



The Edinburgh Gazette.

Published by Authority.

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 31, 1869.

FOREIGN OFFICE, December 24, 1869.

CORRESPONDENCE with United States'
 Minister at Washington
 128 (No. 1.)

The Earl of Clarendon to Mr Thornton.

SIR, Foreign Office, June 10th, 1869.

On the day of Mr Motley's arrival in London, on the 31st of May, he requested to see me unofficially at my private residence. At the interview which took place on the following day the conversation was general, and Mr Motley said that he preferred not to enter upon matters of business, as his instructions had only been delivered to him when he was on the point of embarkation at New York, and he had not yet had time sufficiently to consider them.

I assented of course to the postponement desired by Mr Motley.

His tone was very friendly, and we met as old acquaintances.

Mr Motley called upon me this morning by appointment, and said that as he had now been in London some days his Government would be desirous to hear from him, and he wished therefore to make known to me the general tenor of his instructions, which were of a most amicable character, and he had no hesitation in assuring me that the wish of the President and Government of the United States was that existing differences between the two countries should be honourably settled, and that the international relations should be placed on a firm and satisfactory basis.

I assured Mr Motley of the perfect reciprocity of feeling that existed on the part of Her Majesty's Government.

Mr Motley then proceeded to say that he was empowered to conclude a Treaty on the Naturalization question upon the principle recorded in the Protocol signed by Lord Stanley and Mr Reverdy Johnson, and I expressed my fear that some delay must take place in this matter, not from any unwillingness on the part of Her Majesty's Government to settle the question, but from the great pressure of business now before Parliament, which would make it almost impossible to pass a Bill in the course of the present Session which affected such various interests, and was certain to lead to

protracted discussion. The delay, however, was not likely I thought to be of such importance to the Government of the United States as their main object, viz., the renunciation of our old doctrine of indefeasible allegiance had been achieved by the Protocol, with the general approbation, to the best of my belief, of the British public.

Mr Motley said that in the recent short Session of the Senate there had not been time to take action on the San Juan Convention, and that its consideration had been postponed without any objection to it having been raised.

The Claims Convention, Mr Motley said, had been published prematurely, owing to some accident which he could not explain, and that consequently, long before it came under the notice of the Senate, it had been unfavourably received by all classes and parties in the United States:—the time at which it was signed was thought most inopportune, as the late President and his Government were virtually out of office, and their successors could not be consulted on this grave question. The Convention was further objected to because it embraced only the claims of individuals, and had no reference to those of the two Governments on each other, and lastly, that it settled no question and laid down no principle.

These were the chief reasons which had led to its rejection by the Senate, and Mr Motley added that although they had not been at once and explicitly stated, no discourtesy to Her Majesty's Government was thereby intended. Mr Motley then proceeded to say that in the present state of excitement which existed in both countries, his Government was of opinion that to reopen the question would be inexpedient, as it could not be approached with the calm deliberation which was essential to its satisfactory solution, and he wished therefore to defer discussion on the subject.

I said that Her Majesty's Government would have no difficulty in complying with the wishes of the United States' Government in this respect, though I did not consider that the excitement to which he had alluded was great in this country, but I thought it would be very objectionable indefinitely to postpone a settlement, and to treat the matter as a quarrel held in suspension, to be revived only when circumstances might make it the interest of either party to do so.

Mr Motley assured me that I need be under no such apprehension, as his Government merely desired, for the reasons he had just stated, that a definite time should be allowed for angry feelings to subside. Mr Motley laid great stress upon the opportunity that would be afforded to two great maritime Nations like England and the United States to lay down some general principles of international law, particularly with reference to the rights and duties of neutrals in war, that might be of advantage to the civilized world.

I said I could give no better proof of the readiness of Her Majesty's Government to meet that of the United States on this ground than the fact that I had myself made a somewhat similar proposal to Mr Adams (as might be seen in the papers laid before Parliament), who, however, had shown no disposition to entertain it.

Mr Motley said that his Government did not question the right of England or any other country to confer belligerent rights, but that the Government which acted in that manner must do so at its own risk and responsibility; and upon his proceeding to make some further remarks on the subject, I took the liberty of observing that although I was quite prepared to defend the conduct of Her Majesty's Government, and the complete and honest neutrality it had observed throughout the war, yet if discussion was not to take place at present I thought it desirable not to enter upon such matters.

Mr Motley, in a friendly manner, agreed that it would be the better course. Mr Motley entered at some length upon the responsibility weighing upon men who were charged with the maintenance of friendly relations between Great Britain and the United States, and said he did not disguise from himself the difficulty of replacing them on a sound and equitable footing, as in regulating international affairs, passions and sentiments must be taken into consideration, and intense feeling with regard to the questions at issue between the two countries existed in the United States.

I assured Mr Motley that my earnest desire, as representing Her Majesty's Government, would be to co-operate with him in effecting a settlement of existing differences in a manner honourable to both countries, and he must be well aware that war with the United States would be abhorrent to the feelings of the English people.

I have, &c.,

(Signed) CLARENDON.

(No. 2.)

SIR, Foreign Office, October 15, 1869.

AS I am apprehensive that in reporting from memory to my colleagues I might not do justice to the long and important despatch which you read to me this afternoon, I should be much obliged to you if you would have the goodness to furnish me with a copy of it.

I have, &c.,

(Signed) CLARENDON.

(No. 3.)

Mr Motley to the Earl of Clarendon.—(Received October 18.)

Legation of The United States, London,
MY LORD, October 16, 1869.

I HAVE the honour to transmit herewith, in compliance with the request contained in your note of the 15th instant, a copy of the despatch from the Secretary of State of the United States, which I read to your Lordship yesterday.

{ Renewing, &c.,

(Signed) JOHN LOTHROP MOTLEY.

(Inclosure.)

Mr Fish to Mr Motley.

Department of State, Washington,
SIR, September 25, 1869.

WHEN you left here upon your mission the moment was thought not to be the most hopeful to enter upon renewed discussion or negotiation with the Government of Great Britain on the subject of the claims of this Government against that of Her Majesty, and you were instructed to convey to Lord Clarendon the opinion of the President that a suspension of the discussion for a short period might allow the subsidence of any excitement or irritation growing out of events then recent, and might enable the two Governments to approach more readily to a solution of their differences.

You have informed me that Lord Clarendon saw no objection to this course, and agreed with you that it would be well to give time for emotions which had been excited of late to subside. The President is inclined to believe that sufficient time may have now elapsed to allow subsidence of those emotions, and that thus it may be opportune and convenient at the present juncture to place in your hands, for appropriate use, a dispassionate exposition of the just causes of complaint of the Government of the United States against that of Great Britain.

In order to do this in a satisfactory manner, it is necessary to go back to the very beginning of the acts and events which have, in their progress and consummation, so much disturbed the otherwise amicable relations of the two Governments.

When, in the winter of 1860 and 1861, certain States of the American Union undertook, by ordinances of secession, to separate themselves from the others, and to constitute of their own volition, and by force, a new and independent Republic, under the name of the Confederate States of America, there existed as between Great Britain and the United States a condition of profound peace; their political relations were professedly and apparently of the most friendly character, and their commercial and financial relations were as close and intimate in fact, as they seemed to be cordial in spirit, such as became the two great liberal, progressive, and maritime and commercial Powers of the world, associated as they were by strong ties of common interest, language, and tradition.

The Government of the United States had no reason to presume that the amicable sentiments of the British Government would be diminished or otherwise prejudicially affected by the occurrence of domestic insurrection within the United

States any more than those of the latter had been impaired by the occurrence of insurrection in British India, or might be impaired by such occurrences elsewhere in the dominions of Great Britain.

Least of all could the Government of the United States anticipate hostility towards it, and special friendship for the insurgents of the seceding States, in view of the inducements and objects of that insurrection, which avowedly, and as every statesman, whether in Europe or America, well knew, and as the earliest mention of the insurrection in the House of Commons indicated, were the secure establishment of a perpetual and exclusive slave-holding Republic. In such a contest the Government of the United States was entitled to expect the earnest good-will, sympathy, and moral support of Great Britain.

It was with painful astonishment, therefore, that the United States' Government received information of the decision of Her Majesty's Government which had already been made on the 6th day of May 1861, and was announced on that day in the House of Commons by Her Ministry, and was followed by the issue, on the 13th of May 1861, of a Proclamation which in effect recognized the insurgents as a belligerent Power; and raised them to the same level of neutral right with the United States.

The President does not deny, on the contrary he maintains, that every sovereign Power decides for itself, on its responsibility, the question whether or not it will at any given time accord the status of belligerency to the insurgent subjects of another Power, as also the larger question of the independence of such subjects, and their accession to the family of sovereign States.

But the rightfulness of such an act depends on the occasion and the circumstances; and it is an act, like the sovereign act of war, which the morality of the public law and practice requires be deliberate, seasonable, and just, in reference to surrounding facts; national belligerency, indeed, like national independence, being but an existing fact, officially recognized as such, without which such a declaration is only the indirect manifestation of a particular line of policy.

The precipitancy of the declaration of the Queen's Government, or, as Mr Bright characterized it, "the remarkable celerity, undue and unfriendly haste," with which it was made, appears in its having been determined on the 6th of May, four days prior to the arrival in London of any official knowledge of the President's Proclamation of the 19th of April 1861, by reference to which the Queen's Proclamation has since been defended, and that it was actually signed on the 13th of May, the very day of the arrival of Mr Adams, the new American Minister; as if in the particular aim of forestalling and preventing explanations on the part of the United States.

The prematureness of the measure is further shown by the very tenor of the Proclamation, which sets forth its own reasons, namely, "Whereas hostilities have unhappily commenced between the Government of the United States of America and certain States styling themselves the Confederate States of America." Moreover, it is not pretended by the Proclamation that war exists, but only a "contest," in reference to which it is not unimportant to note that the language used is such as would fitly apply to parties wholly independent one of the other, so as thus to negative,

or to suppress at least, the critical circumstance that this bare commencement of hostilities,—this incipient contest,—was a mere domestic act of insurrection within the United States.

But that which conclusively shows the unseasonable precipitancy of the measure is the fact that on that day, May 13, 1861, and indeed until long afterwards, not a battle had been fought between the insurgents and the United States, nor a combat even, save the solitary and isolated attack on Fort Sumter. Did such a bare commencement of hostilities constitute belligerency? Plainly not.

There was at that time no such thing as a population elevated into force, and by the prosecution of the war, which Mr Canning points out as the test of belligerent condition. The assumed belligerency of the insurgents was a fiction,—a war on paper only, not in the field,—like a paper blockade, the anticipation of supposed belligerency to come, but which might never have come if not thus anticipated and encouraged by the Queen's Government.

Indeed, as forcibly put by Mr Adams, the Queen's Declaration had the effect of creating posterior belligerency, instead of merely acknowledging an actual fact; and that belligerency, so far as it was maritime, proceeding from the ports of Great Britain and her dependencies alone, with aid and co-operation of subjects of Great Britain.

The Government of the United States, that of Great Britain, and other European Powers, had repeatedly had occasion to consider this question in all its bearings.

It was perceived that the recognition of belligerency on the part of insurgents, although not so serious an act as the recognition of independence, yet might well be prejudicial to the legitimate Government, and therefore be regarded by it as an act of unfriendliness. It was a step, therefore, to be taken with thoughtfulness, and with due regard, to exigent circumstances. Governments had waited months, sometimes years, in the face of actual hostilities without taking this step.

But circumstances might arise to call for it. A ship of the insurgents might appear in the port of the neutral, or a collision might occur at sea, imposing on the neutral the necessity to act. Or actual hostilities might have continued to rage in the theatre of insurgent war; combat after combat might have been fought for such a period of time; a mass of men may have engaged in actual war until they should have acquired the consistency of military power—to repeat the idea of Mr Canning—so as evidently to constitute the fact of belligerency, and to justify the recognition by the neutral. Or, the nearness of the seat of hostilities to the neutral may compel the latter to act. In either of these contingencies, the neutral would have a right to act; it might be his sovereign duty to act, however inconvenient such action should be to the legitimate Government.

There was no such fact of necessity, no such fact of continued and flagrant hostilities, to justify the action of Great Britain in the present case. Hence the United States felt constrained at the time to regard this Proclamation as the sign of a purpose of unfriendliness to them, and of friendliness to the insurgents, which purpose could not fail to aggravate all the evils of the pending contest, to strengthen the insurgents, and to embarrass the legitimate Government.

And so it proved; for as time went on, as the insurrection from political came at length to be military, as the sectional controversy in the United States proceeded to exhibit itself in the organization of great armies and fleets, and in the prosecution of hostilities on a scale of gigantic magnitude, then it was that the spirit of the Queen's Proclamation showed itself in the event, seeing that, in virtue of the Proclamation maritime enterprises in the ports of Great Britain, which would otherwise have been piratical, were rendered lawful, and thus Great Britain became, and to the end continued to be the arsenal, the navy yard, and the treasury of the insurgent Confederacy.

A spectacle was thus presented without precedent or parallel in the history of civilized Nations. Great Britain, although the professed friend of the United States, yet in time of avowed international peace permitted armed cruisers to be fitted out, and harboured and equipped in her ports, to cruise against the merchant ships of the United States, and to burn and destroy them, until our maritime commerce was swept from the ocean. Our merchant vessels were destroyed piratically by captors who had no ports of their own in which to refit or to condemn prize, and whose only nationality was the quarter-deck of their ships, built, dispatched to sea, and not seldom in name still professedly owned in Great Britain. Earl Russell truly said, "It so happens that in this conflict the Confederates have no ports except those of the Mersey and the Clyde, from which they send out ships to cruise against the Federals." The number of our ships thus directly destroyed amounts to nearly two hundred, and the value of property destroyed to many millions. Indirectly the effect was to increase the rate of insurance in the United States, to diminish exports and imports, and otherwise obstruct domestic industry and production, and to take away from the United States its immense foreign commerce, and to transfer this to the merchant vessels of Great Britain. So that, while in the year 1860 the foreign merchant tonnage of the United States amounted to 2,546,237 tons, in 1866 it had sunk to 1,492,923 tons. This depreciation is represented by a corresponding increase in the tonnage of Great Britain during the same period to the amount of 1,120,650 tons. And the amount of commerce abstracted from the United States and transferred to Great Britain during the same period is in still greater proportion. Thus, in effect, war against the United States was carried on from the ports of Great Britain, by British subjects in the name of the Confederates. Mr Cobden, in the House of Commons, characterized by these very words the acts permitted or suffered by the British Government: "You have been carrying on war from these shores against the United States," he said, "and have been inflicting an amount of damage on that country greater than would have been produced by many ordinary wars."

The gravity of these facts may be appreciated by considering what had happened, at other periods. In the latter period of the war of the French Revolution Great Britain was compelled to strain every nerve to maintain herself against the power of Napoleon. In such straits, by a sort of war in disguise, she trespassed on the rights of neutrals, with special prejudice of the United States, to the result at length of solemn war between the two Nations. But neither in the events

which preceded that war nor in the events of the war itself, did the United States suffer more at the hands of Great Britain than we did during the late rebellion, by the aid, direct or indirect, which she afforded to the Confederated insurgent States. For while, on the ocean, our merchant marine was destroyed by cruisers sent out from Great Britain, and our military marine was mainly occupied in watching and counterworking blockade-runners fitted out in Great Britain by official agents of the insurgents; on the land it was in like manner the munitions of war and the wealth drawn by the insurgents from Great Britain which enabled them to withstand, year after year, the arms of the United States.

In the midst of all this remonstrances of the Government of the United States were prompt, earnest, and persistent. Our Minister in London appealed to the international amity of the British Government; he called on it to discharge its obligations of neutrality; he invoked the aid of the municipal law of Great Britain.

Ample proofs of the wrong committed were submitted to the Queen's Government. Indeed, these wrongs were open, notorious, perpetrated in the face of day,—the subject of debate and of boast, even in the House of Commons.

The Queen's Ministers excused themselves by alleged defects in the municipal law of the country. Learned Counsel either advised that the wrongs committed did not constitute violation of the municipal law or else gave sanction to artful devices of deceit to cover up such violations of law. And, strange to say, the Courts of England or of Scotland up to the very highest were occupied month after month with judicial niceties and technicalities of Statute construction in this respect, while the Queen's Government itself, including the omnipotent Parliament, which might have settled these questions in an hour by appropriate legislation, sat with folded arms as if unmindful of its international obligations; and suffered ship after ship to be constructed in its ports to wage war on the United States.

We hold that the international duty of the Queen's Government in this respect was above and independent of the municipal laws of England. It was a sovereign duty attaching to Great Britain as a sovereign Power. The municipal law was but a means of repressing or punishing individual wrong-doers; the Law of Nations was the true and proper rule of duty for the Government. If the municipal laws were defective that was a domestic inconvenience, of concern only to the local Government, and for it to remedy or not by suitable legislation, as it pleased. But no sovereign Power can rightfully plead the defects of its own domestic penal Statutes as justification or extenuation of an international wrong done to another sovereign Power.

When the defects of the existing laws of Parliament had become apparent, the Government of the United States earnestly entreated the Queen's Ministers to provide the required remedy, as it would have been easy to do by a proper Act of Parliament; but this the Queen's Government refused.

The United States, at an early day in their history, had set the example of repressing violations of neutrality to the prejudice of Great Britain, by their own authority, and in the discharge of their own National duty, without waiting for the assistance of municipal Statute. They afterwards enacted such Statutes for their own

convenience, and as their attestation of good faith towards other Nations. And on special occasions, where defects were perceived in such laws, we enacted new ones to meet the case, not deeming that such legislation was derogatory to our public dignity, but, on the contrary, conceiving that in so doing we best consulted the highest dictates of National dignity, self-respect, and public honour; and if Great Britain had so understood her National duty on this occasion, she would have done much to save the two countries from the present controversy, and all its possible consequences.

Once before in its intercourse with the United States the Queen's Government had fallen into the error of assuming that municipal laws constitute the measure of international rights and obligations; that is to say, when official agents of the British Government attempted to enlist military recruits in the neutral countries of Prussia, the United States, and elsewhere, for service against Russia, on the hypothesis that if the prohibitions of municipal law could be evaded that would suffice, overlooking the paramount consideration of the respect due to the sovereign rights of the neutral Power.

So, on the present occasion, the Queen's Ministers seem to have committed the error of assuming that they needed not to look beyond their own local law, enacted for their own domestic convenience, and might, under cover of the deficiencies of that law, disregard their sovereign duties towards another sovereign Power.

Nor was it, in our judgment, any adequate excuse for the Queen's Ministers to profess extreme tenderness of private rights, or apprehension of actions for damages, in case of any attempt to arrest the many ships which, either in England or Scotland, were, with ostentatious publicity, being constructed to cruise against the United States.

Surely that was an imaginary difficulty; or if a real one, it presented the election between a serious complication of relations with the United States and the hazard of a legal conflict with John Laird and Charles Kuh Prioleau.

But the Government of the United States has never been able to see the force of this alleged difficulty. The common law of England is the common law of the United States. In both countries, and certainly in England, revenue seizures are made daily, and ships prevented from going to sea on much less cause of suspicion than attached to the suspected ships of the Confederates.

In both countries, and not least in England, the previous order of the Government, or its subsequent approval, covers the acts of the subordinate officers. In both countries, or if not in England assuredly in the United States, under municipal laws in this behalf substantially the same, the Government finds no difficulty in arresting ships charged with actual or intentional violation of the sovereign rights or neutral duties of the States.

Signal examples of this occur in the history of the United States. Thus, during the late war between Great Britain and Russia, on complaints with affidavits being filed by the British Consul at New York, charging that the barque "Maury" was being equipped there as a belligerent cruiser, and this on far less evidence than that which the American Consul at Liverpool exhibited against the "Alabama," the barque "Maury" was ar-

rested within an hour by telegraphic order from Washington. Other examples of the same decision and promptitude in maintenance of the sovereign rights and discharge of the neutral duties of the United States, have occurred, as is well-known, under both the last and the present Administrations.

Nay, at every period of our history the Government of the United States has not been content with preventing the departure of ships fitted out in violation of neutrality, and of putting a stop to military recruitments and expeditions of the same nature, but has further manifested its good faith and its respect for its own sovereignty and laws by prosecuting criminally the guilty parties. Examples of this occur in the early stages of the war of the French Revolution; on occasion of the insurrection of the Spanish-American Continental Provinces, and of revolutionary movements in the Spanish-American Republics; and on various other occasions, including the existing insurrection in Cuba.

But although such acts of violation of law were frequent in Great Britain, and susceptible of complete technical proof, notorious, flaunted directly in the face of the world, varnished over, if at all, with the shallowest pretexes of deception, yet no efficient step appears to have been taken by the British Government to enforce the execution of its municipal laws or to vindicate the majesty of its outraged sovereign Power.

And the Government of the United States cannot believe—it would conceive itself wanting in respect for Great Britain to impute—that the Queen's Ministers are so much hampered by judicial difficulties that the Local Administration is thus reduced to such a state of legal impotency as to deprive the Government of capacity to uphold its Sovereignty against local wrong-doers, or its neutrality as regards other sovereign Powers.

If, indeed, it were so, the causes of reclamation on the part of the United States would only be the more positive and sure; for the law of nations assumes that each Government is capable of discharging its international obligations, and, perchance, if it be not, then the absence of such capability is itself a specific ground of responsibility for consequences.

But the Queen's Government would not be content to admit, nor will the Government of the United States presume to impute to it such political organization of the British Empire as to imply any want of legal ability on its part to discharge, in the amplest manner, all its duties of sovereignty and amity towards other Powers.

It remains only in this relation to refer to one other point, namely, the question of negligence—neglect on the part of officers of the British Government, whether superior or subordinate, to detain Confederate cruisers, and especially the "Alabama," the most successful of the depredators on the commerce of the United States.

On this point the President conceives that little needs now to be said, for various cogent reasons. First, the matter has been exhaustively discussed already by this Department, or by the successive American Ministers. Then, if the question of negligence be discussed with frankness, it must be treated in this instance as a case of extreme negligence, which Sir William Jones has taught us to regard as equivalent or approximate to evil intention. The question of negligence, therefore, cannot be presented without danger of thought or language disrespectful to-

wards the Queen's Ministers; and the President while purposing of course, as his sense of duty requires, to sustain the rights of the United States in all their utmost amplitude, yet intends to speak and act in relation to Great Britain in the same spirit of international respect which he expects of her in relation to the United States; and he is sincerely desirous that all discussions between the Governments may be so conducted as not only to prevent any aggravation of existing differences, but to tend to such reasonable and amicable determination as best becomes two great Nations of common origin and conscious dignity and strength.

I assume, therefore, premitting detailed discussion in this respect, that the negligence of the officers of the British Government in the matter of the "Alabama" at least, was gross and inexcusable; and such as indisputably to devolve on that Government full responsibility for all the depredations committed by her. Indeed, this conclusion seems in effect to be conceded in Great Britain. At all events, the United States conceive that the proofs of responsible negligence in this matter are so clear that no room remains for debate on that point; and it should be taken for granted in all future negotiations with Great Britain.

It is impossible not to compare and contrast the conduct of the States-General as regards Great Britain on occasion of the revolt of the British Colonies, with that of Great Britain as regards the insurrection in the Southern States. No fleets were fitted out by America in the ports of the Netherlands to prey on the commerce of Great Britain. Only in a single instance did American cruizers have temporary harbourage in the Texel. Year after year the exports of munition of war from the Netherlands were forbidden by the States-General, the more completely to fulfil their duty of amity and neutrality towards Great Britain. But, nevertheless, Great Britain treated a declaration of neutrality by the States-General, and the observance of that declaration, as a sufficient cause of war against the Netherlands. Prior to which the British Government continually complained of the occasional supplies derived by the Colonies from the Island of St Eustatius. How slight in this respect would have been the burdens of the United States during the late insurrection, if British aid had been confined to a contraband commerce between the insurgents and the port of Nassau.

Not such is the complaint of the United States against Great Britain.

We complain that the insurrection in the Southern States, if it did not exist, was continued, and obtained its enduring vitality, by means of the resources it drew from Great Britain. We complain that by reason of the imperfect discharge of its neutral duties on the part of the Queen's Government, Great Britain became the military, naval, and financial basis of insurgent warfare against the United States. We complain of the destruction of our merchant marine by British ships, manned by British seamen, armed with British guns, despatched from British dockyards, sheltered and harboured in British ports. We complain that by reason of the policy and the acts of the Queen's Ministers, injury incalculable was inflicted on the United States.

Nevertheless, the United States manfully and resolutely encountered all the great perils and

difficulties of the situation, foreign and domestic, and overcame them. We endured with proud patience the manifestation of hostility there, where we had expected friendship, in England, the protagonist of the abolition of negro servitude, in order to perpetuate which the Southern States had seceded from the Union. We entered on a great war, involving sea and land; we marched to the field hundreds of thousands of soldiers, and expended thousands of millions of treasure for their support; we lavished the blood of our bravest and best in battle as if it were but water; we submitted to all privations without a murmur; we staked our lives, our fortunes, and our honour on the issue of the combat; and by the blessing of God we came out of the deadly struggle victorious, and with courage proved, strength unimpaired, power augmented, and our place fixed among the Nations, second to none; we may without presumption say, in the civilized world. Providence had smiled on our sacrifices and our exertions; and in the hour of our supreme triumph we felt that, while mindful of good-will shown us by friendly Powers in the hour of trial, we could afford to account in moderation with others which, like Great Britain, had, as we thought, speculated improvidently and to their own discomforture on the expected dismemberment and downfall of the great American Republic.

As to Great Britain we had special and peculiar causes of grief. She had prematurely, as we deemed it, and without adequate reason, awarded the status of belligerency to our insurgents. But this act of itself, and by its inherent nature, was of neutral colour, and an act which, however we might condemn it in the particular case, we could not deny to be of the competency of a sovereign State. Other European Governments also recognized the belligerency of the insurgents. But Great Britain alone had translated a measure, indefinite of itself, into one of definite wrong to the United States, as evinced by the constant and efficient aid in ships and munitions of war which she furnished the Confederates, and in the permission or negligence which enabled Confederate cruizers from her ports to prey on the commerce of the United States. Great Britain alone had founded on that recognition a systematic maritime war against the United States, and this to effect the establishment of a Slave Government! As to which Mr Bright might well say: "We supply the ships; we supply the arms, the munitions of war; we give aid and comfort to the foulest of crimes: Englishmen only do it." Thus what in France, in Spain, as their subsequent conduct showed, had been but an untimely and ill-judged act of political manifestation, had in England, as her subsequent conduct showed, been a virtual act of war.

We reflected that the Confederates had no ships, no means of building ships, no mechanical appliances, no marine, no legal status on the sea, no open seaports, no possible Courts of Prize, no domestic command of the instruments and agencies of modern maritime warfare; we asked ourselves what would the Queen's Government have said if the United States had awarded the rights of belligerency to insurgents in India or in Ireland in the same circumstances, that is, on the occurrence of a single act of rebel hostility, and had bestowed upon them their only means of maritime as well as territorial warfare against Great Britain?

In truth, while in the hour of their great triumph, the United States were thankfully inclined to sentiments of moderation both at home and abroad, for at home no man has suffered death for political causes, we were the more inclined to moderation, especially as regards Great Britain, in view of the very enormity of the wrongs we had sustained, and the consequent difficulty of measuring the reparation due, even if sincerely proffered by the Queen's Government. We desired no war with England; we shrank from the thought of another lustrum of fratricidal carnage like that through which we had just passed, with no change in the conditions of war but the substitution on the one side of misguided Englishmen in the place of misguided Americans. We preferred, if possible, to find some satisfaction of our great grievances by peaceful means, consistent alike with the honour of Great Britain and the United States.

The influence of this condition of mind is apparent in all the discussions of the subject by or under the instructions of this Department during preceding Administrations of the Government.

It resulted in earnest efforts on our part to determine the controversy by arbitration in the interest of peace and of international good-will, which efforts, if properly met by the Queen's Ministers in the spirit in which they were made, would long since have removed the present controversy from the field of diplomacy, and effectually harmonized the relations of the United States with Great Britain.

But the amicable advances of the United States to dispose of the question by arbitration were at the start, and persistently long afterward, met by Earl Russell in the name of the Queen's Government with subtleties of reservation and exception, the effect of which would have been, instead of closing up the controversy, to leave us in a condition worse than before, and more perilous to the cause of peace.

The Government of the United States has never been able to appreciate the force of the reasons alleged in support of such reservations and exceptions. When one Power demands of another the redress of alleged wrongs, and the latter entertains the idea of arbitration as the means of settling the question, it seems irrational to insist that the arbitration shall be a qualified and limited one through apprehensions, lest peradventure there might thus be implication that such wrongs had been committed by intention, and that such implication would be injurious to the honour of the wrong-doing Government. On these premises arbitration may be the means of adjusting immaterial international wrongs, but not the material ones; that is to say, if the grievances be serious the two Nations must of necessity go to war, while neither desires it, which would be an absurd conclusion.

Lord Stanley and Lord Clarendon appear to have seen this, and therefore to have regarded the particular question with more correct estimation of incidents than Lord Russell, and thereupon to have admitted as theory, comprehensive arbitration concerning all questions between the Governments.

But the Convention which, in this view, was negotiated by the Earl of Clarendon and Mr Reverdy Johnson, did not prove satisfactory to the Senate of the United States.

It is well known to the Government of Great Britain that the President and the Senate of the United States are distinct powers of the Government, associated in the conclusion of Treaties and in the appointment of public officers, but not dependent one on the other, nor of necessity entertaining the same opinion on public questions. Each acts on appropriate convictions of duty and of right—and the Senate has the same absolute power to reject a Treaty as the President has to negotiate one.

Of course it is not necessarily incumbent on the President to express approval or disapproval of an act of the Senate.

But the President deems it due to the Senate, to himself, and to the subject, to declare that he concurs with the Senate in disapproving of that Convention. His own particular reasons for this conclusion are sufficiently apparent in this despatch. In addition to these general reasons, he thinks the provisions of the Convention were inadequate to provide reparation for the United States in the manner and to the degree to which he considers the United States entitled to redress. Other and special reasons for the same conclusions have been explained in a previous despatch, such, namely, as the time and circumstances of the negotiation, the complex character of the proposed arbitration, its chance, agency, and results, and its failure to determine any principle, or otherwise to fix on a stable foundation the relations of the two Governments. The President is not yet prepared to pronounce on the question of the indemnities which he thinks due by Great Britain to individual citizens of the United States for the destruction of their property by rebel cruisers fitted out in the ports of Great Britain.

Nor is he now prepared to speak of the reparation which he thinks due by the British Government for the larger account of the vast National injuries it has inflicted on the United States.

Nor does he attempt now to measure the relative effect of the various causes of injury, as whether by untimely recognition of belligerency, by suffering the fitting out of rebel cruisers, or by the supply of ships, arms, and munitions of war to the Confederates, or otherwise, in whatsoever manner.

Nor does it fall within the scope of this despatch to discuss the important changes in the rules of public law, the desirableness of which has been demonstrated by the incidents of the last few years now under consideration, and which, in view of the maritime prominence of Great Britain and the United States, it would befit them to mature, and propose to the other States of Christendom.

All these are subjects of future consideration which, when the time for action shall come, the President will consider with sincere and earnest desire that all differences between the two Nations may be adjusted amicably and compatibly with the honour of each, and to the promotion of future concord between them; to which end he will spare no efforts within the range of his supreme duty, to the right and interests of the United States.

At the present stage of the controversy the sole object of the President is to state the position and maintain the attitude of the United States in the various relations and aspects of this grave controversy with Great Britain. It is the object of this paper (which you are at liberty to read to Lord Clarendon) to state calmly and dis-

passionately, with a more unreserved freedom than might be used in one addressed directly to the Queen's Government, what this Government seriously considers the injuries it has suffered. It is not written in the nature of a claim; for the United States now make no demand against Her Majesty's Government on account of the injuries they feel they have sustained.

Although the United States are anxious for a settlement on a liberal and comprehensive basis, of all the questions which now interfere with the entirely cordial relations which they desire to exist between the two Governments, they do not now propose or desire to set any time for this settlement. On the contrary, they prefer to leave that question, and also the more important question of the means and method of removing the causes of complaint, of restoring the much desired relations of perfect cordiality, and the preventing of the probability of like questions in the future, to the consideration of Her Majesty's Government. They will, however, be ready, whenever Her Majesty's Government shall think the proper time has come for a renewed negotiation, to entertain any proposition which that Government shall think proper to present; and to apply to such propositions their earnest and sincere wishes and endeavours for a solution, honourable and satisfactory to both parties.

I am, &c.,

(Signed) HAMILTON FISH,

(No. 4.)

Mr Motley to the Earl of Clarendon.

Legation of the United States,
London, 23d October 1869.
MY LORD,

In reference to the conversation which I had with your Lordship on the 10th of June last, and to the despatch from the United States' Secretary of State which I had the honor to read to you on the 15th instant, it may have possibly appeared that there was some inconsistency between the views of the President upon the subjects of the recognition of the late insurgents in the Southern States as belligerents, and the destruction of American commerce by cruisers of British origin carrying the insurgent flag, as verbally expressed by me at the interview in June, and those views, as set forth in the above-mentioned despatch. I think it necessary to inform your Lordship, therefore, that the Secretary of State, on reception of my despatch recounting the substance of the conversation in June, observed to me in a despatch of the 29th of June that it did not seem that the President's view of the right of every power, when a civil conflict has arisen within another State, to define its own relations and those of its citizens, had been conveyed in precise conformity to that view, as the Secretary of State desired to present it to me, and as it doubtless would have been conveyed by me had my communication been made in writing.

I would therefore request your Lordship to consider the despatch of the United States' Secretary of State, which I read to you on the 15th instant, and a copy of which I have had the honor of sending to your Lordship, as containing the exact and authoritative statement of the President's views on this subject, as laid down in all the

instructions given under his directions by the Secretary of State.

I pray your Lordship to accept the assurance of the highest consideration, with which

I have, &c.,

(Signed) JOHN LOTHROP MOTLEY.

(No. 5.)

The Earl of Clarendon to Mr Motley,

Foreign Office,

SIR, November 5, 1869.

I HAVE the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter of the 23d ultimo, requesting that the despatch from the United States' Secretary of State, which you read to me on the 15th ultimo, and of which you have been good enough to furnish me with a copy, should be considered as containing the exact and authoritative statement of the President's views, as laid down in the instructions given under his direction on the subjects to which it relates, and I have to state to you that your communication shall receive due attention.

I have at the same time to express to you my regret at the delay which has occurred in acknowledging the receipt of your letter.

(Signed) CLARENDON.

(No. 6.)

The Earl of Clarendon to Mr Thornton.

SIR, Foreign Office, November 6, 1869.

MR MOTLEY called upon me at the Foreign Office on Friday the 15th of October, and read to me a despatch from Mr Fish on the "Alabama" claims.

When he had concluded I said that although I had not interposed any observations, and should not then, in compliance with the wish he had expressed, enter into any discussion on the subject, yet I hoped that my silence would not be considered to indicate that the despatch did not admit of a complete reply. I requested that he would have the goodness to give me a copy of the despatch, as I could not undertake from memory accurately to report to my colleagues the contents of the long and important document he had just rapidly read to me.

Mr Motley agreed to do so if I would ask him for it officially, and I accordingly addressed to him the same afternoon the letter of which I inclose a copy, and received from him on the afternoon of the 18th a copy of Mr Fish's despatch, of which I now also inclose to you a copy.

This despatch, as you will see, recapitulates at great length the causes of dissatisfaction which the Government of the United States considers itself entitled to feel with the conduct of the British Government during the late civil war; but it does not make any proposition as to the manner in which that dissatisfaction may be removed, or offer any solution of the difficulty.

On the contrary, Mr Fish distinctly says that the President is not yet prepared to pronounce on the question of the indemnities which he thinks due by Great Britain to individual citizens of the United States for the destruction of their property by rebel cruisers fitted out in the ports of Great

Britain; neither is he prepared to speak of the reparation which he thinks due by the British Government for the larger account of the vast National injuries it has inflicted on the United States; neither does he attempt now to measure the relative causes of injury, as whether by untimely recognition of belligerency, by suffering of the fitting out of rebel cruisers, or by the supply of ships, arms, and munitions of war to the Confederates, or otherwise; neither does it fall within the scope of his despatch to discuss the important changes in the rules of public law, the desirability of which has been demonstrated by the incidents of the last few years now under consideration, and which in view of the maritime prominence of Great Britain and the United States, it would befit them to mature and propose to the other States of Christendom.

All these subjects the President, Mr Fish says, will be prepared to consider hereafter, with a sincere and earnest desire that all differences between the two Nations may be adjusted amicably and compatibly with the honour of each, and to the promotion of future concord between them; to which end he will spare no efforts within the range of his supreme duty to the right and interest of the United States.

The object of his despatch, Mr Fish goes on to say, is to state calmly and dispassionately what the Government of the United States seriously consider to be the injuries it has suffered; it is not written in the nature of a claim, for the United States now make no demand against Her Majesty's Government on account of the injuries they feel they have sustained. Although the United States are anxious for a settlement on a liberal and comprehensive basis of all the questions which now interfere with the entirely cordial relations which they desire should exist between the two Governments, yet they do not now propose or desire to fix any time for this settlement. They prefer to leave that, and the more important question of the means and method of removing the causes of complaint, of restoring the much desired relations of perfect cordiality, and the prevention of the probability of like questions in future, to the consideration of Her Majesty's Government; but they will be ready, whenever Her Majesty's Government shall think the proper time has come for a renewed negotiation, to entertain any propositions which that Government shall think proper to present, and to apply to such propositions their earnest and sincere wishes and endeavours for a solution, honourable and satisfactory to both countries.

I have recited at length the concluding passages of Mr Fish's despatch, because they express many sentiments which Her Majesty's Government most cordially and sincerely reciprocates. The Government of Her Majesty, equally with the Government of the United States, earnestly desire that all differences between the two Nations may be adjusted amicably and compatibly with the honour of each, and that all causes of future difference between them may be prevented; and they would most heartily co-operate with the Government of the United States in laying down as between themselves, and in recommending for adoption by other maritime Nations, such principles of maritime law as might obviate the recurrence of similar causes of difference between them. And it is because they earnestly desire to hasten the period at which these important objects may be accomplished, that Her Majesty's Government

have determined not to follow Mr Fish through the long recapitulation of the various points that have been discussed in the voluminous correspondence that has taken place between the two Governments for several years.

Her Majesty's Government had indeed hoped that by the Convention which, under the instructions of his Government, and with their full and deliberate concurrence, Mr Reverdy Johnson signed with me on the 14th of January of the present year, all correspondence between the two Governments had been brought to an end, and that all matters in dispute would be referred for settlement to a dispassionate tribunal. With a view to that result, Her Majesty's Government had in some degree departed from their deliberate convictions and declared resolves; they agreed to the mode of settlement proposed by the United States' Government, which was more than once in the course of that negotiation modified to meet the wishes of that Government; but they did so willingly because they thought the restoration of a good understanding between Great Britain and the United States might well be purchased by concessions kept within bounds, and not inconsistent with the honour of this country.

Her Majesty's Government learned with deep concern that the Senate of the United States, in the exercise of the powers unquestionably conferred upon it by the Constitution, repudiated the acts of the Government under whose authority that Convention was concluded, and by rejecting it had left open the whole controversy between the two countries, and had indefinitely prolonged the uncertainty attendant on such a state of things.

Her Majesty's Government regret no less sincerely that the President of the United States concurs with the Senate in disapproving that Treaty; but their regret would in some degree be diminished if Mr Fish had been authorised to indicate some other means of adjusting the questions between the two countries, which as long as they remain open, cannot be favourable to a cordial good understanding between them. This however, Mr Fish has not been empowered to do, but he expresses the readiness of the President to consider any proposal emanating from this country. It is obvious, however, and Mr Fish will probably on reflection admit, that Her Majesty's Government cannot make any new proposition or run the risk of another unsuccessful negotiation, until they have information more clear than that which is contained in Mr Fish's despatch, respecting the basis upon which the Government of the United States would be disposed to negotiate.

But Her Majesty's Government fully agree with Mr Fish in considering that it would be desirable to turn the difficulties which have arisen between the two Governments to good account, by making the solution of them subservient to the adoption, as between themselves in the first instance, of such changes in the rules of public law as may prevent the recurrence between Nations that may concur in them of similar difficulties hereafter.

You may assure Mr Fish that Her Majesty's Government will be ready to co-operate with the Government of the United States for so salutary a result, which would redound to the mutual honour of both countries, and, if accepted by other maritime Nations, have an important

influence towards maintaining the peace of the world.

You will read this despatch to Mr Fish, and give him a copy of it if he should desire to have one.

I am, &c.,
(Signed) CLARENDON.

(No. 7.)

The Earl of Clarendon to Mr Thornton.

SIR, Foreign Office,
November 6, 1869.

WITH reference to that passage of Mr Fish's despatch of the 25th of September, in which he says that the object of his despatch, which Mr Motley is at liberty to read to me, is to state calmly and dispassionately, with a more unreserved freedom than might be used in one addressed directly to the Queen's Government, what the Government of the United States considers the injuries it has suffered, I have to say that, looking upon this despatch as not being of a strictly official character, and as being communicated to me personally rather than as the Representative of the Queen's Government, I have not thought it necessary in my official reply to the communication made by Mr Motley to express my dissent from those statements.

I desire, however, to place before Mr Fish, in the same manner as Mr Motley was instructed to place before me, some observations that have occurred to me to make on the statements in his despatch; and I accordingly transmit to you a paper to that effect, which you will read to Mr Fish, giving him a copy if he should desire to have one; and you will explain to him the reasons, as stated in his own despatch, which have induced me to adopt this course.

I am, &c.,
(Signed) CLARENDON.

Observations on Mr Fish's Despatch to Mr Motley of the 25th September 1869, respecting the "Alabama," &c., Claims.

I.—The Queen's Proclamation of Neutrality.

Mr Fish recapitulates the arguments previously used by Mr Seward, as to the "precipitate recognition" of belligerent rights which, he says, "appears in its having been determined on the 6th of May, four days prior to the arrival in London of any official knowledge of the President's Proclamation of the 19th of April 1861," and "signed on the 13th of May, the very day of the arrival of Mr Adams the new American Minister; as if in the particular aim of forestalling and preventing explanations on the part of the United States."

The facts are:—

The President's Proclamation of blockade was published April 19. Intelligence of its issue was received by telegraph (see the "Times") on the 2d of May.

It was published in the "Daily News" and other papers on the 3d of May. Mr Seward in his despatch to Mr Adams of the 12th of January 1867, says it "reached London on the 3d of May."

A copy was received officially from Her Majesty's Consul at New York on the 5th; another copy from Lord Lyons on the 10th. It was communicated officially by Mr Dallas to Lord Russell on the 11th, with a copy of a circular from Mr Seward to the United States Ministers abroad, dated the 20th of April, calling attention to it, and stating the probability that attempts would be made to "fit out privateers in the ports of England for the purpose of aggression on the commerce of the United States."

The reason of the delay in receiving the copy from Washington was in itself a proof of the existence of civil war, arising, as it did, from the communication between Washington and Baltimore more being cut off in consequence of the Confederate troops threatening the capital.

"The prematurity of the measure is further shown by the very tenor of the Proclamation—'Whereas hostilities have unhappily commenced between the Government of the United States of America and certain States styling themselves the Confederate States of America.' Exception is also taken to the use of the word 'contest,' as distinct from 'war.'"

It will be seen on referring to the Report of the Royal Commission for inquiring into the Neutrality Laws (Appendix) that the form of words used is taken from previous Proclamations, "Whereas hostilities at this time exist" (June 6, 1823). "Engaged in a contest" (September 30, 1825, Turkey and Greece). "Whereas hostilities have unhappily commenced" (May 13, 1859, Austria, France, and Italy). The same form was used in the case of Spain and Chili (February 6, 1866), and Spain and Peru (March 13, 1866). "Hostilities have unhappily commenced" (Austria, Prussia, Italy, Germany, June 27, 1866).

The order prohibiting prizes from being brought into British ports, for which the United States Government thanked the British Government, as being likely to give a death-blow to privateering, speaks of "observing the strictest neutrality in the contest which appears to be imminent" (June 1, 1861).

It is remarkable that in the case of Turkey and Greece British subjects were warned to respect "the exercise of belligerent rights." This is omitted in the United States case, the belligerents being spoken of as "the Contending Parties."

The expression "States styling themselves the Confederate States of America" was purposely adopted to avoid the recognition of their existence as independent States, and gave them great offence.

The French Proclamation of the 10th of June has "la lutte engagée entre le Gouvernement de l'Union et les Etats qui prétendent former une Confédération particulière."

The Spanish Proclamation, which the United States Minister at Madrid (see Diplomatic correspondence laid before Congress 1861, p. 224) informed the Spanish Government "the President had read with the greatest satisfaction," issued on the 17th June 1861, has "Confederate States of the South," and uses the term "belligerents" three times over.

Mr Fish's despatch states that the "assumed belligerency" was a "fiction," the "anticipation of supposed belligerency to come, but which might never have come if not thus anticipated and encouraged by the Queen's Government."

What are the facts? A large group of States, containing a population of several millions, and comprising a compact geographical area enabling them to act readily in concert, had established a *de facto* Government, with a President, Congress, Constitution, Courts of Justice, Army, and all the machinery of military and civil power. They possessed the ports along upwards of 2,000 miles of coast; with the exception of Forts Pickens and Munroe, all the Federal posts and forts had been evacuated, including Harper's Ferry, the arsenal of the Potomac valley; Fort Sumter, the only one which had offered resistance, had fallen a month previously, April 13. The Confederate troops were in occupation of the Shenandoah lines, and threatening Washington. The Confederate President had declared war, and called for a levy of 32,000 troops, to which all the seceded States had responded promptly. On the other hand, the Federal President had called for 75,000 volunteers on the 15th of April, and for 42,000 more on the 3d of May; and as fast as the regiments could be armed they were hurrying to the defence of Washington. The contending armies were indeed face to face.

So much for the hostilities on land. The operations at sea, in which British interests were more directly affected, had been carried on with equal vigour. On the 17th of April the Confederate President issued his Proclamation offering to grant letters of marque, which was followed two days afterwards by the Federal Proclamation of blockade. At the date of the Queen's Proclamation of neutrality both these had been carried or were being carried into effect. The Federal Government had instituted the blockade of Virginia and North Carolina, which was declared to be effective on the 30th of April, and were rapidly dispatching all the merchant-vessels which they could procure, and which they were able to convert into ships-of-war, to the blockade of the other ports. The "General Parkhill," of Liverpool, was captured by the United States' ship "Niagara" while attempting to run the blockade of Charlestown on the 12th of May; and the British vessels "Hilja" and "Monmouth" warned off on the same day. Confederate privateers were already at sea. One was captured at the mouth of the Chesapeake River on the 8th of May by the United States' ship "Harriet Lane." On the 15th the Federal bark "Ocean Eagle," of Rockhead, Maine, was taken by the Confederate privateer "Calhoun" off New Orleans. At the same port Captain Semmes had already received his commission and was engaged in the outfit of the "Sumter."

Could any explanations which Mr Adams might have had to offer alter such a state of things as this? Can any other name be given to it than that of civil war?

It is stated that there was no fact of continued and flagrant "hostilities" to justify the action of Great Britain in issuing a Proclamation of neutrality.

Mr Seward, writing at the time, and previously to the Queen's Proclamation (May 4), characterised the proceedings of the Confederates as "open, flagrant, deadly war," and as "civil war" (Congress Papers, 1861, page 165), and in a communication to M. de Tassara, the Spanish Minister; referred to the operations of the Federal blockade as belligerent operations which would be carried on with due respect to the rights of neutrals.

Judge Betts, in the cases of the "Hiawatha," &c., said, "I consider that the outbreak in particular States, as also in the Confederate States, was an open and flagrant civil war."

It was also judicially decided by the Supreme Court of the United States in the case of the "Amy Warwick" and other prizes, that "the proclamation of blockade is itself official and conclusive evidence that a state of war existed which demanded and authorized such a measure." Moreover, the joint resolution of Congress in July 1861, approving and confirming the acts of the President ("North America, No. 1, 1862," page 57), commences, "Whereas, since the adjournment of Congress on the 4th of March last, a formidable insurrection in certain States of this Union has arrayed itself in armed hostility;" and a Resolution of the House of Representatives of the 22d of July 1861, speaks of the "present deplorable civil war," and of "this war."

The date at which the civil war actively commenced has therefore been fixed by the published despatches of the Secretary of State, by proceedings in Congress, by the formal judgment of the United States' Prize Courts, as well as by the universal assent of all the neutral Powers concerned; but it is urged that, nevertheless, there was no necessity for Great Britain to take notice of it, as no ship of the insurgents had appeared in British ports, no collusion occurred at sea, nor did the nearness of Great Britain to the seat of hostilities compel her to act.

With regard to the latter point it is difficult to see how one Nation can be much nearer to another than England to the United States, seeing that the British dominions touch the United States on two sides, while the British Islands of New Providence, &c., lie immediately in front. As to a collision at sea, it was apparent that British commerce must be interfered with the moment the blockade came into operation, as indeed was the case, several British vessels having been captured before there was time for the intelligence of the Proclamation of Neutrality to reach America. As to the arrival of Confederate ships in British ports, such ships were afloat and might at any time be expected. As Mr Dana, in the notes to the eighth edition of Wheaton expresses it (p. 35), "it is not fit that cases should be left to be decided as they may arise, by private citizens, or naval or judicial officers, at home or abroad, by sea or land."

The British Government were compelled to take action of some sort; was that action really unfriendly? was it intended to be unfriendly?

No one who recollects what actually passed, or will consult "Hansard," can suppose that the Proclamation was intended to be unfriendly. On the contrary, as was stated by Mr Foster in his speech at Bradford, it was absolutely pressed upon the Government by the friends of the Northern States, who were afraid lest Confederate privateers should be fitted out in British ports.

Nor was its immediate result injurious to the Federal States. Far from being so, it legitimized the captures of the blockading squadron, and, in the language of the Prize Court, "estopped" the British merchants, whose vessels were seized, from making reclamation.

While the intelligence of the issue of the Queen's Proclamation was still fresh, and almost immediately after hearing of the French and Spanish Proclamations of Neutrality, the President in his Message of the 4th of July 1861

stated that he was "happy to say that the sovereignty and rights of the United States are now practically respected by Foreign Powers, and a general sympathy with the country is manifested throughout the world."

Does any one really believe that the Queen's Proclamation in the very least influenced the movements of the Confederate armies? All the preparations for war had been made long before, munitions collected, troops levied, and generals appointed. The Proclamation reached America at the end of May, by which time the Confederates had taken up their position in the Upper Potomac, and the Federals had occupied Alexandria in Virginia with a force of 13,000 men (May 24).

The armies on both sides were in motion; skirmishes were daily occurring; engagements took place at Little Bethel on the 10th of June, at Carthage, Missouri, on the 6th of July, and at Centreville on the 18th, followed by the great battle of Manassas Junction on the 21st. Can any one suppose that if the Proclamation had not been issued that battle would not have been fought?

The charge of premature recognition, on examination, reduces itself to this, that the Proclamation ought not to have been issued until Mr Adams arrived, or until some event called for it. Against this is to be set the fact that the Proclamation was considered by some friends of the Northern States as a step taken in their interests, and that it was further pressed upon the Government by Mr Dallas's communication of Mr Seward's circular. Moreover, Confederate privateers were at sea, and British vessels being made prizes by the Federal blockading fleet.

Besides the assertion of the premature recognition of belligerent rights, the despatch states that maritime enterprises in the ports of Great Britain, which would otherwise have been piratical, were, "by virtue of the Proclamation," rendered lawful, "and thus Great Britain became, and to the end continued to be, the arsenal, the navy yard, and the treasury of the insurgent Confederacy."

Mr Fish, in a preceding passage, admits that national belligerency is "an existing fact," and he might have added that it exists independently of any official proclamations of neutral Powers, as is shown by the records of the American Prize Courts, which continually recognize the belligerency of the South American States; although, as Mr Seward stated in one of his despatches, the United States have never issued a Proclamation of Neutrality except in the case of France and England in 1793. This was proved in the civil war by the reception at Curacoa of the Confederate vessel "Sumter" as a belligerent cruiser, though the Netherlands had issued no Proclamation of Neutrality. It was this recognition of the "Sumter," after her departure from New Orleans (July 6, 1861,) at Curacoa, and at Cienfuegos, which first practically accorded maritime belligerent rights to the Confederates, a fact which is overlooked when it is alleged that Confederate "belligerency, so far as it was maritime," proceeded "from the ports of Great Britain and her dependencies alone."

Indeed, it is not going too far to say that the Confederates derived no direct benefit from the Proclamation. Their belligerency depended upon the fact (a fact which, when we are told that the civil war left behind it two millions and a half of dead and maimed, is unfortunately indisputable,)

that they were waging civil war. If there had been no Proclamation, the fact would have remained the same, and belligerency would have had to be recognised either on behalf of the Northern States by admitting the validity of captures on the high seas for the carriage of contraband or breach of blockade, or on the arrival of the "Sumter," or some similar vessel, in a British port.

In no case can it be really supposed that the recognition of belligerency, which, unless neutral Nations abandoned their neutrality and took an active part in the contest, was inevitable, materially influenced the fortunes of such a fearful and protracted civil war.

At all events, if it did, the Confederates never acknowledged it; the recognition of belligerency they regarded (as indeed was the case) as a right which could not be denied to them. What they sought was not the mere technical title of "belligerent," but a recognition of independence, and when they found that it was hopeless to expect England to accord it, they cut off all intercourse with this country, expelled Her Majesty's Consuls from their towns, and did everything in their power to show the sense which they entertained of the injury which they believed had been inflicted upon them. The result being that, while one side has blamed us for doing too much, the other side has blamed us for doing too little; and thus an assumption of neutrality has been regarded both by North and South as an attitude of hostility.

As to the Queen's Proclamation rendering lawful the despatch of the "Alabama," "Shenandoah," and "Georgia," from British ports, to which it is to be presumed the expression "maritime enterprises" refers, it is to be remarked that it is exactly against such enterprises that the Proclamation reciting the terms of the Foreign Enlistment Act was intended to warn British subjects. Instead of rendering them lawful it rendered them additionally unlawful, by giving notice of their illegality.

There would be no difficulty in showing by precedents from American Prize Courts that no Proclamation of Neutrality is required to confer belligerent rights on vessels commissioned by a *de facto* Government.

It is admitted that at the time these "enterprises" were undertaken, "hostilities" in America were being prosecuted "on a scale of gigantic magnitude." After, therefore, the "Alabama" escaped on the 29th of July 1862, she became, by virtue of her Confederate Commission, undoubtedly a belligerent cruiser, irrespective of any acknowledgment of belligerency by Great Britain, and was received accordingly by the French authorities at Martinique, where she first touched after leaving Liverpool.

A pirate is *hostis humani generis*, one owing obedience to no authority. If the "Alabama" had been really a pirate depredating on American commerce, it would have been the duty of the French to seize her, and execute justice on her commander and crew, a pirate being triable wheresoever found.

Judge Nelson in the case of the Confederate privateer "Savannah," ruled that though Confederate privateers were pirates *quoad* American jurisdiction, they were not pirates *jure gentium*; and in the case of the "Golden Rocket," in which the owner brought an action in an American Court against an Insurance Company for the

capture of his ship by the "Florida," he being insured against piracy but not against war risk, it was decided that captures by Confederate cruisers were not "piracy" within the usual meaning of the word, and that the Company was not liable.

The American Courts having thus conclusively dealt with the matter, it is unnecessary to pursue the subject further. What is probably meant is, that if the Confederates had not possessed a *de facto* Government, and had not been belligerents in the sense of waging public war, vessels under their Commission would have been mere roving adventurers, pursuing merchantmen for the sake of private plunder,—in short, pirates; but by the admission that "hostilities" (the very word to which exception is taken in the Neutrality Proclamation,) were being prosecuted on a great scale, the only ground on which such a supposition could rest is cut away.

II.—The dispatch of Confederate Cruisers from British Ports.

Any one who read the despatch without any previous knowledge of the subject, might suppose from the language used, that fleets of privateers had been dispatched from British ports with the connivance if not with the direct support of Her Majesty's Government:—

"Great Britain . . . permitted, armed, cruisers to be fitted out," &c.

"The Queen's Government . . . suffered ship after ship to be constructed in its ports to wage war on the United States,"

"Many ships . . . were, with ostentatious publicity, being constructed."

"Permission or negligence, which enabled Confederate cruisers from her ports to prey," &c.

"Great Britain alone had founded on that recognition a systematic maritime war," "a virtual act of war,"

"Suffering the fitting out of rebel cruisers."

The fact being that *only one vessel*, of whose probable intended belligerent character the British Government had any evidence, escaped, viz., the "Alabama."

The "Shenandoah" was a merchant ship employed in the India trade under the name of the "Sea King." Her conversion into a Confederate cruiser was not heard of until more than a month after she had left England.

The "Georgia," or "Japan," was actually reported by the Board of Trade surveyor, who had no idea of her destination, to be built as a merchant ship, and to be rather crank. Nothing was known of her proceedings until she had taken her arms and crew on board in Morlaix Bay, and reached Cherbourg. Her real point of departure as a cruiser, was France, and not England.

The "Florida" was detained at Nassau on suspicion, but discharged by the local Admiralty Court, there being no evidence of her being anything but a blockade-runner. She was fitted out as a ship of war at Mobile.

On the other hand, the British Government prevented the outfit of the "Rappahannock," prosecuted and detained the "Alexandra," seized the Liverpool rams, and stopped the "Pampero," besides investigating carefully every case of suspected outfit brought forward by Mr Adams, and he complained of nineteen, as well as every case which could be discovered independently. Amongst other things, taking charge of Captain

Osborne's Anglo-Chinese flotilla, which it was apprehended might fall into the hands of the Confederates, at a cost to this country of £100,000.

That any sea-going steamer can be converted into a cruiser by strengthening her bulkheads and arming her, which can be done at sea as well as on shore, is proved by the fact that the most efficient blockading vessels in the Federal navy were converted blockade-runners.

"The Alabama."—Mr Fish speaks of the neglect of the officers of the British Government to detain Confederate cruisers, and especially the "Alabama."

There was no neglect to detain the "Shenandoah" or "Georgia," for the reason that neither the Government nor its officers knew they were being intended for the Confederate Service. Indeed it has never been proved that the persons who sold those vessels knew it. Probably they did, but a case might very readily arise in which the vendors might be really ignorant. The American Government could not have expected the English revenue officers to prevent every large steamer leaving England in ballast.

With regard to the "Alabama," it is assumed that the negligence of the officers of the British Government was gross and inexcusable, and such as indisputably to devolve upon that Government full responsibility for all the depredations committed by her. Indeed this conclusion seems in effect to be conceded in Great Britain. At all events, the United States conceive that the proofs of responsible negligence in this matter are so clear that no room remains for debate on that point; and it should be taken for granted in all future negotiations with Great Britain.

By a *petitio principii*, the whole argument is thus assumed to be in favour of the United States.

There is no doubt that the "Alabama" might, if she had not escaped at the moment when the case against her appeared to be legally established, have been seized and tried under the Foreign Enlistment Act, though the result, looking to what occurred in the case of the "Alexandra," might have been doubtful.

This, however, is a very different thing from admitting that her sale to the Confederates was a violation of British neutrality for which the Nation is responsible. This was the first instance which occurred of the sale of a ship under such circumstances, and the British Government had in fact no suspicion of what was going to be done in the matter, no information having been received of an intention to take out her arms and crew in a separate vessel.

Judge Story, in the well-known case "Santisima Trinidad and St Ander," laid it down as indisputable that "there is nothing in our laws, or in the laws of Nations, that forbids our citizens from sending armed vessels, as well as munitions of war, to foreign ports for sale. It is a commercial venture, which no Nation is bound to prohibit, and which only exposes the persons engaged in it to the penalty of confiscation."

But it must be remembered that when Mr Fish claims compensation for all her depredations, he should not overlook the fact of the negligence shown by the Federal navy in twice letting her escape from them. First, when Mr Adams urged the Captain of the Federal ship, which at his instance had gone to Holyhead to look after her, to pursue her, when the Captain refused, and went off to his station at Gibraltar instead—a

proceeding at which Mr Adams expressed the greatest indignation (see Congress Papers, 1862, p. 159); and secondly, when the United States' ship "San Jacinto" blockaded her in the French port of St Pierre, Martinique, and then suffered her to slip away at night from under her bows.

III.—Supplies furnished to the Confederates by British Subjects.

Mr Fish states that the Confederates "had no ships, no mechanical appliances, no open sea-ports," &c., and implies that the maritime force of the Confederates was entirely derived from England.

The "Sumter," "Nashville," and "Florida," however, all sailed from Confederate ports in which they were armed and fitted out, besides a variety of small coasting privateers, such as the "Talahassee," whose captures form a considerable item in the list of Federal maritime losses, lately presented to Congress.

"On the land it was in like manner the munitions of war and the wealth drawn by the Insurgents from Great Britain which enabled them to withstand, year after year, the arms of the United States."

If, as Mr Fish states, the Confederates had no open sea-ports, how did these munitions and arms reach them?

Either the blockade was inefficient, in which case it was illegal, and neutral Nations were not bound to respect it, or it was efficient, as it was recognized by Great Britain to be, and the supply of arms, &c., was hazardous and uncertain.

There is no doctrine more clearly settled than that neutral Nations are not responsible for the supplies of contraband sent through a blockade by their subjects. Indeed the very existence of a blockade implies this; for, if it were the duty of neutrals to prevent the shipment of supplies to belligerents, why should there be a blockade at all? Each side would claim compensation for the assistance rendered to the other, and neutrality would become impossible.

If once it be conceded that blockade-running is an offence against neutrality in a civil war, the precedent would not fail to be invoked in all wars by whichever belligerent considered himself most aggrieved. Instead of establishing a principle in the interests of future peace this would lead to endless complications, and claims and counter-claims, which would make the end of one war the sure beginning of another.

The question of the action of the Dutch in the War of Independence cannot be dealt with without a review of the history of the period, for which this memorandum does not afford space. An account of the proceedings at St Eustache, and subsequent discussions with the Dutch Government, will be found in De Marten's "Nouvelles Causes Célèbres du Droit des Gens."

As to the supplies sent through the blockade having been organized by Confederate agents in England, the example was set them by the bureau established by Franklin at Paris for the assistance of the American Provinces.

On the other hand, it is notorious that the Federal troops were plentifully provided with arms and munitions from this country.

Her Majesty's Government have yet to learn that it has been held in international discussions that individuals are precluded from supplying belligerents with munitions of war.

IV.—Indirect Injury to American Commerce.

"Indirectly the effect was to increase the rate of insurance in the United States, to diminish exports and imports, and otherwise obstruct domestic industry and production, and to take away from the United States its immense foreign commerce, and to transfer this to the merchant vessels of Great Britain."

Mr Fish proceeds to quote figures, showing the decrease in American tonnage between 1860 and 1866.

This allegation of national, indirect or constructive claims was first brought forward officially by Mr Reverdy Johnson, in his attempt to renew negotiations on the Claims Convention in March last (North America, No. 1, 1869, page 46).

Mr Thornton has shown the difficulty there would be in computing the amount of claim even if it were acknowledged (North America, No. 1, 1869, page 53), in a despatch in which he mentions the continual decrease of American tonnage.

This is partly no doubt to be ascribed to the disturbance of commercial relations consequent on a long war, partly to the fact that many vessels were nominally transferred to British owners during the war to escape capture. Sir E. Hornby, in a recent Report, states that this was a constant practice in China.

Is not, however, a good deal of it to be attributed to the high American Tariff, which makes the construction of vessels in American ports more expensive than ship-building in England, and has thereby thrown so large a proportion of the carrying trade into English hands?

There must be some such cause for it, or otherwise American shipping would have recovered its position since the war, instead of continuing to fall off.

"Neither in the events which preceded that war" (of 1812) "nor in the events of the war itself, did the United States suffer more," &c.

No one can now wish to recall to recollection the particular events of that war; it would be much better for the two Nations to congratulate themselves that one of the principal causes of it, the nationality dispute, has, it is to be hoped, been set at rest finally by Lord Stanley's Protocol.

V. The despatch, in conclusion, refers "to important changes in the rules of public law," the desirableness of which has been demonstrated, but does not say what are the changes to which he alludes.

This is in the spirit of the proposal made by Her Majesty's Government in December 1865, (North America, No. 1, 1866, page 164):—

"I, however, asked Mr Adams whether it would not be both useful and practical to let bygones be bygones, to forget the past, and turn the lessons of experience to account for the future. England and the United States, I said, had each become aware of the defects that existed in international law, and I thought it would greatly redound to the honour of the two principal maritime Nations of the world to attempt the improvements in that code which had been proved to be necessary. It was possible, I added, that the wounds inflicted by the war were still too recent, and that the ill-will towards England was still too rife, to render such an undertaking practicable at the present moment; but it was one which ought to be borne in mind, and that was earnestly desired

by Her Majesty's Government, as a means of promoting peace and abating the horrors of war; and a work, therefore, which would be worthy of the civilization of our age, and which would entitle the Governments which achieved it to the gratitude of mankind."

It is not necessary in this Memorandum to dwell on the alleged efficiency of the American, as compared to the English Foreign Enlistment Act. The failure of the American Act in the Portuguese cases, in the repeated filibustering expeditions of Walker against Central America, and the acquittal under it of Lopez, the invader of Cuba, are proofs that its action cannot always be relied upon; and this is further corroborated by the difficulties now being experienced in dealing with the "Hornet," at Wilmington. Although, as Mr Fish says, there have been prosecutions under it, it is believed that, from the trial of Gideon Henfield in 1793, to the present day, there has never been a criminal conviction. The only result of the proceedings *in rem* has been to restore prizes, never to punish privateering; and the effect of the bonds which the Act provides may be taken that the owners of a vessel shall not themselves employ her in a belligerent service, and which has, it is believed, never been practically enforced, is, as Mr Bemis of Boston points out in his volume on American neutrality, to add so much to the price of the vessel.

With regard to the claims for "vast national injuries," it may be as well to observe that Professor Wolsey, the eminent American jurist, has repudiated them as untenable; while the strongest arguments in favour of the recognition of Confederate belligerency are to be found in the notes to Mr Dana's eighth edition of "Wheaton;" and Mr Lawrence, (the editor of the Second Annotated edition of "Wheaton,") in a recent speech at Bristol, stated that "as far as respects the complaint founded on the recognition of the belligerent rights of the Confederates, I cannot use too strong language in pronouncing its utter baseless character. No tyro in international law is ignorant that belligerency is a simple question of fact. With the late Sir Cornwall Lewis we may ask, if the array of a million of men on each side does not constitute belligerency, what is belligerency? But what was the Proclamation of the President, followed up by the condemnation of your ships and cargoes for a violation of the blockade which is established, but a recognition of a state of war? At this moment the United States, in claiming the property of the late Confederate Government, place before your tribunals their title on the fact of their being the successors of a *de facto* Government. I repeat that, however valid our claims may be against you on other grounds, there is not the slightest pretext for any claim against you based on the public admission of a notorious fact, the existence of which has been recognised by every department of the Federal Government."

WHITEHALL, December 27, 1869.

The Queen has been pleased to grant unto the Reverend Frank Robert Chapman, M.A., the Archdeaconry of Sudbury, in the Cathedral Church of Ely, void by the promotion of the Reverend Arthur Charles Hervey (commonly called Lord Arthur Charles Hervey) to the See of Bath and Wells.

WHITEHALL, December 27, 1869.

The Queen has been pleased to present the Reverend Richard Burgess, B.D., to the Rectory of Hornings Heath with Ickworth, in the county of Suffolk, and diocese of Ely, void by the promotion of the Reverend Arthur Charles Hervey (commonly called Lord Arthur Charles Hervey) to the See of Bath and Wells.

FOREIGN OFFICE, December 27, 1869.

The Queen has been pleased to approve of Mr James R. Wheeler as Consul at Kingston, Jamaica; and of Mr Samuel D. Pace as Consul at Port Sarnia, for the United States of America.

WAR-OFFICE, November 8, 1869.

The Queen has been pleased to issue a new Commission of Lieutenancy for the City of London, constituting and appointing the several persons undermentioned to be Her Majesty's Lieutenants for that purpose, viz. :—James Clarke Lawrence, Lord Mayor of Our city of London, and the Lord Mayor of Our said city for the time being; Our trusty and well-beloved Samuel Wilson, Esquire, Sir James Duke, Baronet, Sir John Musgrove, Baronet, Thomas Challis and Thomas Sidney, Esquires, Sir Francis Graham Moon, Baronet, Sir David Salomons, Baronet, Thomas Quedsted Finnis, Esquire, Sir Robert Walter Carden, Knight, John Carter, Esquire, Sir William Anderson Rose, Knight, William Lawrence, and Warren Storms Hale, Esquires, Sir Benjamin Samuel Phillips, Knight, Sir Thomas Gabriel, Baronet, and William Ferneley Allen, Esquire, Aldermen of Our city of London; Our right trusty and well-beloved Councillor Russell Gurney, Recorder of Our city of London, and the Recorder of Our said city for the time being; Our trusty and well-beloved Thomas Dakin, Robert Besley, and Sills John Gibbons, Esquires, Sir Sydney Hedley Waterlow, Knight, Andrew Lusk, David Henry Stone, William James Richmond Cotton, Joseph Causton, and Thomas Scambler Owden, Esquires, Aldermen of Our city of London, and the Aldermen of Our said city for the time being; Our trusty and well-beloved Benjamin Scott, Esquire, Chamberlain of Our city of London, and the Chamberlain of Our said city of London for the time being; Our trusty and well-beloved Frederick Woodthorpe, Esquire, Town-Clerk of Our city of London, and the Town-Clerk, of Our said city of London for the time being; Our trusty and well-beloved Thomas Chambers, Esquire, Common Serjeant of Our city of London, and the Common Serjeant of Our said city for the time being, Our trusty and well-beloved Benjamin Bower, William Hawtry, Frederick Farrar, Septimus Read, Thomas Henry Fry, William Jones, Henry de Jersey, Blomfield Burnell, John Hawkins Elliott, Thomas White, Charles Reed, John Malcolm, Charles Whetham, William Tegg, Samuel Elliott Atkins, Robert James Chaplin, Anthony Locke, John Banister, James Butcher, Thomas Webber, Robert Stapleton, John Christopher Christie, William Webster, John Parker, Archibald McDougall, George Mason, George Walter, Henry Lowman Taylor, Thomas Symonds, and John Kelday, Esquires, Deputies of Our city of London, and the Deputies of Our said city for the time being; Our trusty and

well-beloved James Abbiss, and John Joseph Mechi, Esquires, formerly Aldermen of Our city of London; Our trusty and well-beloved James Southby Bridge, Thomas Watkins, William Tyler, Henry Kebbel, William Christie, Robert Butler Whiteside, Thomas Turnbull, Charles Gammon, Thomas Snelling, George Bone, Robert Obbard, and Thomas Bridge Simpson, Esquires, formerly Deputies of Our city of London; Our right trusty and well-beloved Henry Hulse Berens, Arthur Edward Campbell, Robert Wigram Crawford, James Pattison Currie, Benjamin Buck Greene, Henry Riversdale Grenfell, Henry Hucks Gibbs, John Saunders Gilliat, Charles Hermann Göschen, James Alexander Guthrie, and Thomason Hankey, Esquires; Baron John Benjamin Heath, Kirkman Daniel Hodgson, Henry Lancelot Holland, John Gellibrand Hubbard, Thomas Newman Hunt, Alfred Latham, Thomas Masterman, James Morris, George Warde Norman, Edward Howley Palmer, Alfred Charles de Rothschild, Christopher Weguelin, Clifford Wigram, and Thomas Baring, Esquires; the Right Honourable Stephen Cave, Henry Wollaston Blake and Mark Wilks Collet, Esquires; Our right trusty and well-beloved Councillor Right Honourable George Joachim Göschen; Our trusty and well-beloved Charles Frederick Huth, George Lyall, Alexander Matheson, Albert George Sandeman, Thomas Charles Smith, Thomas Matthias Weguelin, Travers Buxton, and John William Birch, Esquires; Our trusty and well-beloved Ross Donnelly Mangies, Esquires, Sir Frederick Currie, Baronet, Charles Mills, Russell Ellice, and Martin Tucker Smith, Esquires, Sir James Weir Hogg, Baronet, Colonel William Henry Sykes, Elliot Macnaghten, William Joseph Eastwick, John Harvey Astell, and Henry Thoby Prinsep, Esquires; Sir Henry Creswicke Rawlinson, Knight, and Sir Robert John Hussey Vivian, Knight, Commanders of the Most Honourable Order of the Bath; Sir Laurence Peel, Knight, William Henry Chicheley Plowden, and William Dent, Esquires; Sir Dudley Coutts Majoribanks, Baronet, Charles Franks, Charles John Manning, Charles John Baker, James Whatman Bosanquet, Henry Lannoy Hunter, John Iltid Nicholl, Thomas Henry Allen Poynder, Henry Vigne, William Pole, Henry Jeffreys Bushby, and John Neville Warren, Esquires; Our trusty and well-beloved Baron Lionel de Rothschild, Baron Nathan de Rothschild, Sir Moses Montefiore, Baronet, George Carr Glyn, and Jonathan Muckleston Key, Esquires, Sir William Henry Poland, Knight, Thomas Aler's Hankey, Edward Tyrrell, William Croft, John Alexander Hankey, Daniel Britten, William Hughes Hughes, William Hughes Hughes, junior, Ambrose Moore, Joseph Oldham, junior, Alfred Wilson, Cornelius Lea Wilson, Peter Northall Laurie, Edward Wilson, William Peters, Joseph Somes, John Masterman, Frederick Mildred, James Bentley, William Gladstone, John Pemberton Heywood, John Pierce Kennard, Robert William Kennard, Joseph Maynard, William Roper Maynard, John Walter, Charles Fenton Whiting, Charles Hill, Heathfield Smith, Charles Alliston, George Alliston, Philip Champion Toker, William Dalison Starling, John Kinnersley Hooper, William Fowler Mountford Copeland, Joseph Anderson, junior, Samuel Christy Miller, Bonamy Dobree, William Jones Loyd, Donald Nicoll, John Henry Smith, Thomas Matthewman Challis, William Henry Challis, Alfred Wilberforce Challis, John Ridley Hunter, Robert Bousfield, Edward Jones

Williams, Edward Hunter, Edward Masterman, George Moore, John Francis Moon, Richard Nathaniel Philipps, George Wodehouse Currie, Lewis Loyd, Charles Magnaic, James Nugent Daniel, William Schaw Lindsay, George Moffatt, Thomas Parker, Samuel Fisher, Thomas Kerr Lynch, Charles Skipper, George Grenfel Glyn, Alexander Angus Croll, Stephen William Silver, John William Carter, Frederick Graves Moon, Alfred James Waterlow, and Henry Wellington Vallance, Esquires; Sir William Tite, Commander of the Most Honourable Order of the Bath; Sir Anthony de Rothschild, Baronet; Travers Barton Wire, Josiah Hale, Joseph Sebag, Henry Hill, James Duke Hill, Richard Baggallay, Henry Doulton, Robert Nicholas Fowler, Patrick Douglas Hadow, Hugh Jones, Howard John Kennard, John Coleridge Kennard, Hilary Nicholas Nissen, Nathan Mayer de Rothschild, and James Anderson Rose, Esquires; Hugh, Baron Strathnairn, Knight Grand Cross of the Most Honourable Order of the Bath, General in Our Army; John Rose Holden Rose, Esquire, Lieutenant-Colonel in Our Army; Joseph D'Aguiel Samuda, Charles John Todd, Thomas White, and William Foster White, Esquires; Sir Andrew Scott Waugh, Knight Commander of the Most Honourable Order of the Bath, Major-General in Our Army, John Gurney Hoare, Joseph Hoare, Charles Kaye Freshfield, Henry Ray Freshfield, Hugh Mackaye Matheson, Francis Augustus Bevan, Henry Huth, John Knowles, Philip William Flower, Henry Alers Hankey, Thomas Webster, Marmaduke Blake Sampson, Frederick Collier, John Robert Thomson, William Herbert Mullens, William Vivian, William Corrie, Robert Malcolm Kerr, Thomas James Nelson, John Coysgarne Sim, Thomas Gabriel, Henry John Tritton, John Peter Gassiot, Percy Shawe Smith, Alfred James Copeland, James Sprent Virtue, George Frederick White, Samuel Morley, William Kendrick Gladstone, John Thompson Fletcher, Mark Cattley, Richard Whiteman Fall, John Alldin Moore, Philip Twells, Charles Booth, James Pearce Allen, Arthur Burnand, Jeremiah Colman, William Sedgwick Saunders, and William Holm Twentyman, Esquires; Sir Francis Lycett, Knight, Ferdinand Brand, William Collinson, and George Croshaw, Esquires; and Our trusty and well-beloved Sir John Lubbock, Baronet, Alfred Lawrence, Charles William Cookworthy Hutton, Francis Tagart, Edwin Lawrence, William M'Arthur, and Samuel Henry Phillips, Esquires.

DUBLIN CASTLE, December 28, 1869.

His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant has been pleased to appoint O. D. J. Grace, Esq., to be Vice-Lieutenant of the County of Roscommon, during the absence from Ireland of the Lieutenant thereof.

WAR-OFFICE, PALL-MALL,
December 28, 1869.

1st Regiment of Life Guards—Henry Cairnes Westerra, Lord Rossmore, to be Cornet and Sub-Lieutenant, by purchase, vice Henry, Lord Beaumont, who retires. Dated 29th December 1869.

12th Lancers—Surgeon Thomas Tarrant, M.D., from the Cape Mounted Riflemen, to be Surgeon, vice Surgeon-Major Francis Hastings Baxter, M.D., appointed to the Staff. Dated 29th December 1869.

Grenadier Guards—Lieutenant and Captain the Honourable C. Ernest Edgcombe to be Captain and Lieutenant-Colonel, by purchase, vice Robert William Hamilton, who retires. Dated 29th December 1869.

Ensign and Lieutenant Laurence James Oliphant to be Lieutenant and Captain, by purchase, vice the Honourable C. E. Edgcombe. Dated 29th December 1869.

The Honourable William Frederick Fraser, Master of Saltoun, to be Ensign and Lieutenant, by purchase, vice Oliphant. Dated 29th December 1869.

3d Foot—Ensign Robert Albert Hickson to be Lieutenant, by purchase, vice Ashley Pochin, who retires. Dated 29th December 1869.

7th Foot—Ensign Waldyve Wellington St George to be Lieutenant, by purchase, vice William Wolfe Rynd, who retires. Dated 29th December 1869.

14th Foot—Staff-Surgeon John Edward Moffatt to be Surgeon, vice William Henry Price, appointed to the Staff. Dated 29th December 1869.

24th Foot—Henry Vernon Boothby, gent. to be Ensign, by purchase, vice Mackenzie, transferred to the 41st Foot. Dated 29th December 1869.

41st Foot—Staff-Surgeon Samuel Black Roe, M.B., to be Surgeon, vice William Henry Yates, deceased. Dated 29th December 1869.

45th Foot—Ensign John Sabin Smith to be Lieutenant, without purchase, vice Frederick William Pace, deceased. Dated 8th November 1869.

57th Foot—Lieutenant Archibald Kennedy Douglass to be Captain, by purchase, vice Reginald A. Hoby Cox, who retires. Dated 29th December 1869.

Ensign Edward Sealy Vidal to be Lieutenant, by purchase, vice Douglass. Dated 29th December 1869.

Ensign Arthur Neil has been permitted to retire from the service by the sale of his Commission. Dated 29th December 1869.

58th Foot—Ensign William Henry Browne to be Lieutenant, without purchase, vice Charles Scovell Whitmore, deceased. Dated 2d December 1869.

Ensign Edmund Charles Elliston to be Lieutenant, without purchase, vice W. H. Browne, a Probationer for the Indian Staff Corps. Dated 2d December 1869.

Ensign Augustus Williams Morris to be Lieutenant, without purchase, vice E. C. Elliston, a Probationer for the Indian Staff Corps. Dated 2d December 1869.

60th Foot—Lieutenant Reginald Chalmer to be Adjutant, vice Lieutenant C. F. Cramer, who has resigned that appointment. Dated 10th November 1869.

65th Foot—Lieutenant Salisbury Davenport Crookenden, from half-pay, late 4th West India Regiment, to be Lieutenant, vice John D. Macpherson, who retires upon temporary half-pay. Dated 29th December 1869.

89th Foot—Captain Launcelot Charles Brown, from half-pay, late 11th Foot, to be Captain, vice James Wharton Harrel, who retires upon temporary half-pay. Dated 29th December 1869.

Lieutenant Erasmus Harris Vaughton to be Captain, by purchase, vice Launcelot Charles Brown, who retires. Dated 29th December 1869.

Ensign Alfred John Le Cornu to be Lieutenant, by purchase, vice Vaughton. Dated 29th December 1869.

100th Foot—Ensign Charles Villiers Summerville Downes to be Lieutenant, by purchase, vice Louis Nicholas de la, Cherois-Crommelin, who retires. Dated 29th December 1869.

3d West India Regiment—The surname of the Ensign appointed on 15th instant is *Breen*, not *Brien*, as then stated.

Medical Department—Surgeon-Major Francis Hastings Baxter, M.D., from 12th Lancers, to be Staff Surgeon-Major, vice Staff Surgeon William Boyd, superseded for being absent without leave. Dated 29th December 1869.

Surgeon William Henry Price, from 14th Foot, to be Staff-Surgeon, vice John Edward Moffatt, appointed to 14th Foot. Dated 29th December 1869.

Staff Assistant-Surgeon Francis John Shortt to be Staff-Surgeon, vice Samuel Black Roe, M.B., appointed to the 41st Foot. Dated 29th December 1869.

Assistant-Surgeon Alfred Lewer, from Royal Artillery, to be Staff Assistant-Surgeon, vice Francis John Shortt, promoted on the Staff. Dated 29th December 1869.

Purveyor's Department—Deputy Purveyor Voltaire White to be Purveyor. Dated 1st November 1869.

BREVET.

Lieutenant-Colonel William Roberts, 5th Foot, having completed the qualifying service with the rank of Lieutenant-Colonel, to be Colonel, under the provisions of the Royal Warrant of 3d February 1866. Dated 27th December 1869.

Paymaster and Honorary Captain W. Dring, 49th Foot, to have the honorary rank of Major. Dated 5th November 1869.

Paymaster F. E. T. Hobbs, 6th Dragoons, to have the honorary rank of Captain. Dated 9th December 1869.

ADMIRALTY, December 24, 1869.

Lieutenant Leicester Chantrey Keppel has been promoted to be a Commander in Her Majesty's Fleet, with seniority from the 30th September 1869, in the haul-down vacancy of Admiral the Honourable Sir H. Keppel, K.C.B., late Commander-in-Chief on the China Station.

Commission signed by the Lord Lieutenant of the County of Aberdeen.

3d Aberdeenshire Rifle Volunteer Corps. James Munro to be Ensign, vice Bruce, resigned. Dated 18th December 1869.

Commission signed by the Lord Lieutenant of the County of Perth.

7th Perthshire Rifle Volunteer Corps. George Honeyman, Esq. to be Lieutenant, vice Boyd, promoted. Dated 24th December 1869.

Commissions signed by the Lord Lieutenant of the County of Gloucester, and of the City and County of the City of Gloucester, and of the City and County of the City of Bristol.

Royal South Gloucestershire Light Infantry Regiment of Militia.

John Williams Holmes, gent. to be Lieutenant. Dated 20th December 1869.

1st Gloucestershire Engineer Volunteer Corps.

Alfred Thomas Billings, gent. to be Second Lieutenant, vice Washbourn, promoted. Dated 24th December 1869.

2d Gloucestershire Engineer Volunteer Corps.

Thomas Hodgson Johnson Elletson to be Second Lieutenant. Dated 24th December 1869.

Commission signed by the Lord Lieutenant of the County of Surrey.

19th Surrey Rifle Volunteer Corps.

Lieutenant James Alfred Thornhill to be Captain, vice F. T. Prewett, resigned. Dated 1st November 1869.

Commission signed by the Lord Lieutenant of the County of Wilts.

1st Wiltshire Rifle Volunteer Corps.

Ensign Edward Frederick Kelsey to be Lieutenant, vice Pain, resigned. Dated 6th December 1869.

Commission signed by the Lord Lieutenant of the County of Kent, and of the City and County of the City of Canterbury.

21st Kent Rifle Volunteer Corps.

Ensign William Foord Latter to be Lieutenant, vice Carlisle, resigned. Dated 18th December 1869.

Commission signed by the Lord Lieutenant of the County of Monmouth.

8th Monmouthshire Rifle Volunteer Corps.

Samuel Wright Gardner, gent. to be Ensign. Dated 18th December 1869.

Commissions signed by the Lord Lieutenant of the County of Salop.

Charles George Wingfield, Esq. to be Deputy Lieutenant. Dated 22d December 1869.

James Herbert Frame, Esq. to be Deputy Lieutenant. Dated 24th December 1869.

[The following Appointment is substituted for that which appeared in the Gazette of the 10th instant.]

Commission signed by the Lord Lieutenant of the County of Surrey.

15th Surrey Rifle Volunteer Corps.

Frederick Charles Vardon, Esq. late Captain Madras Artillery, to be Captain, vice R. Oldham, resigned. Dated 27th November 1869.

WHITEHALL, November 23, 1869.

The Lord Chancellor has appointed Russell Gole, of No. 49, Lime Street, City, and No. 3, Adelaide Road, North Finchley Road, N.W., Gentleman, to be a London Commissioner to administer oaths in the High Court of Chancery.

WHITEHALL, December 15, 1869.

The Lord Chancellor has appointed John Watkins Johnston, of Stockport, in the county of Chester, Gentleman, to be a Commissioner to administer oaths in the High Court of Chancery in England.

BANKRUPTS

FROM THE LONDON GAZETTE.

BANKRUPTCIES AWARDED.

William Shaw, at 4, Henthorn Street, cotton waste dealer and commission agent, and formerly occupying a warehouse at 14, Bell Street, both in Oldham, Lancaster.

James Bloomfield, of 3, Smith's Buildings, Hemplain, Lowestoft, Suffolk, late carriage proprietor, now out of business.

Richard Samuel Adams, of 2, St Aubyn Street, Devonport, Devon, professor of music, and musical instrument and music seller.

Frederick George Burt, formerly of 2, Sea View Terrace, Plymouth, and now of 13, Park Street, Stoke Damerell, both in Devon, commission agent.

George Vosper, late of Mount Street, Devonport, and of Plymouth, Devon, plasterer, late a prisoner for debt in the Devon County Gaol, at Exeter.

Joseph Wilson, of Botchergate, Carlisle, grocer and provision dealer.

Robert Beanland, of 23, Back Peel Street, Rochdale, Lancaster, smallware dealer, late a prisoner for debt in Her Majesty's Prison at Lancaster.

John Henry Jones, of 5, Margaret's Buildings, out of business, late of 2, Claverton Buildings, both in Bath, beer retailer.

John Simmons, of Newark-upon-Trent, Nottingham, boot and shoe maker.

Thomas Eardley, of Newport, Salop, saddler.

Henry Heyden, of 24, Hatherley Street, tobacconist, and formerly of the Woolpack Inn, Saint Paul's Street South, both in Cheltenham, Gloucester, publican.

Lewis Jenkins, of the British School House, Mynyddysallwyn, Monmouth, tailor and draper.

Job Smith, the younger, of the Star Inn, Overbury, Worcester, licensed victualler and cordwainer.

Job Smith, of Conderton, Overbury, Worcester, blacksmith.

Thomas Clayton, of Sturton-le-Steeple, Nottingham, cottager.

George Johnson, of Bridge Street, Worksop, Nottingham, saddler and harness maker.

Ellis Crompton, of Market Street, Kersley, Lancaster, shopkeeper.

Sarah Smith, of Morley, York, confectioner.

John Rhodes, of Tathwell, Lincoln, butcher.

Albert Ryall, of Smalldridge, Axminster, Devon, baker.

Charles Hobbs, of East View Cottage, Churchills, Shalfleet, Isle of Wight, Hants, carpenter and joiner.

William Pinhorn, of West Cowes, Isle of Wight, Hants, stationer.

Sarah Young, of High Street, Leominster, Hereford, milliner.

George Haworth, of 36, Rose Place, manager to a licensed victualler, formerly of 40, Aber Street, licensed victualler, lately of 40, Leeds Street, all in Liverpool, Lancaster, manager to a licensed victualler.

Margaret Gibbons, at 18, Bridport Street, having also occupation of the hall 38, St John's Market, both in Liverpool, Lancaster, butcher.

Alfred Roe, at 30, Hunter Street, and also tenting the Wellington Hall, Camden Street, both in Liverpool, Lancaster, music hall proprietor, previously at 67, Grafton Street, and 5, Skinner Lane, both in Leeds, York, music hall manager.

Thomas Dukes, of Middlesbrough, York, labourer, formerly a beerhouse keeper.

James Vernon, late of Wortley, Leeds, York, grocer and provision dealer, but now an excavator.

Richard Joseph Pike, late of Lister Gate, and formerly of Bridlesmith Gate, at the same residing at 8, Notinton Place, Sneinton, all in Nottingham, bookseller.

John Horsley, at 13, William Street, Nottingham, coal dealer.

Alfred Hammond, of Kirton Fen, Kirton, Lancaster, farmer and grazier.

William Dowse, late of Wainfleet All Saints, draper and grocer, but now of Cumberworth, both in Lincoln, out of business.

Benjamin Rowe, of 25, Newcastle Street, Burslem, Stafford, plumber, painter, glazier, and paperhanger.
 Marshall Rooks, of 4, Jackson's Row, Deansgate, Manchester, Lancaster, beerseller, and of Walton Cross, Liversedge, York, farmer and horse dealer.
 William Jordan, formerly carrying on business at 57A, Princess Street, Manchester, Lancaster, as a refreshment-house keeper, and at the Queen's Arms, Queen Street, Rusholme, near Manchester, beer retailer, but now of 10, Brunswick Street, Rusholme aforesaid, out of business.
 John Toole, of Peacock Yard, Carrier Street, Halifax, York, fishmonger and hawk.
 William Long Abbey, of the Cock Inn, Hockering, Norfolk, publican and dealer in beer and spirits.
 John Blakeman, of 6A, Newland, Northampton, hatter.
 Joseph Wilson, late of Osborne Street, Oldham Road, Manchester, Lancaster, cabinetmaker, late a prisoner for debt in the Manchester City Gaol.
 William Marsh, late of 8, Boundary Lane, Charlton-on-Medlock, Lancaster, beer retailer, late a prisoner for debt in the Manchester City Gaol.
 Mary Sophia Holden, late of 23, Albion Street, Gaythorn, Manchester, Lancaster, beerhouse keeper, late a prisoner for debt in the Manchester City Gaol.
 John Bennett, of 122, Sussex Street, Lower Broughton, out of business, previously thereto of the Dog and Partridge Inn, and the Lord Nelson Inn, both in Chaple Street, Salford, all in Lancaster, licensed victualler.
 James Henry Firth, of 64, Regent Road, Salford, Lancaster, provision dealer, late a prisoner for debt in the Manchester City Gaol.
 William Dillon, of 87, George Street, Hulme, Lancaster, beerhouse keeper, late a prisoner for debt in the Manchester City Gaol.
 Henry Baggs, of 291, City Road, Hulme, Lancaster, butcher, late a prisoner for debt in the Manchester City Gaol.
 William Deakin, of 5, Meredith Street, Boundary Lane, Hulme, Lancaster, stonemason, late a prisoner for debt in the Manchester City Gaol.
 John Haley, of 18, Sidney Street, Lancaster, green grocer and beerseller, late a prisoner for debt in the Manchester City Gaol.
 Edwin Wilby, of Ossett Common, Ossett, York, cloth manufacturer.
 William Shephardson, of Kingston-upon-Hull, joiner and builder.
 Christopher Heinrich Lassen, of Kingston-upon-Hull, merchant's clerk.
 John Clayton, of Beckingham, Nottingham, farmer.
 Henry Frederic Jorss and James Jack, of Leeds, York, woollen merchants.
 John Kellett, of Cleckheaton, York, hannel and blanket manufacturer.
 William Freeman and Thomas Yeoman Freeman, both of Otley, York, stonemasons, builders, and contractors, the said William Freeman carrying on business at Otley aforesaid, as a licensed victualler.
 James Ackroyde, of Greetland, near Halifax, York.
 Dawson Metcalf, of Halffield Street, Bradford, York, commercial traveller, formerly of Wellington, Somerset, trading with Frederick Haima Window, as general drapers.
 John Moore, of Pickering, York, road surveyor.
 Jabez Chapman, late of 75, Phillip Street, Kingsland Road, Middlesex, coal and potato dealer.
 William Thomas Randall, late of the Fox, Fox Lane, New Brompton, Chatham, Kent, beerseller.
 William Hoskins, of 3, Lismore Road, Southampton Road, formerly of Queen's Crescent, both in Kentish Town, Middlesex, carpenter and joiner, now a prisoner for debt in the Debtors' Prison for London and Middlesex, Whitecross Street, London, (in formâ pauperis).
 Caleb Piper, of Northampton House, Leslie Park Road, Croydon, Surrey, previously of 2, Grove Road, Forest Hill, and 2, Fir Cottages, North Road, Forest Hill, both in Kent, and of Thunders House, Waldron, Sussex, and of Church Street, Heathfield, Sussex, bootmaker, now a prisoner for debt in the Debtors' Prison for London and Middlesex, Whitecross Street, London, (in formâ pauperis).
 Robert Browning, of 9, Baum Cottage, Hackney Wick, prior thereto of 81, Myddleton Street, Clerkenwell, and Grove Street Road, Hackney, all in Middlesex, gas-fitter, now a prisoner for debt in the Debtors' Prison for London and Middlesex, Whitecross Street, London, (in formâ pauperis).
 Joseph Soanes, late of 15, Acklam Road, now of 1A, Blagrove Road, both in Notting Hill, Middlesex, builder.

Peter Balls Pestell, of 7, Myddleton Road, Hornsey, Middlesex, out of business, previously of Norfolk Cottage, Western Road, Clapham, and of 2, Havelock Cottages, Chatham Road, Battersea, both in Surrey, carpenter and builder, now a prisoner for debt in the Debtors' Prison for London and Middlesex, Whitecross Street, London, (in formâ pauperis).
 Frederick Morris, of 2, Ascham Street, Liverton Street, Kentish Town Road, Middlesex, dairyman, a prisoner for debt in the Debtors' Prison for London and Middlesex, Whitecross Street, London, (in formâ pauperis).
 William Gregory, of 290, Euston Road, St Pancras, Middlesex, pastrycook, a prisoner for debt in the Debtors' Prison for London and Middlesex, Whitecross Street, London, (in formâ pauperis).
 Stephen Roberts, of 65 and 66, Shoreditch, Middlesex, wholesale and retail clothier.
 Edmund Gibbs, of Colchester, Essex, ironmonger's assistant.
 Frederick Birdsey, of 7, Edward Street, Penton Place, Walworth, Surrey, assistant to a meat salesman, and formerly of 39, King Street, Snow Hill, London, there keeping a coffeehouse, and also porter and assistant to a meat salesman, and residing at 7, Albion Terrace, Penton Place, Walworth, Surrey, previously of the Market, King's Cross, Middlesex, butcher, and formerly of Triug, Hertford, keeping a house for the sale of beer, and butcher.
 George Pittis, of Wymering, Southampton, farm bailiff, previously of Wymering aforesaid, yeoman.
 Richard Christian Betts, formerly of 91, Newman Street, Oxford Street, in no business, afterwards of 10, Gray's Inn Square, then of 3, South Square, Gray's Inn, all in Middlesex, since of Gwastadcoed Comminscoch, Montgomeryshire, and now of 3, Old North Street, Red Lion Square, Middlesex, barrister-at-law.
 Charles Thomas Debenham Durrant, (known as and usually calling himself Thomas Durrant,) of 453, Oxford Street, and 124, Malden Road, Kentish Town, both in Middlesex, estate and business agent, carrying on business under the style or firm of Durrant & Company.
 Thomas Nevitt, of 78, Blundell Street, Caledonian Road, journeyman wheelwright, previously thereto of 13A, Blundell Street aforesaid, and 18, Bingfield Street, Caledonian Road, and 70, Havelock Street, Caledonian Road, and of 60, Havelock Street aforesaid, formerly of 2, Britannia Street, King's Cross Road, all in Middlesex, wheelwright.
 Samuel Yardley, of 123, Sidney Street, Mile End Road, barman to a licensed victualler, previously of the Buck's Head, Chilton Street, Bethnal Green Road, both in Middlesex, licensed victualler.
 Frederick Thomas Platts, (commonly called and known by the name of Frederick Platts,) formerly of 4, Southampton Row, Bloomsbury, Middlesex, then of 185, Fleet Street, London, and also of 30, Lincolns' Inn Fields, Middlesex, and now of 369, New Cross Road, Deptford, Kent, and also of 185, Fleet Street, London, engraver and lithographic printer.
 James Barnett, of 96, Leadenhall Street, London, and of 77, Grovenor Road, Stoke Newington, Middlesex, and of 4, Lawrence Pountney Place, Cannon Street, London, cheesemonger.
 Henry Johns Barber, (commonly known as and called Henry Barber,) of 53, Ann Street, Plumstead, previously of Old Charlton, baker, and prior thereto of 127, Crescent Road, Plumstead aforesaid, all in Kent, grocer and cheesemonger.
 William Smith, of 146, Manor Street, Clapham, Surrey, corn and coal dealer.
 George Cutler, of Bollo Bridge Road, Acton, Middlesex, bricklayer.
 Ernest John Maidlow, of 14, Fleet Road, Saint John's Park, Hampstead, Middlesex, builder.
 George Cox, of the Island Queen, 34, Hanover Street, Islington, Middlesex, licensed victualler.
 Robert Hewett, formerly of New Bromley, butcher, but now of Mason's Hill, Bromley, both in Kent, out of business.
 Thomas William Taylor, now at 2, Oxford Terrace, Islington, formerly of 39, Great Percy Street, Clerkenwell, and afterwards of 50, Euston Road, all in Middlesex, merchant's clerk.
 Richard Quick, of 131, Gray's Inn Road, and 3, Brownlow Mews, Gray's Inn Road, both in Middlesex, tin-plate worker.
 John Hector Holden, of 21, Eversholt Street, Camden Town, formerly of 4A, High Street, Notting Hill, and afterwards of 314, Oxford Street, all in Middlesex, tobacconist.
 Edward Le Keux, of 32, Gloucester Street, Queen's Square, Bloomsbury, Middlesex, cabinetmaker.

- Philipp Stein, of 9, Three Colt Street, Old Ford, previously of 1, Half Nicol Street, Bethnal Green, both in Middlesex, baker.
- John Brady, late of 5, Walpole Place, Woolwich, Kent, builder, and now a prisoner for debt in Maidstone Gaol.
- Christopher Patterson Thurgate, (sued as Christopher Thurgate,) late of 1, Apsley Terrace, Great Yarmouth, Norfolk, builder, a prisoner for debt in the Gaol of Norwich Castle, Norfolk.
- Henry Summerford, the younger, of 8, Heriot Place, Lismore Circus, Kentish Town, Middlesex, cheesemonger, a prisoner for debt in the Debtors' Prison for London and Middlesex, (in form a pauperis).
- George Youngman, of 19, Russell Mews, Howland Street, Tottenham Court Road, Middlesex, out of business, late of 8, Hare Street, Woolwich, Kent, licensed victualler, a prisoner for debt in Horsemonger Lane Gaol, Surrey, (in form a pauperis).
- Robert Castle, late of 15, Brixton Place, Brixton, but now of 7, Stockwell Green, both in Surrey, blind-maker.
- William Henry Robertson, of 21, Russell Street, Landport, draper, previously thereto of Liss, both in Southampton, draper, grocer, and baker.
- Harry Samuel Long, of 3, Leonard Court, Paul Street, Finsbury, Middlesex, coachbuilder.
- Hannah Garrard, of 1, Plumstead Common Road, Plumstead, Kent, grocer and cheesemonger.
- James Cole, of 16, Bonfire Corner, Portsea, Hants, plumber, painter, and glazier.
- Charles Sloper, of 1, Maiden Lane, Covent Garden, and 30, George Street, late of 5, Ridinghouse Street, both in Great Portland Street, all in Middlesex, working cabinetmaker, upholsterer, and carver.
- Thomas Mealey, of 13, Penton Street, Clerkenwell, Middlesex, out of business, previously of 91, Long Lane, Smithfield, London, previously of the Nag's Head, New Compton Street, Soho, Middlesex, licensed victualler, and formerly of 45, King Street, Woolwich, Kent, carpenter.
- Robert Mickelburgh, of 3, Alfred Street, Victoria Docks, and late of 129, Victoria Dock Road, both in Essex, baker and grocer.
- Walter Buckler Lethbridge, of 292, King's Road, Chelsea, of no occupation, late of 174, Queen's Road, Bayswater, formerly of 14, Duke Street, Saint James's, all in Middlesex, prior thereto of the Hotel D'Orient, Paris, prior thereto of Chantilly, prior thereto of the Boulevard Males Herbes, Paris, all in France, and prior thereto of 19, Han's Place, Chelsea, Middlesex.
- William Stoot, of 6, John Street, Marylebone Road, dairyman's assistant, late of 14, Milton Street, Dorset Square, and Ealing Paddocks Dairy, all in Middlesex, carrying on business with James Pyte, as dairymen and cowkeepers.
- George Smith, formerly of 53, Long Lane, Smithfield, London, beershop keeper, afterwards of the Fox and Hounds, Tottenham Court Road, licensed victualler, now of 47, Stanhope Street, Hampstead Road, both in Middlesex, out of business.
- William Joseph Rundell, of 4, Pereira Place, Shepherd's Bush, formerly of 2, Eastbourne Terrace, Paddington, both in Middlesex, clerk in Holy Orders.
- Robert Mendham Evans, late of Wateringbury, Kent, and 73, Warwick Square, Pimlico, and now of the Charing Cross Hotel, Charing Cross, both in Middlesex.
- James Henry Hassam, of 335, King's Road, formerly of 1, Blantyre Cottages, Cremorne Terrace, both in Chelsea, Middlesex, plumber and decorator.
- Samuel Egan Rosser, of Wealdstone House, Harrow Weald, and of Percy Chambers, Northumberland Street, Strand, both in Middlesex, and at lately carrying on business at 118, Dorset Street, Fleet Street, London, civil engineer.
- Henry Wills, formerly of Red Lion Wharf, 4, Bankside, Southwark, and now of Clink Street, Bankside aforesaid, and 6, Woods Road, Flanders Road, Peckham, all in Surrey, wharfinger, and warehouse keeper, trading under the style or firm of H. Wills & Company.
- Henry Lewis Titus Newhouse, formerly of 5, Mark Lane, afterwards of 10, Brown's Buildings, St Mary Axe, and now of 59, Mark Lane, both in London, wine and commission merchant, carrying on business under the name or style of Titus Newhouse, and residing at 10, Douglas Road, Canonbury, Middlesex.
- John Cooper, of 2, Chadwell Street, Myddleton Square, formerly of 27, Eleanor Road, Hackney, both in Middlesex, teacher of music.
- Edward Hand, of 66, Elsted Street, Walworth, Surrey, general dealer.
- Sidney Hoy, of 22, Burlington Mews, Westbourne Park, Paddington, and previously of 11, Tavistock Terrace, Portobello Road, Notting Hill, both in Middlesex, carpenter.
- John Thomas Milbourne, of 1A, Belgrave Street, Commercial Road, Middlesex, journeyman tailor, and formerly of Devonshire Street, Carlisle, Cumberland, tailor.
- George Thorpe, of 97, Farringdon Street, London, refreshment-house keeper.
- George Thomas Forde, of Wolvercot, Oxford, farmer and mail contractor.
- Henry Whyatt, of Dovercourt, Harwich, Essex, ink-keeper.
- Simon Laars, of 11, Saint Leonard's Terrace, Maida Hill, Middlesex, draper, trading in the name or style of Mme. H. Doodeward.
- William Henry Bagnall, of Stone, near Dartford, Kent, late a farmer, but now of no occupation.
- Joseph Cook, formerly of 17, Little Grove Street, Marylebone, and now of 1, Amberley Mews, Warwick Road, Paddington, both in Middlesex, wheelwright.
- Thomas Hutchinson Baylis, of 22, Upper Baker Street, formerly of 55, Mornington Road, both in Middlesex, then of 29, Burlington Street, Manchester, Lancaster, then of 6, Medina Place, Saint John's Wood, and afterwards of 118, Marylebone Road, both in Middlesex, commission agent.
- Alfred Forward, of Clifton Villa, Princes Road, Buckhurst Hill, Essex, out of business, previously of 31, Union Street, Spitalfields, Middlesex, licensed victualler.
- James Robinson, of 15, Azenby Square, Lyndhurst Road, previously of 8, Carlton Grove, both in Peckham, Surrey, commercial clerk.
- John Kellner, of the Three Tuns Inn, Eton, Bucks, licensed victualler.
- Francis Larter, late of 108, Rodney Road, and carrying on business at Chatham Row, both in Walworth, Surrey, timber dealer and wheelwright.
- Frederick Lowe, of Musgrove Cottage, Mansfield Road, Kentish Town, out of business, previously of 166, Saint John's Street, Clerkenwell, oilman, previously of Mabledon Place, Euston Road, previously of 41, Great Pulteney Street, Golden Square, all in Middlesex, commission agent, now a prisoner for debt in the Debtors' Prison for London and Middlesex, Whitecross Street, London, (in form a pauperis).
- Thomas Daws, of 13, Brook Street, Kennington Road, Surrey, cabinetmaker, now a prisoner for debt in the Debtors' Prison for London and Middlesex, Whitecross Street, London, (in form a pauperis).
- Charles Bennett, of 7, Manchester Buildings, Silchester Road, Notting Hill, smith, prior thereto of Metcalfe Road, Enfield Lock, Enfield, journeyman in the Ordnance Factory at Enfield, prior thereto of Oakley Crescent, Manor Street, Chelsea, foreman to the Manor Iron Works, all in Middlesex, now a prisoner for debt in the Debtors' Prison for London and Middlesex, Whitecross Street, London, (in form a pauperis).
- Thomas Barford, formerly trading under the firm of Barford & Thomas, of London Road, straw hat manufacturers, and now trading as Thomas Barford, of New London Road, both in St Alban's, Herts, straw hat manufacturer, now a prisoner for debt in the Debtors' Prison for London and Middlesex, Whitecross Street, London, (in form a pauperis).
- Jabez Lacey, of Luton, Beds, timber dealer, now a prisoner for debt in the Debtors' Prison for London and Middlesex, Whitecross Street, London, (in form a pauperis).
- Robert George Marzetti, (known and sued as Robert George Mazzetti) of 14, Wales Place, East India Road, and of 25, High Street, Poplar, and previously of Salmon's Lane, Limehouse, all in Middlesex, packing-case maker, and proprietor of the Poplar Saw Mills, now a prisoner for debt in the Debtors' Prison for London and Middlesex, Whitecross Street, London, (in form a pauperis).
- Thomas Frederick Adams, of 83, York Road, Lambeth, Surrey, bath proprietor.
- William Loat, of 14, Vale Place, Hammersmith, Middlesex, out of business, formerly carrying on business with Thomas Allison Readwin, at 29, Great St Helen's, and 108, Dorset Street, Fleet Street, both in London, under the style or firm of Tar & Co., as sanitary agents.
- Robert Hopkin Bobby, of 1, Knowle House, Brooke Street Hill, Brentwood, Essex, builder.
- Joseph Dickerson, of 2, Upper North Street, wire rope maker, late of 2, Canterbury Place, West Ferry Road, both in Poplar, Middlesex, green grocer, carrying on business there with John Brown, under the style or firm of Dickerson & Co.

- Frederick Sendall, of Mead Vale, Redhill, Surrey, butcher.
- Frederick George, of 59, High Street, Hampstead, Middlesex, cheesemonger and pork butcher.
- Thomas Catchpole, of 13, Albert Terrace, formerly of 8, Manor Terrace, both in New Church Road, Surrey, commission agent's clerk.
- Frederick Rudd Masser, formerly at 2, Star Court, Bread Street, Cheapside, since at 4, Bond Court, Walbrook, both in London, formerly at Clarence Cottage, The Woodlands, Lewisham, Kent, and now of 19, Wayland Avenue, Dalston Rise, Dalston, Middlesex, commission agent.
- George Spill, of 1, Hampstead Cottages, Acton Green, and of Wellington Road, Bow Road, both in Middlesex, manager to a waterproof clothing manufacturer.
- Ernst Christian Bleckmann, of 45, Buttesland Street, commercial traveller, previously of 3, Ashford Terrace, both in Hoxton, Middlesex, commercial clerk.
- Thomas Heatley, the younger, of 8, Victoria Road, Wanstead, carpenter and builder, also lately with Thomas Treffrey at 53, London Wall, London, as carpenters and builders.
- Robert Watt, of 19, Rodney Street, Pentonville, Middlesex, assistant relieving officer to the Holborn Union.
- John Bamford, of Bulwick, Northampton, farmer and grazier.
- William Denton, of Cliff Hill, Gorleston, Suffolk, fishing-boat owner.
- William Deeley, of 26, Peckwater Street, Kentish Town Road, out of business and employ, previously of 32, Duke Street, Grosvenor Square, both in Middlesex, licensed victualler, formerly of Leighton Buzzard, Bedford, painter, glazier, and licensed victualler.
- James Wood, the younger, of 2, Richmond Villas, Crystal Palace Road, East Dulwich, Surrey, commission agent.
- Edward Allen, of East Dereham, Norfolk, tanner, currier, leather cutter, and boot and shoe manufacturer.
- Joseph Shirley, of Nelson Street, Wyndham Road, Camberwell, Surrey, general dealer.
- Charles Brady, late of 5, Chadwell Street, Myddleton Square, Clerkenwell, green grocer and ironmonger, then of 167, City Road, ironmonger, and now of 1, Stock Orchard Street, Caledonian Road, all in Middlesex, out of business.
- Alfred Howard, of 374, Mile End Road, and 100, New Road, Whitechapel, both in Middlesex, boot and shoe maker.
- Ehrhardt Anton Weitzel, of 81, Lisson Grove North, Marylebone, Middlesex, baker.
- William Garner, of 23, Cotton Street, Limehouse, Middlesex, millstone maker.
- Charles Flint, of Great Marlow, Buckingham, embroiderer.
- James Prince, of the White Bear, Hounslow, Middlesex, general dealer.
- David Spence, of 3, Walmer Crescent, Notting Hill, Middlesex, hay and corn dealer.
- James Thurlow, late of Osborne Villa, Maitland Park, Haverstock Hill, Middlesex, but now of Meopham Park, Meopham, Kent, builder.
- Richard Adams, at 12, Marston Street, Rochdale Road, beerseller, and also at 347, Oldham Road, both in Manchester, Lancaster, wheelwright.
- Herman Alexander, of 57, and late of 28, Travis Street, both in Manchester, Lancaster, glass dealer.
- Theophilus Edward Sutton, of 68, Spencer Street, chemist's assistant, and carrying on the business of a chemist and druggist at 3, Bath Street, previously at 2, George's Dock Gate, and 70, Waterloo Road, all in Liverpool, Lancaster.
- William Heatley, at 100, St Domingo Vale, Everton, previously of 1, Ash Villas, Cardwell Street, Fairfield, both in and near Liverpool, Lancaster, previously of Montreal, and of 149, Smithdown Lane, Liverpool aforesaid, commission agent, and commercial traveller for a provision and tea merchant.
- William Dransfield, formerly of Claremont, but now of 78, New Bank, both in Halifax, York, contractor.
- William Waring, formerly of Morley, butcher, afterwards of Ossett, both in York, butcher and beerhouse keeper.
- Robert Barton, of Tradesman's Mark, Lower Parliament Street, Nottingham, general dealer.
- Thomas Harrison, late of 23, Smeinton Street, Nottingham, improved boiler liquid manufacturer, trading under the firm of Thomas Harrison & Co.
- George Foster, of Attercliffe, Sheffield, York, forger and milliner.
- John Levitt Richmond, of Bishop Auckland, Durham, beerhouse keeper.
- John Evans, of North Bondgate, Bishop Auckland, Durham, blacksmith.
- Frederick Adolphus Whitaker, of Pittshill, near Tunstall, Stafford, grocer and provision dealer.
- John Rowe Taverner, of 6, Alphonington Street, Saint Thomas the Apostle, Devon, butcher.
- Richard Vaughan, of Etum Street, Leominster, Hereford, cattle dealer.
- James Johnson, of Caunton, Nottingham, grocer.
- Mary Canter, of 246, High Street, Cheltenham, barmaid, and late of Cirencester, both in Gloucester, out of business.
- William Killard, of 8, Bath Buildings, Swindon, Wilts, clerk, Great Western Railway Company, New Swindon.
- John Payne Woodman, of Highbridge, Barnham, Somerset, cordwainer.
- Edward Addison, of Penrith, Cumberland, lately a mining agent, and now out of business.
- Samuel Briggs, of Bradford, York, bedstead and mattress dealer, trading as Samuel Briggs & Company.
- Elizabeth Ann Woodhead, now of Forest Row, near East Grinstead, Sussex, but formerly of Carlton House, Bridge Avenue, Hammersmith, Middlesex, schoolmistress.
- William Bennett, of Bloxham, Oxford, farmer.
- David Wicks, of Shinfield, Berks, carpenter.
- David Machin, of 94, Friar Street, Reading, Berks, poulterer, wine merchant, and licensed dealer in game.
- Edward Hey, formerly of John Street, beerseller, lately of High Street, and now of Arker Street, all in Rochdale, Lancaster, factory operative.
- John Henry Corbett, of 116, High Street, Stourbridge, Worcester, bank manager at Brierley Hill, Stafford.
- William Smith, at The Thorns, miner, late green grocer, coal, and breeze dealer, previously thereto at Rockshill, both in Brierley Hill, Stafford, miner.
- William Margerison, the younger, of Brampton, Derby, slater.
- Charles Castle Martin, of Ford Street, Aldham, Essex, innkeeper.
- William Robinson, of Barnsley, York, painter.
- Gilbert Hall, of the Millstone, Skerton, near Lancaster, licensed victualler, joiner, and wheelwright.
- John Richard Dediccoat, at 2, Jenner Street, previously of 26, Whitefriars Street, and 8, Cow Lane, all in Coventry, machinist, and also carrying on business as a licensed victualler at 26, Northwood Street, Birmingham, all in Warwick.
- John Wilson, of 23, Victoria Street, Scarborough, York, joiner and builder.
- George Tunncliffe, of Scarborough, York, plasterer.
- Stephen Smith Stevenson, of 69, Upper Green Street, Newtown, previously at 60, Edmund Street, and 9, Coleridge Place, Burmoutofts, all in Leeds, York, and previously at 43, Ann's Villa, London Street, Southport, Lancaster, lodging-house keeper.
- William Gamble, of 1, Byron Street, Leicester, butcher.
- Charles Horatio Tylor, at 2, previously of 1, Tripple Road, Dudley, Worcester, commission agent and manager of cement works, now out of business.
- James Weaver, of the Sydney Arms Inn, Alvin Street, Gloucester, plasterer and publican.
- John Williams, of Holtón Farm, Merthyr Dovan, Glamorgan, farmer.
- William Rowland, now at 69 and 70, Millicent Street, butcher, previously thereto of the Butchers' Arms, Quay Street, and of the Alma Hotel, Butte Docks, all in Cardiff, Glamorgan, publican.
- John Rees, (otherwise John Rees Davies,) of Porth, Llanwonno, Glamorgan, tailor and draper.
- Frederick Gould Spurway, of Liskeard, Cornwall, hatter.
- Samuel Hall, formerly of 19, and now of 11, Dean Street, Aberdare, and of Treherbert, Ystradyfodwg, both in Glamorgan, cabinetmaker and furniture dealer.
- Challis Holmes, of Clue, Lincoln, fish buyer.
- Thomas Vernon Marsh, of 59, now at 64, Spring Gardens, Buxton, Derby, auctioneer, valuer, surveyor, estate agent, grocer, provision dealer, and dealer in paper hangings.
- Hamlet Chetwin, now in Cross Street, journeyman crate maker, formerly in High Street, both in Fenton, Stoke-upon-Trent, Stafford, crate maker and retail beerseller.
- Philip Phillips, of Cefn Coity, Llanvigan, Brecknock, farm labourer.
- John Hurren, of Sutton, near Deal, Kent, late farmer and machine thrasher, now a labourer.
- John Wyborn, of Lower Walmer, Kent, late publican and fish dealer, now out of business, but occasionally acting as assistant to a licensed victualler.
- Thomas Wilson, of Ivy Lane, Canterbury, Kent, horse dealer.
- Thomas White, of Fountain Street, Whitstable, Kent, painter and glazier.
- Richard Birch, the elder, of 13, Parrock Street, Gravesend, Kent, furniture dealer, late a prisoner for debt in Maidstone Gaol.

- William Fetherstone, the younger, of 7, Tontine Street, Folkestone, Kent, picture frame maker, paperhanger, house decorator, and general furnishing warehouseman.
- William Vinson Daws, (sued and committed as William Vincent Daws,) of Cobham, near Gravesend, Kent, tailor, and late a prisoner for debt in Maidstone Gaol.
- George Lewis, of Chesham, Buckingham, fruiterer and fishmonger.
- George William Shepherd, of 7, Prince Albert Street, Brighton, Sussex, fruiterer.
- Albert Wood, the younger, formerly of North Street Passage, and now of 107, High Street, both in Mile Town, Sheerness, Kent, shipwright in Her Majesty's Dockyard, Sheerness aforesaid.
- John Dudley, of Long Crendon, Buckingham, stationer, dealer in tea, postmaster, and registrar of Births and Deaths.
- George Morgan, of West Street, Exeter, out of business, previously of the White Hart Inn, Saint Thomas the Apostle, Devon, innkeeper and general dealer.
- Isaiah Waller, of Barrack Street, Pockthorpe, Norwich, licensed victualler and pensioner, (in formâ pauperis).
- Robert Smith, of King Street, Crook's Place, Norwich, baker, (in formâ pauperis).
- John Peek, late of Poringland, Norfolk, carpenter and wheelwright, (in formâ pauperis).
- Thomas Beard, of Brownhills, out of business, previously thereto of High Street, both in Tunstall, Stafford, beerhouse keeper and confectioner.
- Thomas M'Millan, now at 20, Southall Street, Strangeways, Manchester, previously thereto of the Locomotive Inn, Martin Road, Middlesborough, York, beerseller.
- Richard Nicholson, of 80, Upper Saint Philip's Road, Sheffield, York, boot and shoe maker and dealer.
- Walter John Badger, of 74, Franklin Street, Sheffield, York, table blade forger, and late beerhouse keeper.
- James Gregory, of Steel Bank, Sheffield, York, warehouseman.
- John Murphy, now at Green Lanes, Wallsall, previous thereto of the Hop and Barley Corn, Coseley, beerseller and grocer, and at Oxford Street, Bilston, all in Stafford, licensed victualler and grocer.
- William Alexander Gorringe, (and not Torrings, as previously advertized,) of Staverton House, Shoreham, Sussex, commission agent.
- John Molen, late of Harbour Street, Whitstable, Kent, dredgerman and dealer in fish manure.
- William James Wetherly, late of Albert Street, Whitstable, Kent, dredgerman and beer retailer.
- Henry Russell, of Saint Ann's, Lewes, Sussex, out of business, and late of 16, Mark Lane, London, merchant and commission agent, trading as Bedford, Russell, & Co., (in formâ pauperis).
- Thomas Trulock, (known as Thomas Trulock Campbell,) late of West Street, Brighton, Sussex, formerly at Reading, Berks, next of Kensington Park Road, then of 22, Hereford Road North, both in Bayswater, and of Ealing, then of 12, Edward Street, Portman Square, then of Kildare Terrace, Bayswater, then of 30, Eastbourne Terrace, Paddington, all in Middlesex, then of Addiscombe, Surrey, and 78, Old Broad Street, London, trading with Charles Harcourt as stock and share dealers, under the style of Campbell & Co., and now of Saint Ann's, Sussex, (in formâ pauperis).
- Sebastian Torre, of Saint Ann's, Lewes, Sussex, late of 21, Fenborough Road, Brompton, and 163, Fenchurch Street, both in Middlesex, trading under the style or firm of Dymond, Torre, & Co., as commission merchants, (in formâ pauperis).
- Henry Russell Crawfurth Smith, of Saint Anne's, Lewes, Sussex, prior thereto of Claverton Street, Pimlico, Middlesex, prior thereto of Kingston, Surrey, prior thereto of Winchester Street, Pimlico, Middlesex, and of Bombay, out of business, formerly trading there with Richard Adolphus Passmore, as Passmore, Smith, & Company, (in formâ pauperis).
- Nathaniel Cohen, of Saint Anne's, Lewes, Sussex, late of 18, and then of 19, Well Street, London Docks, and of 14, Great Prescott Street, Goodman's Fields, all in Middlesex, tailor and outfitter, (in formâ pauperis).
- Frederick Linnat, of Saint Anne's, Lewes, Sussex, out of business, late of 33, High Shadwell, Middlesex, formerly of Hadleigh, Suffolk, corn chandler, (in formâ pauperis).
- John Frederick Wieland, of Bramer, Sussex, and of 7, Sillwood Place, Brighton, Sussex, previously of Harefield, and of Marlboro' Hill, both in Middlesex, previously of Liverpool, and formerly of Glasgow, insurance agent, (in formâ pauperis).
- Julius Lourie, of 56, George Street, Brighton, Sussex, merchant, late of 136, Fenchurch Street, London, (in formâ pauperis).
- John Davies, of Brighton, Sussex, out of business, late of Regent Square, Middlesex, and of King William Street, London, (in formâ pauperis).
- John Redford, of High Street, Lewes, Sussex, and late of 270, Vauxhall Bridge Road, Middlesex, house agent, (in formâ pauperis).
- John Wellington Loosemore, of Wellington Road, Portslade, Sussex, and late of 10, St Benet Place, Gracechurch Street, London, commission agent, and recently a wine merchant, (in formâ pauperis).
- Richard Adolphus Passmore, of St Anne's, Lewes, Sussex, prior thereto of 86, Lancaster Road, Notting Hill, Middlesex, prior thereto of Bombay, out of business, formerly in partnership there with Henry Russell Crawfurth Smith, trading as Passmore, Smith, & Company, (in formâ pauperis).
- Peter Henry, of Portslade, Sussex, out of business, (in formâ pauperis).
- George Campion Wilson, late of the King's Head Inn, Red Lion Street, licensed victualler and brewer, since at 13, Crosland Street, and afterwards and now at 95, Red Lion Street, all in Nottingham, out of business.
- Francis Fitzwalter Read, late in partnership with William Ross, trading under the firm of Ross & Read, of Postern Place, Middle Pavement, accountants and agents, and now in Raglin Street, all in Nottingham, messenger.
- Thomas Franklin, of the Royal Engineers' beerhouse, Nailsea, Somerset, grocer and beer retailer, a prisoner for debt in the Gaol of Bristol, (in formâ pauperis).
- John Vincent, of 12, Berkley Place, Bristol, carpenter and green grocer.
- James Smith, of Francis Place, Stokes Croft, Bristol, journeyman cabinetmaker.
- Robert Weston Sessions, of Walton Terrace, City Road, Bristol, draper's assistant, a prisoner for debt in the Gaol at Bristol, (in formâ pauperis).
- Edward Ford, of Frogmore Street, Bristol, mason and tobacconist, a prisoner for debt in the Gaol at Bristol, (in formâ pauperis).
- James Street, of Narrow Wine Street, Bristol, previously of 1, West Row, Weston-super-Mare, Somerset, confectioner and general dealer, (in formâ pauperis).
- Henry Mitchell, of 45, Goodhind Street, Saint Philip and Jacob, out of business, previously of the Union Tavern, Nicholas Street, both in Bristol, licensed victualler, and previously thereto of the Eagle Hotel, Rothessay, Bute.
- John Bailey, of Silsden Moor, Kildwick, York, labourer.

The undermentioned persons have been adjudged Bankrupts in the District Court of Bankruptcy at Manchester:—

- Wiseman, David, porter and general dealer, Manchester.
- Kelly, Wm., assistant dentist, Manchester.
- Besley, Richd. Thos. Wm., advertising contractor and agent, Manchester.
- Howarth, Edmd., builder, &c., Middleton.
- Witherington, Jno. Thos., fish curer, &c., Blackburn.
- Lester, Peter, provision dealer, Rochdale.
- Hawkins, Thos., joiner, grocer, &c., Blackburn.
- Walton, Jno., out of business, Manchester.
- Beattie, Edwd. the yr., commission agent, Manchester.
- Walker, Wm., beer retailer, Harpurhey.
- Clegg, Edwim, joiner and builder, Rochdale.
- Massey, John, floor cloth manufacturer, Chorley.
- Briggs, Hy., and Briggs, Thos., cotton manufacturers, Newchurch.
- Stansfield, Jas., pit and well sinker, Ashton-under-Lyne.
- Schofield, Edmd., cotton waste dealer, &c., Lees, near Oldham.
- Birchal, James and Andrew Armstrong Johnstone, ironmongers and washing machine agents, Manchester.
- Gillett, George Albert, auctioneer, &c., Bolton-le-Moors.
- Forster, James, farmer, Werneth.
- Farnell, Sidney Hy., draper, Warrington.
- Booth, Jno., baker and provision dealer, Stockport.
- Wyatt, Thos., contractor, &c., Marple.
- Brennand, (Cable & Brennand,) John, calico printers, Manchester.
- Bradshaw, Reuben, grocer, &c., Manchester.
- Fogg, Elias, day waiter and bottler of wine, Manchester.
- Ryan, Henry Louis, skirt and bonnet manufacturer, Manchester.
- Denton, Francis, accountant, &c., Manchester.
- Griffiths, Wm., and Wolstenholme, Jno., boiler makers, Manchester.
- Horsfall, Wm., and Horsfall, Jno., cotton and cotton waste dealers, Manchester.
- Barber, Chas. Worthington, cotton broker and cigar merchant, Manchester.
- Rodocanachi, Demetrio K., merchant, Manchester.

CORN IMPORTED AND EXPORTED.

AN ACCOUNT shewing the Quantities of the several kinds of Corn and Meal, Imported into each division of the United Kingdom; and the Quantities of British and Foreign Corn and Meal, of the same kinds, Exported from the United Kingdom, in the Week ended the 25th December 1869,

	QUANTITIES IMPORTED (SO FAR AS THE LANDING ACCOUNTS WERE MADE UP) INTO—				QUANTITIES EXPORTED FROM THE UNITED KINGDOM.		
	England.	Scotland.	Ireland.	The United Kingdom.	British.	Colonial and Foreign.	Total Exported.
	Cwt.	Cwt.	Cwt.	Cwt.	Cwt.	Cwt.	Cwt.
Wheat	758,489	52,313	164,012	974,814	2,055	10,061	12,116
Barley.....	141,044	30,568	3,154	174,766	190	...	190
Oats	330,157	10,651	...	340,808	9,061	332	9,393
Rye.....	569	569
Pease	26,738	5,602	...	32,340	440	...	440
Beans	29,176	1,859	...	31,035
Indian Corn	137,118	...	116,843	253,961
Buckwheat.....
Beer or Bigg
Total of Corn (exclusive of Malt)...	1,423,291	100,993	284,009	1,808,293	11,746	10,393	22,139
	Cwt.	Cwt.	Cwt.	Cwt.	Cwt.	Cwt.	Cwt.
Wheatmeal or Flour	41,528	18,249	5,381	65,158	163	76	239
Barley Meal
Oat Meal	175	175	167	...	167
Rye Meal
Pea Meal
Bean Meal
Indian Corn Meal ...	166	166
Buckwheat Meal ...	1	1
Total of Meal...	41,870	18,249	5,381	65,500	330	76	406
Total of Corn and Meal (exclusive of Malt)	1,465,161	119,242	289,390	1,873,793	12,076	10,469	22,545
Malt (entered by the Quarter).....	Quarters.	Quarters.	Quarters.	Quarters.	Quarters.	Quarters.	Quarters.
	3,598	...	3,598

R. WHITMORE, Assistant Inspector-General,
Office of the Inspector-General of Imports and Exports,
Custom-house, London, December 27, 1869.

STATEMENT shewing the Quantities Sold and Average Price of BRITISH CORN, Imperial Measure, as received from the Inspectors and Officers of Excise, conformably to the Act of the 27th and 28th Victoria, cap. 87, in the Week ended 25th December 1869.

	QUANTITIES SOLD.		AVERAGE PRICE.	
	Qrs.	Bus.	s.	d.
Wheat	49,921	0	43	5
Barley	74,415	3	35	11
Oats	3,946	5	21	6

A. W. FONBLANQUE,
Statistical and Corn Department, Board of Trade,
December 27, 1869. Comptroller of Corn Returns.

COMPARATIVE STATEMENT, for the corresponding Week in each of the Years from 1865 to 1868.

Corresponding Week in	QUANTITIES SOLD.						AVERAGE PRICES.					
	WHEAT.		BARLEY.		OATS.		WHEAT.		BARLEY.		OATS.	
	Qrs.	Bus.	Qrs.	Bus.	Qrs.	Bus.	s.	d.	s.	d.	s.	d.
1865	72,309	7	80,285	7	8,427	7	46	11	32	6	22	6
1866	57,445	5	53,467	3	7,170	2	60	0	44	0	24	3
1867	49,929	1	80,742	4	10,459	7	67	4	41	9	25	3
1868	64,171	7	57,744	4	3,996	4	50	7	46	1	26	2

Statistical and Corn Department, Board of Trade,
December 27, 1869.

A. W. FONBLANQUE,
Comptroller of Corn Returns.

COTTON STATISTICS' ACT, 1868.

RETURN of the Quantities of COTTON Imported and Exported at the various Ports of the United Kingdom during the Week ended 23d December 1869.

	American.	Brazilian.	East Indian.	Egyptian.	Miscellaneous.	TOTAL.
	Bales.	Bales.	Bales.	Bales.	Bales.	Bales.
Cotton Imported during the Week ended the 23d day of December 1869, ...	36,702	14,912	37,905	15,167	1,383	106,069
Cotton Exported during the Week ended the 23d day of December 1869, ...	1,378	306	11,568	39	141	13,432

Dated the 24th day of December 1869.

LOUIS MALLET,
Assistant-Secretary, Board of Trade.

BURGH OF KILMARNOCK.

NOTICE is Hereby Given that the Commissioners appointed, in accordance with the Municipal Elections Amendment (Scotland) Act, 1868, have RE-DIVIDED the BURGH of KILMARNOCK into the FIVE WARDS Limited and Bounded as follows, and which has been approved of by one of Her Majesty's Principal Secretaries of State, in pursuance of Section 16th of said Act:—

FIRST WARD.

That part of the Burgh included within a line drawn from the point where the road to Hillhead leaves the Kilmarnock Road, eastward along the Parliamentary Boundary to the point where it crosses Kilmarnock Water, thence along the Parliamentary Boundary to the Parish Road to South Dean, thence down the said Parish Road and Muirs Brae to the bridge over the Kilmarnock Water near Craighead, thence down said water to the north end of the Factory Mill, thence along the centres of Green Street, New Street, and East and West George Streets, to the junction of the last Street with Langlands Street and John Finnie Street, thence in a line across the Glasgow and South-Western Railway till it reaches Hill Street, and thence along the centres of Hill Street and Kilmarnock Road to the point first described.

SECOND WARD.

That part of the Burgh included within a line drawn from the point where the road to Hillhead leaves the Kilmarnock Road, southward along the Parliamentary Boundary to the junction of the Water of Kilmarnock with the Water of Irvine, thence up the Kilmarnock Water to the Saint Marnock Street Bridge, thence along the centre of Saint Marnock Street to its junction with John Finnie Street, thence along the centre of John Finnie Street to the junction of the last Street with Langlands Street and West George Street, thence in a line across the Glasgow and South-Western Railway till it reaches Hill Street, and thence along the centre of Hill Street and Kilmarnock Road to the point first described.

THIRD WARD.

That part of the Burgh included within a line drawn from the centre of John Finnie Street at its junction with Langlands Street and West George Street, along the centres of West and East George Streets, New Street, and Green Street, to the north end of the Factory Mill, thence down the Water of Kilmarnock to the Flesh Market Bridge, thence along the centre of Market Lane to King Street, thence along the centre of King Street to Saint Marnock Street, thence along the centre of Saint Marnock Street to John Finnie Street, and thence along the centre of John Finnie Street to the point first described.

FOURTH WARD.

That part of the Burgh included within a line drawn from the Green Bridge up the Water of Kilmarnock to the bridge near Craighead, thence along Muirs Brae and the Parish Road to South Dean, to the Parliamentary Boundary, thence southward along said boundary to the Water of Irvine, thence down the said water to the road near Richardland Brewery, thence along the centre of said road and East Netherton Street to its junction with Titchfield Street, thence along the centres of Titchfield Street and King Street till opposite to Market Lane, thence along the centre of the said lane to the Flesh Market Bridge, and thence up the Kilmarnock Water to the Green Bridge, the point first described.

FIFTH WARD.

That part of the Burgh included within a line drawn from the junction of Titchfield Street with East Nether-ton Street, along the centre of said Street and the road near Richardland Brewery to the Water of Irvine, thence up said water to the point at which the Parli-amentary Boundary intersects the Water of Irvine, thence along said boundary southward, westward, and north-ward, to the junction of the Waters of Irvine and Kil-marnock, and thence up Kilmarnock Water to the bridge at Saint Marnock Street, thence along the centres of Saint Marnock Street, King Street, and Titchfield Street, to the point first described.

By Order,

ALEX. & JAS. HAMILTON
Town-Clerks.

Kilmarnock, December 31, 1869.

NOTICE

TO THE CREDITORS OF

HARPERS, THOMSON, & COMPANY, Corn Factors and Commission Agents in Leith, and of William Arthur Thomson, residing at No. 7, Bonnington Place, near Leith, as one of the Partners of that Firm, and as an Individual.

THE said William Arthur Thomson has presented a Petition to the Honorable the Lord Ordinary officiating on the Bills, praying to be discharged of all debts or obligations contracted by him or for which he was liable at the date of the sequestration of the estates of the said Firm and Partners thereof, and of the said William Arthur Thomson as an Individual, on 11th March 1869: On which Petition the Lord Ordinary has pronounced the following Deliverance:—'Edinburgh, 31st December 1869. —The Lord Ordinary appoints this Petition to be inti-mated in the Edinburgh Gazette, and to each Creditor, in terms of the Bankruptcy (Scotland) Act, 1856.'

(Signed) 'R. MACFARLANE.'

HENRY BUCHAN,

Solicitor before the Supreme Courts of Scotland,
30, Dublin Street, Edinburgh,
Agent for Petitioner.

TO THE CREDITORS ON

The Sequestrated Estates of JOHN M'INTYRE & COMPANY, Anchor and Chain Cable Manufacturers at Kelvinhaugh, near Glasgow, and John M'Intyre, Finlay M'Intyre, and Robert M'Intyre, all Anchor and Chain Cable Manufacturers at Kelvinhaugh, the Individual Partners of said Company, as such Partners, and as Individuals.

BY virtue of an Order of the Sheriff-Substitute of Lanarkshire, John M'Intyre & Company, and John M'Intyre, Finlay M'Intyre, and Robert M'Intyre, above designed, hereby intimate that they have pre-sented a Petition to the Sheriff of Lanarkshire, at Glas-gow, to be finally discharged of all debts contracted by them before the date of the sequestration of their estates, in terms of the Statutes.

BALFOUR & PATERSON.

Glasgow, December 30, 1869.

NOTICE

TO THE CREDITORS ON

The Sequestrated Estates of HUGH CRAIG, Grocer, Partick.

BY virtue of an Order of the Sheriff-Substitute of Lanarkshire, Hugh Craig, above designed, hereby intimates that he has presented a Petition to the Sheriff of Lanarkshire, at Glasgow, to be finally discharged of all debts contracted by him before the date of the sequestra-tion of his estates, in terms of the Statutes.

JAMES DUNBAR,

11, West Nile Street, Agent.

Glasgow, December 29, 1869.

SEQUESTRATION of JAMES HUNTER, sole Partner of the Firm of JAMES HUNTER & COMPANY, Manufac-turers, Philiphaugh Mill, near Selkirk, as such Part-ner, and as an Individual.

BY virtue of an Order of the Sheriff-Substitute of the Counties of Roxburgh and Selkirk, James Hunter, above designed, hereby intimates that he has presented a Petition to the Sheriff of the Counties of Roxburgh and Selkirk praying to be finally discharged of all debts and obligations contracted by him, as such Partner, and as an Individual, for which he was liable at the date of his and the said Company's sequestration, in terms of the Statute.

LEES & STEWART,
Solicitors, Galashiels, Agents.

Edinburgh, December 31, 1869.

In the Sequestration of WILLIAM KELLY, Grocer, Wine and Spirit Merchant, and Ship Store Dealer in Greenock, carrying on business as such in Greenock in his own Individual Name, and also carrying on business as a Cottonspinner at Fereneze Mill, in the Parish of Neilston, in the County of Renfrew, under the Name or Firm of The FERENEZE SPINNING COMPANY, as well under his Individual Name as under the said Name or Firm of the Fereneze Spinning Company, of which Firm he is sole Partner, as such sole Partner, and as an Individual.

JAMES WELSH, Accountant in Greenock, Trustee on the said sequestrated estates, hereby intimates that the accounts of his intromissions with the funds of the estates, to the 14th day of December 1869, have been audited by the Commissioners, who have postponed a dividend until the recurrence of another statutory period for making a dividend.

JAMES WELSH, Trustee.

Greenock, December 28, 1869.

SEQUESTRATION of ALEXANDER SHAND, Farmer, Cornhill, in the Parish of Gamrie, and County of Banff, now deceased.

JOHN REID, Farmer, Muirycook, in the Parish of Rathven, and County of Banff, hereby intimates that he has had no intromissions with the funds of the estate since last statutory period, (13th September 1869), and that the Commissioners have postponed payment of a dividend till the recurrence of another statutory period, and dispensed with sending circulars to the Creditors.

JOHN REID, Trustee.

Muirycook, Rathven, December 25, 1869.

THOMAS JOHN BREMNER, Agent at Peterhead for the Commercial Bank of Scotland, Trustee on the sequestrated estate of ALEXANDER GOURLAY, Oil Merchant, Peterhead, hereby intimates that his accounts, brought down to the 16th current, have been audited by the Commissioners, who have postponed the declaration of a second dividend till the recurrence of another statutory period, and dispense with sending circular letters to the Creditors.

TH. J. BREMNER,
Peterhead, December 29, 1869. Trustee.

JOHN M'DOWALL of Girdstingwood, Trustee on the sequestrated estate of JOHN SPROAT, Farmer in Ingleson of Keltou, hereby intimates that an account of his intromissions with the funds of the estate, brought down to the 16th instant, and state of the funds outstanding as at same date, have been made up and examined by the Commissioners on said estate, in terms of the Statute, who have postponed the declaration of a dividend till the recurrence of another statutory period.

JOHN M'DOWALL, Trustee.

Girdstingwood, Kirkcudbright,
December 30, 1869.

SEQUESTRATION of J. B. TOD & SON, Wine Merchants, Leith, and of Henry Monteath Tod, the sole Partner of said Firm.

THE Commissioners have audited the account of my intromissions, brought down to the 15th instant, postponed declaration of a dividend till next statutory period, and dispensed with sending circulars to Creditors.

JAS. ALEX. MOLLESON, Trustee.

Chambers, 5, North Saint David Street,
Edinburgh, December 31, 1869.

THE Estates of GORDON RHIND, Fleisher in Huntly, in the Parish of Huntly, and County of Aberdeen, were sequestrated on the 23th day of December 1869, by the Sheriff of Aberdeenshire.

The first deliverance is dated the 23th day of December 1869.

The meeting to elect the Trustee and Commissioners is to be held at 12 o'clock noon, on Saturday the 8th day of January 1870, within the Court-house at Huntly.

A composition may be offered at this meeting; and to entitle Creditors to the first dividend, their oaths and grounds of debt must be lodged on or before the 23th day of April 1870.

A Warrant of Protection has been granted to the Bankrupt.

All future Advertisements relating to this sequestration will be published in the Edinburgh Gazette alone.

GEORGE GRUB, Advocate, Aberdeen, Agent.

THE Estates of JOHN SINCLAIR, Fleisher, Greenock, were sequestrated on the 23th day of December 1869, by the Sheriff of the County of Renfrew.

The first deliverance is dated 28th December 1869.

The meeting to elect the Trustee and Commissioners is to be held at 12 o'clock noon, on Friday the 7th day of January 1870, within Borland's Temperance Hotel, Cathcart Street, Greenock.

A composition may be offered at this meeting; and to entitle Creditors to the first dividend, their oaths and grounds of debt must be lodged on or before the 23th day of April 1870.

A Warrant of Protection has been granted to the Bankrupt till the meeting for election of Trustee.

All future Advertisements relating to this sequestration will be published in the Edinburgh Gazette alone.

WRIGHT & MORRISON, Writers, Greenock, Agents.

THE Estates of DONALD MAIN, otherwise called DONALD MAIN IAN, Merchant and Fisherman, residing at No. 37, Park Street, Nairn, were sequestrated on the 29th day of December 1869, by the Sheriff of Banff, Elgin, and Nairn.

The first deliverance is dated the 29th day of December 1869.

The meeting to elect the Trustee and Commissioners is to be held at 11 o'clock forenoon, on Tuesday the 11th day of January 1870, within Anderson's Hotel, in Nairn.

A composition may be offered at this meeting; and to entitle Creditors to the first dividend, their oaths and grounds of debt must be lodged on or before the 29th day of April 1870.

A Warrant of Protection has been granted to the Bankrupt till the meeting for election of Trustee.

All future Advertisements relating to this sequestration will be published in the Edinburgh Gazette alone.

J. D. LAMB, Solicitor, Nairn, Agent.

THE Estates of JOHN BRUCE, Clothier, 45, Renfield Street, Glasgow, were sequestrated on the 29th day of December 1869, by the Court of Session.

The first deliverance is dated 29th December 1869.

The meeting to elect the Trustee and Commissioners is to be held at 11 o'clock forenoon, on Monday the 10th day of January 1870, within the Hall of the Faculty of Procurators, Saint George's Place, Glasgow.

A composition may be offered at this meeting; and to entitle Creditors to the first dividend, their oaths and grounds of debt must be lodged on or before the 29th day of April 1870.

A Personal Protection was granted to the Bankrupt until the meeting for the election of Trustee; and the Sequestration remitted to the Sheriff of Lanarkshire.

All future Advertisements relating to this sequestration will be published in the Edinburgh Gazette alone.

JAM MONTGOMERIE STACEY, S.S.C., 33, Hanover Street, Edinburgh, Agent.

THE Estates of JAMES MELROSE, Draper, 77, King Street, Dundee, were sequestrated on the 29th day of December 1869, by the Court of Session.

The first deliverance is dated 29th December 1869.

The meeting to elect the Trustee and Commissioners is to be held at two o'clock afternoon, on Monday the 10th day of January 1870, within the Royal Hotel, Dundee.

A composition may be offered at this meeting; and to entitle Creditors to the first dividend, their oaths and grounds of debt must be lodged on or before the 29th day of April 1870.

The Sequestration has been remitted to the Sheriff of Forfarshire at Dundee, and a Warrant of Protection granted to the Bankrupt.

All future Advertisements relating to this sequestration will be published in the Edinburgh Gazette alone.

W. MILNE, S.S.C., 9, Heriot Row, Edinburgh, Agent.

THE Estates of J. & A. WILLIAMSON, Bleachers, Calderbank, Lochwinnoch, and of John Williamson, Bleacher there, sole Partner of said Firm, as such, and as an Individual, were sequestrated on the 31st day of December 1869, by the Lord Ordinary officiating on the Bills in the Court of Session.

The first deliverance is dated 31st December 1869.

The meeting to elect the Trustee and Commissioners is to be held on Monday the 10th day of January 1870, at one o'clock afternoon, within the Faculty Hall, St George's Place, Glasgow.

A composition may be offered at this meeting; and to entitle Creditors to the first dividend, their oaths and grounds of debt must be lodged on or before the 1st day May 1870.

A Personal Protection has been granted in favor of the said John Williamson.

All future Advertisements relating to this sequestration will be published in the Edinburgh Gazette alone.

JAMES SOMERVILLE, S.S.C., Agent, Chambers, 60, Hanover Street, Edinburgh.

NOTICE.

A PETITION having been presented to the Sheriff of Perthshire at the instance of Alexander Sanson, Grocer, residing in Causeyside, Newington, Edinburgh, for Sequestration of the Estates of DAVID DONALDSON, Plumber and Brassfounder in Perth, his Lordship of this date granted warrant for citing the said David Donaldson to appear in Court at Perth, on Thursday the 6th day of January next, 1870, at 11 o'clock forenoon, to shew cause why sequestration of his estates should not be awarded.—Of all which Intimation is hereby given.

J. C. PINKERTON, Solicitor, 25, George Street, Perth, Petitioner's Agent.

Perth, December 29, 1869.

NOTICE is Hereby Given that the Lord Ordinary officiating on the Bills has, on considering a Petition by The Commercial Bank of Scotland, Incorporated by Royal Charter, for Sequestration of the Estates of JOHN FORBES, Tenant of the Farm of Mains of Fincastle, in the Parish of Dull, and of the Farm of Edintian and Carrick, near Pitlochrie, both in the County of Perth, granted warrant for citing him to appear in Court on the seventh day next after citation if within Scotland, and the twenty-first day next after citation if furth of Scotland, to shew cause why sequestration of his estates should not be awarded.

MELVILLE & LINDESAY, 110, George Street, Edinburgh, Agents.

SEUQUESTRATION of BLAIR BROTHERS, sometime carrying on business as Grocers in Nicolson Street, Edinburgh, as a Company, and of John Alexander Blair and William Blair, both residing in James Street, Leith Walk, Edinburgh, the Individual Partners of that Company, as such Partners, and as Individuals.

ROBERT BUIST, Cattle Salesman, Edinburgh, has been elected Trustee on the estate; and Francis Bolton Woodthorp, 3, Sciennes Place, Edinburgh, Robert Smith, Wine Merchant, Edinburgh, and Adam Mossman, Merchant, Edinburgh, have been elected Commissioners. The examination of the Bankrupts will take place in the Bankruptcy Court-room, Sheriff-Court-house, Edinburgh, on Saturday the 8th day of January 1870, at 11 o'clock forenoon. The Creditors will meet in Cay & Black's Rooms, No. 65A, George Street, Edinburgh, on Wednesday the 19th day of January 1870, at three o'clock afternoon.

ROB. BUIST, Trustee.

Edinburgh, December 31, 1869.

SEQUESTRATION of WILLIAM DICKIE & SONS, Shipbuilders in Ferry-Port-on-Craig, in the County of Fife, as a Company, and William Dickie, John Dickie, George Dickie, and James Dickie, all Shipbuilders in Ferry-Port-on-Craig, the Individual Partners of the said Company of William Dickie & Sons, as such Partners, and as Individuals.

JAMES DONALDSON, Timber Merchant, Ferry-Port-on-Craig, has been elected Trustee on the sequestrated estate of the said William Dickie & Sons, as a Company; and Gershom Gourlay, Engineer, Dundee, John Kirkland, Dundee, sole Partner of the Firm of John Kirkland & Son, Wood Merchants, Dundee, and John Machan, Ship Chandler, Dundee, have been elected Commissioners. The examination of the Bankrupts, the said William Dickie, John Dickie, George Dickie, and James Dickie, the Individual Partners of said Firm of William Dickie & Sons, as Partners of said Firm, will take place in the Sheriff-Court-room, Cupar, on Friday the 7th day of January next (1870), at 11 o'clock forenoon. The Creditors will meet in the Royal Hotel, Cupar, on Tuesday the 18th day of January next (1870), at 11 o'clock forenoon.

JAS. DONALDSON.

Ferry-Port-on-Craig, December 28, 1869.

Sequestration of GEORGE MANSON CRICHTON, Outfitter, Bank Street, Edinburgh.

JAMES HOGARTH BALGARNIE, Chartered Accountant, Edinburgh, has been elected Trustee on the estate; and James Crawford, Warehouseman, Edinburgh, John Macfarlane Cook, Accountant, Edinburgh, and James John Dundas Watson, Warehouseman, Glasgow, have been elected Commissioners. The examination of the Bankrupt will take place within the Bankruptcy Court-house, George IV. Bridge, Edinburgh, on Thursday the 6th day of January 1870, at 12 o'clock noon. The second general meeting of Creditors will be held in the Trustee's Chambers, 9, North St David Street, Edinburgh, on Friday the 14th day of January 1870, at two o'clock P.M.

JAS. H. BALGARNIE, Trustee.

SEQUESTRATION of JOHN MUNRO, Spirit Dealer and Cab Proprietor, Huzar Tavern, Jock's Lodge, Edinburgh.

JAMES HOGARTH BALGARNIE, Chartered Accountant, Edinburgh, has been elected Trustee on the estate; and John Somerville, Wine Merchant, Leith, John White, Plumber, Leith Street, Edinburgh, and Ebenezer Dewar, Wine Merchant, Leith, have been elected Commissioners. The examination of the Bankrupt will take place in the Bankruptcy Court-room, Sheriff-Court-house, George IV. Bridge, Edinburgh, on Monday the 10th day of January next, at one o'clock afternoon. The Creditors will meet within the Trustee's Chambers, No. 9, North Saint David Street, Edinburgh, on Tuesday the 18th day of January next, at two o'clock afternoon.

JAS. H. BALGARNIE, Trustee.

SEQUESTRATION of WILLIAM MENZIES, Hotel-keeper in Port-Glasgow.

JOSEPH LOWRY, Accountant in Glasgow, has been elected Trustee on the estate; and Robert Brown, Wine Merchant and Agent, 20, Dixon Street, Glasgow, Thomas Prentice, Wine Merchant in Greenock, and John Gibson Patrick, Wholesale Wine and Spirit Merchant in Paisley, have been elected Commissioners. The examination of the Bankrupt will take place in the Sheriff-Court-house (Nelson Street West), Greenock, on Friday the 7th January next, at 12 o'clock noon. The Creditors will meet in the Office of Lewry & Smith, Accountants, 175, Hope Street, Glasgow, on Monday the 17th January 1870, at two o'clock afternoon.

J. LOWRY, Trustee.

175, Hope Street, Glasgow, December 29, 1869.

SEQUESTRATION of JAMES YOUNG HAMILTON, sometime Inspector of the Poor for the Parish of Gorbals, now residing in Renfrew.

ROBERT BOYD, Accountant in Paisley, Trustee of the said sequestrated estate, hereby intimate that James Dunlop Kirkwood, Inspector of Poor for the Parish of Govan, and Andrew Crawford, residing at No. 2, Clyde Terrace, Glasgow, have been elected Commissioners, in room of John Wilkie, Writer, Glasgow, and James Weir, Grocer, Renfrew, who resigned.

ROBT. BOYD, Trustee.

Paisley, December 30, 1869.

SEQUESTRATION of WILLIAM LOUIS M'KAY, Ironmonger in Dumfries.

I hereby call a meeting of Creditors to be held on Monday 10th January next, at 12 o'clock noon, within the Chambers of Messrs T. & J. M'Gowan, Solicitors, Dumfries, for the purpose of electing a new Commissioner, in room of William Gun, Solicitor in Dumfries, resigned.

W. D. HALLIDAY, Trustee.

The Sequestration of JOHN CONNON, Commission Agent in King Street of Aberdeen.

THE Commissioners have postponed a dividend until the recurrence of another statutory period. A meeting of the Creditors is hereby called, in terms of the Statute, to be held within the Office of Messrs Ligertwood, Advocates, 89, Union Street, Aberdeen, upon the 22d day of January 1870, at one o'clock afternoon, to take into consideration a sale by auction of the outstanding debts belonging to the sequestrated estate.

J. IRVING DICKSON, Trustee.

SEQUESTRATION of AIKMAN, GIBSON, & CO., Wholesale Tea Merchants, Glasgow, as a Company, and Matthew Douglas Aikman, Wholesale Tea Merchant there, the only Individual Partner of that Company, as Partner thereof, and as an Individual.

JOHN WRIGHT, Merchant, Glasgow, has been elected a Commissioner on said estates, in room of Thomas Henderson, Tea Merchant, Glasgow, who has resigned.

JAMES HUTTON, C.A., Trustee.

Glasgow, December 30, 1869.

I Trustee on the Sequestrated Estates of **SAMUEL ANDERSON & COMPANY,** Coppersmiths, Crown Street, Leith Walk, in or near Edinburgh, as a Company, and of Samuel Anderson, Coppersmith, Crown Street foresaid, the only Individual Partner of that Company, as such Partner, and as an Individual, hereby call a meeting of the Creditors to be held within Lyon & Turnbull's Rooms, No. 51, George Street, Edinburgh, on Monday the 10th day of January 1870, at one o'clock afternoon, for the purpose of obtaining the concurrence of the Creditors in regard to the disposal or discharge, by private bargain, of the Bankrupt's right and interest in and to certain heritable subjects situated in Stirling, in terms of and to the effect contained in a Minute of Agreement which has been entered into by me, with advice of the Commissioners thereabout; and which Minute of Agreement will be submitted to the meeting for the approval and concurrence of the Creditors.

ROBT. S. LAIRD, Trustee.

1, Abbey Mount, Edinburgh,
December 30, 1869.

JOHN MILLER, Chartered Accountant, Glasgow, Trustee on the sequestrated estates of **JAMES GIBB & COMPANY,** Publishers and Wholesale Stationers in Glasgow, as a Company, and of James Gibb and James Skinner, both Publishers and Wholesale Stationers in Glasgow, the Individual Partners of said Firm, as such Partners, and as Individuals, hereby calls a meeting of the Creditors on the said estates to be held within the Chambers of John Miller & James H. Ferguson, Accountants, 71, Queen Street, Glasgow, on Thursday the 27th January next, at 12 noon, to consider as to an application to be made for his discharge.

JNO. MILLER, C.A., Trustee.

Glasgow, December 28, 1869,
71, Queen Street.

JOHN MILLER, Chartered Accountant, Glasgow, Trustee on the sequestrated estates of **JOHN M'NAUGHT,** Saddlers' Ironmonger, St James' Street, Paisley Road, Glasgow, Renfrewshire, hereby calls a meeting of the Creditors to be held within the Chambers of John Miller and James H. Ferguson, C.A., 71, Queen Street, Glasgow, on Wednesday the 26th day of January 1870, at 12 o'clock noon, to consider as to an application to be made for his discharge as Trustee.

JNO. MILLER, C.A., Trustee.

Glasgow, December 28, 1869,
71, Queen Street.

THOMAS M' MURTRIE, Draper in Ayr, Trustee on the sequestrated estate of **MRS ISABELLA HUNTER** or **ROSE**, residing at Craigowan, in the Parish of Symington, hereby calls a meeting of the Creditors to be held within the Office of **William Macrorie**, Solicitor, Newmarket Street, Ayr, on Tuesday the 21st day of January next, at 11 o'clock forenoon, to consider as to an application to be made for the Trustee's discharge,
THOMAS M' MURTRIE, Trustee.

Ayr, December 28, 1869.

JAMES MILNE, Timber Merchant in Aberdeen, Trustee on the sequestrated estate of **JOSEPH WRIGHT, Junior, & COMPANY**, Timber Merchants in Aberdeen, and **Joseph Wright, Junior**, Timber Merchant in Aberdeen, sole Partner of that Company, hereby calls a meeting of the Creditors on said estate to be held within the Office of **Milne & Walker**, Advocates, 129, Union Street, Aberdeen, upon Friday the 28th day of January next, at one o'clock afternoon, to consider as to an application to be made for the Trustee's discharge,
JAMES MILNE, Trustee.

Aberdeen, December 27, 1869.

DAVID KINNEAR, Accountant in Edinburgh, Trustee on the sequestrated estate of **PATRICK BARKER**, sometime Furniture Dealer in Edinburgh, and presently residing at Prestonpans, in the County of Haddington, hereby intimates that at a meeting of Creditors held on this date, the Bankrupt offered a composition on all debts due by him at the sequestration of his estates, payable one month after his discharge, and to pay or provide for the expenses of the sequestration and the Trustee's remuneration, with security for payment of the same; and which offer and security proposed was, by the requisite majority, entertained at said meeting; and Notice is hereby given that a meeting of the Creditors will be held within the Trustee's Chambers, 21, Elder Street, Edinburgh, on Monday the 24th day of January next, at two o'clock afternoon, for the purpose of deciding on said offer of composition and security proposed.

DAVID KINNEAR, Trustee.

Edinburgh, December 28, 1869.

SEQUESTRATION of ALEXANDER DUNCAN, Draper, Carnoustie.

MONCRIEFF MITCHELL, Chartered Accountant in Glasgow, Trustee on the estate, hereby intimates that the accounts of his intromissions with the funds of the estate, brought down to the 14th instant, have been audited by the Commissioners; that he has examined the claims of those Creditors who have lodged their oaths and grounds of debt on or before said date, and that an equalising dividend will be paid to those Creditors whose claims have been admitted by the Trustee, and who did not participate in the last division, within the Chambers of Messrs Mitchell & Watson, Chartered Accountants, No. 4, National Bank Buildings, Queen Street, Glasgow, upon Tuesday the 15th day of February 1870; further, that the Commissioners have postponed the declaration of any further dividend until the recurrence of the statutory period; and Notice is hereby given that a general meeting of the Creditors will be held within the Chambers of Messrs Mitchell & Watson, Chartered Accountants, No. 4, National Bank Buildings, Queen Street, Glasgow, upon Monday the 17th day of January 1870, at 12 o'clock noon, to consider as to the propriety of disposing of the outstanding debts belonging to the estate.

MONCRIEFF MITCHELL, C.A., Trustee.

Glasgow, December 28, 1869.

SEQUESTRATION of JAMES BREMNER, lately Grocer at No. 449, Lawnmarket, Edinburgh.

The Trustee hereby intimates that his accounts, to 16th December current, have been audited by the Commissioners, and that a first dividend will be paid within his Chambers, No. 9, North Saint David Street, Edinburgh, on the 17th day of February 1870.

JAS. H. BALGARNIE, Trustee.

Edinburgh, December 31, 1869.

SEQUESTRATION of the Deceased THOMAS FERGUSON, Stirling.

ROBERT ANDERSON, 47, Charlotte Street, Leith, the Trustee, hereby intimates that his accounts have been audited by the Commissioners, who have postponed the declaration of a dividend till the next statutory period, and have dispensed with circulars.

ROB. ANDERSON, Trustee.

Leith, December 28, 1869.

SEQUESTRATION of WILLIAM HUNTER, Tobaccoist in Paisley.

The Trustee hereby intimates that his accounts of intromissions and disbursements on the estate have been audited by the Commissioners, and they have postponed payment of a dividend till the recurrence of the next statutory period.

A. POLLOCK, Jr. Trustee.

SEQUESTRATION of the Deceased JAMES EWEN, Farmer, Millegan, Parish of Grange, Banffshire.

The Commissioners have audited my accounts to 15th current, postponed the declaration of a dividend, and dispensed with circulars to the Creditors.

JOHN M' GREGOR, Trustee.

Bogniebrae, by Huntly,
 December 29, 1869.

NOTICE.

London, 31st December 1869.

The Subscriber, **Thomas Sellar**, has retired from the Copartnership carried on by him and the other Subscribers hereto (being the sole Partners thereof), as Bankers and Commission Agents in London under the Firm of **DENNISTOUN, CROSS, & COMPANY**, in New York under the Firm of **DENNISTOUN & COMPANY**, and in New Orleans under the Firm of **A. & J. DENNISTOUN & COMPANY**, and the said other Subscribers hereto have of mutual consent **DISSOLVED** the said Copartnership.

ALEX. DENNISTOUN,

J. HU. GRAHAM, 70, Miller Street, Glasgow,
 Witness to the Signature of Alexr. Dennistoun.
JOHN ANDREW, of 151, West George Street,
 Glasgow, Clerk-at-Law.

Witness to the Signature of Alexr. Dennistoun.

JOHN DENNISTOUN.

A. DENNISTOUN, Jr.

THO. SELLAR.

D. P. SELLAR.

J. W. CROSS,

by **D. P. SELLAR**, Atty.

ROBERT BARRET.

JOHN DENNISTOUN, Jr.

W. G. HERDMAN, Merchant's Clerk, of 122,
 Cannon Street, London,

Witness to the Signatures of John Dennistoun,
 Tho. Sellar, D. P. Sellar, J. W. Cross by
 his Attorney D. P. Sellar, Robert Barret,
 and John Dennistoun, Jr.

JAMES M. HENDERSON, Merchant's Clerk, of 122,
 Cannon Street, London,

Witness to the Signatures of John Dennistoun,
 Tho. Sellar, D. P. Sellar, J. W. Cross by
 his Attorney D. P. Sellar, Robert Barret,
 and John Dennistoun, Jr.

CHARLES STIRLING, 179, Bath Street, Glasgow,
 Witness to the Signature of A. Dennistoun,
 Junior.

JOHN ANDREW, of 151, West George Street,
 Glasgow, Clerk-at-Law,

Witness to the Signature of A. Dennistoun,
 Junior.

NOTICE.

The Firm of **CHRISTIE & LIDDLE**, Plumbers, Gasfitters, and Zinc Workers, 78, Constitution Street, Leith, of which the Subscribers are the sole Partners, has been this day **DISSOLVED** by mutual consent. **John Macnochie**, Accountant, Leith, is authorised to collect all accounts due to, and to pay all debts due by the said Firm.

Leith, December 31, 1869.

WILLIAM M. CHRISTIE.

ROBERT LIDDLE.

JOHN MACNOCHIE, Accountant, Leith, Witness.

MICHAEL M'QUEEN, Clerk, James' Street, New-
 haven, Witness.

The Subscriber, **WILLIAM GRAY COCHRANE**, of the Hermitage, Leith, has ceased to be a Partner of, or to have any interest in the business carried on at Leith as Corn Factors and Merchants, under the Firm of **COCHRANE, PATERSON, & COMPANY**.

Dated at Leith, the 31st day of December 1869.

W. G. COCHRANE.

A. HORMANN, Witness.

J. O. WALLACE, Witness.

NOTICES.

Glasgow, 31st December 1869.

ON the expiry to-day of the Contract of Copartnership of the Firm of ROBINOWS & MARJORIBANKS, Merchants in Glasgow, (of which the Subscribers are the sole Partners,) the Subscriber, Rudolph Feldtmann, retires from the business, which will be carried on in future under the same Firm by the other Subscribers, who will realise assets and discharge liabilities.

M. E. ROBINOW.
ADOLPH ROBINOW.
WM. MARJORIBANKS.
R. FELDTMANN.

F. von ROTBERG, of 62, Constitution Street, Leith, Merchants' Clerk, Witness to the Signature of Adolph Robinow.

GEO. DE B. WATSON, of 62, Constitution Street, Leith, Merchants' Clerk, Witness to the Signature of Adolph Robinow.

DAVID IMRIE, of No. 16, Bothwell Street, Glasgow, Merchants' Clerk, Witness to the Signatures of M. E. Robinow, Wm. Marjoribanks, and R. Feldtmann.

GRAHAM F. ROSS, of No. 16, Bothwell Street, Glasgow, Merchants' Clerk, Witness to the Signatures of M. E. Robinow, Wm. Marjoribanks, and R. Feldtmann.

Leith, 31st December 1869.

ON the expiry to-day of the Contract of Copartnership of the Firm of ROBINOWS & MARJORIBANKS, Merchants in Leith, (of which the Subscribers are the sole Partners,) with their Branch in Glasgow, for carrying on the Grain Trade, the Subscriber, Meinhard Erast Robinow, Merchant in Glasgow, retires from the business, which will be carried on in future by the other Subscribers, under the Firm of ROBINOW, MARJORIBANKS, & COMPANY, who will realise assets and discharge liabilities of the former Firm.

ADOLPH ROBINOW.

F. von ROTBERG, of 62, Constit. Street, Leith, Merchants' Clerk, Witness to the Signature of Adolph Robinow.

GEO. DE B. WATSON, of 62, Constitution Street, Leith, Merchants' Clerk, Witness to the Signature of Adolph Robinow.

WM. MARJORIBANKS.
M. E. ROBINOW.

DAVID IMRIE, of No. 16, Bothwell Street, Glasgow, Merchants' Clerk, Witness to the Signatures of Wm. Marjoribanks and M. E. Robinow.

GRAHAM F. ROSS, of No. 16, Bothwell Street, Glasgow, Merchants' Clerk, Witness to the Signatures of Wm. Marjoribanks and M. E. Robinow.

THE Firm of BENNIE & TAYLOR, 139, Springburn Road, was this day DISSOLVED by mutual consent. Debts will be received and paid by Angus Taylor, who retains the business in same premises.

JOHN BENNIE.
ANGUS TAYLOR.

JOHN POWELL, Witness,
ADAM TAYLOR, Witness.

Glasgow, December 23, 1869.

NOTICE.

THE Company carrying on business as Tailors and Clothiers in Glasgow, under the Firm of ADDIE & SMITH, of which the Subscribers were sole Partners, was DISSOLVED on 6th September 1869, of mutual consent.

The Subscriber, Peter Addie, who continues to carry on the business in his own name, in the same premises, has right to all accounts due to, and will pay all debts due by the Firm.

Glasgow, December 30, 1869.

PETER ADDIE.
MALCOLM SMITH.

JAMES LOW, Writer, Glasgow, Witness.

WM. RENISON, Writer, Glasgow, Witness.

DISSOLUTION OF COPARTNERSHIP.

THE Copartnership carried on by the Subscribers, as Ironmongers at Coatbridge, under the Firm of GARDINER & DAVIDSON, of which Firm they were the sole Partners, has this day been DISSOLVED of mutual consent.

The Subscriber, Hugh Gardiner, has acquired right to the debts and whole assets of the Company, and will continue to carry on the business in the same premises on his own account. The outstanding debts due to the Firm must hereafter be paid to him, and he will discharge the debts contracted by the Firm.

HUGH GARDINER.

JOHN DAVIDSON.

WILLIAM J. ANDREW, Solicitor, Coatbridge,
Witness.

JNO. COOPER, Law-Clerk, Coatbridge, Witness.
Coatbridge, December 29, 1869.

ARCHIBALD ALLISON, Grocer, &c., No. 18, Pipe Street, Portobello, in the County of Edinburgh, and presently a Prisoner in the Prison of Edinburgh, has presented a Petition to the Sheriff of Edinburghshire craving warrant of liberation, and decree of Cessio Bonorum against his Creditors; and the said Sheriff has appointed Monday the 31st day of January next, 1870, at one o'clock afternoon, within the Bankruptcy Court-room, Sheriff-Court-house, George IV. Bridge, Edinburgh, for the examination of the said Archibald Allison, and requiring all his Creditors to be present at said examination.

MICH. LAWSON, S.S.C.,
7, Elder Street, Edinburgh, Agent.

Edinburgh, December 31, 1869.

ANDREW BLAIKIE, Farmer, Holydean, present Prisoner in the Jail of Selkirk, has presented a Petition to the Sheriff of Roxburgh and Selkirk praying for decree of Cessio Bonorum, liberation, and interim protection from the diligence of his Creditors; and the said Sheriff has appointed the 4th day of February next, at 12 o'clock noon, within his Court-house, Selkirk, for the public examination of the Bankrupt, when all his Creditors are required to attend.

ALEXANDER JEFFREY, Petitioner's Procurator,
Jedburgh, December 29, 1869.

N.B.—The Fees of all Notices must be paid in advance, and all Letters post-paid.

Printed and Published at the Office, 13, North Bank Street, by WILLIAM ALEXANDER LAURIE,
Printer to The QUEEN'S MOST EXCELLENT MAJESTY.

* * This Gazette is filed at the Offices of the London and Dublin Gazettes.

Friday, December 31, 1869.

Price Two Shillings.

