sixteen are employed between Southampton and foreign ports; twenty-three are employed inter-colonially; six are under repair; eight building; and five on an average in port at a time fit for sea. Two out of the five are vessels of inferior character, employed in the Peninsular service. Out of the sixteen vessels plying between Southampton and foreign ports five are of iron, (Madrid, Ripon, Sultan, Bombay, and Madras,) and three (Jupiter, Iberia, and Tagus,) are considered incapable of carrying an efficient armament, being much inferior in tonnage and horse power to the vessels generally of the two companies, and having raised poops and forecastles, with other obstructions to carrying and fighting guns. There remain, therefore, only eight (wooden) vessels out of the sixteen, which we consider capable of being efficiently fitted to receive an armament for war purposes on an emergency; and that number would become gradually available as they return home, in succession, within periods varying from three to nine weeks. But here we would remark, that if any of these vessels were taken up by the government, the mail packet companies might experience great difficulty in replacing them, more particularly since government would be first in the market, and there would be a great demand for ships to afford the earliest means of communicating the news of hostilities, or of reinforcing the colonies with men and stores. The remaining thirty-seven, with the exception of those building and under repair, (which in the month of June amounted to fourteen) are employed inter-colonially, or otherwise permanently abroad.

At this period of our report we think it right to invite attention to the fact that there are no less than twenty-two out of thirty three vessels belonging to the Peninsular and Oriental Company of iron. These twenty-two vessels have all been built since 1843, to the exclusion of wooden vessels, with the exception of only two, now building, of 910 tons each. Had we considered the iron vessels in other respects suitable for men-of-war, we should have hesitated to recommend them for that service, on account of the materials of which they are built.

We do not consider that we are called upon to express an opinion as to the fitness of iron vessels for war purposes; at the same time the question as to the propriety of using that material in the construction of armed mail steam packets will become important when we shall have to report upon the "General Screw Steam Shipping Company," which will shortly possess eight vessels of 1,800 tons each, the whole of which will be of iron.

Our opinion of the qualities of the packets generally belonging to the two companies now under consideration, and of their fitness to be armed for purposes of war, is derived from a personal inspection of the following vessels (twenty-one in number), as they have severally returned to the port of Southampton, which we think may be considered to afford the means by which we may fairly judge of those at present abroad:—

Names.	*Tons.*	*Horse Power.*	*Names.*	*Tons.*	*Horse Power.*
Parana.....	2,948	900	Formosa.....	613	120
Orinoco.....	2,900	800	Magdalena...	2,948	800
Bentinck.....	1,974	520	La Plata.....	2,462	1,000
Severn.....	1,836	440	Tay.....	1,838	430
Jupiter.....	543	210	Tagus.....	782	286
Avon.....	1,880	410	Iberia.....	515	190
Conway.....	898	260	Clyde.....	1,841	430
Teviot.....	1,444	450	Bombay.....	1,219	288
Madras.....	1,210	288	Euxine.....	1,165	400
Sultan.....	1,090	420	Ripon.....	1,928	450
Thames.....	1,839	400			

Our opinion is, that the ships of these companies can never be regarded as efficient substitutes for regular men-of-war, and that opinion is based on the following considerations:—

First, Their sharp form of bow to promote speed, continued upwards as it is to the height of the port sills, renders it impossible to point and elevate guns in the line of keel. Secondly, Their rake of stern would render it dangerous to fire a gun when elevated, more particularly when trained from a fore and aft line. Thirdly, These vessels, having been designed entirely for steam propulsion and passenger accommodation, all other purposes have been made subservient to those ends. Hence we find that they are greatly under masted; that they have a height between decks unnecessary for men-of-war; that they appropriate more than the space usually allowed for engine room and the stowage of coal in her Majesty's ships; and the consumption of fuel on board these vessels, say Parana class, amounting to about eighty tons of coal per diem would become a grave question with the government when estimated at per gun, considering how few guns it is proposed to place on board these vessels in relation to their tonnage, in comparison with regular men-of-war.

We find, too, that no attention has been paid to the importance that should be attached to the exposure of the engines, boilers and steam chest, to shot, which, though in some degree unavoidable in all paddle wheel steamers, appears to exist in these vessels to a most dangerous extent. Further, the paddle wheels are usually of enormous size and weight, rendering them very vulnerable, and presenting a great impediment when under sail. That none of them carry paddlebox boats, and that if these were fitted in so elevated a position it would cause the vessel to roll deeply and labor in heavy weather, and that the height and space for saloon and cabin accommodation is quite disproportionate to the requirements of a man-of-war.

We are apprehensive, from what we can learn of the qualities of these vessels, that the stability of some of them, after a certain consumption of coal, is already very questionable, and that increased masts and yards, with the addition of an armament, would render them still more deficient in that important property. To correct so serious an evil it would be necessary to introduce ballast, and to diminish proportionately the stowage of coal.

We may also observe that the additional weight to the armament, masts, yards, rigging, water, stores, provisions, &c., would increase the displacement and immerse the paddle-wheels so as to affect the speed, unless still a further reduction were made in the quantity of coal to lighten the ship. A total change in the internal economy of the ship would result from these circumstances, and it is doubtful, after all, whether the ship would have capacity to receive and displacement to sustain the armament, water, provisions, and stores required to be supplied to her Majesty's ships for a given period.

It appears to the committee to be desirable, should the Lords Commissioners approve of a provision for armament being made, that a clause in future contracts be introduced to that effect; and we also consider it to be important that another clause should be inserted, requiring that vessels which have been prepared for an armament under the authority of the Admiralty, should not be sold without previous notice to government, with the right of pre-emption on such terms as the Lords Commissioners may think fit to agree to.

To make the whole of the necessary alterations now would incur an enormous outlay, without making those vessels after all, in our opinion, efficient men-of-war; that is to say, we should not think them competent to cope with an enemy of equal rating or tonnage, and consequently that arming these vessels and calling them vessels of war might involve the credit of the British flag, if subjected to any reverse, by affording a pretext for superior skill on the part of an enemy where tonnage and horse power would be taken as a comparison of force, and their inefficiencies as men of war would not appear to be the real cause.

After taking a deliberate view of the whole question submitted to us, we have arrived at the conclusion that the ships referred to, provided they could be spared, would serve the purposes of armed troop ships, and might occasionally be used, in the event of war, in our colonies abroad. That for this purpose, and to enable them to perform their duties as packets, they should be prepared to be armed with guns of sufficient calibre for self-defence.

To provide for this, we do not think it proper that an emergency should be waited for, but would propose that they be fitted as opportunities occur, while under repair for the armament hereafter mentioned, and be pierced with as many ports (including the cargo ports) as would admit of working the whole of the broadside guns on either side. Further, that a magazine and shell room of sufficient capacity be provided, and that these be arranged so as to suit the ordinary service of the ship.

Our view of an emergency is, that it would be a case of sudden and immediate effort in which time could not be spared, and that any work required to be performed would not be either so well or so economically executed as when it could be more leisurely attended to. Nor could we recommend reliance being placed on private yards to despatch, at such a time, work to which they had been accustomed, though by proper direction on the part of government no difficulty at other times would be experienced.

In considering the number and nature of guns which these vessels should carry, we have deemed it important to select ordnance of such calibre as are commonly used in her Majesty's navy, confining ourselves to one class of 8-inch and 32 pounder guns, to facilitate the supplies of ammunition from her Majesty's ships and arsenals on foreign stations; and we have adhered, as far as practicable, to the recommendation contained in our instructions, of rendering them capable of being transferred, so that the equipment may fit any ship of the same class.

We consider that the armament of a packet ship should be especially directed to the object of defence, and that for this purpose it should include, if possible, a pivot gun in the stern. But we have found it impracticable, in almost all cases, to fit a pivot gun, either forward or abaft, on account of the sharp form of bow and great rake of stern. The armaments which we propose as being best adapted to the packets generally are as follows:—

First Class Armament—2 of 8 inch calibre, 65 cwt., and 8 feet long; 8 of 32-pounder calibre, 42 cwt., and 8 feet long. Second Class Armament—2 of 8 inch calibre, 65 cwt., and 9 feet long; 4 of 32 pounder calibre, 42 cwt., and 8 feet long. The guns to be mounted on the broadside on truck carriages. The two foremost and two aftermost may be transported to fight as bow or stern guns; and it is proposed to pierce each vessel with a sufficient number of ports to fight the whole of the armament, if necessary, on either side of the ship.

We consider that provision should be made for 40 rounds of shot per gun, and that shells be supplied in addition, as follows:—namely, if pivot guns be introduced, 20 rounds of shells per pivot gun; but if the 8 inch guns be mounted on truck carriages, it is proposed in that case to supply 10 shell for each 8-inch gun so mounted, with the usual proportions of grape and case shot as supplied to her Majesty's ships. The small arms, pikes and cutlasses should be suited to arm the crew, and average number of male passengers usually carried, in the proportion of two thirds of what would be allowed to the same number on board her Majesty's ships, and that the small arm ammunition should be one-half that proportion.

To put these vessels in a condition to carry and fire the guns assigned to them, it is estimated that the expense of alterations and fittings of ports, with a magazine and shell room, would vary from £600 to £800; and it is submitted whether the fittings for receiving the packet armament should not, in equity, be at the charge of the company, but for the auxiliary armament at the cost of the government.

A great saving of expenses would be effected by early attention to the arrangements necessary for receiving an armament. This remark specially applies to the two vessels building at Cowes and Blackwall; also to the Avon, under repair at Northfleet, and the Clyde at this port, (Southampton.)

We beg to make reference, as an example, to the drawings of the Clyde, showing proposed fitments. By permanently placing the bitts and capstan as there laid down—by constructing the deck house for removal altogether—by working the tiller under the deck, and by fitting the steering wheel in such a manner that it could be shifted and placed before the mizzenmast, two pivot guns could be worked as proposed and marked upon the plan; or if wanted as a packet, one pivot gun only need be carried, to be transported to bow or stern as required.

The ports for working these guns, as well as the broadside ports, might be temporarily canked in when not required for use. Shackle bracketing bolts and eye bolts should be fitted not only to the broadside, but also to the cargo ports, and by allowing the necessary space for transporting the broadside guns in common carriages, not only fore and aft, but also across the ship, the entire armament could be worked on either side. We are of opinion that this armament might consist of two pivot guns, 8 inch, 65 cwt., and four 32 pounders of 42 cwt. on common carriages; and we suggest that measures be taken to ascertain if during the present opportunity of her repair, the Royal Mail Steam Packet Company might be willing to consent to the alteration required to fit her for the performance of the clause in the contract so far as concerns four guns; and on what terms two other guns might be fitted. Such a mode of proceeding would tend to prepare, in turn, for self defence, all the West India mail packets, without disadvantage to the interests of the company.

In conclusion, we would observe, by way of recapitulation, that the two companies have fifty three vessels; that sixteen ply between Southampton and foreign ports; that five, on an average, are always at home and fit for sea; that eight may be rendered available for war purposes on an emergency, if they can be spared from the mail packet service, within different periods, extending altogether over sixty-six days; that they would not make efficient substitutes for regular men-of-war; that they might be fitted for armed packets and armed troop ships; that it would be prudent in future that the fittings be executed beforehand; that the fittings necessary to the nature of proposed armaments (including magazines and shell rooms) would cost from £500 to £800 for first and second class vessels, if attended to while a vessel is in progress of building, or undergoing a large repair, and proportionably less for smaller vessels. That guns of such calibre be used as are common in the Royal Navy, (viz., 8 inch guns of 65 cwt., and 32-pounders of 42 cwt.) to facilitate the supplies, and render fittings and ordnance stores transferable from ship to ship. That a store of guns be kept at the port of Southampton or Portsmouth, with a proper proportion of ordnance and gunners' stores, laid apart ready for an immediate call. That it would be advisable to introduce a clause in the contracts giving the Admiralty a right of pre-emption, and possibly to prevent their sale, unless by permission, to a foreign power.

The American Diplomatic Costume at the European Courts.

MR. BUCHANAN AND THE OPENING OF PARLIAMENT.

[From the London Globe, Feb. 3.]

We observe a rather unnecessary degree of importance attached to a circumstance which must have been of merely formal origin, though it is a matter for regret that it should have occasioned the absence of the American Legation from the House of Lords at the opening of Parliament.

Notice, it seems, was sent round to the members of the diplomatic corps that they must appear in full dress. Of course this was a mere stereotyped announcement on all such occasions. The last time the Queen opened Parliament the American Legation appeared in its uniform, which was a rather handsome one. Our *episcopi* of etiquette, we may suppose, knew nothing of any change having taken place in the interim. But President Pierce recommended the representatives of the United States to distinguish themselves by appearing, on all occasions, in plain clothes. At the Congress of Vienna, Lord Castlereagh (the late Marquis of Londonderry) was the only member of the *corps diplomatique* who was not belizoned with multiform decorations, and on this peculiarity he is pointed out to Prince Metternich, he exclaimed, "*Ma foi c'est tres distingue.*" American of course outstrips English distinction, and so strips itself of court dress altogether. We have no objection; but we think it a pity the difficulty was not represented in higher official quarters here, when there can been no doubt it would have been removed. The Turkish Ambassador wears his *fez* in her Majesty's presence; and that the American Ambassador should wear his coat without rather than with lace upon it, is a sartorial revolution which cannot, we should hope, affect the good understanding between two great nations.

The whole mightily minute question really turns on the international construction of what is court dress. The Turkish notion of it is clearly not the English. Neither is ours, when our ministers present themselves at Constantinople or Teheran in the anecinct garments of Western Europe, at all accordant with the Oriental conception of ceremonial clothing.

The difficulty of ascertaining the American standard of court dress is perhaps somewhat complicated by General Pierce's apparent non recognition of court dress for American citizens altogether. We cannot ourselves see the harm of distinguishing public functionaries on public occasions by a peculiar uniform; and the disuse of it seems to us merely to deprive the popular eye of an accustomed entertainment. Still, if the Venetian aristocracy was fond of dressing itself in black in former times, or the American democracy prefers doing so now, it is purely a point of national taste, and we have no right and no desire to pick any quarrel with this last refinement of republican simplicity. We only wish so merely formal a matter had been explained and adjusted before any, even momentary, misunderstanding was allowed to arise out of it. There have been recent precedents for getting over the difficulty, and, on the *fas est et ab hoste doceri* principle, that of Russia is worth notice. The same difficulty, it appears, about American costume, was an obstacle to the American Minister at that court having an audience with the Emperor. He was told that court dress was *de rigeur*; but on being asked by Count Nesselrode in what dress he would appear before his own President, and replying in plain clothes, the rejoinder of the Russian Minister was, "Then that is your court dress." And such is clearly the rational solution of this ceremonial problem.

[From the London News, Feb. 3.]

A contemporary, speaking of the scene in the House of Lords when Parliament was opened, pointed out one melancholy blot upon the general splendor of the proceedings. The diplomatic box, it was stated, presented a blaze of stars, crosses and ribbons. "Only one exception to official uniform was observable, and the gentleman in question, who appeared in evening dress and seemed unpleasantly conscious of his singularity, was at once seconded as the American Minister." We desired to know at once whether the American Minister was really unpleasantly conscious of his singularity. We know very well certainly that an historical personage named Jeames, whose history has been handed down to us by that most veracious of all chroniclers, Mr. Thackeray, was very "unpleasantly conscious" of the extremely suggestive singularity of the court dress. The illustrious hero of Mr. Thackeray's tale, who had been accustomed to wear the uniform of a footboy from his youth, entertained a most invincible dislike to the court costume, and never could be induced to wear it, inasmuch as it was associated with many disagreeable reminiscences of a period when he touched his hat for half crowns, instead of signing his name for thousands of pounds. Of course the American Minister has no recollections of a similar nature to those of Mr. Yellowplush to disturb him. He had never made his way to eminence up the backstairs, even although the staircase should be that of a court. He, therefore, could scarcely be affected by the same reasons which acted so powerfully upon our friend Jeames. Nevertheless, there might be, as the court flunkey had it, some reasons why the American ambassador should have been "unpleasantly conscious" of his singularity, although at the same time thanking his stars that the "singularity" existed. If he had looked into the secret history of the causes of the magnificence of the starred and gartered individuals around him, he might have been glad to acknowledge that it was better to be distinguished for the simplicity of his costume than for its ornament. There is a story told of Prince Metternich, who, seeing an English nobleman in plain costume at an evening party, amidst a vast crowd of officials groaning under the splendor of their decorations, observed, upon being made acquainted with the rank of the nobleman, "*Ah! c'est bien distingue.*" Amongst a crowd of official lickspittles who had groped for their diamonds, like the slaves who found them in the rough, in the mud, it was really "distinguished" to be without a decoration. An American ambassador, therefore, might very easily have been "conscious" of his singularity, although in a very different sense to that which the court flunkey suggests.

However, what the American ambassador might have thought had he been present at the ceremony, need not occupy our attention at the present moment, as it appears that he was not there. The Court print of the Wednesday morning discourses satirically on the unpleasant consciousness of the American ambassador, while the Court print of Thursday evening informs us confidentially that the ambassador was not present. "It was inadvertently stated in the *Times*," says the *Globe*, "that the American Minister was present in the diplomatic tribune, in evening dress, at the House of Lords, on Tuesday, upon the opening of Parliament by her Majesty." The *Globe* neglected to mention another piece of intelligence "inadvertently" reported by the *Times*—that the Minister was "unpleasantly conscious of his singularity." Strange "inadvertence," not only to announce the appearance of a person who was not present, but to tell you the exact state of his mind! "Neither the Minister nor any member of the legation," says the evening Ministerial organ, "was present; information having been sent by the master of the ceremonies that members of the diplomatic corps must appear in court dress, which cannot be worn by the American legation without disregarding instructions."

Now, if this account be true, there can be very little doubt that a deliberate insult has been offered to the great nation with which, of all others, it becomes us to entertain the best relations. We will leave out of consideration the magnitude of our trade with America, the community of language, the common stock; we will only point to the possible position in which England may be placed in the course of the war into which it seems we are entering. No one can shut his eyes to the fact that this is a war of principles—that it is a war between the two principles of despotic and popular sovereignty. The tories have never endeavored to conceal that the Emperor Nicholas conceives that he has a mission to maintain the "right divine" of kings against the claims of the people. That the Emperor is fanatical on this point is well known. That the sympathies of a great portion of the ruling families of the continent are united with him is well known a so. Here is a steady, never failing source of opposition to England, however circumstances may occasionally contribute to throw a balance in our favor, as in the case of the French alliance. But the chances of war are proverbial. Is it not, then, in the highest degree absurd, nay, wicked, to interpose any obstacle between the thorough good understanding of the two greatest nations in the world, unless such obstacle is founded upon reason? And what reason can be more absurd than that founded upon the cut of a coat or the presence of a star or ribband? The dress in which an American Minister appears before his own President should be considered to be that in which he is justified in appearing before any sovereign in the world. English diplomatists in the East, appearing before sovereigns with whom etiquette is a matter of life and death, choose the dress which best suits them. What right have we to claim from others what we do not allow others to claim from us? If it shall appear that the American legation was really prevented from being present at the ceremony of the opening of Parliament because they refused to put on a dress disallowed by the government of their country, the world will come to the decision that England, with all its boasted progress, is, with respect to its court, no further advanced than a petty German principality of the last century. This is not the first time that we have heard of insults being offered to American officials because they are not allowed by a wise government to deck themselves in the gewgaws of an effete splendor. We hope, however, that it will be the last; and that a cause of ill feeling will not arise between the two great Anglo-Saxon nations on a subject which is fitted to be debated only between a couple of chamberlains of defunct principalities of the ancient Germanic Confederation.

[From the European Times, Feb. 4.]

Some stir has been caused in diplomatic circles by the absence of the American Ambassador from the opening of Parliament on Tuesday. The *Times* blundered in its account of the ceremony thus:—

"Only one exception to official uniform was observable, and the gentlemen in question, who appeared in evening dress, and seemed unpleasantly conscious of his singularity, was at once set down as the American Minister."

The mistake on the part of the leading morning paper was too good a thing to be passed over, and the *Globe* accordingly lost no time in supplying the real facts:—

"Neither the Minister nor any member of the legation," says the evening ministerial organ, "was present; information having been sent by the master of the ceremonies that members of the diplomatic corps must appear in court dress, which cannot be worn by the American legation without disregarding instructions."

The *Daily News* is highly indignant at this alleged insult put upon the American people and government, and our democratic contemporary speaks out in this style:—

"There can be very little doubt that a deliberate insult has been offered to the great nation with which, of all others, it becomes us to entertain the best relations. We will leave out of consideration the magnitude of our trade with America, the community of language, the common stock; we will only point to the possible position in which England may be placed in the course of the war into which it seems we are entering. We hope, however, that a cause of ill feeling will not arise between the two great Anglo Saxon nations on a subject which is fitted to be debated only between a couple of chamberlains of defunct principalities of the ancient German Confederacy."

The most circumstantial account of this silly business appears in the columns of the *Morning Advertiser*:—

"Mr. Buchanan we understand, wrote two letters for cards of admission for his suite and others. No answer was vouchsafed to these, save a printed form, stating that court dress could not be dispensed with, and two tickets one for a lady who does not even exist.

In this manner Gov Seymour, United States Ambassador to the court of Russia, who is now on his way to St. Petersburg, was prevented from being present, although he applied to his Minister to get him a ticket of admission. He will, probably, be very differently entertained by the Emperor of the French and the Czar of Russia, both of whom will "condescend" to dispense with court livery.

Gen Webb, also, was disappointed in the same manner. This gentleman is ex minister from the United States to Austria, and was we understand, head of the engineering department in the American army. The embassy is said to feel the affront deeply."

We really hope, for the credit of our country, that another misunderstanding of this kind will not again occur. In the middle of the nineteenth century such a dispute is worse than a mistake—it is a blunder.

Fashions for February.

[From Le Follet.]

The reports which were so generally circulated of the extensive preparations making by the leading dressmakers and manufactures for the present season, which was anticipated to rival the gay period of the empire, have been fully corroborated by the various novelties in style and material daily issuing from the most fashionable houses. To such an extent is the taste for luxury carried, that it has become a question as to where its limits must be placed. The policy of indulging this passion is justified by the encouragement and occupation it affords to the several branches of trade; and it becomes a merit to be in the fashion, and so benefit the community generally. Moire antique, reps, and damask silk, embroidered with gold and silver, and stout silks à dispositions, are the favorite materials to trim with rich lace. Silks, tastefully embroidered in colors, have a very rich and mosaic-like appearance. After these materials for grande toilette, may be noticed many novelties for ball dress; those of tarlatan with three skirts embroidered in colored silks, or trimmed with ribbons or flowers, are very pretty for young ladies. One of this material may be made with three skirts, the upper one an tunique, bordered with a wreath of roses, embroidered so much à jour that the flowers and leaves appear to be made of lace inserted in the muslin at short distances; and as if thrown upon this wreath, are ears of corn embroidered in thick work. The body is accompanied by a berthe descending en cœur on the back and chest, and open over the sleeves; in these openings are bows of pink ribbon, with long floating ends. An échelle of the same bows is placed on the front of the corsage, and two bows hold up the corners of the tunique, having long ends which reach the bottom of the dress. Nothing can be more distingue than this dress.

For ladies who very seldom visit balls, or for those who do not like to appear often in the same dress, nothing can be lighter more elegant, and, at the same time, less expensive than tarlatan or organdi. Another beautiful, though less durable, tissue is the tulle de Lyons; its web-like delicacy and snowy whiteness contrasting well with the bright colored flowers which form its most suitable trimming. The sorties de bal appear this season combining much luxe and elegance; some cashemire, embroidered in gold and ornamented with fringes of an Asiatic richness; others of white satin, bordered with gold guipure, broad feather fringes, or magnificent point d'Alençon, which, after forming two rows all round are placed so as to be raised en capuchon over the head. Those of pink or blue terry velvet, lined with ermine, without any exterior trimming, are very distingées; some, lined with white satin, are trimmed with broad bands of curled feathers of the same shade as the velvet. There are some, more simple, made of white or pink satin, with a stitched pattern; this style of work is a real *chef d'œuvre*, producing rich designs over all the satin. A deep fringe edges these sorties de bal. An elegant and very suitable one for young ladies may be made of white satin, trimmed with small rosettes of the narrowest ribbons, resembling roses.

All ornaments for the head are worn very low on the back hair. Feathers, flowers, point d'angleterre, gold and silver blonde, and corrail, plaited with gold passementerie, are all much used in this part of the coiffure. A small diadem of diamonds, or a large headed pin set with stones, forms an elegant finish to the head dress when the front hair is turned back. Necklaces are again becoming fashionable, although not yet sufficiently so to be indispensable. A flat one of diamonds set in a pattern, or a single row of brilliants, is the most recherche. Many ladies, not possessing this article de luxe, adopt a very fine Venitian gold chain, to which is suspended a medallion, composed of an engraved precious stone surrounded by diamonds.

Bracelets of stones or mosaic are much in favor, as the gloves are now worn so short that the most beautiful arm requires some ornament.

Railroad Excitement in New Jersey.

ANTI-MONOPOLY MASS MEETING AT NEWARK—THE PROPOSED EXTENSION OF PRIVILEGE TO THE CAMDEN AND AMBOY COMPANY CONDEMNED—THE SPEECHES AND RESOLUTIONS.

An enthusiastic mass meeting of the citizens of New Jersey was held at Washington Hall, Newark, on last Saturday evening, for the purpose of expressing the popular feeling with regard to a bill now pending in the Legislature of that State, with a view to extend the exclusive privileges now enjoyed by the Camden and Amboy Railroad and Transportation and Delaware and Raritan Canal Company, to a further period of twenty years after the expiration of the present charter.

The meeting was convened pursuant to the annexed requisition:—

NO MONOPOLY EXTENSION—MASS MEETING.

The citizens of the city of Newark, without distinction of party, who are opposed to any extension, under any pretext whatever, of the exclusive privileges of the Camden and Amboy Railroad Company, are requested to assemble in Washington Hall, on Saturday evening, Feb. 16, at half past seven o'clock, to give such an expression to their views as will be calculated to stay this great wrong, and thus advance the honor and welfare of New Jersey. Addresses will be made by Asa Whitehead, of this city, Col. J. Allen, of Burlington, and others.

At 8 o'clock there were about eight hundred of the most respectable citizens present, among whom were the Mayor and ex Mayor of Newark; Senator Conger; David Ripley, Esq., Member of the Assembly; Asa Whitehead, Esq.; Cortland Parker, Esq., with many members of the Common Council.

Mr. Pointer, Mayor of Newark, was called to the chair, and Marcus L. Ward, F. H. Lecse, James T. Bond, A. C. M. Ball, G. M. Spencer, and Milton Baldwin, were appointed secretaries to the meeting.

Ten gentlemen, taken from each of the eight wards of the city, were named as Vice Presidents, and the majority of them took their seats on the platform, amidst acclamation.

It was proposed that Lucius D. Baldwin, James H. Tickenor, C. F. Tompkins, Silas Merchant, and J. N. Tucker, be appointed a committee to draft resolutions conveying the sense of the assembly.

It was carried, and the committee retired.

Senator CONGER then came forward and said—Mr. Chairman: I am particularly happy to meet so large an assembly of my fellow citizens, although I would be glad to be spared the necessity of raising my voice on a subject such as the iniquitous measure which is now forced on to be passed through the Legislature of New Jersey. I am sorry to say that I have lately spoken to Jerseymen who make no secret of an inclination to favor the imposition of this badge of slavery; but I stand here to address you as the representative of one hundred thousand freemen who are determined to resist it. But to the subject. In the year 1830 an act was passed to incorporate the Delaware and Raritan Canal and the Camden and Amboy Railroad Company, in which it was guaranteed that no other company should make a road to compete with their lines, within a distance of five miles from any point or terminus thereof. By another clause it was enacted that if any other railroad shall be incorporated for the transmission of passengers or merchandise across this State from New York, within three miles from the commencement or terminus of this railway, the tax of ten cents to be levied for each passenger and for each ton of merchandise shall cease to be paid to the State. In the year 1831, an act, called the "Marriage act," for the consolidation of the two companies, was passed, and in the March of 1832 the Legislature passed another act, which binds the State of New Jersey to a monopoly, by declaring that it shall not permit the building of any road for the carriage of goods and passengers between New York and Philadelphia which would compete with the road of the Camden and Amboy line. Whether legal or not, it is a claim of this body that no other railroad shall be built upon one of the greatest thoroughfares in the United States, for a certain period of years; and in my opinion that is disgrace enough for New Jersey and a sufficient monopoly for any company. I will show to you upon the map the vast territory over which their power extends. (Here the hon. Senator pointed out the various localities in the State where no company could be permitted to make a road under the monopoly clause.) For twenty years the Camden and Amboy Company have rigidly exercised this monopoly; they resisted the proposal to make a road through the heart of the State to the Delaware Bay; they resisted the New Brunswick and Trenton branch and they resisted the proposal for a road from Somerville to Lambertville, as an infraction of their vested rights. You know now what they have and what they claim. The Legislature of the State provided that at the expiration of thirty years from the date of the charter an appraisement of the works of this company should be made by three men appointed by the State and three appointed by the company, with liberty to call in a seventh if they did not agree, and that this appraisement be made on the value of the road, and not on the market value of the stock, and also that it be made at the expense of the company. The Camden and Amboy Company propose to avoid this, and enjoy the monopoly by an extension of privilege to the year 1867. Now, if the charter cease in 1857, when it closes the State is entitled to assign the works to another company, or sell them out at a large bonus after appraisement; but if you permit the extension of privilege, they will have no difficulty in perpetuating their monopoly *ad eternum*. Let us look at what they propose. The Senator read from the preamble of the bill now before the Senate, in which a re-assertion of the exclusive rights of the company was made; and continued. The first section enacts that no canal or canals, or railroad or railroads, shall be built without the consent of the company, to compete with them, unless the State shall agree to purchase the whole capital and stock of the company not already possessed by the State, at the market value of said stock &c. Now, fellow-citizens, is it not a monstrous proposition that the State shall be obliged to buy all the bonds, debts, and stocks of this company, at a market value which will always be controlled by the members, and at a time when they have about seven millions of dollars worth of bonds in England? Why, it is most monstrous; when Brennus, at the head of the Gauls, took Rome and threw his sword into the scale, he only demanded a thousand pounds of gold for the ransom of the city; but the Camden and Amboy Railroad Company must have a monopoly or their own price. The animus of the proposed statute is, that they shall enjoy a monopoly for twenty years more over a two-thirds part of the State of New Jersey, and I fear that we will soon see again what has been seen in this State before—that this company will overshadow the Legislature, and say: "Pass the bill" and it will pass; or, "Do not pass it at present," and it will be postponed. The plan is to saddle on the farmers and mechanics of New Jersey a cost of twelve millions of dollars for these works. But they offer a few amendments by way of a sop. The first is, that if the State do not wish to purchase the works in 1860 the monopoly shall cease. Gentlemen, if to be free from the incubus in 1860 be a great boon to you, it is infinitely better for you to make yourselves free now. Why, sir, in 1860 Louis Napoleon will have toppled from his throne, and we will drive railroad cars through republican Russia, whilst we are only terminating a terrible monopoly in New Jersey. They say that in 1860 they will pay one hundred thousand dollars to the school fund; but our estimates show that they would be only returning us our own cash. They have a sop also for West Jersey, for inasmuch as they have diverted all the traffic of every branch road to their lines, so if any other company propose to build a road and want money, this magnanimous Camden and Amboy company say, "Oh, if the people so will it, we will make the railroad for them;" and immediately they go themselves to Trenton, and bring their lobby men, and say to the Legislature, "If we now build this new road we want our privileges extended." (Cheers.) Is it possible that you will for any sop or consideration sell the sovereignty of the State for twenty years? (No, no.) Is it possible that you will perpetuate the disgrace that a man travelling from New York to Philadelphia—about eighty eight miles—shall pay three dollars fare in order to enrich monopolists? (Cries of "No, no.") From Newark to Trenton he has to pay one dollar and fifty cents, and this with all the natural advantages for railroads which the country possesses. Why, sir, in 1869 the population of the United States will be forty millions of people; in 1889 it will amount to seventy or eighty millions. And can you imagine all the mighty travel southward from New York to be then rolled over one line of road, putting at that time five dollars into the pockets of the monopolists for every one dollar they now receive? Let the business men of New York, Philadelphia and Newark look to it; let the farmer and the mechanic look to it, and they will at once see the ruinous effects of this monopoly. (Cheers.) Manufactures and merchandise are now forwarded to New York, and sent from thence to Philadelphia, at an advance of cost, owing to the fact of one company owning the Delaware and Raritan canal and the railroads; whereas, if you were free from the grasp of this company your trade with Philadelphia would be enhanced fifty per cent. I can show that your trade with that city is now little or nothing; but if the cars ran over a double track, and ran free from restrictions, business men would have heads of their houses in Philadelphia as well as in New York. If this be a question of principle, it is also one of interest, for every one who possesses real estate is interested to have hamlets, villages, and cities spring up, in consequence of cheap and unimpeded public travel. (Cheers.) The Hon. Senator then combatted the idea that this was a political question, and conjured whigs and democrats, conservatives and men of progress, to unite for the overthrow of the monopoly. He said—If you permit this bill to pass, you will create in New Jersey a money power, a power of capital, an aristocracy—lords of the iron track—a power which will be equal with and above the Legislature, and a power which, if possible, will be greater than you, the people. (Cheers, and cries of "Never.") Now is your time to crush it forever; and I ask you, men of Jersey, to rise up and say that these exclusive privileges shall not continue a day longer than that day to which the faith and honor of New Jersey is pledged. (Loud cheers.)

Mr. L. D. BALDWIN reported the following resolutions from the committee appointed to draft them:—

Resolved, That in the former history of New Jersey, all its citizens have just cause for pride and congratulation. In its first compacts with the aborigines, in its historic fame, in its glorious battle fields, and its sacrifices for the cause of popular rights, this State has presented a bright example to her sister States, and has preserved a conscious rectitude for all her children; and until these late years her scutcheon has been sustained by any act of oppression upon the weak, or of base submission to the strong.

Resolved, That this State, by its position, and its mineral and agricultural wealth, possesses advantages equalled by few, and surpassed by none, of its sisters in this Union. And if we be troubled by unwise and oppressive enactments, the people of the State, advancing rapidly in intelligence and wealth, will soon arrive at a condition of prosperity and renown which is seldom enjoyed by any other.

Resolved, That since the political existence of this State commenced, the first blow ever struck at the freedom of its citizens in the exercise of their just franchise, and the first attack upon the sovereignty of the people as a body politic, was the character of the Camden and Amboy Railroad and transportation, and the Delaware and Raritan canal companies, commonly called the "combined companies," and since that disastrous era the history of these companies, and of the Legislature in their behalf, has been but a series of insidious and artful attempts to obtain such possession of legislative and money power as would give them entire control of that State sovereignty which of right belongs only to the free people thereof.

Resolved, That the only taint which could make the cheeks of Jerseymen tingle with shame for the honor of our beloved State is that which has rung from Maine to Georgia, "that New Jersey was in the power of the monopoly;" and while all good citizens have been consulting what plan may be devised to free the State from the disgrace, and the people from the incubus, without offending any just rights, we are astounded by the report from Trenton which brings the latest propositions from these audacious companies; and while the State holds in her hands the power in a few years to purchase their railroads at cost and end the monopoly forever, we are met by them in a spirit of defiance and told to agree now to purchase their entire works at a great advance upon the cost, or else to extend their monstrous privileges twenty years longer. In this offer of the companies we know not which is the greater, its brazen impudence or its base infidelity; but toward it this assembly has but one unanimous sentiment of inveterate hostility.

Resolved, That these companies have forfeited all claim to the respect or to any indulgence from the people of New Jersey; and we hereby recommend our fellow-citizens so to make a necessary war upon the monstrous privileges and arrogant claims of these companies, until this disgrace shall be wiped out, and the sovereignty of New Jersey shall be restored again to the rightful owners thereof; and in the name of the glorious inheritance bequeathed to us by our fathers, and of the responsibility we owe to those who shall succeed us, we hereby pledge ourselves to enlist in this cause until the end shall have been accomplished.

Resolved, That as we are thus utterly opposed to any extension of the exclusive privileges of the Delaware and Raritan Canal and Camden and Amboy Railroad and Transportation companies, under any pretext whatsoever, we do therefore most respectfully and earnestly remonstrate against the passage of the bill now before the Senate, being a supplement to the act relative to the Delaware and Raritan Canal and Camden and Amboy Railroad and Transportation companies.

The resolutions were adopted amidst tremendous cheering.

Mr. REUBEN D. BALDWIN moved:—

Resolved, That we tender to our State Senator, Dr. Conger, our heartfelt thanks for his noble and able defence of the rights of the people.

Carried unanimously.

Mr. BALDWIN then moved—That this meeting have full confidence in those members of the House of Assembly from this county, who have already defined their positions in opposition to the extension of the powers of the monopoly, and would urge every member to use all lawful means to defeat this nefarious plot against the rights and sovereignty of the people.

Carried by acclamation.

ASA WHITEHEAD, Esq., then addressed the meeting in a very eloquent strain. He commented, in his legal capacity, upon the provisions of the proposed bill, and stated that they were under a cover, designed to fasten the evils of a railroad monopoly upon the people and posterity. He denied that the Legislature, when it made the original grant, ever contemplated such an absorption of power by a few men: and suppressed the views of Senator Conger, that men of all shades of party should unite in order to get rid of a monopoly which fettered trade and depressed the best interests of the State.

CORTLAND PARKER, Esq. made an eloquent address, in which he advised the people to treat the money power as Jackson did the U. S. Bank—blast it in the bud, lest, if not dangerous now, it should become so.

DAVID RIPLEY, Esq., member of Assembly, made a caustic and humorous speech. He advised all the people to go *en masse* to Trenton and proclaim their hostility to the bill. If any were too poor to go, he would give them his pay as a member all the time, and live himself on his "stealings," commonly called the "spoils." (Loud laughter.)

When Mr. Ripley concluded, the large assemblage dispersed.

CAPT. WATKINS IN BOSTON.—Yesterday, about 1 P. M., Capt. Watkins, of the unfortunate San Francisco, appeared on 'Change, accompanied by the ever assiduous in matters of maritime interest, Capt. R. B. Forbes. Capt. Watkins was warmly welcomed by many of our merchants, and, indeed, the congratulations became so fast and furious that he thought it best to take advantage of a proper moment and slip quietly away. Capt. W.