on March 31, and he was informed of this fact. On Sunday night he arrived by the train leaving London-bridge at 9.35 in company with two ladies, for whom he gave up two single tickets. Witness asked him for his own ticket, and he replied, “Season,” and upon being requested to show it, said “Season ticket on a Sunday night; why it is absurd,” and explained that he had not got it with him. With that he gave his name and address, and left the station. For the defence, Mr. Man said no doubt the defendant should have renewed his ticket on April 1, but being very busy he gave it to a friend to renew, and he was perfectly justified in presuming that he had done so. Mr. Charles Stewart, the gentleman referred to, said it was true that Mr. Bennett asked him to renew the ticket, but he did not intend to do so until he got the money for it. Mr. Brewer informed the Bench that, as a matter of fact, the new ticket was not applied for until the 12th inst., the day after this offence was alleged to have been committed. Mr. Man contended that there was no fraudulent intent, inasmuch as the company held a deposit of 10s. The Bench said if the defendant had acted honestly in the broad sense of the word, and explained the exact circumstances of the case to the ticket collector, probably nothing more would have been heard of the matter. Instead of that he said what was untrue. The case would be dismissed, but they would advise the defendant not to act in a similar manner again. The company were quite right in bringing the case before the Court.

England and of India were prepared for a somewhat long and anxious period in which war would have to be waged against very real and very abundant elements of disorder. . . . The police are not as yet organized in a satisfactory manner, and it is by no means too soon that a committee of officers has been established to take into consideration this first of all administrative questions. Sir Frederick Roberts when he visited Burmah at a critical moment expressed a strong opinion that a very good police force might be raised from the Burmans themselves, and we may suppose that a recommendation from such a quarter will not be neglected.

With reference to these extracts from your leading article, I would point out that it was not alone "the sanguine and the inexperienced" who, when Mandalay (as was anticipated by myself and by all who knew the place) was so easily captured, "jumped to the conclusion that the whole thing was over," because Lord Randolph Churchill boasted in the House of Commons, when Secretary of State for India, that "we had added a territory to the Empire as large as France at a mere trifling cost of lives and money," and he seemed to infer that therefore "the whole thing was over." If my memory serves me, I wrote both in your columns and in the columns of the military journals at the time that this was an intense delusion and that "the thing" was just begun, and that it would cost many thousands of lives and many millions sterling before Burmah was pacified and properly annexed to our Empire. In due time, I added, perhaps it will become an even more valuable addition to our Empire than any other previous annexation.

Regarding the police, I had an interesting correspondence with Sir Frederick Roberts on the subject, to which I will not further allude than to mention that I said I was very sceptical as to whether, for a very long time, it would be possible to raise an effective and well-disciplined police from the Burmese. When writing to this effect I had in my memory the fate of the two "Pegu Light Infantry" Battalions raised in Lower Burmah after the war of 1852. I am still of the same opinion, as the Burmese will not readily submit to discipline of a regular kind. Mr. Man says :-

"The Burmese, as a rule, hate and despise the natives of India, and, while they appear to have something in common with Europeans, they look down upon Eastern nations.

"The natives of India lack that independence of character and geniality which characterize the Burmese. During a lengthened stay in both India and Burmah, while in the former country I saw and heard of many instances of natives of India being beaten or assaulted by Europeans; I never saw or heard of a case of a European mistreating a Burman. The latter is a type of what I gather the Scotch were some 200 years ago."

I think these extracts, which I fully endorse, bear out my opinion as to the difficulty, at present, of enrolling a disciplined purely Burmese police force. All this was well known, or ought to have been well known, to the Governments in India and at home.

#### TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

Sir,—Will you permit me to say a few words on the subject of Burmah with reference to your able article in *The Times* of to-day, and Mr. Garnet Man's and Mr. Chan-Toon's excellent letters in the same issue?

"It is inevitable that the settlement of a vast country like Upper Burmah should proceed slowly. At the time of the easy capture of Mandalay the sanguine and the inexperienced jumped to the conclusion that the whole thing was over, and that all that remained was to explain the new state of affairs to a willing people. Those, however, who remembered the circumstances of the annexation of Lower Burmah were not so ready to believe in this magical result of a bold stroke of policy, and the Governments both of

"It seems, however, that the 'tacking principle' finds favour with those who look at British possessions from a distance, being regardless of the different customs and institutions of those people who are to be 'tacked' together without their knowledge. . . . Once more, he sees no other means of pacifying the disturbances in Upper Burmah than by employing Indian troops—while granting the bad effect this has on the Burmese mind—and then rashly commits himself by sneering at the idea of employing Burmese military police under the command of English officers, because by so doing 'one might as well leave the landlords of Ireland to be solely protected by Messrs. Parnell, Dillon, O'Brien, &c., and withdraw the Irish Constabulary from that unhappy country.' Obviously, there never was a comparison more unfortunate, and if in the case of Burmah it is the dacoits who disturb the country, will it not be for the interests of the people to suppress their enemies, when they are made to feel that their safety and happiness lie entirely on their own exertions rather than upon the skill of the Indian troops? Even from this aspect of the question we are brought round to the bearing of my meaning of allowing the Burmese to have a representation in the Legislative Council of their country.

"The country should be divided into independent provinces, having regard in that division to the distinctions of customs obtaining among the people; each of such provinces to be governed by Englishmen or Burmese who are selected under the proposed scheme of the Burmese Civil Service Commissioners. It is not here meant that the successful candidates should at once fill those posts, but should gradually, after many years' service, become qualified for them. By the side of these provincial governors Burmese officials may be employed to fulfil minor administrative and executive functions, and the local affairs to be almost entirely left to the representatives of the people. Such a method seems to be the most feasible, as it would make the people zealous of their interests, and it being also the natural source of development as shown by the study of progressive nations. It never works well to introduce cut-and-dried institutions among peoples tied down by the weight of superstitions and customs.

"Over these separate provinces a representative of the Queen might be sent quinquennially from England, and his duty to consist of, among other things, passing laws on the recommendations of his Council, composed of Anglo-Burmans and Burmans."

I have carefully read all Mr. Chan-Toon's letters in your columns, and I think, generally speaking, he has hit the right nail fairly on the head, and has clearly indicated a course with regard to the future government of Burmah which should receive the earnest and careful consideration of the Government.

I think it is a very great pity that the names of Mr. Gladstone, Mr. Balfour, Mr. Parnell, and the Irish question generally should be dragged into every discussion, more particularly in the present instance, as this cannot in any way better either the Burman nation or the British Empire.

Your obedient servant,  
A. R. GLOAG, Lt.-General, late Colonel Com-  
manding R.A. in Burmah.

September 1.

## ASHMORE V. SIR ALGERNON BORTHWICK.

This was an action against the proprietor of the *Morning Post* to recover damages for an alleged libel. The statement of claim alleged that "on November 2, 1882, the defendant falsely and maliciously printed and published of and concerning the plaintiff the words following. She (meaning the plaintiff's wife) had, however, been frequently beaten by him (meaning the plaintiff) black and blue, and there were witnesses present to prove it. On the 26th ultimo he (meaning the plaintiff) beat her unmercifully because she had pawned not only her wedding ring, but her clothes and articles of furniture to support the home on account of his (meaning the plaintiff's) lazy and drunken habits, and not giving her a farthing to keep house and home together." The statement then went on to allege that in consequence of the publication the plaintiff was injured in his reputation and prevented from getting employment. The defence was a denial of the publication, and, moreover, that the defendant was a public journalist, and that the alleged publication was made *bond fide*, without malice, and for the public benefit.

Mr. Kemp, Q.C., and Mr. Garnet Man were counsel for the plaintiff; and the Solicitor-General (Sir Edward Clarke, Q.C.) and Mr. Lewis Coward for the defendant.

Mr. KEMP, Q.C., said, on behalf of the plaintiff, that the publication complained of appeared in the *Morning Post* in the form of the report of proceedings in a police-court against the plaintiff. Plaintiff, a person in somewhat humble circumstances, had been married some years before. The marriage turned out very unhappily, and on the 30th of October, 1882, the wife summoned her husband for an assault. He was remanded, and on a second occasion he was bound over to keep the peace. In the report of the proceedings in the *Morning Post* it was stated that "it appeared from the evidence," and then the account was given which was the libel now complained of. The learned counsel said that the account did not appear from the evidence, and that he should prove that no evidence was given at all of the acts alleged in the account.

The depositions taken before the magistrate were put in and read.

The plaintiff, James Ashmore, was called, and said he had been an auctioneer's clerk. He had been married in 1875 and led an unhappy life. He and his wife quarrelled in consequence of what he discovered of her previous life. She summoned him to Westminster Police-court on the 30th of October, 1882, for assault, and the case was remanded. On the next occasion a solicitor, Mr. Dutton, appeared for his wife, and said that for certain reasons she only wished her husband to be bound over to keep the peace. Witness said his wife did not swear the acts as alleged against him in the *Morning Post*. Other local papers had copied the report, and the consequence was he was much injured in character and unable to obtain employment, and was obliged to leave London and seek work elsewhere.

Other evidence was also given as to the relations between plaintiff and his wife and what took place in the police-court.

No evidence was called on behalf of the defendant, and the learned SOLICITOR-GENERAL, in addressing the jury on his behalf, said he could not ask a verdict from them for the defendant, because in fact the report had not been strictly accurate; but he said, taking the circumstances of plaintiff's general conduct into account and that he had not showed that he had suffered any real injuries, the damages against his client ought to be very small.

MR. JUSTICE DENMAN then summed up. He told the jury the case had been tried before, when some evidence had been given which had led the Judge who tried it to direct the jury to find a verdict for the defendant, which they did. On appeal the Divisional Court granted a new trial. His Lordship then told them that in estimating the damages they should take into consideration the circumstances as elucidated by the evidence and the conduct of the plaintiff.

The jury found a verdict for the plaintiff for £40, and judgment was given accordingly, but his Lordship refused to certify for a special jury.

**COMPANY PROMOTING.**—Yesterday in the Lord Mayor's Court the case of "Cramer v. Elborough" came on for trial before the Recorder (Sir T. Chambers, Q.C.) and a special jury. The plaintiff, Mr. B. F. Cramer, an accountant and member of the firm of Brett and Cramer, Suffolk-house, E.C., sued the defendants, Messrs. Elborough and Co., financial agents and company promoters, of Lombard-street, to recover £5,000 under an agreement in connexion with the converting of the Metropolitan and South London Music-halls into limited liability companies. The plaintiff also claimed under a *quantum meruit* for work and labour done, while the defendants pleaded that they never were indebted as alleged, and that whatever services were rendered by the plaintiff were made null and void by his conduct. Mr. A. Cock, Q.C., and Mr. Newson were counsel for the plaintiff; and Mr. Littler, Q.C., and Mr. E. Garret Man for the defendants. Mr. Cock, in opening the case, said that the proprietors of the Metropolitan Music-hall and the South London Music-hall were anxious to launch them as limited liability companies, and they communicated with a Mr. Shum, who in turn went to the plaintiff with a view to floating the companies. The plaintiff not being conversant with that kind of business, went to the defendants, and an arrangement was come to and put into writing, by which the defendants undertook to pay to the plaintiff £5,000 upon the launching of the company. The negotiations went on, and the Metropolitan-hall Company was duly launched, but in consequence of the inability or indisposition of the defendants to pay £1,500 as a deposit, as required by the proprietors of the South London Music-hall, the arrangements for that company did not succeed and no company was floated. Under those circumstances the plaintiff considered that as he had done all that he could to complete the negotiations he was entitled to the full amount as specified in the agreement. But, in case the opinion of the Court should be against him on that point, the plaintiff had claimed upon a *quantum meruit* for that part of the arrangement which had actually been completed—namely, the floating of the Metropolitan Music-hall as a company. The plaintiff was called, and bore out this statement. Mr. Littler asked leave to reserve his cross-examination, which was granted. Mr. Bignold, solicitor to the plaintiff, was called to prove that he had had conversations with Mr. Hill, the defendant's solicitor, and that that gentleman had admitted that the London Scottish Investment Company (Limited) was really the same as the defendants. That company had a capital of £1,000, and only had seven shares allotted. According to the defendants' contention it was that company, and not themselves, which had floated the Metropolitan Music-hall. Mr. Littler submitted that the plaintiff could not recover on several grounds, among them being that there was no evidence that the defendants had been paid any money, and according to the commission note given by the defendants that would be necessary before the plaintiff could recover; that the contract was a whole contract and could not be fulfilled in part (it being admitted that the second company was not floated); and, further, that the failure of the floating of the South London Company had not been shown to be in consequence of the conduct of the defendants. The Recorder ruled that the case must go to the jury, although there was weight in the objections raised, but they could be reserved. Mr. Littler then said he would re-call the plaintiff for cross-examination, but Mr. Cock objected on the ground that it was too late. The plaintiff could be called as a witness for the defendants, but could not be cross-examined now, as the plaintiff's case had closed. The Recorder upheld this view, and Mr. Littler intimating that he did not propose to call witnesses, Mr. Cock addressed the jury. Mr. Littler, following, said that the plaintiff was seeking here to recover £5,000 for work which was done in two interviews of about two and a-half minutes each, £1,000 a minute. It made one's mouth water. He had heard of eminent men in the law Courts costing £1 a minute, but never of £1,000 a minute. The jury found for the plaintiff for £2,500.

in the list of Masters of Arts at Oxford, in *The Times* of yesterday, instead of Thomas H. Kebble it should have been Thomas Edward Kebbel.

**RAILWAY COMMISSIONS.**—In consequence of the Whitsun holidays the Commission have only met once this week—the 9th of June. Present—the Duke of Devonshire, chairman; Sir Rowland Hill, Captain Galton, Messrs. Leveson-Gower, Lowe, Horsfall, Dalglish, Glyn, M'Clean, and the secretary, Mr. Pole.

**CALLS TO THE BAR.**—**INNER TEMPLE, June 9.**—The undermentioned gentlemen were this day called to the Bar by the Hon. Society of the Inner Temple:—William Thomas Charley, Esq. (certificate of honour, first class, Michaelmas Term, 1864, and holder of the Exhibition awarded in the present Trinity Term), B.A., Oxford; Charles Jeffery, Esq., B.A., Cambridge; Benjamin Guest, Esq.; Richard Masheder, Esq., B.A., Cambridge; Henry Hibbert, Esq., B.A., Cambridge; Robert Samuel Wright, Esq., M.A., Oxford; Donald Grant Macleod, Esq., LL.B., Cambridge; William Pharasyn, Esq., B.A., Cambridge; John Hampson Jones, Esq., Oxford; William Alexander George Goodall, Esq., Oxford; Albert Hutton, Esq.; Walter Patrick Joseph Purcell, Esq., Queen's University, Ireland; Frederick Lee, Esq., B.A., Cambridge; Hugh Flamsteed Pigot, Esq.; Sir Charles Lawrence Young, Bart., B.A., Oxford; Owen Roberts, Esq., M.A., Oxford; John Macpherson, Esq., B.A., Oxford; Andrew Simon Lamb, Esq., Edinburgh, Scotch Advocate; Robert William Trouche, Esq.; George Clement Bertram, Esq., B.A., Cambridge; Henry William Verey, Esq., B.A., Cambridge; Charles Herbert Mallock, Esq., B.A., Oxford; and George Cockle, Esq., M.A., Cambridge. **Middle Temple.**—Barristers-at-Law, June 9.—The undermentioned gentlemen, called to the degree of the Utter Bar, by the Hon. Society of the Middle Temple, were this day published in the Middle Temple Hall:—Chaloner William Clute, Esq., certificate of honour awarded by the Council of Legal Education, M.A., Fellow of Magdalen College, Oxford; Reginald Montagu Auber Branson, Esq., certificate of honour awarded by the Council of Legal Education; Thomas Noon Talfourd, Esq.; John Wilson Gray, Esq. (of the Irish Bar), A.B., Trinity College, Dublin; David Lindsay Macatoo, Esq., B.A., Queen's University, Ireland; Frederick Baruch Toogood, Esq., B.A., St. Alban Hall, Oxford; George Edwardes Dering, Esq., B.A., Magdalen College, Oxford; Joseph Vere Woodman, Esq., B.A., London University; Richard Scott Kisbey, Esq.; Horatio Lucas Treney, Esq.; Cecil Augustus Blake, Esq., B.A., Exeter College, Oxford; James Henry Minns, Esq.; William Jackson, Esq.; Charles Jones Nixon, Esq., M.A., Wadham College, Oxford; George Henry Haydon, Esq.; Jean Emile Florens, Esq.; Martin William M'Kellar, Esq., B.A., Corpus Christi College, Cambridge; Charles Martin Gibson, Esq.; William Beaumont Baduall, Esq.; George William Marshall, Esq., LL.M., of Peterhouse, Cambridge; Grove Humphrey Chapman, Esq.; Thomas Lionel Jenkins, Esq.; Hugh Davidson, Esq.; Henry Martin Franz Lumley, Esq., of the University of London; Louis Arthur Goodeve, Esq., B.A., Christ Church, Oxford; William Cockerell, Esq.; Maurice Edmond Piston, Esq.; and George John Currao, Esq. **Lincoln's-inn, June 9.**—The undermentioned gentlemen were this day called to the degree of Barrister-at-Law by the Hon. Society of Lincoln's-inn, viz.:—James Liddell Purves, Esq., Trinity College, Cambridge; Matthew S. Grosvenor Woods, Esq., M.A., Cambridge; Edward Samuel Farrier Moore, Esq.; Andrew Anderson, Esq., B.A., Cambridge; Kenyon Wood Wilkie, Esq., B.A., Oxford; John Matthias Spread, Esq.; Thomas Smyth Abraham, Esq., B.A., Oxford; Archibald Hyndman Stein, Esq.; George Daw, Esq., B.A., Cambridge; John Power Hicks, Esq., M.A., Oxford; Archibald Edward Dobbs, Esq., B.A., Oxford; Edmund Fuller Griffin, Esq., B.A., late Oxford; John Finlaison, Esq., B.A., Cambridge; William Gerald Seymour V. Fitzgerald, Esq.; John Lodwick Warder, B.A., Oxford; Edward Garnet Man, Esq.; William Henry Mitchell, Esq., Downing College, Cambridge; and Henry Francis Mutukisna, Esq., Oriel College, Oxford. **Gray's-inn, June 9.**—At a pension of the society holden this day John Hawtrey Thwaites, Esq., B.A., Trinity College, Dublin; Rowland Wilkinson, Esq.; John Jenkins, Esq., M.A., University of Glasgow; Robert Carr Woods, jun., Esq.; Iludus Thomas Pricnsrd, Esq., and Francisco Evaristo Pereira, Esq., were called to the degree of Barrister-at-Law.

## TO THE EDITOR OF THE TIMES.

Sir,—In your issue of August 1 you publish a minute of the Liberation Society in which is recorded the following :—

“The unprecedented exertions of those engaged in the production of intoxicating liquors, aided by the supporters of national establishments of religion . . . have destroyed the majority in favour of religious equality,” &c.

As one actively engaged in speaking and canvassing at Walsall, South Derby, and Alnwick, and in close contact with the electors of those districts, might I be allowed to question in your columns the accuracy of the impression under which the framers of that minute appear to be labouring ?

I can rely on no better *data* than the result of conversations between myself and the poorer class of electors with whom only my intercourse was held. I have no hesitation in recording that the “parson and beer” had not so much to do with the result as the framers of the minute would appear to presume. At Walsall there was a publichouse said to be the stronghold of Radicalism, and I spent some time in it.

The landlord was a strong supporter of Sir Arthur Hayter, and when I entered nothing but politics were being discussed. One man was hotly abused for being a turncoat and supporting the Conservatives, as he had always voted before with the Radicals. But his retort was, “England for the English.” He was not going to stand 80 Irish members coming over here to be in our Parliament, while we had nothing to do with theirs. One was asked the landlord when his house was going to be shut up without compensation. The answer was, the Liberals would never touch him. The chances of the rival candidates were talked over ; one man stated that Sir A. Hayter had never been in the borough since he was elected, while Mr. Gedge had been with them weekly for 18 months.

I attended a Separatist meeting which was addressed by a local Nonconformist minister. I noticed at all these meetings Home Rule was tabooed. This gentleman confined himself to the Local Veto, and shortly put it thus :—“My intelligent friends and brother workers, the Liberals do not want to stop your beer. We only give each of you the key of the cellar, so that you may drink or not as you like.” This statement was received with loud cheers ; a voice from the crowd cried, “but you give to two who don't want to drink a key each, while you don't give a key to a third who likes his glass of beer.” This remark was hooted down.

It was pitiable to hear the complaints of short work amongst the miners. The Church or beer question did not appear to affect them. Their only anxiety was to keep their families from want, which was staring them in the face. At the last election promises had been made that if Sir A. Hayter were elected they would get better wages, instead of which times were getting harder. They had heard that their mining agent had received about £18 for speaking for the Liberals, and had boasted at a meeting that he would bring his miners “up in a lump to vote for Hayter.” This appears to have offended them, and they voted accordingly.

The Walsall election was not won by a coalition between “Bung and the Church.” It was won because there was a general disgust with the whole Separatist programme—with promises broken ; a general feeling against Home Rule ; a feeling that it was unfair to ruin a poor man's trade and not give him compensation ; a feeling, fostered by the Roman Catholic priesthood ; that it was unjust to ruin voluntary schools ; and last, and most important, Mr. Gedge's careful and judicial candidature. For 18 months before the election he had held conversational ward meetings in which he conversed with the electors, who were all invited, and he thoroughly ventilated the various political questions at issue. The organization at the head office under Mr. Middleton was also superb. A long placard was published by the Separatists on the Friday before the election charging Mr. Gedge with having voted against the good of the people in 18 different Parliamentary divisions. It was most important to have this placard answered before the following Tuesday. I was asked to take it to London to the head office to have all Mr. Gedge's votes looked up, and all the *data* obtained from Hassard, ranging as it did through some years ; this involved immense labour. But, although Mr. Middleton was engaged with many other elections, the machinery of the office was in such good order that by Saturday night a full *procès* of his votes was en route to Walsall, and a placard from his agent on Monday triumphantly refuted the placard upon which the Separatists had relied as their last *coup*. Thus was the election won.

Yours faithfully,

E. GARNET MAN.

QUEEN'S BENCH DIVISION.  
(Before LORD COLERIDGE and a Special Jury.)

MAN V. WARD.

This was an action of libel.

Mr. Crump, Q.C., and Mr. Reginald Brown appeared for the plaintiff; Mr. Lockwood, Q.C., and Mr. Firth were for the defendant.

The plaintiff, a well-known member of the common law Bar, who takes an active part in politics on the Conservative side, is the vice-chairman of a voluntary society for the relief of the poor at Croydon, where he lives, known as the Croydon Resident Unemployed Relief Fund. He brought this action to recover damages for libel from the defendant, the proprietor of the *Croydon Advertiser*, under the following circumstances. Last winter a sum of £300 out of the Mansion-house fund for the relief of great distress then prevalent among the unemployed was sent to the Mayor and vicar of Croydon, £50 of which had been apportioned to the relief fund in which the plaintiff was interested and the same amount to a society at Croydon of a similar character but of longer standing. The society in which the plaintiff was interested would appear to have been somewhat dissatisfied with this arrangement, and at the close of one of its meetings, held in March last, a resolution had been carried that the minutes then passed should be forwarded to the local Press. The plaintiff sent a report of the meeting, including some remarks he had made at it, to the defendant among others, and thinking that it was right to offer some remuneration for its insertion sent a guinea with it. The defendant did not publish the report, but inserted an article in which the plaintiff was spoken of as having been successful in smuggling into some of the local Press "a garbled report of a slanderous speech" which he had made in the previous November, and in which the society was spoken of as the "artful creation of the 'rimrose League.'" There were also the following passages in this article:—

"The minutes are practically devoted to Mr. Garnet Man's defence of himself, with insulting observations respecting several of his superiors in good manners. The report is 'dressed up' from beginning to end, and is a woful exhibition of sham consideration with the poor. There being no more elections imminent, the funds of the Croydon Resident Unemployed Fund have been run out, and it is only in rage that he cannot replenish its coffers with the Lord Mayor's money that Mr. Garnet Man speaks with his customary want of courtesy. Croydon has every reason to be proud of a Mayor who is superior to the blarney even of so experienced a professor as Mr. Garnet Man, and who has wisely kept from a Tory faction what was meant for all the Croydon poor. We observe that several passages reported where Mr. Man's volubility got the better of his reason have been struck out, showing that in his 'sane moments' (vide E. G. M.) he was ashamed of what he said. Mr. Man says that his society has distributed its funds without regard to party or creed. But who will believe anything that he says, after the many times he has been proved unworthy of credence?"

After the present action had been commenced and the plaintiff had declared his willingness to accept an apology, a further article had appeared in the defendant's paper with these words:—

"A few weeks ago he (the plaintiff) insulted us greatly by offering us a guinea as a bribe to insert under the guise of the minutes of a politically benevolent relief fund with which he was connected a garbled report of his own speech. . . . He has been led into an attempt first to hoodwink the Press by a garbled report and then to nobble it by an appeal to law. We have no apologies to make to Mr. Garnet Man. Throughout the two recent elections there was no man who spoke so rashly, so libelously of his neighbours; no man who so embittered the political strife with vulgar personalities. One of his speeches was so bad, so abusive, so ungentlemanly, that the next morning, so anxious was he that a correct report of what he had actually said should not appear, that he went to one of the Croydon newspaper offices before its doors were open for the day."

This second article was used by the learned counsel for the learned plaintiff to show that the defendant had acted maliciously in the matter. The defence was simply that the article complained of was a fair comment on a matter of public interest, no justification being relied upon, and it being fully admitted that the allegations as to the plaintiff's untruthfulness were absolutely withdrawn. The plaintiff was the only witness called in the case, and he was cross-examined at some length to show that he, in November, 1883, made a somewhat violent attack on Mr. Spencer Balfour, the Liberal candidate at Croydon, and upon another occasion had charged Mr. Sydney Buxton with having been mixed up with the bribery which had led to the disfranchisement for a time of Boston.

LORD COLERIDGE, in summing up the case, told the jury that he should hold the occasion of the publication of the matter complained of to have been privileged, and that therefore the only question for them would be whether or not such privilege had been exceeded.

The jury found, on their return into Court after an absence of 25 minutes, a verdict for the plaintiff—damages one farthing.

His LORDSHIP thereupon gave judgment for the plaintiff and a certificate for a special jury, but on the application of the learned counsel for the defendant he gave a certificate depriving the plaintiff of costs, intimating that he took that course, as he could not seriously differ in the matter from the jury, whom he supposed to wish that each party should be left to pay his own costs.

Several of the jurors thereupon assured the learned Judge that he had rightly understood the true purport of their verdict.

The Court then adjourned.

QUEEN'S BENCH DIVISION.

(Before LORD COLERIDGE and a Special Jury.)

MAN Y. WARD.

This was an action of libel.

Mr. Crump, Q.C., and Mr. Reginald Brown appeared for the plaintiff; Mr. Lockwood, Q.C., and Mr. Firth were for the defendant.

The plaintiff, a well-known member of the common law Bar, who takes an active part in politics on the Conservative side, is the vice-chairman of a voluntary society for the relief of the poor at Croydon, where he lives, known as the Croydon Resident Unemployed Relief Fund. He brought this action to recover damages for libel from the defendant, the proprietor of the *Croydon Advertiser*, under the following circumstances. Last winter a sum of £300 out of the Mansion-house fund for the relief of great distress then prevalent among the unemployed was sent to the Mayor and vicar of Croydon, £50 of which had been apportioned to the relief fund in which the plaintiff was interested and the same amount to a society at Croydon of a similar character but of longer standing. The society in which the plaintiff was interested would appear to have been somewhat dissatisfied with this arrangement, and at the close of one of its meetings, held in March last, a resolution had been carried that the minutes then passed should be forwarded to the local Press. The plaintiff sent a report of the meeting, including some remarks he had made at it, to the defendant among others, and thinking that it was right to offer some remuneration for its insertion sent a guinea with it. The defendant did not publish the report, but inserted an article in which the plaintiff was spoken of as having been successful in smuggling into some of the local Press "a garbled report of a slanderous speech" which he had made in the previous November, and in which the society was spoken of as the "artful creation of the Primrose League." There were also the following passages in this article:—

"The minutes are practically devoted to Mr. Garnet Man's defence of himself, with insulting observations respecting several of his superiors in good manners. The report is 'dressed up' from beginning to end, and is a woful exhibition of sham consideration with the poor. There being no more elections imminent, the funds of the Croydon Resident Unemployed Fund have been run out, and it is only in rage that he cannot replenish its coffers with the Lord Mayor's money that Mr. Garnet Man speaks with his customary want of courtesy. Croydon has every reason to be proud of a Mayor who is superior to the blarney even of so experienced a professor as Mr. Garnet Man, and who has wisely kept from a Tory faction what was meant for all the Croydon poor. We observe that several passages reported where Mr. Man's volubility got the better of his reason have been struck out, showing that in his 'surer moments' (vide E. G. M.) he was ashamed of what he said. Mr. Man says that his society has distributed its funds without regard to party or creed. But who will believe anything that he says, after the many times he has been proved unworthy of credence?"

After the present action had been commenced and the plaintiff had declared his willingness to accept an apology, a further article had appeared in the defendant's paper with these words :—

"A few weeks ago he (the plaintiff) insulted us greatly by offering us a guinea as a bribe to insert under the guise of the minutes of a politically benevolent relief fund with which he was connected a garbled report of his own speech. . . . He has been led into an attempt first to hoodwink the Press by a garbled report and then to nobble it by an appeal to law. We have no apologies to make to Mr. Garnet Man. Throughout the two recent elections there was no man who spoke so rashly, so libellously of his neighbours ; no man who so embittered the political strife with vulgar personalities. One of his speeches was so bad, so abusive, so ungentlemanly, that the next morning, so anxious was he that a correct report of what he had actually said should not appear, that he went to one of the Croydon newspaper offices before its doors were open for the day."

This second article was used by the learned counsel for the learned plaintiff to show that the defendant had acted maliciously in the matter. The defence was simply that the article complained of was a fair comment on a matter of public interest, no justification being relied upon, and it being fully admitted that the allegations as to the plaintiff's untruthfulness were absolutely withdrawn. The plaintiff was the only witness called in the case, and he was cross-examined at some length to show that he, in November, 1885, made a somewhat violent attack on Mr. Spencer Balfour, the Liberal candidate at Croydon, and upon another occasion had charged Mr. Sydney Buxton with having been mixed up with the bribery which had led to the disfranchisement for a time of Boston.

LORD COLERIDGE, in summing up the case, told the jury that he should hold the occasion of the publication of the matter complained of to have been privileged, and that therefore the only question for them would be whether or not such privilege had been exceeded.

The jury found, on their return into Court after an absence of 25 minutes, a verdict for the plaintiff—damages one farthing.

His LORDSHIP thereupon gave judgment for the plaintiff and a certificate for a special jury, but on the application of the learned counsel for the defendant he gave a certificate depriving the plaintiff of costs, intimating that he took that course, as he could not seriously differ in the matter from the jury, whom he supposed to wish that each party should be left to pay his own costs.

Several of the jurors thereupon assured the learned Judge that he had rightly understood the true purport of their verdict.

The Court then adjourned.

CROYDON.—Mr. Grantham, the Conservative candidate, addressing a working men's meeting last night, denounced the Liberal party for having boycotted the Royal Commission on Trade. The late Government had while in office been urged to appoint such a Commission to inquire into the severe depression of trade from which Croydon, like most other parts of the country, was suffering; but for fear of some injury to their great cry of free trade the Liberals had refused. The Conservative Government, in their desire for the improvement of trade, appointed the Commission immediately after coming into office. A great deal of credit was being claimed by the Liberals for having passed the Employers' Liability Act, but that Act was the result of a Royal Commission appointed by the Conservative Government, for in 1874 Mr. Disraeli's Government appointed a Commission to inquire into the whole relations of master and servant. The Employers' Liability Act would have been passed by the Conservative Government before they went out of office in 1880 but for the obstruction of Mr. Chamberlain and his friends. Mr. Chamberlain now denied having been guilty of any obstruction, but in Parliament he himself admitted it at the time when he said, "We cannot get anything from the Government except by what is called obstruction." The Conservative party had done far more for the working man than the Liberals. The late Mr. Macdonald, the Radical working men's member, in 1879 said that the working men had got more out of the Conservatives in five years than they could get out of the Liberals in 50 years. The real cause of the depression in trade was that capital had lost confidence, and capital had lost confidence because the flag of England had been trailed in the dust abroad by the Liberal party, who favoured revolutionary and communistic legislation at home. A vote of confidence in Mr. Grantham, proposed by Mr. Garnet Man, was carried with much enthusiasm.

Mr. E. Garnet Man writes from the Bath and County Club, Bath:—"In your obituary of Mr. Ross L. MANGLES, V.C., you stated that he obtained the Victoria Cross for his services as a Volunteer during the Mutiny. As I was in the vicinity at the time he performed the gallant action which won for him the Cross, I beg to supplement your account by stating it in detail. When the troops were sent up to relieve Arrah from Dinapore they had to march along a road with much jungle on each side. They were ambushed by about 15,000 rebels, who formed in a semi-circle and attacked them as they advanced. Our troops—I think their number was about 1,000—replied to the firing, but, unfortunately for them, the old "Brown Bess" ammunition had been put into their reserve pouches instead of the Minie cartridge. The Minie had not long been changed for the older weapon. This mistake was disastrous. When the men found they could not ram the bullets down their rifles some dashed them to the ground, and they all retreated. One hundred of Waller's Sikhs formed the rearguard, and, as they were armed with the old weapon and appropriate cartridges, they gallantly saved the whole body from being massacred. The retreat became a rout, and when they arrived at the Koozie river two-thirds of our men had either been killed or wounded. Mangles carried a wounded soldier down to a boat and placed him in it. Many soldiers had divested themselves of all clothing and dashed into the river to swim across, in which attempt many were drowned. The rebels were close on the bank. Mangles was plunging into the water to swim across too, as the boat was crammed with men, when there was a shout that the painter had not been loosed. Mangles, in face of a heavy fire, dashed ashore, loosed the painter, and helped to tow the boat as he swam to the other side. For this act of heroism he obtained the Cross, which he richly deserved. Nearly 50 years have passed since then, but I heard of it two days afterwards from an eye-witness, and, as far as my memory will allow me, I think I have stated the facts correctly. His gallant action created a great sensation at the time."