ple upon which the societies referred to were founded had been productive of the greatest advantage to both England and America.

Mr. COBDEN proposed "The Health of the President," and said, probably there was no one who could more appreciate the services Mr. Walker had rendered, not only to his own country but to this, in that able manifesto in favor of free trade which he gave to the world five years ago. (Applause.) At that time we had been engaged in this country for many years in the free trade struggle, and one of the arguments with which they were most uniformly met was this:—"Its of no use your attempting to carry out the principles of free trade in this country until you have a guarantee that other nations will respect and follow your example." And it was especially alleged that there was no prospect of reciprocity from the United States; but just at the critical moment out came that manifesto from Mr. Walker, which had more than anything else recommended him to the sympathies of the people of this country and of Europe. (Hear, and applause.) And they must not undervalue the merit of the author of that report, for it must be recollected that while he (Mr. Cobden) and others in the free trade struggle were private and irresponsible individuals, Mr. Walker held a high official and responsible office in his country, and in giving forth the doctrines of free trade was invested with the authority of a powerful government. (Hear, hear) He congratulated the company that they lived in a time when such meetings as this could be held, and that they could thus assemble to do honor to a gentleman who had thus distinguished himself in the politics of another country. It showed a great progress in the world's history, and that the politics of nations were becoming expansive and cosmopolitan. They had altogether passed over the artificial divisions of mankind, and were living in an age when the policy and acts of one nation were necessarily of a character which should combine within them the sympathies and interests of all mankind. In fact, everything that was now passing around them showed more and more how they were linked together—how the whole of the nations of the world were bound up in one common interest and sympathy. It was a truly dramatic age, for the incidents which were passing on the world's surface were really of that sudden and startling character that they reminded one of the transitions upon the stage We heard one day of the discovery of Californian gold, and another, that the passage of the isthmus of Panama had been effected by an American, after being the subject of dispute and discussion for centuries. Another year they had the submarine telegraph, by which a person standing on the cliffs of Dover could send an electric spark underneath the Channel, which would explode a cannon on the other side. Men were no longer satisfied that their sympathies should be bounded by the limits of their municipality, or even nation—in this age they lived for the whole world (Cheers) Men were growing rapidly in mental stature, and this meeting was another sign of the progress He (Mr. Cobden) had no apprehension for England from the despotisms of the Continent—he was much more afraid of the progress of American navigation and commerce. But let the rivalry of the nations continue, and those would make most progress which did not keep up unproductive establishments, wasting their resources by keeping great multitudes of men in idleness and dissipation. (Cheers) Mr. Cobden concluded by proposing the health of the President, which was enthusiastically responded to.

Several other toasts were proposed before the company separated

The President's Chances.

[From the Allgemeine Zeitung.]

When the first intelligence of the *coup* in Paris reached Germany, many took it for granted that within a week Louis Napoleon would be either in the Tuileries or Vincennes. The majority would have decided for Vincennes as the more probable of the two, believing it impossible that the French nation could throw off a republic as easily, and with as much indifference, as a yesterday's shirt. But Germans will never rightly understand the history of the French nation unless they clearly understand the contradictions of the French national character. The French have twice had a republic, and have never attained to a free commune or a free municipality. Their talent for organization displays itself in small things and great, and in their hands everything takes a form that can be quickly moved at the word of command. This spirit animates the whole nation and all parties. The wildest revolutionists themselves began by creating a hierarchy, and, at least for the moment, subjecting themselves blindly to it. The prosecution of the conspirators of Lyons gave the most striking proofs of this. Every revolutionist served from below upwards; they were first leaders of sections, then presidents of arrondissements, were admitted then—if they succeeded in attracting attention to themselves—into the committee of the department, and thence into the Central Committee. Whoever knows how to command the French, him they follow with a instinct of discipline, and the art of commanding is precisely the one they understand perfectly. Every public authority may feel quite certain that its subaltern officials will allow the dignity of their office to lose nothing in their hands. They all act with an imperative air; none will tolerate either objection or contradiction; every gendarme, every sentry, every diligence conductor seek opportunities of making their authority seen or felt. Command—obey; obey—command; if there is anybody who can give France the *parole*, there it stands in rank and file before him and shoulder its arms. It would march with the Bourbons, with the Orleanists, with the Matadors of the "National," with the Burgraves, with the Bonapartists The President, perhaps, has the best chance of all these; during three years of that sharp and critical Parisian atmosphere, he has not, as a personality, been quite worn out; and his name still works wonders on the Bourse and among the blouses.

The Republic began with very little self confidence. It kept the Bourbons in exile, and drove the Orleans family across the frontiers. And yet, even before the conflict of June, the sovereign Assembly did not venture to refuse to revoke the decree of banishment against Louis Napoleon. What can have fixed on the French the reputation of being difficult to govern? In 1793 had they not three masters at once—the Committee of Public Safety, the Jacobin Club, and the Convention? Had not each of those bodies men in the departments who willingly received their orders and executed them? And, at last, was not the question merely which of the three should suppress the other two? The confusion always arises from everybody wanting to command. The restless blood of the French creates every day a new fashion, and in a certain course of time must have a change of rulers. One must be pushed forward that others may find places behind him. *Gens novarum rerum cupida*, Cæsar called them. Had they been ten times more softly bedded under Louis Phillippe, he could not make them forget that for eighteen years things had worn the same aspect, the official hierarchy the same faces. He could not but fall, not for any special error, but because he had not fallen long before. The oppression of any form of government, the Frenchman does not feel; he recognises the power of the State in the schoolmaster and the rural guard; and if the socialists ever get the opportunity of "organizing," they will maintain society at the cost of the State, and feed the citizens through State officers, in State establishments.

Before a resolute man, who is believed able to command, the French will bend. Yet the *coup d'état* of the 18th Brumaire was a more perilous attempt than the present imitation of it. The republican leaven was then still active, and the young General Bonaparte had rather dazzled the public than created any belief in his more solid qualities. The fame of his two rivals Massena and Moreau had increased, while the public confidence had been rather shaken than gained by the fantastic campaign on the Nile. It had been remarked that his imitation of Alexander was affected, like his after passage of the Alps—a movement of questionable military value, though as a State effect, cleverly calculated. And yet all went off so easily and smoothly that Napoleon had only to show himself with a few of his epauletted Macedonians to be congratulated on his success, and to find people on all sides, "placing themselves at his disposal." The government had at that time generals on whom it could safely rely; the army of the Rhine passed for strongly republican, and the troops in Egypt were deeply enraged at the desertion of Napoleon, after whose departure the discipline of the army became completely dissolved. It was then also attempted to justify the *coup d'état* by the allegation of conspiracy; and probably the parties did conspire, but only against the impending usurpation they began to foresee.

But, it is asked—how will Louis Napoleon maintain himself, since the first notabilities and celebrities of France have condemned his *coup*? In the one scale is the triumvirate, Napoleon, St. Arnaud, Magnan; in the other, Thiers, Molé, Changarnier, Berryer, Dupin, Leon Faucher, Tocqueville, Dufaure, Barrot, Cavaignac, Lamoricière, not to mention the supernumeraries. "Impossible he can maintain himself," it is said; perhaps it is even still more incredible that Thiers, Tocqueville, Berryer, Changarnier, and the others will be able to recover themselves and gain the ground from the staff of Napoleon; the republicans of to-day and yesterday will have enough to do in turning themselves into Imperialists of the *lendemain*; in making the *queue*, their places will naturally be behind the Bonapartists. If this appears bitter or insupportable, it should be rembered that the French have for every political situation much more elasticity than the Germans.

The German republican, if that traceless Hyperborean be yet worth speaking of, and the quiet dependent on the Frankfort constitution, have let the destiny of 1848 and 1849 pass over them. They dreamt they actually had faith. It was their hope that Germany would realize this constitution. It was their ideal, and therefore they flew into a passion when its impossibility was represented to them, when a doubt was expressed as to the fitness of the people for it. For themselves they desired nothing. It never occurred to them to make a trade of political opinions. The dream of the German has vanished, and he has, in a fit of ill temper, locked himself into his study, stopped his ears against all suggestions, and begun again, where he was interrupted in February, 1848; his investigations into the Indian mythology, or of some obscure passage in the Roman laws of the Twelve Tables, or an analysis of the effect of light on the oxidation of metals. As nothing happened as he had predetermined it ought to happen, he considered the rest not worth a thought, and has consigned politics to the bottomless pit. The Frenchman does not so soon give himself up as beaten. If a "situation" has escaped him, he has only lost a game, and looks about to see how he can best turn the new *fait accompli* to account. I will slander none; perhaps they may be "all, all honorable men;" but the French feel so happy when they can play like flies in the sunbeam of any authority, that after a little while one comes in after the other and confesses his errors, especially when, true to the Napoleon traditions, and according to the maxim of the church, every sinner is accepted who truly repents. Louis Napoleon will soon have found his Cambaceres, his chancellors, marshals, and treasurers, and a court historiographer will not long be wanting, like Fontanes, to varnish the wisdom of the *coup d'état* with unction and ponderous dignity.

That we do the French no injustice in believing the fiercest opponents of Louis Napoleon may possibly become the suitors and courtiers of imperialism, we will prove from French testimony, which no one will accuse of under rating his countrymen. When, after the 18th Brumaire, the consular constitution was drawn up, and it became known there were to be 80 Senators nominated with 25,000f. salary, 300 legislators with 10,000f., and 100 tribunes with 15,000f., everybody gathered round the usurper. "There was an expression in every mouth," says M. Thiers, "characteristic of the disposition of temper at the time. *Il faut se montrer*, it was said; we must show that far from throwing obstacles in the way of the new power, we are willing, on the contrary, to push themselves out of its way," which meant no more, in reality, than this—"We must court the attention of the five great men who have got all the places to give way." When the heat of the revolution begins to cool, desire to gain by it rises, and from horror to weariness is but a step. Napoleon himself despised these courtiers of places so thoroughly, that on the seventh Nivose he allowed the following remarks to appear in the *Moniteur*:—"Since, according to the new constitution, a number of brilliant offices are to be given away, how has the world been put in motion! What faces unseen before; what new names every where! How low do the stern republicans of the year eight bend themselves, and creep before the powerful man who can procure them a place! What bands of Brutuses in the ante-chambers!" The petty god of the world, as Goethe says, is still the same; and whether M. Thiers has rightly sketched the genius of his country, the conduct of the vanquished parties will soon show.

The Election in France.

[From the London Times, December 22.]

A few hours will probably furnish us with some account of the results of Louis Napoleon's electoral appeal to the French nation, and a few days will disclose, with the weight of irresistible evidence, the scandalous practices resorted to by his government for the purpose of overbearing all opposition. No public discussion can be held on this vital point of the choice of a ruler, who is to frame the very constitution of the State at his pleasure. No communications can be exchanged between the capital and the provinces, for the press is mute, and the post is only an engine of detective police. Just before the election, that is on the 18th inst., the decree authorizing the police to seize and remove from Paris for deportation all suspected persons came into operation; and there is reason to believe that, in pursuance of M. de Morny's positive injunctions, some hundreds of persons were so seized in Paris on the night of Thursday, and have been conveyed no one knows whither, though a squadron of powerful steamers is ominously waiting at Brest and Cherbourg to convey these untried convicts to Cayenne. Such a measure may naturally check the license of universal suffrage, which is, in fact, no more in terror-stricken France than the license to every one to vote in one way for one man. Even the bulletins or voting-tickets are said to be controlled by the police to such a degree that it is an offence to print the word "Non" on a card; and it is evident from these extraordinary precautions that Lous Napoleon has ceased to rely on the enthusiasm of the people, and is speculating mainly on the effect of force and fear. Meanwhile, in spite of the defection of M. de Montalembert and the Ultramontane prelates, the Legitimists and the constitutional party are acting with manliness and unity in behalf of their opinions. Their votes will be given against Louis Napoleon or not given at all. It is also a remarkable circumstance that a quarter of the seamen in the navy have had the courage to vote against the Bonapartist plot, though, from their position in the fleet, they are probably quite ignorant of the frauds and attrocities which accompany it.

The settlement of these questions, and the retribution which must one day fasten on such crimes, exclusively concern the French nation; and he must be a bold man who would bide the brunt of their resentment when these deeds of darkness are brought to light, and when this duresse or imposture is taken off. The subject that more immediately interests ourselves and the rest of Europe, is the nature of the relations to be established between the new government of France and other States; and to this matter we shall for the present confine our observations.

The great continental powers hastened, through their representatives in Paris, to express satisfaction at the military measures resorted to by Louis Napoleon, and they have not disguised their satisfaction at the overthrow of the republic. But here, if we are not mistaken, their satisfaction ends. Even those rulers who are most disposed to regard despotic or military government as a lawful means of protecting the rights of the crown and the order of society, are little accustomed to approve measures of equal severity when they are employed against all law, and to support the pretensions of a fresh usurper. Moreover, the governments of the continent have not discovered in the position of Louis Napoleon, since the *coup d'état*, any pledge of its security or duration. "*On peut tout faire avec des baionettes*," said Prince Schwartzenburg to the French minister at Vienna, "*excepté de s'asseoir dessus*." And, lastly, admitting that Louis Napoleon's power is legalized by the people and rendered lasting by the army, it is clear that such a government in France will respect the peace of Europe only so long as its own interests are opposed to war, and that no reliance can at present be placed on the traditional and conventional engagements of France in such hands.

The first question that arises after a sudden and violent transfer of supreme power is whether, the new government accepts and adopts the foreign obligations of the country to their full extent. It was on that ground that Louis Philippe claimed the support of Europe in 1830; and it was on somewhat similar grounds that M. de Lamartine asked and obtained of Europe the recognition of the republic in 1848. He adopted, indeed, in his celebrated manifesto on that occasion a large amount of the jargon of the day, about "the hour of oppressed nationalities striking in the decrees of Providence;" and he went so far as to declare that "the treaties of 1815 no longer exist *de jure* in the eyes of the French republic." But this announcement was qualified by very positive assurances of a pacific policy, and by a distinct avermet that "the territorial arrangements of the treaties of 1815 are facts which France adopts as the basis and starting point in her relations with other nations." We revert to these expressions of M. de Lamartine—slender and unsatisfactory as they were thought at the time—because it may now be questioned whether declarations of even this force and import have been or can be obtained from Louis Napoleon; and, if we are not misinformed, the attempts hitherto made to procure such declarations have not been successful. To this fact may be added a circumstance apparently of minor importance, yet of considerable significance—we mean the resignation of M. de Vieil Castel, the political director of the ministry of Foreign Affairs, a man of consummate ability and prudence, who had hitherto patriotically consented to hold under the successive ministers of the republic the practical direction of French diplomacy, which he conducted under the late monarchy, but who has now relinquished the task and ceded his post to a mere creature of the Bonapartes.

We need scarcely protest, in the name of this country, and, we might add, of all Europe, that, whatever may be the opinions entertained of the actions of the French Executive, there is a strong and general determination to abstain from all interference in French affairs, and to leave that nation to work out its own perplexing destiny. The idea of any attack upon France, in consequence of the late revolution, has never crossed the mind of any European statesman; and, on the contrary, the prevailing disposition has been to acquiesce in this, as we have acquiesced in every other self-inflicted political torture of the people of France. But we have already seen wilder deceits and delusions than this idea of foreign aggression propagated by the government among a credulous people; and it is precisely when a nation is distracted with a panic at home, aggravated by the absence of free discussion, that it most readily catches up every suggestion of danger from without. The very names of Pitt and Coburg added desperation to the reign of terror. If it again suited the French government to engage in hostilities, some such pretext would readily be found and this pretext, however shallow, would be believed. It is altogether uncertain in which direction such a blow might be struck—whether against the radical or Protestant governments of Switzerland—against the neutrality of Belgium—for territorial acquisitions in Savoy, or on the Rhine, or even, in the hardihood of defiance, against the coasts of England. On this point we hazard no conjecture, and we hope the time is far distant when any such conjectures may be hazarded. But the principle at which we would arrive, and on which we lay the utmost stress, is, that the maintenance of peace is now, more than ever, the common interest of Europe. If the great principles of the European compact be violated for one, they are violated for all; and the chief security we have for the pacific maintenance of that compact is the overwhelming force by which it can be supported as long as there is union between all who are interested in it. It may happen that attempts will be made to purchase the neutrality of some powers while others are attacked, or to associate other powers with France in measures of repression abroad, or even to procure a more active co-operation in her designs. Such proposals have already been made by Louis Napoleon, since he filled the office of President of the republic. But woe to the government which shall lend itself to any such insidious overtures, and woe to Europe if the general confederacy for the defence of peace and public law be broken up! We earnestly trust that no petty rivalries, no past differences, no minor divisions, will be allowed to weigh for an instant against the paramount duty of maintaining, in presence of the altered state of France, one dignified and common line of conduct. All the governments of Europe may assure her of their resolution to acknowledge all and every form of sovereignty she may adopt; all may assure Louis Napoleon of their fixed desire for the maintenance of peace upon the conditions of existing treaties, and of their complete forbearance from every hostile intention and act. But they may also, and we hope they will also, require from the head of the French government declarations no less general and positive; and they may at the same time resolve, that although no combination ought to be or can be formed against France, yet that the common interests of Europe are equally opposed to every act of French aggression. With these precautions, isolated and weakened as France must be for some time by the insecurity of her internal government, the maintenance of peace will be rendered as essential to her as it is desirable to ourselves.

The New Austrian Tariff.

[From the London Daily News, Dec. 3.[

VIENNA, Nov. 26, 1851.

The Austrian tariff, the principal provisions of which were contained in the patent forwarded yesterday, has at length appeared, in the form of a small pamphlet. The prohibitions formerly enforced against the admission and exportation of various goods into or from the Austrian territories, are abolished, excepting in respect of common salt, gunpowder, and tobacco.

Mixed goods, as those are called which have passed through two or more stages of manufacture, are divided into three categories. Articles included in the lowest of these pay 15 florins per cwt. The second-class, containing materials which are liable to a higher duty than the foregoing, pays 50 florins. The third, consisting of furniture made up of silk and feather beds of the same material, or of the finest wool or cotton, pays 100 florins per cwt. The following are the rates per customs' cwt. of the mose important articles of commerce:—tea, 15 florins; raw coffee, 10 florins; cocoa, 7 florins, 30 kreutzers; loaf sugar, 14 florins; moist ditto, 11 florins; syrup, 5 florins; common spices, 10 florins; fine, 25 florins; nutmegs, mace, vanilla, and the finest spices, 50 florins; sago and tapioca, 5 florins; prepared food, 20 florins; skins, 25 kreutzers; furs, 10 florins; preparations of lead, 2 florins, 30 kreutzers; iron, 2 florins, 30 kreutzers; rails and tires, 3 florins, 30 kreutzers; block sheet iron, 4 florins; steel, 4 florins; raw cast iron goods, 2 florins; copper, in sheets, or wire, 25 florins; beaten tin, 7 florins, 30 kreutzers; raw cotton, flax, hemp and wool, 5 kreutzers; raw and unspun silk, 45 kreutzers; raw and spun silk, 15 florins; cleaned and dyed or undyed silk, 25 florins; cotton yarn, 7 florins; raw, 10 florins; bleached, stretched, or spun, 15 florins; dyed linen yarn, 2 florins, 30 kreutzers; raw, 12 florins, 30 kreutzers dyed and 30 florins spun. The import duty on raw linen yarn will be raised to 6 florins three years after the introduction of this tariff. Wollen yarn, raw, 6 florins; dyed and spun, 12 florins, 30 kreutzers. Cotton goods, common, raw, unbleached, 50 florins; middle fine (as stockings, &c.,) 75 florins; fine printed, 100 florins; extra fine, as jaconets, muslins, &c, 150 florins; finest, as lace, 2 florins, 30 kreutzers per lb. Linen goods, 7 florins 30 kreutzers, 20 florins, 75 florins, and 100 florins, according to specified qualities; the finest, 2 florins, 30 kreutzers per lb. Coarse silk goods, 2 florins, 30 kreutzers; fine, 6 florins. Leather goods, 25, 50, and 100 florins. Paper, 7 florins, 30 kreutzers, and 25 florins. Clay goods, 5, 10, 15, and 40 florins. Manufactured iron goods, 10, 15, 25 and 100 florins; manufactured Britannia metal, 100 florins; zinc manufactures, 7 florins, 30 kreutzers, 15 and 50 florins; machines and implements, 15 florins. During the first year the import duty on raw cotton will be 1 florin per cwt, and on cotton yarn 8 florins. This gradual reduction is intended to protect those speculators from sudden and serious loss who possess large stores of cotton. The former duty of 14.0 florins per cwt. produced an annual average return of 700,000 florins to the revenue. The tariff will take effect throughout the empire, with the exception of Dalmatia, Venice, and Trieste, and the town of Brody, in Gallicia, on the 1st of February next.

Bank of England, Dec. 19.

ISSUE DEPARTMENT.

Notes issued.....	£30,279,620	Government Debt	£11,015 100
		Other Securities ...	2,984 900
		Gold Coin and Bullion.....	16,246,945
		Silver Bullion....	33 375
Total.....	£30,279,620	Total.....	£30,279,620

BANKING DEPARTMENT.

Proprietors' Capital.....	£14 553,000	Government Securities (including Dead Weight Annuity).....	£13 241,768
Rest	3,129,894	Other Securities ..	11,451,732
Public Deposits (including Exchequer, Savings' Banks, Commissioners of National Debt, and Dividend Accounts)	8,534,018	Notes	11,330,345
		Gold and Silver Coin.....	641,368
Other Deposits....	9,358,848		
Seven Days' and other Bills.....	1,152,453		
Total.....	£35,728 213	Total	£35,728,213

STATE OF TRADE IN FRANCE.—The events of the week before last gave rise to the apprehension that the great commercial operations which generally take place at the conclusion of every year might be either stopped altogether or retarded. Those fears, fortunately, have proved to be groundless. The working classes, in general, kept clear of the barricades. Scarcely any large manufactory stopped work for more than one day; and, as the preparations for the new year are in arrear, the reaction has been general and instantaneous. Not only have all the orders given previous to the 2d December been renewed, but they have become so numerous that some manufacturers have found it necessary to apprise their customers that they cannot deliver their last orders till after the 1st of January next. It is probable, therefore, that as the season, as it is termed, has commenced later than usual it will be prolonged until the end of January, by which means the operatives are certain of employment until the month of February. The establishments which have received the greatest number of orders during the last few days are those engaged in the manufacture of Paris ware. Other branches are not so brisk. The jewellers, for instance, who are generally employed for extra hours at this season, are not at present overworked. It is remarked that an extraordinary movement has taken place in the purchase of raw cotton, wool, and silk. There were more than two million pounds weight of raw silk sold daily at Lyons during the first three days of last week. Cotton has risen considerably in Havre, Elbeuf, and Paris This rise is explained by the fact that for the last six months the merchants kept no large stock on hand. Some American houses have made large purchases of manufactured silks and woollens within the last few days, although this is not the season; but no doubt they feared that they should have to pay higher prices if they waited until the spring. There was a considerable amount of business transacted in the flour market of Paris on Thursday last. The sales amounted to 8,564 quintals. There was no remarkable rise in price, but there were numerous purchasers. If we are to believe the speculators, a great rise in the price of flour is inevitable. The late cattle fairs in the departments have been more favorable to the graziers than for some time past. At Vierzon all the horses, oxen, and pigs offered for sale found purchasers at an advance on the previous fairs. The last was a busy week at the wine market of Bercy. The wines of the present year are in considerable demand. The wine growers in general appear to be inclined to hold over their stock.

Webster vs. Palmerston.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK HERALD.

SIR:—This morning I found in an extract from the NEW YORK HERALD (which paper interests the calmest minds in more than one quarter of the world), the following sentence:—

We hear that Mr. Webster has determined not to address Kossuth officially—thus following the example of Lord Palmerston in England.

Much as there may be in English society which Mr. Webster might imitate with advantage, if he could, surely the gentlemen at present in administration are not exactly models for American diplomacy. A better than Lord Palmerston may be found among your own countrymen, in the person of Mr. Walker. His candor—his eloquence—his love of truth and justice—finally, his sympathy with Kossuth, and his ardor in the cause of the Hungarians, have endeared him to every honest man in Great Britain. Sometimes I should be ashamed of partiality—here I should be ashamed of wanting it. But thus far I am impartial; I never saw—never had any correspondence with Mr. Walker; I am anxious to preserve the respectability of any American citizen, and I could not cordially join in the coarse merriment which would be excited in this country, at the sight either of an awkward or of a successful imitation of Lord Palmerston by Mr. Webster. On the contrary, I should stand in trembling anticipation of a caricature—a pig on his hinder legs, imitating a poodle, each in a court dress, and the defender of Hungary in a corner. I am, sir, very respectfully, &c.,

BATH, Dec. 19. WALTER SAVAGE LANDOR.

DEATH OF WM. C. CARRINGTON, LATE EDITOR OF THE RICHMOND (VA.) TIMES.—The Richmond *Times* of the 31st ult is dressed in mourning, and announces the death of its late editor and proprietor, Wm. C. Carrington, who died on Monday, the 28th Dec. Mr. C. was a delegate elect to the Legislature of Virginia.

THE FORREST DIVORCE CASE.

Superior Court.

Before Chief Justice Oakley.

CATHARINE N. FORREST VS. EDWIN FORREST.

[Continuation of Friday's proceedings.]

Mr. O'Conor said he thought that a great many of Mr. Van Buren's remarks were much in place—just as much as was his charge against him personally, that he would strike a blow where his adversary had no power of retorting. It required a gentleman very recently admitted to the bar, to believe such of him. He had as little inclination to answer such a charge as to complain of the gentleman when he departed from the rules of order. If he were inclined to take such an advantage, or to speak without giving his opponent an opportunity of answering, he would certainly select some one else. The gentleman had also said, when they had as much confidence in the plaintiff's truth as they had in that of the defendant, they would call her to the stand. This was certainly a strong expression of want of confidence—as strong as the vote of want of confidence which ousted the English ministry. If the plaintiff could not gain as much confidence with them as their client had from him (Mr. O'C.) she was certainly sadly off. (Suppressed laughter.) But enough of this. He would proceed to the argument. The whole issue as a legal or forensic question, he apprehended, turned upon the question whether these affidavits were to be treated as responsive. He, (the defendant's counsel) had never made an attempt to meet that argument, which he seemed to admit had been fairly presented to him to answer. They had been drawn in the exercise of the right and power, and in conformity with the constant habit and practice of counsel, not to answer many things that they deemed inexpedient at that stage of the case.—Without entering very fully, there were one or two points he could not allow to pass unanswered. The first, and an important one, was a heresy that he could not subscribe to. It was, that in consequence of Mrs. Forrest's oath on the pleadings in this cause, presuming that they were on oath, she stood as well as by her affidavit in answer to the other suit. This was not so. The oath subscribed to the pleadings (if there was one) could not be taken in favor of either party making it. The jury had no right to know they were under oath. It was like an affidavit of merits filed to prevent an inquest being taken, and never was to be read to the jury or put to them as evidence for the party making it—it was only required to avoid the Court being embarrassed by false issues. They might certainly call for any affidavit of the opposite party, if they pleased, and were then bound to admit the whole. The opposite counsel had attempted to amplify, by instances, that Mrs Forrest had referred to, and adopted as true, statements in Mr. Forrest's affidavit. Counsel had spoken of the "said Consuelo letter," by that expression she referred to one of which she spoke and described, and it was not necessary that she should say every time, "I mean the letter of which I spoke;" and although she did not undertake to cite the passage and letter and deny it, she did deny the character of the letter, and she did deny that the letter of which she spoke admitted any criminal act; she did, therefore, so far deny it, though she did not specifically deny the allegation that the copy annexed was a true copy. A part of Mrs. Forrest's affidavit was, as he conceived, irrelevant, and he did not call for the reading; in this, in folio 411, Mrs. Forrest spoke of this letter; but if the defendant's counsel chose to read that, did that give him the right to read his own client's affidavit? Mrs. Forrest had answered that she did not think it necessary to say anything further—that she had sufficiently censured that letter; and it was a proper question, how had she censured it? What were the terms—the nature, of her expression of censure? The answer to those questions was to be found in Jamieson's affidavit, which they had asked for. The learned gentleman had taken credit for the patience and assiduity with which he had read his client's affidavits; and he had asked whether they wanted any more. They had answered, they thought he should read Jamieson's affidavit, and they understood he was willing to do so; they thought he was going to read it; but he changed his mind then and objected, and his Honor (the Chief Justice) decided that it could not be read. He also took credit for reading what he did read. He had certainly read it as badly as he possibly could. He did not charge the learned gentleman with being a bad reader; but he thought he might say, as Henry Clay once did to Isaac Hill, when the latter had read a speech which Mr. Clay had made on the subject of the Union Bank, and which had often been very distastefully quoted to him, that he had no further reply to make than that he had heard that read very often before, but never so badly. (Laughter.) And he, Mr. O'Conor, would venture to say, that notwithstanding Mr. Van Buren was not a bad reader, and the affidavits of Mrs. F. had been read so often, yet they had never been read so badly. The point on which this question must turn would be mainly whether there were to be implied any admissions from Mrs. Forrest's silence, and he submitted there could not.

The Chief Justice gave his decision: The proposition, he said, was to admit Mr. Forrest's affidavit, comprising from folio 370 to 391—and he would decide each point as it arose. The proposition covered the whole of Mr. Forrest's affidavit, containing statements on the part of Mr. Forrest relative to the transactions at Cincinnati, in connection with Mr. Jamieson and Mrs. Forrest, in relation to certain discoveries alleged to have been made by him; to the party at Mrs. Voorhies; the manner in which he discovered that letter, and which he sets forth, as he says, *in hæc verba*. He then sets forth the circumstances of the quarrel between them, with some statement as to the words used—"you lie" and soforth. That he then wrote to Mr. Jamieson to obtain his handwriting. He had already determined that the reading of Mrs. Forrest's statement will not open the door to the introduction of that. If a party choose to lay the statement of their adversary before the jury, taking the risk of what impression it may make, it is not that they are to be taken as true; or to open the door to their own statements. In the next place, is the statement thus given in evidence intelligible, or whether it requires the other to explain it? He could discover nothing in Mrs. Forrest's affidavit that was uncertain, standing by itself; it might be untrue, that was another question. But whether the statement itself is fairly understood, is the one, and he thought there could be no explanation necessary to be got before the jury. Each party was at liberty to call for the statement of the other side; but that did not admit him to give his own. The question I now dispose of, continued the Judge, is: the defendant offers in evidence statements of his own, some of which have and some have not reference to the letter. I am very clearly of opinion, and have been in every case but one, certainly not more than two, in which testimony has been offered to be given to this jury, that it was inadmissible, without hearing any discussion; but I have determined to give to this trial the most regular course, and had therefore heard arguments where, in many cases the court would have ruled the testimony at once inadmissible. At present I exclude this proposition. (Defendant's counsel took an exception to this decision, which was noted; and the court thereupon took a recess.)

Mr. Van Buren said: I now propose to read from Mr Forrest's affidavit, commencing at folio 373, omitting the allusion to the interview between Mr. Jamieson and Mrs. Forrest. Then he proposed to read folio 375, where he described the examination of the bundle of letters, and down to the end of the letter of George W. Jamieson. That will embrace the manner in which it was received, the manner in which it was kept, and the manner in which it was discovered.

Mr. O'Conor merely said he objected.

The Chief Justice said—If you have no observations to make, I will dispose of it as it strikes me. The proposition is in detached parts. It does not seem to me to come within the rule laid down. As to the parts respecting Mrs. Forrest concealing about her a bundle of letters, I do not think that can be read—as to the party at Mrs. Voorhies, that is immaterial. Now we come to letter which has struck me as the contest between the counsel. Everything else is extremely simple. The letter has been proved to be in the handwriting of Mr. Jamieson, and the affidavit goes on to charge that it was retained by Mrs. Forrest secretly. All the propositions as to the character of that letter come within the same rule. The point is, whether in Mrs. Forrest's affidavit, there is sufficient identification of this letter; and after all the labor, it comes down to that. It seems to me, to comply with the evidence that has hitherto been given. It is set forth *in hæc verba* in Mr. Forrest's affidavit, and it is impossible that she was unaware of its contents. She speaks of it without suggesting a denial. The evidence strikes me as quite satisfactory, that the letter referred to in Mrs Forrest's affidavit and set out in Mr Forrest's affidavit, is the letter she received from Jamieson and kept for a considerable time. I am of opinion that if the party wish to give that letter in evidence they are at liberty to do so, and that the difficulty which hitherto existed has been satisfactorily removed.

Mr. O'Conor—What part of the affidavit does your Honor admit?

Chief Justice—I do not allow any part of the affidavit of Mr Forrest, but I allow the letter itself, which has been proved to be in the handwriting of Jamieson, and admitted to be set out *in hæc verba* in Mr. Forrest's affidavit.

Mr. O'Conor excepted.

Mr. Van Buren—I would here remark to the Court that, having been reprimanded for my bad reading, I will now endeavor to improve. (Laughter.) The learned gentleman then proceeded to read the Consuelo letter, emphasizing certain parts:—

"And now, sweetest Consuelo, our brief dream is over—and such a dream! Have we not known real bliss? Have we not realized what poets love to set up as an ideal state, giving full license to their imagination, scarce believing in its reality? Have we not experienced the truth that ecstacy is not a fiction? I have, and as I will not permit myself to doubt you, am certain you have. And oh! what an additional delight to think—no, to know, that I have made some hours happy to you. Yes, and that remembrance of me may lighten the heavy time of many an hour to come. Yes, our little dream of great account is over; reality stares us in the face. Let us peruse its features. Look with me, and read as I do, and you will find our dream to be not all a dream." Can reality take from us, when she separates and exiles us from each other? Can she divide our souls, our spirits? Can slander's tongue or rumor's trumpet summon us to a parley with ourselves, where to doubt each other we should hold a counsel? No! not a doubt of thee can no more find harbor in my brain than the opened rose could cease to be the humbled's harbor. And as my heart and soul are in your possession, examine them, and you will find no text from which to discourse a doubt of *me*. But you have told me, (and oh! what music did your words create upon my grateful ear!) that you would not doubt me. With these considerations, dearest, our separation, though painful, will not be unendurable; and if a sombre hour should intrude itself upon you, banish it by knowing there is one who is whispering to himself, Consuelo. There is another potent reason why you should be happy, and that is, having been the means of another's happiness, for I am happy, and with you to remember, and the blissful anticipation of seeing you again, shall remain so. I wish I could tell you my happiness. I cannot. No words have been yet invented that could convey an idea of the depth of that passion, composed of pride, admiration, awe, gratitude, veneration and love, without being worthy, that I feel for you.

Be happy, dearest; write to me and tell me you are happy. Think of the time when we shall meet again. Believe that I shall do my utmost to be worthy of your love; and now, God bless you, a thousand times my own, my heart's altar.

I would say more, but must stow away my shreds and tinsel patches—ugh! how hideous they look after thinking of you!

Adieu! adieu! and when thou art gone,
My joy shall be made up alone,
Of calling back with fancy's charm,
Those halcyon hours when in my arm,
Clasp'd Consuelo.

Adieu! adieu! be thine each joy
That earth can yield, without alloy,
Shall be the earnest, constant pray'r
Of him who in his heart shall wear,
But Consuelo.

Adieu! adieu! when next we meet,
Will not all sadness then retreat,
And yield the conquer'd time to bliss,
And seal the triumph with a kiss:
Say, Consuelo?

Mr. Van Buren—I now propose to give in evidence Mr. Forrest's letter to Mrs. Forrest, dated 24th December, 1849, and her reply. We have given the other side notice to produce it.

Mr. O'Conor—If Mr. Forrest sent such a letter he can prove it.

Mr. Van Buren—You admit the notice to produce it?

Mr. O'Conor—Yes, sir.

Mr. Van Buren—Then we offer the copy of this letter, which is set out in Mr. Forrest's affidavit, and spoken of in Mrs. Forrest's affidavit, where a part of the letter is set out.

Mr. O'Conor objected

The Chief Justice said it seemed to him that there was sufficient here to admit the letters.

Mr. Van Buren then read the following letter and reply:—

I am compelled to address you by reports and rumors that reach me from every side, and which a due respect for my own character compels me not to disregard. You cannot forget that before we parted you obtained from me a solemn pledge that I would say nothing of the guilty cause, the guilt alone on your part—not on mine—which led to our separation; you cannot forget that at the same time you also pledged yourself to a like silence, a silence that I supposed you would be glad to have preserved. But I understand, from various sources, and in ways that cannot deceive me, that you have repeatedly disregarded that promise, and are constantly assigning false reasons for our separation, and making statements in regard to it, intended and calculated to exonerate yourself and to throw the whole blame on me, and necessarily to alienate from me the respect and attachment of the friends I have left to me. Is this a fitting return for the kindness I have ever shown you? Is this your gratitude to one who, though aware of your guilt, and most deedly wronged, has endeavored to shield you from the scorn and contempt of the world? The evidence of your guilt you know is in my possession. I took that evidence from among your papers, and I have your own acknowledgment by whom it was written, and that the infamous letter was addressed to you. You know as well as I do that the cause of my leaving you was the conviction of your infidelity. I have said enough to make the object of this letter apparent. I am content that the past shall remain in silence, but I do not intend nor will I permit that either you or any one connected with you shall ascribe our separation to my misconduct. I desire you therefore to let me know at once whether you have, by your own assertions, or by sanctioning those of others, endeavored to throw the blame of our miserable position on me. My future conduct will depend on your reply. Once yours,

(Signed) EDWIN FORREST.

NEW YORK, Dec. 24, 1849.

I hasten to answer the letter Mr. Stevens has just left with me, with the utmost alacrity, as it affords me at least the melancholy satisfaction of correcting misstatements, and of assuring you that the various rumors and reports which have reached you are false.

You say that you have been told that I am "constantly assigning false reasons for our separation, and making statements in regard to it intended and calculated to exonerate myself, and to throw the whole blame on you;" this I beg most distinctly to state is *utterly untrue*.

I have, when asked the cause of our sad differences, invariably replied, that was a matter known only to ourselves, and which would *never* be explained; and I neither acknowledge the right of the world, nor of our most intimate friends, to question our conduct in this affair.

You say "I desire you therefore to let me know at once whether you have, by your own assertions, or by sanctioning those of others, endeavored to throw the blame of our miserable position on me." I most solemnly assert that I have never done so, directly or indirectly, nor has any one connected with me ever made such assertions with my knowledge, nor have I