

directed against a still more cruel and formidable despotism.—The motion that the Speaker leave the chair was then put, but opposed by Mr Disraeli, who offered many reasons for delaying even the first stage of a resolution tending to increase the income tax. The question was too vast to be embarked upon at midnight. The motion was, however, agreed to, after an appeal from Mr Gladstone, and the house went into Committee of Ways and Means.—The Chancellor of the Exchequer proposed the following resolution:—"That it is the opinion of this committee that, towards raising the supply granted to her Majesty, there shall be charged and raised for the year commencing on the 6th day of April, 1854, for and in respect of all property, profits, and gains chargeable in and for the said year with the rates and duties granted by the act 16 and 17 Vic., c. 34, additional rates and duties, amounting to one moiety of the whole of the duties which by virtue of the said act shall be charged and assessed, or shall become payable under any contract of composition, or otherwise, in respect of such property, profits, and gains respectively, for the said year; and that the whole amount of the said additional duties shall be collected and paid with, and over and above, the first moiety of the duties assessed or charged by virtue of the said act for the year aforesaid."—The resolution having been read, the chairman was directed to report progress.—Leave was given for the committee to sit again on Friday.

The Friendly Societies (Salaries and Expenses) bill was passed through committee.

The Marine Mutiny bill, as amended, was considered, and ordered to be read a third time next day.

The Mutiny bill was read a third time and passed.

The Exchequer Bills (£1,750,000) bill went through committee.

Mr FREWEN obtained leave to bring in a bill to amend the law for uniting parishes into districts, and the appointment of district surveyors of highways over the parishes so united.—Adj.

### TUESDAY.

Mr CHAMBERS gave notice that, on the 28th, he should nominate the select committee on convents.

In reply to Mr Adderley, Lord PALMERSTON said he could not at present state when a bill would be brought in on the subject of juvenile reformatories. He had given directions to obtain information, and believed he should be enabled to assist in increasing the number of such establishments, as far as the government could co-operate with the voluntary efforts made for reformation of juvenile criminals.

A short discussion arose on a motion by Mr HEXWOOD, for a copy of the alteration proposed by the royal commissioners for the revision of the liturgy in 1689, intended to be submitted to convocation, and subsequently considered in parliament, and the original of which passed eventually into the hands of the Archbishop of Canterbury.—The motion was objected to by Mr GLADSTONE, on the ground of its compulsory nature.—The house divided.—For the motion, 132; against it, 83; majority for it, 49.

Mr PELLATT moved for leave to bring in a bill for the substitution of declarations for oaths, and went into the question at some length, contending that the present system tended to the commission of perjury.—Lord PALMERSTON did not oppose the introduction of the bill, and admitted that many cases existed in which affirmations might be advantageously substituted for oaths, more especially as to the discharge of municipal functions. In matters of a more solemn nature, he did not think oaths could be dispensed with, and he did not agree with the conclusions of Mr Pellatt. A measure was before the House of Lords for making an alteration in the law, and he thought it would be better to wait and see what that measure was before introducing a new bill. He thought that experience testified to the effect really produced by the imposition of oaths; but in cases where conscientious scruples were entertained, some power should be vested somewhere of deciding where and under what circumstances an oath should be dispensed with.—Mr HUME briefly supported the motion.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL, after referring to the bill introduced in the other house on the subject of oaths, pointed out the evils which he considered would result from their substitution of declarations for oaths, and the cases in which it might be left to the judge to decide whether those who conscientiously objected should not be permitted to make an affirmation.—The house divided on the question of bringing in the bill.—For the motion, 109; against it, 108; majority for the bill, 1.

Mr WHITESIDE moved for leave to bring in a bill to assimilate the law and practice existing in cases of high treason in Ireland to that of England.—After a few words from Lord PALMERSTON, leave was given to bring in the bill.

Mr WHITESIDE also moved for leave to introduce a bill for securing to persons under religious vows the free exercise of their rights in the disposal of their property. The measure was intended chiefly to apply to nuns. He detailed several cases in which influences of a religious kind were brought to bear on persons making a disposition of their property. The object of the measure was to give a free will to those inmates of conventual establishments who under the present system were deprived of it. As from the nature of such establishments there was the utmost difficulty at getting at evidence, the proper remedy was that every deed, will, or conveyance executed within the walls of a convent, shall be deemed to be executed under coercion, unless the contrary be proved to the satisfaction of the tribunal who shall be called upon to decide upon the validity of such deeds and conveyance.—Mr MOORE opposed the motion, on the ground that it intended to place nuns in the position of married women. It also would be found nugatory.—Mr BOWYER urged that sufficient security was provided by the law as it now stood. He pointed out the defects of the bill, and moved a negative to its introduction.—Mr J. O'CONNELL regretted the introduction of the bill, as calculated to produce and keep up religious differences. No ground had been shown for its being brought in.—Mr MALINS supported the motion. The burden of proof of validity was very properly thrown on the persons who were to be benefited by the execution of any deed in any convent.—Mr LUCAS contended that the cases adduced to prove the necessity of the bill proved the direct contrary. A committee had been appointed to inquire into the convent system, and the proper course was to wait until something was done by that committee.—Lord PALMERSTON admitted the force of the latter project, and thought it would be better to wait until a report was made by the committee and laid before the house. He, however, did not object to the principle of the bill; but, if brought in, he would advise that it be postponed until the committee had suggested such alterations as might be deemed necessary. He thought it very desirable that such institutions should be exempt from every suspicion which might be attached to them.—Mr WHITESIDE would assent to the proposition.—The ATTORNEY-GENERAL expressed his doubts whether the bill would have the effect contemplated by the mover.—After some remarks from Mr NAPIER in favour of the bill, the house divided—For bringing in the bill 68; against it 40; majority 38.—Leave was then given to bring in the bill.

The Counties Court Extension Act was read a second time; and the Friendly Societies' bill was reported and read.

The Marine Mutiny bill was read a third time and passed.—Adjourned.

### WEDNESDAY.

On the motion for the second reading of the Payment of Wages bill, Mr HUME said there was no necessity for the bill, and he should resist the motion for the second reading.—Mr CRAUFORD moved as an amendment—"That before any further legislation on the subject of the payment of wages be sanctioned, a select committee be appointed to inquire into the operation of the laws affecting the relations of masters and workmen, and to report whether any amendment may be requisite."—Mr L. HEXWOOD seconded the amendment.—Mr DRUMMOND said this bill had nothing to do with determining the rate of wages, and he should give it his decided opposition.—Sir J. WALMSLEY believed that great abuse existed, and hoped the house would interfere and remove the injustice.—Mr BOOKER, being a large employer of labourers, believed that further legislation was necessary on this subject.—Mr BRUCE supported the bill in the hope that it would allay some of the angry feelings that unhappily prevailed at this moment amongst the working classes.—Mr BRIGHI was satisfied it would increase rather than diminish the ill-feeling that prevailed in the manufacturing districts.—Mr FOSTER, who had charge of the bill, conjured the house to pass it.—Lord STANLEY objected to the bill.—Mr MOFFATT opposed the bill.—Sir G. GREY said it appeared to him that parliament having sanctioned the principle of the Truck Act, the house ought to have no difficulty in adopting a bill for its amendment, so as to render it efficient and complete. There was no doubt that the existing law was evaded by the collusive payment of wages; and as the first clause of this bill would remedy that defect, he was prepared so far to support the bill. He was, however, decidedly opposed to the remaining provisions of the bill; and if they were to affirm the whole of the bill before they had an inquiry, he must oppose it. The house then divided, when there appeared—For the second reading, 166; against it, 56; majority, 110. The amendment was accordingly negatived, and the second reading of the bill having been agreed to, it was ordered to be referred to a select committee.

The Friendly Societies bill passed through committee *pro forma*, and was ordered to be recommitted that day fortnight.

The Exchequer-bills (£1,750,000) bill was read a third time and passed.—Adj.

### ATTENDANCE AND VOTES OF THE MEMBERS FOR NORTHUMBBERLAND AND DURHAM.

(From a Register kept by the National Parliamentary and Electoral Reform Association, 2, Duke St., Adelphi, London.)

NO. OF PAPER.	NO.	MEMBER.	NO.	MEMBER.
16	1	Mr. J. P. B. Blackett	24	Mr. F. A. Agnew
17	2	Mr. T. F. H. Headlam	25	Mr. W. A. Wood
18	3	Mr. W. D. Harcourt	26	Mr. W. G. Riddell
19	4	Mr. W. A. H. Wood	27	Mr. W. G. Riddell
20	5	Mr. W. A. H. Wood	28	Mr. W. G. Riddell
21	6	Mr. W. A. H. Wood	29	Mr. W. G. Riddell
22	7	Mr. W. A. H. Wood	30	Mr. W. G. Riddell
23	8	Mr. W. A. H. Wood	31	Mr. W. G. Riddell
24	9	Mr. W. A. H. Wood	32	Mr. W. G. Riddell
25	10	Mr. W. A. H. Wood	33	Mr. W. G. Riddell

- 16. Proceeding with Dublin and Mullingar Road Ayes, 25; noes, 126.
- 17. Proceeding with Dublin, Clontarf, &c., Roads Bill. Ayes, 136; noes, 15.
- 18. Proceeding with Succession to Real Estate Bill. Ayes, 82; noes, 203.
- 19. Repealing Ministers' Money (Ireland), and providing a substitute from Ecclesiastical Commissioners. Ayes, 88; noes, 103.
- 20. Leave for a Bill to Amend Laws relating to Ministers' Money and Church Temporalities (Ireland). Ayes, 136; noes, 93.
- 21. Proceeding with Wandle Sewerage and Water Bill. Ayes, 114; noes, 143.
- 22. A Copy of the Alterations in the Prayer Book proposed by Commissioners in 1689. Ayes, 132; noes, 83.
- 23. Leave for a Bill for substituting Declarations for Oaths. Ayes, 109; noes, 108.
- 24. Leave for a Bill to enable Nuns, &c. to dispose of Property by Will. Ayes, 68; noes, 40.

### POLICE INTELLIGENCE.

#### NEWCASTLE.—FRIDAY, March 10.—Before C. E. Ellison, Esq., the Mayor, and Capt. West, R.F. O.—

William Simpson and Robert Harris were charged with uttering a counterfeit half-sovereign at a public-house, No. 21, Clayton-street. Mr JOEL appeared for Harris. It appeared from the evidence that the prisoner Simpson, last night, paid the counterfeit half-sovereign to

the landlady for a glass of ale, and received the change; and that during the transaction the prisoner Harris, alleged to be a companion of Simpson's, came in and inquired if a certain person was there—his real object, it was suspected, being to draw the landlady's attention from the coin she had then received. Detective Elliott stated that there had been several cases of a similar kind, and the police required a remand to give time for further inquiries. Simpson was remanded till Wednesday; but the evidence against Harris being slight, it was stated that he would be liberated on entering into recognizances to answer any charge that might afterwards be made against him.—Joseph Henderson was charged with having, last night, stolen a piece of beef from the shop of Mr Robert Scott, butcher, St. Peter's. It appeared that while the prosecutor was absent, the prisoner was observed by a passer-by to take the beef from the shop and walk off. The witness gave the alarm, and the prisoner was soon afterwards taken with the beef in his possession, wrapped in a handkerchief. He was committed for one month.—John Richardson *alias* Whisky Jack, was charged with having an illicit still in his possession. Mr STOKER, solicitor, attended on the part of the crown, and called Mr Howse, who proved seizing a still, complete, in Spring-street, also a quantity of sugar, wash, spirits, and other articles for carrying on illicit distillation. E. Buchlow corroborated the aforesaid evidence, and stated that he assisted, with Mr Young, to search a house in Lawson-street, on the 15th June, and found in that house the prisoner, with a quantity of tin piping, and on seizing the still in Spring-street he discovered the piping fitted to the still. Other evidence having been tendered, the magistrates convicted the defendant, who is an old offender, in the penalty of £200.—Jessie Parker, beer-retailer, Clayton-street, appeared to answer an information that had been laid against her, for having spirits in her possession, and also for selling spirits, contrary to the tenor of her license. The second count having been withdrawn, Mr Howse proved seizing, in the bar of Miss Parker, a quantity of rum, gin, whiskey, and other wines, on the 31st of January last. Mr JOEL, solicitor, defended the case, and pleaded for a mitigation of the penalty; after which the magistrates convicted in the mitigated penalty of £12 10s.

#### MONDAY.—Before the Stipendiary and Ald. Headlam.—Peter Ballantyne, charged with assaulting a police-officer in the discharge of his duty, was fined £1 and costs, and in default of payment was committed one month.—John Henderson, a boy, charged with assaulting a girl in an indecent manner, was fined 2s 6d.—Three respectably-attired young men were each fined 5s, for being found in the streets drunk and disorderly.—John Blackburn was charged with an attempt to commit an unnatural crime, and was sent to the assizes.

TUESDAY.—Before C. E. Ellison, Esq., (stipendiary magistrate) and N. G. Lambert, Esq.—Isabella Martin appeared to complain that her husband had turned her out of house and home on the previous night; compelling her to seek the police-station for a shelter. She stated that it was his constant practice to ill-use her and turn her out of doors. She had the marks of a severe blow on the nose; and the bench accordingly advised her to bring him up for the assault; when they would enquire into an alleged promise on his part to allow his wife a separate maintenance of 8s per week.—Amongst the "incapables" was a young man named Jonathan Maxwell, who described himself as a clerk; who had been found "staggering drunk," at the entrance of one of the markets, and interrupting passengers. He expressed his sorrow for his offence, and was fined 2s 6d.—Two young men, named Cutbert John Goodwin and John Snowball, were each fined 2s 6d for fighting on the Leazes; in which quiet and respectable locality, as the officer described it, they had created great alarm. Their dispute arose out of a game of dominoes in a beer-house.—A brazen looking virago, named Elizabeth Brown, was fined 2s 6d for being drunk, and 10s for assaulting a publican about 1 o'clock on the previous night as he was putting up his shutters. It seems she did not content herself with knocking violently at the doors and shutters, and using foul language, but actually scratched and beat the man.—A little girl, named Margaret Hall, about 15 years of age, was brought before their worships; whom Inspector Little described as an outcast creature, whose only resting-place at night lately had been staircases and such like places in Sandgate. The poor girl stated that her mother was dead, and that her father, who is a mason living in Oakwellgate, Gateshead, had turned her out, but she did not know why. Inspector Little stated that she was at present sheltering herself in one of the worst neighbourhoods of the town; and of course he had thought it his duty to bring the case under their worships' notice, to prevent further worse consequences. The bench commended the course which had been taken; and directed the relieving-officer to make some inquiries and take charge of the girl.—William Simpson and a man named Harris, who had been remanded, were charged with uttering a counterfeit half-sovereign at a public-house kept by Mrs Wilson, in the High Bridge. It appeared that Simpson had tendered the spurious coin in payment for a pint of beer; but Harris did not come in till afterwards. Simpson was apprehended in a low public-house by detective Elliot; who found upon him precisely the change he had received from Mrs Wilson, except one penny. It seems there had been attempts made to pass similar coins upon several other parties; who, however, had not been able to identify the offenders. Mr BREWIS watched the case on behalf of the prisoners. Harris was discharged, the evidence being considered insufficient to detain him, but Simpson was committed for trial. The spurious coin was dated in 1853, and was a tolerably good imitation, but it was found to be easily bent. Detective Elliot mentioned that five of them had been passed in the town.—Several tradesmen were summoned by officer Lillie for obstructing the footpaths by placing goods upon them. In nearly every case the fine of 2s 6d was inflicted; the stipendiary magistrate remarking that he saw no reason why tradesmen in Newcastle might not carry on their business without such obstructions just as well as tradesmen in other towns.—Ann Craigs, *alias* Ann O'Brien, was summoned for keeping a common lodging-house without being registered, and in which persons of both sexes were found sleeping in one room. She did not deny the offence. Her house bears a very bad character; the police handed in a long list of robberies which had been committed there. Fined £2 10s.—James Gaughan, whose wife appeared, was fined £2 for a similar offence. It appeared that their room, which is in Sandgate, had previously been condemned; and in the present case their own daughter, fifteen years of age, must have been witness of the disgraceful immorality described by the officer, she sleeping in the same room.—Thomas Burke, for a similar offence, but less disgraceful in character, was fined 5s. The house is in Black Bull Entry, Dog Bank.—The last on the list was a notorious brothel-keeper, named Mary Coulthard, of Sandgate, this being her third offence of like character. Fined £2 10s, or six weeks' imprisonment.

#### WEDNESDAY.—Before C. E. Ellison, Esq., and N. G. Lambert, Esq.—A number of unimportant assault cases were disposed of; and several beerhouse-keepers were fined for keeping their houses open beyond the appointed hours.

THURSDAY.—Before C. E. Ellison, Esq., the Mayor (R. Dodds, Esq.), and N. G. Lambert, Esq.—A woman, said to be the wife of a joiner, was brought up on suspicion of stealing a plane and other joiners' tools found in her possession. She was remanded till Monday, to enable detective Elliott to make further inquiries.—Henry Jepson, a fitter, was sent to prison for a fortnight for indecently exposing his person to two little girls.

MOOT-HALL.—SATURDAY.—Before Edward Collingwood, Esq., Edward Riddell, Esq., Capt. Potts, and Thos. Barker, Esq.—German Wheatcroft, an officer in the 6th regiment of Enniskillen Dragoons, was summoned to answer an assault committed upon a foreigner named Mr Hans Staat Lutzen Albeck. Mr HODGE, solicitor, appeared for the complainant, and was about to detail the circumstances attending the assault, when Mr STOKER, solicitor, on behalf of the defendant, admitted the charge, and said that his client was willing to submit to the penalty. The bench then fined the defendant £5.—Samuel Chantler and Andrew Johnson were charged with running foot races and obstructing the turnpike near to Scotswood-bridge, on Monday, the 27th ult. Evidence being adduced to show that the defendants were the principal offenders, the bench fined them £1 each with costs.—Several other petty assaults, besides a few bastardy cases, were disposed of in the usual manner.

SOUTH SHIELDS.—WEDNESDAY.—A number of disorderlies were fined.—Jeremiah Browell, publican, for having his house open during prohibited hours, was discharged on payment of costs, being his first offence.—Lydia Dorothy, for trespassing on the York, Newcastle and Berwick Railway, on the 9th inst., was discharged on paying costs, and promising not to do so again.

#### HEXHAM PETTY SESSIONS.—MONDAY.—James Johnson, John Pearson, Margaret Jamison, and Jan Johnson, were charged by Superintendent Stephenson, constable for Tindale Ward, with encamping on a highway in the township of Prudhoe, and were sentenced—the two former to two months' hard labour in Her Majesty's house of correction, and their horses and carts ordered to be sold to defray expenses!

LANCHESTER.—FRIDAY.—Before Messrs Bland and Greenwell.—Thomas Potts and Robert Peddie were charged, under the Hawkers' Act, with selling drapery goods at Towlaw, on the 3rd March, without a proper license, by which they became liable to a penalty of £10. Mr STOKER, solicitor, of Newcastle, appeared for the prosecution, and stated that the information charged Thomas Potts, who is a draper, residing at Berry-edge with opening a shop at Towlaw, and in it selling by auction various articles of drapery; the other defendant, Th. Peddie, acting in the capacity of auctioneer. The point for the consideration of the bench would be as to whether, by so selling, Potts at the time of his usual residence, there was such a breach of the hawkers' act as made him liable to the penalty. The fact of sale was admitted; and the only point to determine was as to whether Potts was a householder or not? Now Th. (Mr S.) understood that it would be set up in defence that, on the day previous to the sale, Potts had entered into an agreement with the landlord of the premises to become his tenant for 12 months; but that before this became only a colourable proceeding to evade the consequences of the fine. Several witnesses having been examined, Mr BREWIS, solicitor, Newcastle, on behalf of the defendants, put in an agreement for the sale and shop for 12 months, from the day before the sale; but Mr STOKER elicited, in cross-examination, that up to the evening of that day the house was occupied by the man named Feint, and the shop by Potts; and that Potts had been warned previously that if he persisted in selling goods he would be proceeded against. The bench decided that Towlaw was not Mr Potts's usual residence, and that the taking of the house as well as the premises in consequence of his being threatened with legal proceedings. Under these circumstances, they were bound to fine him £10. On this decision the charge against Peddie was withdrawn.—Thomas Smith, of Waldrade Fell, pitman, for poaching at Langley, was fined £1, including costs.—John Wilson, of Shield-row, for assaulting George Dixon, of Oxhill, pitman, for assaulting Bernard Jennings, hawker, were fined £1 each, including costs.—Albert Lewis, of Durham, botanist, was charged with obtaining money as a medical practitioner from Eleanor Hankey, of Hamsteels, but the case was not promised.—Patrick McKavelan, Jane Kelly, and Mabel Slavin, of Dipton, for assaulting Ann McKavelan, of the same place. McKavelan was bound over to keep the peace for three months; the others were fined £1 and 7s 6d costs each.—A number of the workmen of the Derwent Iron Works were charged with absenting themselves from their masters' service, and were ordered to pay costs, and return to their work.