by Mr. Roebuck, Sir C. Wood, Sir R. Peel and Sir G. Lewis; and was again adjourned, on the motion of Mr. Collier, till May 18.

The trial of the Cagliari before the Court of Salerno, has been again suspended. *The Times* says sinister rumors have been going the round of political circles about the intentions of France toward Belgium, and that at Brussels the prospect of a French invasion is a familiar topic of discussion.

The Cologne Gazette says, the fortifications of Konigsberg are to be considerably strengthened, and eighteen additional forts are to be erected at Spandau, which will make it a fortress of the first rank.

The Chronicle contains the following:

LIVERPOOL, Monday evening, May 11.—The Phœnix, Capt. Hodie, that arrived here to-day from Mobile, reports the destruction of a ship by fire. On the 11th the Phœnix fell in with the Grand Duchess of Boston, from New-York to Liverpool, which sailed from the latter port for her destination on the 13th of April. The Grand Duchess was then on fire, and in a most dangerous and critical position as regards not only the ship herself, but her passengers and crew. The ship was totally consumed; passengers and crew saved by the Phœnix.

The following is from *The Times* (city article), May 18:

"The amount of business transacted to-day in the English funds has been altogether unimportant, but a further slight advance has taken place, apparently on the prospect of the approach of satisfactory arrangements for the future government of the country. Console for money, 97¼@⅛; Consols for the account, 98⅛@⅛ (June 3)."

The Daily News (city article) of May 18th, says:

"So long as the fate of the Administration hangs in the balance, the stock markets cannot be expected to show animation. To-day business was extremely inactive, but great firmness prevailed. The rapid influx of gold and the prospect that the Bank of England will recover at least a portion of the sum lately withdrawn from it, promoted a more favorable feeling to-day. The money market was quiet, the demand having slackened. At the Bank there were very few applications, and in the open market first class bills are discounted at 2¼@2½ ⁴ᵛ cent.

"The final quotations of the Three par Cents on the Paris Bourse were 69f. 70c. for money, and 69f. 65. for end of May. *The Times* says, 'The change in the wind 'has brought up the over-due gold ships from Australia, 'viz., the Coleroon, with 19,921 ounces; Roxbury Castle, 50,267 ounces; Sydenham, 26,669 ounces, valued 'at £387,428. Guy Mannering also with 167 ounces.'

"American Securities and Mines were dull and without material variation. Great Western of Canada were also heavy, from the continued decrease in the traffic.

"LIVERPOOL COTTON MARKET, May 17.—The demand for Cotton to-day has been moderate only, and the sales do not much exceed 6,000 bales—1,500 on speculation and for export. Buyers have had a slight advantage in price.

"LONDON CORN AND BREADSTUFFS MARKET, May 17.—Last week's arrivals were moderate. Business done in foreign Wheat was at fully previous rates. In American samples of Flour there was no change.

"LONDON PRODUCE AND PROVISION MARKET, May 17.—Sugar steady, but inactive. Coffee nominal. Tea unaltered. Saltpeter firm. Linseed Oil, 33/@33/6. Turpentine, 40/@41/. Tallow, 53/6 on the spot; June, 50/3."

GREAT BRITAIN.

THE ATTACK ON THE DERBY MINISTRY.

IMPORTANT DEBATE IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

The adjourned debate on the Governor-General of India was resumed on the 17th by Mr. Roebuck, who spoke as follows:

Sir, a question of more importance was, perhaps, never submitted for discussion in any legislative assembly than that which now occupies the attention of this House. If we think of the number of persons likely to be affected by it, and of the time at which the proposition is brought forward, all these considerations indicate the importance of the subject now under discussion. Sir, Gibbon, in his *History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire*, enters into a discussion on the probable capacity of that empire, and in that magnificent *resumé* which he gives of the power and importance of the empire of Rome he says, that the Italians and provincials taken together, amounted in numbers to about 120,000,000, and he adds that that was the largest community of men ever subject to any system of domination. But, Sir, our Indian empire leaves this far behind. There are not only 120,000,000, but I think the persons who are influenced by our dominion in India amount to nearly 200,000,000, and there is now submitted to our consideration a question involving the happiness of this large section of the human race; for we have to determine whether this dominion is to be guided by the great principles of honesty and virtue (cheers), or whether the power which we exercise is to be the only guide of our conduct, and that the object which we have in view is the sole aggrandizement of England. As an Englishman, I cannot help feeling strongly for the dominion, the happiness, and the power of my country; still, there are things which in my mind are even greater than England's importance, and one of these is that mankind should learn to recognize and practice the great principles of honor and virtue. At this present moment there is involved in our discussion this important question—Shall we, in the furtherance of our dominion, for objects purely selfish, forget the great principles of virtue and justice. Shall we, in order to establish our dominion over what I may call the defenseless people of India, utterly regardless of that which civilization ought to teach us to regard—shall we, I say, pursue our own objects without any consideration of the principles which ought to govern us as a people? The motion made by the right hon. gentleman the other night is, I think, one of the most transparent of party maneuvers I have ever seen [loud cheers], and I have seen many transactions of that sort. At this very moment we, the House of Commons, are vindicating to ourselves the government of India—for it is idle to talk of the Crown. The Crown means the House of Commons. [A laugh.] That appears to excite in the minds of some a feeling something like surprise; but I would ask any man who understands the practical working of our system of government to answer me this question—is not all the power said to be centered in the Crown really exercised by this House? Shall we say, when we transfer the government of India from the East India Company to the Crown, that we do not give it to the Ministers of the Crown who act under the control of this House? Therefore I say that when we talk about transferring the government of India from the East India Company to the Crown, we really declare that the House of Commons is to govern India. And at the very time when we are so discussing this matter of the government of India there comes before us a mere matter of party politics. [Cheers.] We forget the happiness of 200,000,000 of men, and we reduce the question to the consideration of this bench and that. [Renewed cheers, and "No, no!"] No, no! Is there any man so utterly void of consideration of what is going on around him and of what is being enacted before his eyes—is there any man so like a blind puppy [a laugh] as not to perceive that what we are fighting for now is not the happiness of India, but the government of this country? [Cheers.] But, Sir, let us, if we can, forget these party politics; let us, if we can, consider this question as affecting the happiness of 200,000,000 of human beings. Now, what is the question before us? The right hon. gentleman, the member for Oxford [Mr. Cardwell], propounds a resolution which really involves three points for consideration. First, he says that the President of the Board of Control was wrong in writing any dispatch in answer to the proclamation of Lord Canning; then he says he wrote the wrong dispatch; and then he says he was wrong in the publication of that dispatch. Now, I am prepared to meet him all these points. [Cheers.] I say, first he was bound to write that dispatch; I say, secondly, he wrote the right answer to that dispatch; and, thirdly, I say he was not answerable for the production of that dispatch. [Cheers.] I have no doubt that may astonish some gentlemen in this House, but before I have done I hope I shall be able to satisfy them of its justice. Was he or was he not bound to write an answer to that proclamation? I will not now enter into any discussion of the manner which we have acquired dominion in India; I will only say this—that having entered it as a body of mere merchants we in course of time acquired the dominion of that vast country, but that we did not do so without sacrificing on almost every occasion every principle which ought to guide the justice of a nation [cheers],—that we have been rapacious, that we have been cruel, that we have been unjust, but that we have acquired dominion. [Cheers.] We have done it by the great power and capacity of the men we have sent there—by the wonderful valor of our troops, than which nothing can be more wonderful [hear, hear]; but, notwithstanding, we have sacrificed truth, honor and justice. [Hear, hear.] I know these are to many gentlemen unpalatable truths, but they are truths, nevertheless. [Hear, hear.] There is only one justification of dominion, but that is, that it is such as to promote the happiness of the people over whom it is exercised, but in order to produce that happiness it must be a merciful Government. [Hear, hear.] Now, having acquired this dominion in India there arose a rebellion against us. We had a wonderful army, and that army mutinied. Let no man for one instant suppose that I stand up as one not feeling, deeply feeling, all the atrocities that mutinous army has perpetrated. No man has been more ready to raise his voice against them than I have been, and I will say let punishment to the utmost follow those atrocities [hear]; but I draw a broad distinction between the mutinous army and the people of India. [Hear, hear.] And now I come to Oude. The Governor-General of India and the Directors of the East India Company were pleased to annex Oude to our dominions. I hold some peculiar opinions on this matter. ["Hear, hear," from the Opposition.] You do not know what these opinions are, why do you cheer? [Laughter.] The opinions I hold are that I think the first injustice the least [Hear, hear]; that when you have conquered a country you ought to annex it at once, and not create intermediate authorities and enter into treaties with them; but that having done so, you are bound by those treaties. [Hear, hear.] Let me take the instance of Scinde. There we began unjustly, but still we conquered Scinde, and we annexed it. That I think a better mode of proceeding than we followed in Oude. We entered into treaties with Oude as far back as 1801, and these treaties contained certain stipulations with regard to the dominions of Oude. Another treaty was made after that, but though laid on the table of this House, it has been declared to be no treaty at all. [Hear, hear.] Ultimately it was declared, on the ground of the treaty, that because the King of Oude did not behave to his people as he ought to have done, his kingdom was to be annexed to our dominions. Now, I say that was an injustice which it would have been far better to avoid by annexing Oude at once. [Hear, Hear.] Be that as it may, it pleased the Governor-General and the Court of Directors to annex Oude to our dominions. We ought to recollect that the people of Oude were accustomed to their native dominion, and when the annexation took place they expressed strong feelings of dissatisfaction, and when the muty of the army broke out they joined the mutineers. We warred against them, but will any man tell me that we warred against the people of Oude as a band of mutineers, and not as a nation? [Hear, hear.] It was a nation warring against a nation, and we conquered them. Now, I solicit the attention of the House to what followed. A scene was enacted to which the history of mankind shows no parallel. [Hear, hear.] Annexing Oude, we immediately proceeded to dispossess the landowners. [Hear.] That created discontent. When the mutiny broke out the people of Oude, as I have said, joined the mutineers, and we conquered them. But before Oude was conquered the present Governor-General issued a proclamation, by which he confiscated—I use the term in English as it was written in English—he confiscated, with the exception of that of six persons, all the landed property of Oude. (Hear.) I say that the history of mankind affords no parallel to such a case. (Hear.) I know that the Normans in their day confiscated a great deal of the land, but they did not go the length of confiscating all with the exception of the property of six persons. (Hear, hear.) But to come to the commencement of the question now before us. The Government of India in this country receives from India a proclamation that was ordered to be issued on the fall of Lucknow; and what did that Government do? It sees that a proclamation is about to be issued which, in that Government's opinion would make the whole people of Oude rebellious to the very end of their lives. (Cheers.) And I ask gentlemen to observe that it has been said, and I believe cannot be contradicted, that this proclamation, so issued, so declared, was done in opposition to the opinions and wishes of Sir Colin Campbell, Sir J. Outram and Sir J. Lawrence. [Hear, hear.] I have seen private letters in London from India, which say that the effect of this proclamation was equivalent to a demand for 20,000 troops in addition to those we have already in India. [Hear.] I say, then, that the Government which would have passed over a proclamation of that description in silence would have deserved impeachment [hear]; and I believe there would have been none so ready to say so as the gentlemen now on that (the Opposition) bench. [Laughter.] The President of the Board of Control, on receiving such a proclamation, was bound to express an opinion. Whose opinion? What opinion? His own. [Hear.] He was bound, acting on his own understanding, to tell Lord Canning what he thought of it, and he did tell him. [Hear, hear.] What other conclusion could he have come to when he read of the confiscation forever of the lands of the people of Oude—for it is idle to tell me this proclamation does not confiscate the whole land of Oude! [Hear, hear.] There are some ugly words in that proclamation, the true sense of which the House cannot fail to see, if it will only be guided by its own judgment, instead of being led away by party feeling. [Hear, hear.] The Governor-General in this proclamation, it will be observed, informs the people of Oude that the Government will remunerate those who preserve their allegiance, and he names six persons who are to be permitted to retain their property. But he says further—and, mark you, this proclamation is addressed to the people of Oude [cheers], not to the chiefs, not to the landed proprietors, not to the Dukes of Bedford [cheers and laughter], but to the people of Oude, with six exceptions, and to them he says that "The proprietary right in the soil of the province is confiscated to the British Government, which "will dispose of the right in such manner as to it may "seem fitting." [Cheers.] You will recollect that this was written in English [hear], and that words more complete could not be used to signify that the whole landed property of Oude was confiscated to the Government of England. [Hear.] And now I will make an observation, if the House will allow me, upon the statement made by the noble lord the member for the city of London, on the injustice of publishing that proclamation and the dispatch of the noble lord the President of the Board of Control. Now, let us hear how it did occur. This intended proclamation was sent home, but the proclamation was issued at Lucknow, after the fall of Lucknow, and differed in some respects from that proclamation. My hon. friend the member for Birmingham (Mr. Bright) read the actual proclamation as it was published in *The Times*. He put a question, and an answer was given to him, to which, by and by, I will refer. The answer given was the answer to this proclamation that I have read, and he was promised that the answer should be laid on the table. It was laid on the table. Could you lay on the table an answer that was not given? ["Oh!"] All the Government could do was to say, "We have "sent an answer to the intended proclamation, and "that answer you shall know." You did know it, and what was there wrong in that? It is a very simple statement, but a very true one. Therefore, I say that Lord Ellenborough was bound to give an answer; that, in the second place, he was bound to give that answer which in his honest mind he intended to give; and that this answer was made. And now I come to the third question involved. It has been said that Lord Ellenborough ought to have made an answer, but that he had no right to publish that dispatch. Therein was the gravamen of the charge made by the Right Hon. gentleman (Mr. Cardwell). I would ask the House whether there are not certain questions which compel an answer? If I go up to the Secretary of the India Board and say, "Would you rob a man?" and if the Hon. gentleman replied, "Considerations of public policy prevent my answering the question," the presumption would be that he would rob him. [A laugh.] The Hon. member for Birmingham said: "I have seen a proclamation from the Governor-General of India about "Oude, and I want to know if you have heard of it, "whether you have answered it, and the nature of "your answer." What occurred? The Secretary to the India Board got up and answered one half of that question. He said: "We have answered that proclamation, and you shall see the "answer." Upon which my Hon. friend, who is not a man to be put off, said, 'I hope the Government are not satisfied with that answer; I am not. I want to know what you said. Did you agree with the proclamation?' "No," said the Chancellor of the Exchequer, "we did not agree agree with it; we differed from the policy indicated in every sense." [Cheers.] Now I ask the House, as men of common sense, whether, if the right hon. gentleman had got up and said "considerations of public policy prevent my answering the question," the conclusion of every man would not have been that the Government blamed that proclamation? [Hear, hear.] It is as certain as daylight. If he had approved the proclamation, he would have told us so, and by declining to answer he would, in fact, have answered that the Government did not agree with the proclamation. [Hear.] What, then, was the conduct to be pursued by the right hon. gentleman? That which he did pursue. He said, "We did disagree from the proclamation." Will you tell me about paralyzing the Governor-General's arm? Who was to blame? [Hear, hear.] Was not Lord Ellenborough bound to answer the proclamation as his own judgment told him it should be answered? and, if you compelled the publication of that dispatch, the evil of it rests here, and not with the Government. [Cheers.] There is this wonderful peculiarity—I will not say mischief—of a Government like ours—that the people should know what is going on. I believe that the arguments used in this debate go further than some hon. gentlemen think, and that they condemn the hidden diplomacy which is the curse of this country. [Cheers.] I firmly believe that if we knew from day to day what the Government are doing, we should be better off than we are. [Cheers.] Now, we are led blindfold into every error. War comes on us, and we are told we must not inquire. Peace comes on us, and we are told we are too late. [Cheers.] When it is important that we should know, the public interests step in, and when to know is of no use at all we are told all. [Loud cheers.] Sir, I want to know if this is not a fair description? There was no other course before the Government except that which they pursued. They were called upon to give an opinion. They did give an opinion, and they gave it according to the honest bias of their own minds. [Cheers.] When they were called upon to publish that opinion, it was by this side of the House, and they had no alternative. It was published in spite of themselves, and the publication is not to be laid at their door. [Cheers.] Well, then, if we are to regard our Indian dominion as a matter in which we have an interest, we have a yet greater interest in truth and justice. [Hear.] If you wanted to pacify India, it would be by the course pointed out in the dispatch of Lord Ellenborough. It has been said that this dispatch ought to be printed in letters of gold. Sir, I believe so. That was an honest dispatch, and I do not know my own countrymen if they do not come to the same conclusion. [Cheers.] I entreat my countrymen to remember that there are things above party. If they are to consider mere party moves I will ask them what they will get if the Government are in a minority to-night? Why, a Government that we have chastised lately [loud cheers] because they neglected the honor of England. [Continued cheering.] We are to allow hon. gentlemen on this side of the House, after passing a few weeks in the cold regions of Opposition, to go in state across to that (the Treasury) bench. [Cheers.] And for what? Do the people of England expect any change in the policy of the late Government? If they do they are wofully deceived. Sir, I believe that good government, that happiness for the people, that the advance of liberal measures, which we all desire, are more to be obtained from that weak Government (pointing to the Treasury bench) than from the strong insolence of this (pointing to the front Opposition bench, amid great cheering). I have seen, Sir, both; I have tried them both; and I am sure that we are further advanced in a course of improvement and liberty than we should have been under the guidance of the noble lord (Lord Palmerston). [Cheers.] If we seek simple honesty, if we want justice for the people of England, if we seek the happiness of the people of England and good government for England, we shall give a decided negative to the resolutions of the right honorable gentleman the member for Oxford. [Loud cheers.]

Sir C. Wood complained that the attention of the House had been diverted from the real question at issue, which was simple enough. The supporters of the resolution, he said, contended that the Government, in prematurely condemning Lord Canning's proclamation, and in condemning it in unjustifiable terms, and, worse than all, in publishing their condemnation, to the detriment of the Governor-General's authority, had promulgated opinions almost incompatible with the maintenance of our power in India. The House was not called upon to approve the policy of Lord Canning with reference to Oude, respecting which there was a deficiency of evidence; it was irrespective of that policy that he called upon the House to condemn the proceedings of the Government. He proceeded to argue that an incorrect construction had been put upon the proclamation; that misapprehensions prevailed as to the proprietary right in Oude; that the landholders oppressed and maltreated the people, for whose good it was desirable that the talookdar system should be extirpated—though he did not believe that this was the meaning of the proclamation, which was, he observed, of the usual character, and in accordance with the policy pursued in the Punjaub. But if the proclamation was thought to be too severe, it ought to have been reproved in more appropriate terms, not with harshness and invective; and at all events it ought not to have been published. The responsibility for the publication could not, he insisted, be shifted upon a single Minister; the act must, upon constitutional grounds, and upon their own showing, be shared by all the members of the Cabinet. He dwelt, in conclusion, upon the mischievous effects which the publication of the dispatch would, in his opinion, exert upon the authority of the Governor-General, upon the population of Oude, and upon the people of India; contending that, instead of being a message of peace, the dispatch would be a firebrand of war.

Mr. Hardy could not consider the motion an honest one. The resolution, he said, was involved and ambiguous in its terms, and shaped so as to catch votes. With regard to the proclamation, he contended that there could be no mistake in India, any more than in England, as to its meaning, which was repugnant to the rules and principles prescribed in a dispatch to India dated the 24th of March, and which was laid upon the table of the House on the 29th of April. Those rules and principles of justice and humanity, he said, had been acted upon by the Government, and enforced, he admitted in strong and forcible terms, in the dispatch in question, which was intended not to insult, but to warn Lord Canning, who, he believed, would read it in a very different spirit from that in which it was read in that House. If it was an error to condemn an act of a Governor-General before his explanation had been received, it was no more, he remarked, than had been done by a former Government, of which some members of the late Administration had formed a part, which had condemned an act of Lord Auckland in 1839, without giving him an opportunity to explain it. He read extracts from Indian newspapers to show the opinions entertained throughout India as to the effects of the proclamation, and that to carry it out would require a fresh army of 50,000 men.

Sir R. Peel observed that Mr. Cardwell had referred to the motives and objects of his motion. Those motives and objects, in his (Sir R. Peel's) opinion, were not the interest of poor Lord Canning, nor of the millions in India under our rule; but an opportunity was offered, and was not to be lost, for attacking the Government, and India must be made the battlefield. Such a motion, instead of tending to the assistance of our countrymen in India, must greatly increase their embarrassment, and the country must, he thought deprecate the course pursued. After defending the policy of Lord Dalhousie in annexing Oude, he denounced in strong terms that disclosed in the "manifesto" of Lord Canning, and asked the House whether it was prepared to sanction arbitrary spoliation, or whether it would require that severe acts should be tempered with moderation. Assuming that this had been made a party question, Sir Robert discussed with great freedom the comparative merits of Lord Derby and Lord Palmerston, as First Ministers of the Crown, making the scale preponderate sensibly in favor of the former, and he called upon the liberal party to give their support upon this motion to the Government.

Sir G. Lewis denied that the motion was an attempt to raise a party issue; there was nothing farther from the truth, he said, than that this question had not been forced upon the Opposition, who could not, without a dereliction of political duty, have passed it over. He reviewed the policy of annexing Oude from its inception, and then examined the proclamation, and the meaning of the term "confiscation" in that document, upon which so much stress had been laid. What he understood by it was, he said, not actual, but threatened confiscation. According to the fairest and most reasonable construction, what Lord Canning intended was, in case of rebellion, where the territory had belonged to the Crown and the East India Company, to declare as a penalty that the proprietary right should be forfeited to the British Government. It never could have been his intention to dispossess the entire population of Oude, and turn them adrift, which was contrary to modern policy; and the Government, before assuming anything so improbable, ought, he contended, to have waited for explanation. If after the dispatch was officially brought to the knowledge of the House it took no step, but silently acquiesced in the writing and dispatching such an instrument, it would share in the responsibility of the Government, and become an accomplice in their acts.

Mr. Whiteside began by noticing the inconsistency shown by the supporters of a resolution which declared that the House abstained from giving an opinion upon the policy of the proclamation in defending its policy, and asserting that that was the true question before the House, and the foundation of the whole discussion. He observed that, although the publication of the opinion of the Government on the subject of the policy contained in the proclamation had been made the foundation of this resolution, this declaration of their views had been distinctly and unequivocally made by the Chancellor of the Exchequer, in reply to a question put by Sir F. Perry on the 23d of April, the declaration being, he said, cheered by members of the late Government. How, he asked, could they, after this, turn round and censure the present Government? He then commented upon the want of explanation of the proclamation, and upon the "private letter," which was still not forthcoming, suggesting, as no explanation had yet been received from Lord Canning, that there might have been some other private letter, withheld as the other had been, the information in which would have afforded a material guide to Lord Ellenborough.

Referring to the proclamation, which he termed an awful one, he contrasted its policy with similar documents promulgated by the Marquis of Wellesley and the Marquis of Dalhousie, and challenged the production of any proclamation issued by the British Government in which private property was not respected. The meaning of the proclamation was disputed; but the question was what the document, when submitted to the Government, could be fairly understood to mean; he contended that this monstrous proclamation could only be understood to be fulminated not only against large landholders, but holders of small properties—a class martial as well as agricultural. He read the dispatch of Lord Ellenborough by the light of this construction of the proclamation, and he repelled the objection of Lord John Russell to the reference made in the dispatch to the annexation of Oude. He defended the policy of the dispatch, not, he said, in the letter, but in spirit; if the other side disputed that policy, he called upon them to bring the question to an issue upon a distinct motion, and try whether it was condemned by the House and by the country.

On the motion of Mr. Collier, the debate was again adjourned till the 18th.

LORD CANNING AND THE EAST INDIA COMPANY.

The following copy of a letter from the Court of Directors of the East India Company to the Governor-General of India in Council was presented to Parliament and ordered to be printed on Friday, May 14:

"MAY 5.—1. You will have received by the mail of the 25th of March a letter from the Secret Committee, which has since been laid before us, respecting the policy which it becomes you to pursue toward those natives of India who have recently been in arms against the authority of the British Government.

"2. That letter emphatically confirms the principles which you have already adopted, as set forth in your circular of the 31st of July, 1857, by impressing upon you the propriety of pursuing, after the conquest of the revolted provinces, a course of policy distinguished by a wise and discriminating generosity. You are exhorted to temper justice with mercy, and, except in cases of extreme criminality, to grant an amnesty to the vanquished. In the sentiments expressed by the Secret Committee we entirely concur. While there are some crimes which humanity calls upon you to punish with the utmost severity, there are others of a less aggravated charater which it would be equally unjust and impolitic not to pardon and to forget.

"3. The offenses with which you will be called upon to deal will be of three different kinds. Firstly, high crimes, instigated by malice prepense, and aggravated by treachery and cruelty. Secondly, offenses the results rather of weakness than of malice, into which it is believed that many have been drawn by the contamination of example, by the fear of opposing themselves to their more powerful countrymen, or by the belief that they have been compromised by the acts of their associates, rather than by any active desire to embarrass the existing Government. And, thirdly, offenses of a less positive character, amounting to little more than passive connivance at evil, or at most to the act of giving such assistance to the rebels as, if not given, would have been forcibly extorted, and which in many cases it would have been death to refuse to bodies of licentious and exasperated mutineers.

"4. It is the first only of these offenses, the perpetrators of which and their accomplices it will be your duty to visit with the severest penalty which you can inflict; and it is happily in such cases of exceptional atrocity that you will have the least difficulty in proving both the commission of the offense and the identity of the offender. In the other cases you might often be left in doubt, not only of the extent of the offense committed, but of its actual commission by the accused persons; and, although we are aware that the retribution which may be righteously inflicted upon the guilty may be in some measure restricted by too much nicety of specification, and that in dealing with so large a mass of crime it is difficult to avoid the commission of some sets of individual injustice, we may still express our desire that the utmost exertion may be made to confine within the smallest possible compass these cases of uncertain proof and dubious identity, even though your retributory measures should thus fall short of what in strict justice might be inflicted.

"5. As soon as you have suppressed the active hostility of the enemy, your first care will be the restoration of public confidence. It will be your privilege, when the disorganized provinces shall no longer be convulsed by intestine disorder, to set an example of toleration and forbearance toward the subject people, and to endeavor by every means consistent with the security of the British Empire in the East to alley the irritation and suspicion which, if suffered to retain possession of the minds of the native and European inhabitants of the country, will eventually lead to nothing less calamitous than a war of races.

"6. In dealing with the people of Oude you will doubtless be moved by special considerations of justice and policy. Throughout the recent contest we have ever regarded such of the inhabitants of that country as, not being Sepoys or pensioners of our own army, have been in arms against us, as an exceptional class. They cannot be considered as traitors, or even rebels, for they had not pledged their fidelity to us, and they had scarcely become our subjects. Many, by the introduction of a new system of government, had necessarily been deprived of the maintenance they had latterly enjoyed, and others feared that the speedy loss of their means of subsistence must follow from the same cause. It was natural that such persons should avail themselves of the opportunity presented by the distracted state of the country, to strike a blow for the restoration of the native rule, under which the permitted disorganization of the country had so long been to them a source of unlawful profit. Neither the disbanded soldiers of the late native Government, nor the great talookdars and their retainers, were under any obligation of fidelity to our Government for benefits conferred upon them. You would be justified, therefore, in dealing with them as you would with a foreign enemy, and in ceasing to consider them objects of punishment after they have once laid down their arms.

"7. Of these arms they must forever be deprived. You will, doubtless, in prosecution of this object, address yourself, in the first instance, to the case of the great talookdars, who so successfully defied the late Government, and many of whom, with large bodies of armed men, appear to have aided the efforts of the mutinous soldiery of the Bengal army. The destruction of the fortified strongholds of these powerful landholders, the forfeiture of their remaining guns, disarming and disbanding of their followers, will be among your first works; but while you are depriving this influential and once dangerous class of people of their power of openly resisting your authority, you will, we have no doubt, exert yourselves by every possible means to reconcile them to British rule, and encourage them, by liberal arguments made in accordance with ancient usages, to become industrious agriculturists, and to employ in the cultivation of the soil the men who, as armed retainers, have so long wasted the substance of their masters and desolated the land. We believe that these landholders may be taught that their holdings will be more profitable to them under a strong Government, capable of maintaining the peace of the country, and severely punishing agrarian outrages, than under one which perpetually invites, by its weakness, the ruinous arbitration of the sword.

"8. Having thus endeavored, on the reestablishment of the authority of the British Government in Oude, to reassure the great landholders, you will proceed to consider, in the same spirit of toleration and forbearance, the condition of the great body of the people. You will bear in mind that it is necessary, in a transition state from one government to another, to deal tenderly with existing usages, and sometimes even with existing abuses. All precipitate reforms are dangerous. It is often wiser even to tolerate evil for a time than to alarm and irritate the minds of the people by the sudden introduction of changes which time can alone teach them to appreciate, or even, perhaps, to understand. You will be especially careful, in the readjustment of the fiscal system of the province, to avoid the imposition of unaccustomed taxes, whether of a general or of a local character, pressing heavily upon the industrial resources, and affecting the daily comforts of the people. We do not estimate the successful administration of a newly-acquired province according to the financial results of the first few years. At such a time we should endeavor to conciliate the people by wise concessions, and to do nothing to encourage the belief that the British Government is more covetous of revenue than the native ruler whom it has supplanted."

MURDER ON THE HIGH SEAS.—John Shiels, boatswain, and George Williamson and James Thom, sailors on board the ship J. S. Parsons, an American ship, are in custody in Liverpool, charged with having caused the death of Henry Barwell, a seaman on board the same vessel. It was stated that the ship left New-Orleans for Liverpool on the 19th of March last, on the evening of which day the prisoner Shiels dragged the deceased out of his bunk onto the deck, and knocked him down with a slung-shot, and he and Williamson and Thom beat him to death with belaying-pins. The body of the deceased was seen lying on the deck a short time afterward, but a few minutes after that it was missed, and the prisoner Shiels was heard to say that "they had planked the ——," meaning that they had thrown the body overboard. It was not seen again. On the arrival of the ship at Liverpool information was given to the United States Consul, which led to the apprehension of the prisoners on Friday at a lodging-house in Gibraltar-row. The prisoners have not yet been taken publicly before the magistrates, the necessary authority from the Home Secretary, in conjunction with the authority of the United States Consul, being required before removing the prisoners for trial to New-Orleans, they being American citizens, and the offense having been committed under the American flag.

TURKEY.

DEFEAT OF THE TURKS BY THE MONTENEGRINS.

The Chronicle says: Telegraphic dispatches have been received announcing the issue of the battle of Gralovo. The Turks were completely beaten by the Montenegrins, losing their cannon and baggage. Kismil Pasha was left dead on the field of battle. The Turks retired to Kioback, where they were in a state of blockade.

The Herald says that the solution of the difference between Turkey and Greece is expected to be shortly terminated.

INDIA.

RELIEF OF AZIMGHUR—DEFEAT OF THE BHEELS.

Sir H. Rose's advance in Calpee has been delayed by the fear that the Kotah rebels will fall on Jeanse. Orders have been issued to General Roberts to advance to Kotah to cooperate with Sir H. Rose. The military movement is reported since the capture of Kotah. The Sikh force under Major Evans, after an obstinate battle of some hours, inflicted a severe defeat on a large body of Bheels—60 men and 400 women were captured. British loss, 71 killed, 2 wounded.

Azimghur was relieved by Sir E. Lugard on the 15th of April. The enemy retreated with regularity, but lost 3 guns and a great number of men. It is said the enemy will make a stand at Calpee.

CHINA.

YEK A CHANGED MAN.

The correspondent of *The London Times*, who gave so amusing a sketch of Yek as he appeared during the voyage to Calcutta, reports that he has become quite another man since his arrival at Calcutta:

"The change has been brought about by the Calcutta journals and the British House of Commons. With the desperate hope of amusing him, Mr. Alabaster translated to him a few phrases from the debate upon the India bill. From that moment Yek has been a transformed man. He gets up early, and is restless until *The Calcutta Englishman* is brought; he is miserable if it does not contain its usual modicum of Parliamentary eloquence. His particular delight is in the speeches which are most vehement against the Company. He thought Mr. Ayrton a great orator. When the interpreter came to that paragraph of Lord Palmerston's speech wherein he says that nations have suffered much by ill-considered changes, he was much excited, and said, 'Good, good, good,' but when the translator completed the sentence, 'but they have 'suffered much more by obstinate resistance to necessary reforms,' he threw himself back and grunted. He was delighted to hear that Lord Palmerston had been turned out, and he chuckled all through his great body when he heard Lord Derby's declaration that he hoped for a speedy peace with China.

"These readings are interspersed with many explanations and inquiries, and Yek is really beginning to acquire some glimmering notion of the British Constitution.

"'I am afraid I weary your Excellency,' says the interpreter, himself weary with two hours arduous translation.

"'No, go on. I understand it all now. It is much better than I used to get from Hong-Kong. I never could understand them.'

"'Then you did get translations at Canton?'

"'Of course I did, from your teachers.' Had he forgotten what he had said to Mr. Layard upon this, or was he simply indifferent to the admission of having stated an untruth?

"Yek was never so palpably moved as by the information that the letter which Mr. Oliphant delivered at Soochow contained inclosures from the embassadors of England, of America, and also of *Russia*. He started, and rose from his seat. It was quite evident that he had some secret cause for great surprise, if not for great indignation. You will recollect what the Chinese believed and told me as to an understanding between Russia and China. I cannot help recurring to my early belief that Count Putiatin has cards in his hands which he does not show Lord Elgin.

"Yek gave us his version of the murder of the French missionary. He says the man was dressed as a Chinaman and spoke Chinese, and no one suspected him of being a Frenchman; that the people accused him of having stolen women, and also of being a rebel, so his head was cut off. 'If,' said Yek, 'any one had a notion that he was a Frenchman he would have been 'sent to the French Consul.'

"There is probably not one word of truth in this. The two common stock accusations by the Chinese against the missionaries of all denominations is that they steal women, and that 'they pick out sick men's eyes.' What they mean by this latter imputation I could not discover, but I believe it is intended literally and not figuratively.

"Yek received the edict which degraded him with great equanimity. Sir John Bowring had forwarded a copy in the original Chinese. 'I expected this,' he said, 'may I keep it sometime to consider it?'

"'As long as your Excellency pleases.'

"'Then I will keep it a week.'

"The decree requires some consideration. It is much milder than was anticipated—much milder than the translation which went to Europe would lead us to think, for the translator has interpolated some words of censure not in the Chinese. It does not appear that, although Yek is removed from his government, he is degraded from his rank, or from his post as Grand Councillor. He read it so; for he remarked, 'Henceforward, then, I have nothing to do with foreign affairs.

"'Your Excellency must be glad to have escaped from so troublesome a post!'

"'I am neither glad nor sorry. It was at the Emperor's command I took them up, and at his command I lay them down.'

"Yek has been tenderly dealt with. He has evidently some great protecting interest in Pekin, and will probably become again a great power in China."

MEXICO.

REPORTED CLOSING OF MEXICAN PORTS.

From The New-Orleans Picayune, May 25.

The steamship Tennessee, Capt. Forbes, arrived here yesterday from Vera Cruz, which she left on the 21st inst., to which date we have files of papers thence.

The Tennessee brings Admiral Zerman as passenger, and six others in the steerage.

Capt. Forbes reports that the shipping in port at Vera Cruz consisted of only the Spanish brig Aurora, which arrived from Cadiz on the 19th inst., and the American bark Wildfire, Capt. Campbell, which arrived from New-York on the 21st.

At Sacrificios, the Spanish frigate Baylen, and the French brig-of-war La Perouse, were laying at anchor.

Daily communication with the interior was uninterrupted, as far as mails and passengers were concerned, but the conveyance of freight was not attempted.

The port of Vera Cruz had been blockaded for three days by the Mexican war steamer Guerrero, but on the 17th she went south for fuel.

On the morning of the 21st, Capt. Forbes was informed that advices had been received from the capital that the Zuloaga Government had declared all Mexican ports closed to commerce.

The mail arrived from the capital in time for the Tennessee.

The *Progreso* of the 21st inst. published a decree of Gov. Zamora, strictly ordering the debts due on corporation property purchased under the *ley Lerdo*, the law of *desamortizacion*, to be paid and enforced in accordance with the provisions of that enactment, which some of the purchasers, at least, have sought to evade, endeavoring to secure the property without paying for it.

The same paper publishes lengthy correspondence of Sr. Jose Gutierez Zamora of Vera Cruz, brother of the Governor, and Sr. J. M. de Sevilla, at present of this city, with explanations of the former in reference to allegations and difficulties on political matters between himself and Sr. Sevilla.

On Gen. Marin, of the steamship Guerrero, announcing to Com'r Geoffroy, of the French brigantine-of-war "La Perouse," that he had blockaded that port, this officer observed that the blockade was attempted in a very unusual manner, and that until he received instructions from the French Minister in Mexico, he should take under his immediate protection French merchant vessels which might be on the way thither, and ignorant of the steps taken to blockade the port.

The *Progreso* gives a lamentable picture of the condition of Echegaray's forces in Cordova. They are said to be without pay or rations, the soldiers and their families dependent on charity for support, and the former subjected to severe punishments for the slightest of offenses. Two of the garrison are said to have died from ill treatment, and four others to be in the hospital without hope of recovery. The chiefs are said to have plundered the rector of $800, and then to have tried to induce him to sign a document declaring that the *puros* or Constitutionalists had robbed him of it! In order to secure a vote of thanks from the ladies to Echegaray, they are said to have threatened their fathers and brothers that they would ally with the soldiers if they did not sign the document! One lady, for declining to take it round for signatures among her friends, was threatened with exclusion from church and refusal of absolution! Coming through the channel it goes—the *Progreso* being a vehement *puro*—all this is to be taken *cum grano salis*.

A decree of Gov. Zamora, of the 19th inst., permits the introduction of foreign ordinary soap into Vera Cruz for the period of three months, at the same duty as is charged on the home-made article.

Official communications from Gen. Alvarez, according to the *Progreso*, announce to Sr. de la Llave that he would have two additional brigades in the field by the 3d inst., one of which was to operate against Toluca, the other against Iguala, with a view of advancing on Cuernavaca. The routing of Miramon at San Luis Potosi, and the brilliant triumps of the liberals at Zacatecas, conjoined with this, had induced the Zuloaga Government to send Osollos, with a force of 1,500 recruits and $120,000, to reunite the scattered troops, and meet the old General. His triumph, however, is confidently calculated on; for, says the *Progreso*, in the case of Alvarez, there will be no