to 200 who were not drawn away from schools already in existence, and costing absolutely nothing to the ratepayers. Although this result must be financially disastrous to the ratepayers it should not be disposed to deplore it if it flowed from fair competition. But this is not the case. The Board schools, with the rates to fall back upon, can and do offer education at a lower cost than is possible in the case of the voluntary schools, which are compelled to rely upon fees as an important element in their ways and means. The parents, be it remembered, have been quite willing to pay the amount of the weekly pence demanded by the Board when the Board comes to the market, and promises them the same thing at a cheaper rate, of course they jump at the offer. It is a good thing for the parents, but what about the ratepayers? They are in the position of a belligerent who finds that his own shell guns are turned against himself. The voluntary system is a boon to all the rates, and yet the rate is practically expending the rates to break down. Let this policy be pursued a few years more and the voluntary system will be annihilated, and then the whole cost of national education will fall upon the taxpayers, either in the form of contributions from the rates or from the national treasury. The ratepayers are beginning to recognise this truth, and to take action accordingly. There is nothing in this report, nor in the action of the Board upon which should silence their protests and remonstrances. The Board seems resolved to pursue blindly as ever its characteristic policy of crushing away the voluntary system and throwing the whole cost of national education upon the ratepayers.

September last it was announced that the City Government Board were endeavouring to form a combination of the metropolitan casual wards, with a view to economy and the repression of mendicancy. There were forty casual wards in the metropolis, and the Local Government Board thought that twenty would be sufficient. It was thought that the homeless wanderers who applied for relief in one union might have to walk five miles to get to the next union. But this was thought to be useful kind of "test," and it was argued that there was no hardship in making an able-bodied pauper "walk a distance" in order to get relief. How this economical and repressive measure has been carried we are only partially informed. It appears that on Monday, November 11, the casual ward of the Strand Union, in Cleveland-street, was closed, and applicants for admission were sent on to the workhouse of St. Giles, in Great-street-gardens, Endell-street, a distance of about a mile and a quarter. This arrangement was to last three months, "to see how it would work." It appears that the Strand Union which has been the victim of the economical and repressive system, in paying this way do not exonerate the individual parish or union which has been the scene of the catastrophe, and who is now explaining in prison the offence against a higher law than that which "its embodiment in poor-law regulations; but it cannot sever the individual responsibility of the men who are the law and its agents. The piteous case of Mrs. CHIPGWYN and her children is now fully before the public. We believe that general opinion will not endorse both the verdict of the jury and the sentence pronounced by Mr. Justice QUAIN. But the individual is strictly and rigidly held to be responsible for the consequences of his mistakes or errors of the system. At a quarter to seven "pouring wet" and tempestuous evening in the month of November, ELIZA CHIPGWYN, having slept in her arms, and two little children at her feet, applied for admission to the casual wards of the Strand Union. It seems that while a certain form of ceremony is necessary for the admission of these poor creatures they may be sent away on the verity of anybody who happens to answer the bell. "The system" was allowed to operate, in this case, no doubt, to "see how it would work." The poor woman with her little ones, all shivering and hungry, were compelled to proceed to the workhouse of St. Giles. According to the woman's account, which is sufficiently confirmed, it was "raining very hard," and on her way she sought shelter in various doorways. This weary pilgrimage—the Poor-law "test"—occupied three-quarters of an hour, and it is by no means clear that the infant "in long-clothes" would not have perished from such exposure even if no further hardship had followed.

According to the law laid down by the learned judge who tried the case, if the child sought to be told which caused its death during this pilgrimage to St. Giles, the mother would be guilty of an offence, and would be liable to be officially prosecuted for the death" of the infant. It would seem indeed, that with the faults of the law and the faults of the man, there was enough accomplished to kill any ordinary infant outright. Arrived at the casual wards of St. Giles, the woman was addressed by the superintendent, GEORGE CANNON, in a rude and cruel manner. This individual, it appears, had made himself sent for a constable to take her in charge. The woman sat down with her babe in her arms, two little children crying aloud at the proceeding of their hapless mother being sent to. It was a sight to melt any heart not hardened by a desire to "repress" pauperism. The police behaved nobly throughout, and their report of the proceedings GEORGE CANNON, in the face. The poor woman and her children, wet and weeping, were indeed taken to a low-street police-station, there to meet with kindness which their miserable state so desperately needed, but which was sought in vain at the hands of those coolly institutions mismanaged by CANNON and his subordinates. The police-station back to the workhouse. But the inexorable CANNON stood in the way, and the poor woman was forced to go back to the Cleveland-street Workhouse from whence she had been sent in the first place. Once more the mother, the babe, and the children had resumed their pilgrimage, but this time in a cab, thanks—not to the poor law, but to the police. Three hours had thus elapsed. The relief was now complete. The infant in arms died, "wheezed," grew restless, sickened, and died, expiring on the Sunday from the effects of cold exposure.

The infant which the police had saved from GEORGE CANNON is now undergoing a sentence of twelve months' imprisonment and hard labour. But we would ask—How was it that this being a union official, simply superintending a ward, had to such an extent the power of life and death in his hands? As we look down the long array of evidence in this case we see at once with something unsatisfactory at every stage. GEORGE CANNON does not appear to us like a dark spot in a field of light, but rather as the nucleus of a cloud of evils. If CANNON or anybody else wrote to send the woman and her children to the Strand Workhouse, why did he not write to that workhouse in the first instance? What authority was the woman sent away from the workhouse of St. Giles? CANNON was superintendent of the casual ward, and had no right to interfere when the woman was sent out into the street—not to the casual ward, but to the workhouse. The evidence of the surgeon of the workhouse is "the practice and the law to send paupers brought by a policeman in uniform." The law, but clearly it is not the practice. The medical surgeon of the police sent a certificate recommending that the woman and her children should be at once admitted, but at the Strand Union the medical surgeon of the workhouse approved of having the party sent back to Cleveland-street. At the Cleveland-street there was an order from the assistant relieving officer of the Strand Union that the woman and children should be received into the casual ward of St. Giles. But orders, certificates, law, and all go for naught in a case like this. The desire to "repress" pauperism, and the inherent natural tendency to mould its agents according to its inherent purpose. Putting GEORGE CANNON entirely on one side, we observe much that is foolish and unpleasant in this affair. We seem to see an over from a satisfactory treatment of the poor. If half the casual wards of London are to be suppressed, why did they ever exist? They were instituted under a pressure from without—the force of public opinion and sentiment, outraged by the spectacle of men, women, and children homeless in the streets on a winter's night. The feeling has quieted down, and the administrators of the poor law are beginning to undo that which they seemed to have done. Wrong as was the conduct of GEORGE CANNON, the catastrophe to which we have this inquiry would not have happened but for the "consolidation" of the casual wards, an arrangement which could hardly have been put on its trial at a worse time than at the commencement of winter. It is very desirable to discourage vagrancy, but we must be careful lest in the squeeze which is designed as a "test" we shutout well-deserving poor. We followed, perhaps, by a criminal trial, though it is not often that matters arrive at the latter stage. That so serious an issue should be reached in the present instance scarcely shows that we are improving.

The punishment of the gas stokers has come upon them suddenly. The rant and fire, who simply did as they were told, and quarrelled with their bread and butter for no earthly reason, have paid the penalty of their folly by the loss of permanent employment at wages higher than those of skilled mechanics. Others, who broke their contract under circumstances of greater provocation, have been punished under the Master and Servants Act, and sentenced to short terms of imprisonment. And yesterday five of the ringleaders in the recent strike were placed upon trial for conspiring together to commit, and for actually committing, a multitude of offences, all of which were set out with circumstances which, if the facts alleged by the defence pleaded. We shall not inflict upon our readers an analysis of this very lengthy document, which one of the defendants' counsel said was long enough to reach from the Old Bailey to the Holborn Viaduct. In substance, however, it charged the prisoners with combining together in an unlawful manner for the purpose of inducing or constraining the companies' employés to leave their work without giving notice of their intention, and so, by suddenly suspending the manufacture, to stop the supply of gas, and put the metropolis in darkness. That such was their intention we should have presumed from the mere statement of the acts they avowed, and gloried in for forty-eight hours or so, were not sufficient evidence of what they meant to do. But the question remained whether any of them could be fixed with legal responsibility for the purpose which all entertained. That problem is now solved. As against the five defendants the evidence was conclusive, and it was clear and conclusive. It was shown that after DILLEY had been dismissed for insubordination, his fellow-prisoners, in various ways, employed their influence to prevent the rest of the men from resuming work, and that when the manager promised to reinstate DILLEY "under protest," the men in question were dissatisfied, and was supplemented by one for taking on two men employed by another company, who had just before been dismissed at Fulham. As the manager had no power to do this, he declined to promise what he could not perform. The leaders then said they should wait for orders from their delegates, and that until they had received them they should not go on. The company could not submit to such dictation, and forthwith their men quitted their employment and London was left in semi and in fear of total darkness, in which the dangerous classes might have reaped a plentiful harvest at the expense of the orderly and well-disposed portion of the population. Of the moral result of such evidence there could be no doubt whatever. And though attempts were made to exclude some portions of it upon technical grounds, the material facts were proved to demonstration. A verdict of guilty was returned, and Mr. Justice DILLEY, after commenting in strong terms upon the conduct of the prisoners, sentenced to twelve months' imprisonment with hard labour.

Severe as is this punishment, it is by no means disproportioned to the offence, or to the mischief which would have been done by allowing an important trade to be suspended illegally, illegally combine with absolute or practical impunity. It may be that the stokers as a body scarcely realised the nature of their acts, for that they persuaded themselves that all means were lawful and right which tended to increase the power of their newly-formed trade union, and of their self-constituted leaders. But no such excuse can be urged or accepted on behalf of those whose business it is to see that the law is made known to themselves the instruments of bringing about what might have been a very great calamity. Witness after witness yesterday told the jury that he had no grievance and no complaint on the day he struck work. He was satisfied with his wages, as he had every reason to be so. He was well treated by his employers who seem to have acted with most thoughtful kindness. But "he was told not to go to work or put on his working clothes," . . . and when the others left the works he "did the same." On similar pretexts, and in very similar language, many of those convicted at the police courts have sought to excuse themselves for their misconduct. But if duty, we fear, have been very properly told that they cannot escape responsibility by putting forward a plea upon which a schoolboy detected in wilful disobedience to his teachers would rely in vain. Still it is melancholy to reflect upon the sufferings which these men have caused to themselves and others by their misconduct. Not only have they been sent to prison yesterday must bear the blame of having induced some thousands of their fellows to throw up engagements which might have lasted their lives, and of having thus compelled them to seek other and less liberally remunerated employment, a life beginning of what threatens to be a very bad and long-drawn-out industrial conflict, rather than face the prospect which lay before him. It is to be hoped that none will be equally desperate, but it is certain that many must now be looking back upon the events of the last few weeks with very unenviable feelings. Twelve months' imprisonment is undoubtedly a heavy sentence, but it is not a sentence which should be the punishment of men who have committed, though it may be that the greater criminals are still at large. Indeed, this seems more than likely. An unavailing attempt was made to postpone the trial on the ground that the prisoners had been robbed of funds provided for their defence by those to whom the money was entrusted. A Mr. Wade, a judge chamber, had probably brought them to their present position. The fact is significant, and ought to have its influence in enlightening the working classes as to the true character of those who live by exciting animosity between employer and employed, and who always manage to leave others in the lurch, while they escape with the wages of their work. Some of these enriched themselves with funds provided by their dupes for very different purposes.

The difficulties with which an earnest clergyman of a large parish, anxious for the spiritual and moral welfare of his people, has to contend, are very serious, and in some cases almost insuperable. He has but which array of evil-doers against him. When he interferes with a view to verify a social irregularity, or suppress some flagrant abuse, he has frequently to encounter an unscrupulous opposition, and is subjected to personal insults; and, what is still worse, he is not seldom made the object of false and infamous accusation, to refer to his character, and to deprive him of his religious, moral, and social influence.

Whether the Rev. ALFRED BLOMFIELD, late Fellow of All Souls, and incumbent of St. Matthew's, City-road, and now vicar of Barkine, Essex, was well advised in remonstrating with Mr. and Mrs. BOWLER, of the Queen's Head public-house in that town, in reference to the management of their establishment, may, perhaps, be open to question. It is certain, however, that the warning he gave Mrs. BOWLER was prompted by a right spirit, and that he acted in the interests of his parishioners, who had complained of the way in which the house was conducted; probably, too, the warning was given in a kindly spirit to save the BOWLERS from the public exposure which might be forthcoming over them. Moreover, it is impossible to gainsay the course adopted by Mr. BLOMFIELD, when he alleges that "anything which concerned the morality of his parish concerned him." He acted on what he considered the call of duty. The result was an action for slander brought against him in the Court of Exchequer, which we reported yesterday under the title "BOWLER v. BLOMFIELD."

It is not necessary to enter into the details of the case. Suffice it to say, that ROBERT BOWLER, the husband of Mrs. BOWLER, sought to recover damages from Mr. BLOMFIELD for slander in the sense that he had alleged to him in the course of remonstrating with BOWLER's wife in reference to the management of the Queen's Head. Mr. BLOMFIELD was charged with having said that Mrs. BOWLER "got her living by prostitution;" and, to make matters worse, Mr. BOWLER, in his examination, accused Mr. BLOMFIELD of being drunk when he went to the house to remonstrate with him, and insulted his wife. Other interviews took place, and a correspondence ensued, in which from the very first Mr. BLOMFIELD denied ever having used the words attributed to him. The jury believed Mr. BLOMFIELD and declined to believe the BOWLERS, and gave their verdict for the defendant, with costs, and Mr. Hale bade us address them. This was tantamount to declaring that the BOWLERS had deliberately concocted a false charge, or rather two false charges, against the vicar of Barking, simply because, in obedience to what he considered his duty and on behalf of the well-being of his parishioners, he had remonstrated with the husband and wife of the proprietors of the Queen's Head public-house.

Those who know Mr. BLOMFIELD's antecedents and character as a clergyman of the Church of England would, no doubt, have thought no worse of him even had he sustained an adverse verdict. They would have thought it to be simply a misfortune, if a large section of the public would have been scandalised, and men in a public position, especially as clergymen, would have had the difficulties by which they are surrounded still further increased. There is no class of men so exposed to false charges, frequently of an infamous nature, as clergymen. Designing persons are unscrupulous opposition to well know how their good name is all in all to them, and on this knowledge they often trade; and it not unfrequently happens that victims threatened with these charges compound with their accusers in some way or other rather than be the subjects of a public scandal or run the risk of a verdict at law. False and shameful charges are made, and the clergyman of large parish, but it is a comfort to find that English juries are not so credulous as they were. They have learnt that those who are base enough to make such charges are not deserving of the slightest credit.

THE FUNERAL OF VISCOUNTESS BEACONSFIELD.

Yesterday the funeral of Lady Beaconsfield took place in the family vault in the churchyard of St. Michael, in the park of Hughenden. The funeral was a private one, no one being present except those connected with the estate and village. The church of St. Michael is very old, and, while the interior has scarcely the picturesque beauty which one generally assigns to great antiquity, it is interesting from some sculptural figures of great age, in the chancel, which, it is said, belonging to Mr. Disraeli. It is of quite modern construction, and contained, prior to yesterday, only the coffins of James Disraeli, the late brother of Mr. Disraeli, and of Mrs. Williams, the lady who lived with the Beaconsfields for many Years since. Here, as the hour for the funeral approached, the occupants of many of the cottages upon the estate gathered, in spite of the rain, to see the last of a middle-aged lady who had won their kind to them. At a few minutes past the appointed time the funeral *cortège* was seen coming down from the house. The coffin, borne some low by its handles, the bearers being all labourer—the coffin was followed by Mr. Disraeli, chief mourner; Mr. Montagu Corry, his private secretary; Mr. Philip Rose, solicitor; Mr. Loggen, F.R.C.S., the medical attendant; and Mr. Ralph Earle, the agent. After whom came Messrs. Coates, Cartright, T. Lee, T. Lee, tenants, followed by the servants of the establishment. As the *cortège* entered the church the organ was played softly by Mrs. Blagden, the wife of the vicar of the parish, and the coffin was borne down the coffin, upon being placed in the chancel, was covered with lovely wreaths of flowers, sent by the Baroness Meyer de Rothschild, Mrs. Rose, Mrs. Leggat, Mrs. Gordon, Mrs. Blagden, and others. The service was then commenced by the Rev. T. H. Blagden, and after its completion the coffin was lowered to its place in the vault, where it remained literally covered with the votive flowers laid upon it.

RUMOURED STRIKE OF RAILWAY SERVANTS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE STANDARD.

SIR,—You may not be aware that the railway service of this country comprises nearly 300,000 men, and, as your correspondent, Mr. Phillips, only lays claim to a tithe of them as members of the very powerful organisation he holds out as a terror to the public.

The Amalgamated Society knows as well as we do that a strike amongst railway men is next to impossible, and that some but "outsiders" (by which I mean those who never joined the society, and always scamp in their lives) dare mention such a subject entirely in our offices, yards, or workshops.

Will you kindly set us right again in the eyes of the public, and remove the impression which Mr. Phillips sought by inserting this disclaimer of any connection or sympathy with either Mr. Edwin Phillips or his very powerful organisation, one of the chief objects of which, he has told the people of the colonies, is to "repress pauperism" (a word, by the way, which we have never heard in our lives) dare mention such a subject entirely in our offices, yards, or workshops.

Will you kindly set us right again in the eyes of the public, and remove the impression which Mr. Phillips sought by inserting this disclaimer of any connection or sympathy with either Mr. Edwin Phillips or his very powerful organisation, one of the chief objects of which, he has told the people of the colonies, is to "repress pauperism" (a word, by the way, which we have never heard in our lives) dare mention such a subject entirely in our offices, yards, or workshops.

I write in the name of a number of railway *employés*, who claim to represent the service far better than Mr. Phillips.

—I am, Sir, your obedient,

ONE OF THE NINE-TENTHS.

THE INCOME TAX.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE STANDARD.

SIR,—I was glad to see that you had a leader on the income-tax question yesterday. It is a shame that a tax against Schedule D being singled out for repetition, to the exclusion of the others; and that you also held out hopes that the Chancellor would not do this. In this you are right. There is but little chance of its being given up; and I do not think it ought to be, for there are thousands of incomes, some of them very large, which escape the abstraction of indirect taxes can in no other way be brought to contribute to the expenses of the state. The only grievance is the mode of collection. Let it be a real tax, and not one that we have no protection whatever against.

Now, Sir, I maintain that the government should always accept the return made by the person signing the declaration, unless there is strong reason to believe it false; and that in the event of the assessor altering the return and failing to substantiate it on appeal, the person aggrieved should be at liberty to bring an action against him for damages, as what would be in more common parlance a proceeding, that the magistrates providing at appeal should be empowered to grant damages then and there for trouble and loss of time and expense, and that the assessor should pay—all the better if such damages be deducted from his salary, for we must never forget that every one of these abstractions has a personal interest in making the revenue higher. Anything short of this will be useless.—Your obedient servant,

M.

Dec. 14.

THE ENDOWED SCHOOL COMMISSIONERS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE STANDARD.

SIR,—Lady Dacre's School at Westminster, to which, as appears by the Westminster Gazette, a report of to-day, alderman Sir Benjamin Phillips has, with so much consideration, presented one of the orphan girls. It seems that Hospital founders, Dean, who destroyed himself, in which Hospital Rosalind, now awaiting the decision of parliament as to its fate. Such decision will depend, it is said, on the report of the Endowed School Commissioner, sine; and if their scheme is not stopped by parliament, not only will no more poor little innocent children be saved from such a fate, but may be worse, by the good founder's bounty, but this little child will herself be soon turned into the street.

CIVIS.

Dec. 16.

The Archbishop of Canterbury and Mrs. Tait have been on a visit to the Marquis of Salisbury at Hatfield, and return this day to Addington Park, Croydon, where they propose to remain till the meeting of parliament.

FRANCE.

(FROM OUR OWN CORRESPONDENT.)

PARIS, DEC. 18, EVENING.

M. Dufaure's "cruel irony" and the "reconstituted majority" of 113 will, we have quite cast into the shade by the new and unexpected turn given to events by M. Thiers' speech to the Commission of Thirty. This speech, as I have endeavoured to show, I fully anticipated the effect of the vote which followed the debate of Saturday and brings us back to the very point from which we set out. This view of the situation appears so obvious that it is astonishing to find a writer like M. John Lemoinne giving it an entirely opposite interpretation to the facts. By what mental process his conclusions have acquired this roseate tinge I do not pretend to determine. The fact is, however, that, whereas in his former articles he has constantly laid the greatest stress upon the spirit of hostility which he considered to characterise the attitude of the majority towards the President, he now describes the two as literally hand and glove together. In the Journal des Débats, M. Lemoinne writes in the *Débats* of this morning, that the Commission of Thirty was chosen in a hostile spirit towards the Republic and its President. Between things are entirely changed; the Conservative parties have joined hands on the ground of the Conservative Republic, and the new majority has no other object in view than to cooperate with the President in the work of organisation on the lines laid down in the Message. It may be so; but I frankly confess that this pleasant view of things is not borne out by the opinions one generally hears expressed in private conversations by members of the majority. The predominant feeling in this party is one of perplexity and misgiving as to the possibility of remaining for long even on nodding terms with a Government that blows hot one day and cold the next. He has been called a woman by her word, and an eel by its tail, holds nothing," says an unpalatable Spanish proverb; and if, in the present instance, for the words "a woman" we substitute "M. Thiers' Government," we shall have the exact sentiment of a majority so curacy the present state of feeling in the majority of the Assembly. Nay, the Radicals themselves, who are naturally looking on politics from a different point of Communism cannot but feel that, while these shifting tactics prevail at head-quarters, the tables may very possibly be turned upon themselves another day. This feeling is manifest in a smart article in the *Rappel* of this day, in which the Radical journal alternately compares the President to Vishnu, the principle of good, and to Siva, the principle of evil. When Siva carries the day, darkness descends on the country; when Vishnu is victorious, we are in a blaze of light.

"One gets used in time (M. Lockroy continues) to this Government, that makes day follow night, and night follow day! But, upon the strength of the Message, we are in a permanent, and another day in the gloom of Erebus. All that I ask of the Assembly now is, to regulate the pleasure of Government by the Constitutional statutes, which the clauses of the moon are regulated. Thus, on Mondays, Tuesdays, and Wednesdays, M. Thiers may contradict M. Dufaure, and on Tuesdays, Thursdays, and Saturdays M. Dufaure may contradict M. Thiers, Sunday being reserved for the Message, which, by the way, it is said, was not spoke, and spoke well—spoke as we hoped he would speak. He refused to yield an inch of his Message or a grace of his eloquence to the Commission of Thirty, which, by the way, He is a clever god, is Vishnu, and very laudatory to boot. Let the ocean be upheaved in its lowest depths let the earth tremble, let the sun be darkened, let the moon, stars, and planet, come tumbling down heter-skelter like the drops in a shower—nothing counts him, nothing makes him wince, nothing can make him lose his balance. He is the lotus flower in the future Constitution. He gave us his Message over again. His speech contains three things—the Conservative Republic, the Commission of Thirty, the Decisiveness of the Monarchy, and the promise of a future dissolution. This last part is half veiled, and appears in a vague, mysterious, and, I should add, obscure phrase, however, for wherever will take the trouble to reflect."

The *République Française* has very little doubt that the Commission of Thirty will be ready to fall to pieces. M. Thiers' speech, it says, has damped the joy of the Bonapartists and Royalists of Paris and Versailles.

The *Ordre*, which but a day or two ago was addressing congratulations to M. Dufaure, now speaks of the "reopening of the crisis."

The *Liberté*, just to hand, admits that the speech in committee has had the disastrous consequence of throwing into the shade the importance of the "vote of the 14th," and the effect produced by the words of M. Dufaure. It adds, however, that M. Thiers, though compelled by his position to play at see-saw, "borrowing from the Left his force of initiative, from the Right his force of resistance"—how prettily the thing is put!—will be wise in time, and avoid the danger of undoing the work of the recent vote, by which a strong, and, the *Liberté* thinks, a durable, line of conduct was marked out for the Left Centre, and the Radical elements. I give this opinion for what it may be worth. It might, perhaps, be more appropriately named a devout wish.

The Assembly has, of course, little to offer to interest. At yesterday's sitting the discussion of the Financial Budget was brought to a close, the concluding chapters being voted at a gallop—all amendments being summarily rejected.

A letter from Strasburg, in the *République Française*, draws attention to a grievance which appears to weigh heavily upon the manufacturing interests of the detached provinces. It seems that there is no law in Germany establishing a right over property in industrial designs, the natural consequence of which is that the patterns of manufactures which have in many cases cost considerable sums to the Alsatian manufacturer are pilfered without remorse in all parts of the country. I am not prepared to say how far any change in the existing state of things may be desirable; but it is, at least, a good symptom to find the French press occupying itself with practical questions affecting the general welfare of the country, and not, as it was wont to do, indulging in "patriotic exploits," must be to facilitate the "Germanisation" of the lost provinces. Manufacturers have, in many instances, sold their real property, and transported their machinery, and the skilled hands upon French soil, amid the lamentations of the Parisian press; and the void thus created at home is, of course, filled up by enterprising Germans, generally Prussians. Another example of the way in which the Germans are taking the leadership of the Alsatian question met my eyes a few days ago. The German Government, for reasons into the value of which it is useless to enter here, is disposed to favour the establishment of a permanent French theatre in Strasbourg. Overtures were made in this sense to a well-known actor, a native of the province, with the offer of a subsidy if he would undertake to form a company. The actor at first stands aloof, "I want no German money, I want gold," and came to Paris, where he is received with open arms, as a man who has conferred a signal service upon his country! No one will deny that the motives which dictated the act are worthy of respect; but the result of the transaction will be thereby to France and to Alsatia is fairly open to question. Is the maintenance of the French language and of French traditions a thing of no moment in Strasbourg? And would not the existence of a French theatre have contributed to this result, and have afforded, besides, an opportunity for political allusions and sarcasms half-expressed, but completely in their sense by the hand of a sympathetic audience? And, if the conqueror is good-natured enough to contribute to this result out of his superabundance of what, after all, may quite as justly be called "French" money, the question might it be, "patriotic," as well as profitable, to look a humour him? I may add, that the "Alsatian dodge" has been practised with such effect and on such a vast scale by adventurers and impostors of all kinds, Indulgence, Jesuits, Dispensations and Difficulties, that many of the sincere and charitable persons, who at first threw themselves into the movement out of sheer goodness of heart, are now fully convinced that they made a sad mistake, and are ready to cry out, "Let the dead bury the dead! France shows no symptoms of abating, and there is every reason to fear that, in addition to the damage to house property caused by the general floods, the consequences will be serious as regards next year's harvest. In Paris, the Seine is higher than any living being can remember it to have been; but, as most things in Paris are out of the ordinary run, it serves as a spectacle, and people go to Bercy and to the confluent of the Marne to look at the river overflowing its banks, just as they would go to see a race or an execution.

Apropos of an execution, a new guillotine was "inaugurated this morning" on the person of a young reprobate, who had stabbed his gaoler on the way out the last to leave Paris for the hulks. The gaoler died of his wounds, and his murderer, who rejoiced in the singularly inappropriate name of Jolly, was sentenced to death, and exploited his crime this morning. The new guillotine is lower, and the grooves, and the process is much expedited by the shackled wretch not having to clamber up a flight of steps. There were barely 100 persons present to witness this ghastly sight, and most of them were roughs.

AMERICA.

(FROM OUR OWN CORRESPONDENT.)

NEW YORK, DEC. 6.

The obsequies of the late Horace Greeley, which were observed on the 4th instant, were of the imposing character. There was no pomp of military display, no drooping banners, no wailing music in the streets, no boom of funeral guns upon the air. The effect was seen in the vast multitude of people who thronged the funeral rites, and in the general aspect of grief that pervaded the town. At the church where the religious exercises were held the demand for places was twenty times greater than could be met by the capacity of the building. The aisles, the space around the pulpit and reading desk, the pew that Mr. Greeley had occupied, were all profusely decorated with flowers. The wreaths, crowns, crosses, and other floral emblems that were sent by societies and official personages and private individuals to rest upon the coffin were enough to fill the dwelling from which the body was borne to the church. It had been judged necessary to place two mounted policemen at the door of the police force to prevent an unseemly rush at the doors, and the prudence of this precaution was shown in the immense throng that filled the church, the aisles, and the fact that large sums—in some instances as much as five dollars—in money were offered for a ticket. Many persons came from distant states to follow the coffin to the grave. The services that were performed in the church were not of a kind to detract from the interest they wanting to them that impressive solemnity that belongs to the magnificent office for the burial of the dead in the Book of Common Prayer. But the solemnity was felt in the hearts of the hearers, and good taste as well as deep feeling characterised the address of the Rev. Dr. Chapin, the pastor, a Universalist, and the Rev. Henry Ward Beecher, Congregational Presbyterian, while the solo of Miss Cary, "I know that my Redeemer liveth," was sung with a sweetness of tone and expression was very simply ordered. It consisted only of battalions of police and the fire brigade, a few societies, and the funeral *cortège*. The hearse had four horses, and the pall-bearers were no excessive scarves or other trappings of conventional mourning. About one hundred carriages followed in line, two and two; but the houses for miles along the route were festooned with crape, with flags at half-mast, and the sidewalks were lined by thousands of people were at the windows and on the house-tops, and massed on the side-walks. It is said that so great a popular turn-out has not been witnessed in New York since the body of Abraham Lincoln was borne through the streets on its way from Washington, where he was murdered, to Springfield, where he was buried. The funeral procession was remarkable for the absence of any political feature. The President and Vice President of the United States, the Vice President elect, the Chief Justice, the Secretary of War, the United States Minister to France, the Governor and Governor elect of New Jersey, the Governor of Massachusetts, Senators Schurz, Trumbull, and Tipton; the mayors of many cities and towns, and a large number of men distinguished in private life, testified by their presence for the dead by their presence. And so, upon a day memorable in the annals of the year, all that world mortal of Horace Greeley was carried to Greenwood Cemetery. That President Grant should have come from Washington to attend the funeral of his rival competitor for the highest office in the Government, will tell to be a very graceful and becoming thing, and the effect of it was enhanced by his returning immediately after the burial, though a formal reception, at which he was expected to preside, was to take place in the evening at the Union League Club House, to his political and personal friend, Mr. Washburne, our Minister at the French Republic.

The Congress of the United States of Congress has not been marked by any important event. The annual Message of the President was submitted to both Houses on the 2d instant, and its leading features have already been sketched in the cable dispatches. Its leading sections are, perhaps, as noteworthy as its contents. There is not a word said, for instance, in recommendation of a general amnesty, and it is although the first Congress of the Rebellion States of San Domingo. But the relinquishment of this latter dearly-cherished measure, if, indeed, the President has wholly given it up, is accompanied by the adoption of schemes not less wild and foreign to the wishes of the American people, as understood by President Grant's predecessor, Andrew Johnson. He favours the project of making postal telegraphy a matter of public administration, at an outlay of from twelve to twenty millions of dollars, and an increase of office-holders by some thousands of Government employés, who have under his patronage the old repudiated Whig policy of internal improvements by the Federal Government on a scale that Henry Clay never dreamt of in urging the construction of "a continuous railway from the Canadian frontier, through the Gulf of Mexico." With this view he commends the building of a ship canal around Niagara Falls, involving an expense of from fifteen to twenty millions, and the enlargement of the Erie canals to connect the Mississippi Valley with the waters of the Atlantic, which will cost fifty millions more. One of these canals, already begun, and worked for two hundred miles, is the James River Canal, which, if it be carried out, as understood by President Grant's predecessor, will complete of which, by appropriations from Congress, Governor Walker, in his message just laid before the Legislature of Virginia, emphatically disapproves. The Mississippi Valley Canal, he thinks "an expenditure of five millions per annum would be profitably expended (*sic*), it it would restore to us our proportion of the carrying trade of the world." The domesticating effect on the Indian tribes would be worth many millions of dollars in subsidies within the next five years could hardly be conjectured, nor would the moral injury of teaching the people to rely upon Government aid and special legislation in their behalf be worth a moment's thought. Furthermore, the President advises Congress to make appropriations in aid of the great Pennsylvania Central Railroad, which, in Philadelphia in 1876, a matter with which Congress has no more to do than with the rebuilding of Boston or the future improvement of the New York Central Park.

In the House of Representatives on the first day of the session General N. P. Banks, of Massachusetts, asked to be excused from continuing to serve as chairman of the committee on foreign relations, a position for which he now thought himself unfitted, he was so far from sharing in sympathy with the Administration, but the House refused to accept his resignation, and this was thought to indicate a return of good feeling between parties. The subsequent action of the Senate in the rearrangement of its committees, by which Messrs. Trumbull and Schurz were displaced from the chairmanships they had respectively filled, shows that party animosity is as rife as ever. The Senate, let one or more of its members be excluded ceding ten years. Special space will be set apart for such a representation. It is resolved that the works of Messrs. Ward, Lock, and Tyler, be placed in the Hall.

NEW YORK EXHIBITION OF SKETCHES OF ALL NATIONS.—Arrangements have been made to hold an International Exhibition of Sketches of all Nations, to commence in New York, on the 1st of February next year, under the control of the council of the National Academy, and it is understood that the principal artists of the various countries of the world have agreed to the proposals made at the request of numerous artists in England, and are prepared to contribute to the exhibition, which will consist of coloured drawings of sketches in black and white, to be exhibited simultaneously with their own works, the council will deal the proceeds of the Exhibition to the benefit of British foreign exhibitors for that purpose some of the best rooms in the new National Academy. The council have undertaken the charge of all the arrangements, and the transaction of any business connected with them. No pictures can be received in London for transmission to New York after the 1st instant.

ROYAL COLLEGE OF SURGEONS OF ENGLAND.—The following members were elected fellows of the college at a meeting of the council on the 12th inst., viz., Messrs. Frederick Palmer, L.S.A., of Great Yarmouth, diploma of membership dated February, 1837, and Charles Evans, L.S.A., of Bakewell, Derbyshire, August, 1839. A special meeting of the council will be held on the 26 proximo for the election of a member of the court of examiners in the vacancy occasioned by the resignation of Mr. John Adams, consulting surgeon to the London Hospital.

CHRISTMAS APPEALS.

THE BLIND POOR OF LONDON.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE STANDARD.

SIR,—Will you permit me through your column to draw your attention to a form of charity which appears to be specially suited to this season of the year, and free from all possible objection? The Indigent Blind Visiting Society asks for charity years, make a special appeal at Christmas to enable them to give the most destitute and deserving of the blind of London a small gift of money, cash for the purchase of food, fuel, or other necessaries, followed by reading and music. Last Christmas the committee received sufficient contributions to enable them to distribute 1,100, among 630 blind paupers, to give each a ticket of coal per month for the winter months to spend 500, and to give substantial relief to 170 blind people who have to about 700 and their guides. The money collected is distributed by the ordinary visitors of the society, so that no expense is incurred in the distribution, and the charity that is subscribed goes direct to those for whom it is intended. The visitors (who are generally themselves blind) are an intimate knowledge of the individuals, and as the Indigent Blind Visiting Society is in close connection with that for the Organisation of Charity it is scarcely possible that any fraud can be practised upon the relief. The committee depend entirely upon special contributions to enable them to supply a Christmas dinner and cake for the recipients of their bounty. The Christmas relief they know to be deserving; and the present high price of the necessaries of life makes assistance this year more essential than ever.

Contributions will be thankfully received by the secretary, Mr. W. Gibson, 17, Bedford-square, W.C., or by Messrs. Williams, Deacon, and Co., Birchin-lane, E.C.

Warm clothing is much needed, and will be judiciously distributed by Mr. Colmer, if sent to the office of the Society.

T. B. ARMITAGE, M.D.

33, Cambridge-square, Hyde Park.

POOR GENTLEWOMEN.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE STANDARD.

SIR,—Allow me to inform your readers that we are distributing their Christmas gifts to "the poor," may I ask for a small space in your widely-read columns on behalf of poor gentlewomen—not the poor of the East, but those of ancient gentilitude is but little known. The privation and suffering they endure from want of food, want of clothing, and, in the cold season, want of fire, is terrible, yet with them to be classed among "the poor" is not to receive the sympathy and help of those in better circumstances.

A great number of them are the widows of the Gentlewomen's Self-Help Institute, 15, Baker-street, Portman-square—a society established for the benefit of necessitous gentlewomen—and the Institute, of which we are the distributing cases of distress are constantly presenting themselves. At the present time there are between three and four hundred members, all of them born in good circumstances, but reduced by various causes to poverty, and in many instances to great distress. The Institute enables them to sell their work, or any other production, to provide them with employment in needlework, &c.; to give them instruction in different branches, and to procure them situations as governesses, companions, &c. Money grants are never made. What these ladies receive—and receive gladly—are gifts in kind, and they are very, very, very poor.

I ask your readers, then, to aid these gentlewomen in their necessity, and to assist them in their praiseworthy struggle for independence. They will be remembered, we trust, by purchasing their work or any other production, always on sale at the Institute; by giving orders for needlework, &c., which will be executed with the utmost neatness; and by sending a donation or subscription towards the support of the society, to defray some rent, salaries for superintendents and assistants, and for instruction. The Upper House, occupied during the present year for removal. The smallest sum will be thankfully received by the secretary, Miss E. Mudge, Esq., M.P., 15, Wood-street, Cheapside, E.C., or by yours obediently,

MARY C. LUPTON, Hon. Secretary.

2, Chesterfield-street, Mayfair.

HELP FOR THE LOST.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE STANDARD.

SIR,—I venture a second Christmas appeal to the readers of the *Standard* on behalf of the East Penitentiary, which will also need assistance at the end of the year. The Institution owe debt considerably this year, and 3000*l.* would now set us free. Will not some of the munificent benefactors of some widely-known charities, which, no doubt, they are deserving of support, and extend their charity to us? Donations will be thankfully received by the Rev. F. W. Murray, Hon. Secretary, 1, Pembroke-square, Kensington; the Rev. H. B. Bowlby, Dartford Vicarage, Kent, sec.; James Smith, Esq., London and County Bank, Dartford; or by—Yours very obediently, Lady Superior, S. Mary's, Stone

---

ORPHAN AND DESTITUTE CHILDREN.

TO THE EDITO