

ITALY.

REPORTED DEATH FROM TORTURE.—MORE ARRESTS AT NAPLES.—Considerable sensation has been created at Naples by the reported death of a man in the prisons of the Vicaria, and the public voice has added that he died from torture. We do not, however, put faith in the report. Be that as it may, he was the brother of a Salvatore di Sunoni, a spirit merchant in the Strada Pigna Secca, and was arrested together with him about the 9th or 10th of January. Two days after the arrest, the shop was closed. The reason assigned for this violence is, that suspicion attached to Di Sunoni of having sold a pipe of spirits wherein was placed the body of Milano, previous to its removal. Many fresh arrests were made on the nights of the 28th and 29th, in some cafes and billiard rooms near the Teatro Fiorentini and the Teatro Nuovo. It is said that no fewer than 79 persons were taken to the Vicaria, and that the place was so full that they were confined with prisoners of the lowest class. On the morning of the 29th there were found attached to the walls of many parts of the city tricoloured flags cut out in paper. On a new house in the Morcatello there was found a large flag made of cloth, of the same colours, and some too in the Largo Castello. The 29th day of January is the anniversary of the day when the constitution was granted. In the villa also were found many pieces of card with three colours upon them scattered about amongst the walks.—Unmistakeable signs are these that in spite of persecution in every form the spirit of the people is not crushed, and that they never cease to pine after their liberty. The reason assigned for the arrests on the 9th and 10th is that a correspondence had been discovered between certain Neapolitans and adherents of Mazzini in Genoa.

French Account of the Chinese War.

The Paris *Moniteur de la Flotte* publishes a letter of the date of the 16th December that gives some interesting details relative to the late affair at Canton, showing that the damage sustained by the foreign merchants was not as great as had been stated in the first accounts. It appears that of 13 quarters, of which Chy-San-Hang, the residence of the Europeans, is composed, five have been destroyed. It was said that of the 80 foreign factories and stores which existed at Canton, only nine, including the British Consulate, escaped the conflagration; this, it states, is an error. Of the 80 establishments, 21 have been burnt down. This is a considerable loss no doubt, but it is much less than that reported. It appears that there existed at Canton a floating population of from 25,000 to 30,000 thieves and vagabonds—refugees from all parts of China. As soon as the English ships commenced their fire these men, taking advantage of the general alarm, rushed in large bodies into Chy-San-Hang, and having first pillaged the European stores, set fire to them. The British Admiral, seeing what was going forward, brought two of his ships to bear on the pillagers, and sent some shells among them, which caused them to fly. Unfortunately the shot from the British ships increased the fire lighted by the vagabonds. The captain of the French frigate *Virginie* sent a detachment of 150 men on shore with four light howitzers, to complete the discomfiture of the pillagers, who fled in every direction, leaving a number of their body dead on the streets. The French seamen were labour-

ing indefatigably in extinguishing the fire, which they in a great measure accomplished. As to the Chinese town, it suffered horribly, as well by the fire of the English ships as by the native robbers. Of the 12 great factories belonging to the Hong merchants, and which were situate near the Tartar town, nine were destroyed by the first attack. The English merchants interested in those establishments suffered considerably by that disaster. At the latest dates, the British Admiral, having occupied the Chinese military positions, had no more opposition to expect, but a new eruption of the thieves and vagabonds was apprehended. A great number of merchant had emigrated to Shanghai, but the 500,000 inhabitants of Canton cannot so easily dispose of themselves.

The *Pays* says:—

“It is positively stated that the latest news from China announces that the representatives of all the foreign powers, with the exception of the United States, have persisted in their declaration of neutrality in the Canton affair. It appears that while blaming the conduct of the Viceroy of Canton, and admiring the justice of the English complaints, the general opinion before the commencement of hostilities was that Admiral Seymour's plan would not bring about the just concessions from the court of Peking that were asked for, and that its only result would be to strike a fatal blow at European commerce. The soundness of his opinion has been justified by subsequent events.”

THE CHINESE WAR.

OFFICIAL DOCUMENTS.

The papers relating to the proceedings of her Majesty's naval forces at Canton presented to both houses of Parliament by command of Her Majesty, were published on Saturday. They include the despatches from Sir John Bowring to the Earl of Clarendon, Admiral Seymour's despatches to the Admiralty, the respective correspondence between Sir John Bowring, Admiral Seymour, and Consul Parkes, and with the Chinese authorities; documents relative to the proceedings of the French and American representatives, together with a variety of papers, the substance of which has already been made known. There is also an appendix, composed of papers dating from 1848, respecting the right of British subjects to free entry into Canton.—The only expressions of opinion on the part of the home government contained in the papers will be found in the following despatches:

THE EARL OF CLARENDON TO SIR JOHN BOWRING.

Foreign Office, Dec. 10, 1856.

Sir,—I have received your despatches of the 13th and 15th of October, reporting what had passed in regard to the seizure, by the Chinese authorities at Canton, of the crew of the lorcha *Arrow*, sailing under British colours.

I have consulted the law officers of the crown on this matter, and I have now to state to you, that I am of opinion that this act of the Chinese authorities constitutes an infraction of Article IX. of the Supplementary Treaty.

The only possible defence open to them appears to be, that the *Arrow* was not “an English merchant ship” within the true intent and meaning of the Treaty; but Article XVII., Rule 1, in Supplementary Treaty, recognizes and includes this particular class of vessels; she had a British master, British colours, and papers; and even if her license had been improperly granted in August 1854, this was a matter of British internal regulation, and to be dealt with by the British authorities. This point is evidently an after-thought on the part of the Chinese, and the only evidence of it is the uncorroborating assertion of one of the crew whilst in custody. No British lorcha would be safe if her crew were liable to seizure on such grounds.

I have further to observe that there do not seem to have been any circumstances of urgency in this case as would afford any justification or excuse for the arbitrary conduct of the Chinese authorities, who were, probably, emboldened by the absence of any of Her Majesty's ships from Canton. The *Arrow* was bound to Hong Kong, and if any of her crew could be identified as having been guilty of piracy, or were ever suspected of it, there would have been no difficulty in securing their apprehension and delivery, had the Chinese authorities taken the course indicated by Article IX., viz., communicating with the British Consul. Only two of her crew were charged with piracy, viz., Lem-ming-tae, and Liang-kien-foo, the third detained (Woo-n-jen) is apparently only wanted as a witness; and there was no other objection for seizing the other nine, who were afterwards released.

The accidental and temporary absence of the British master on board a neighbouring vessel could not affect the question. The British flag is clearly proved (by the deposition of Kennedy and French) to have been hauled down by the Chinese Mandarin crew, notwithstanding the denial of this fact by the Imperial Commissioner; but even if the flag had not been actually flying at the moment, it is obvious that the national character of the lorcha was well known to the authorities.

The expiration of the *Arrow's* sailing license on September 27, previous to her seizure, does not appear to have been known to the Chinese authorities; and this, again is a matter of British regulation which would not justify seizure by the Chinese.

The principle involved in this case is most important, and the demands made by Mr. Consul Parkes appear to me to be very moderate under the circumstances. I consider that the redelivery of the three men still detained, and a subsequent formal demand for their extradition before they are given up again, should be insisted on as a *sine qua non*. They must be considered as having been forcibly taken in breach of Treaty, and without any justification or excuse, from on board a British vessel, and illegally detained in custody by the orders of the Imperial Commissioner, with full knowledge of all the circumstances and in defiance of a formal demand by the British Consul.

Under all the circumstances of the case, I approve of the intention to seize and hold one of the imperial junks as security for the redress which the high commissioner has been called upon to afford in this case.

I have only to add, that I conclude you will have caused a strict inquiry to be made into the circumstances connected with the grant of the license to the lorcha in the year 1854—I am, &c.,

(Signed) CLARENDON.

THE SECRETARY OF THE ADMIRALTY TO MR. HAMMOND.

(Received January 3.)

Admiralty, Jan'y 3, 1857.

Sir,—I am commanded by my Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty to transmit to you copies of a letter from Rear-Admiral Sir Michael Seymour, and of such of its inclosures as have not been received at the Foreign-office, detailing the operations at Canton; and in laying the same before Earl of Clarendon, I have to request that you will move his lordship to inform my Lords what instructions are to be sent to the Admiral by the mail of the 10th instant.—I have &c.,

(Signed) THOMAS PHINN.

R. HAMMOND TO THE SECRETARY TO THE ADMIRALTY.

(Extract.) Foreign Office, Jan'y 10, 1857.

I have laid before the Earl of Clarendon your letter of the 3d instant, inclosing Rear-Admiral Sir Michael Seymour's report of the late operations in the Canton River, and requesting to be made acquainted with the instructions which should be sent to him on the subject; and in reply I am to request that you will acquaint the Lords Commissioners of the Admiralty that