at this advanced period of the Session so short a time can be devoted to this object. There is one feature that I cannot pass unnoticed in the allusion made to the Civil List Bill, which is, that their Honors are quite prepared to alter the compact by an *addition* to the amount of the Several salaries of the Government officers but are quite unprepared to admit of any thing that can be construed into a reduction; as it must be in the recollection of your Honors that in his Excellency's speech at the opening of the session—and I conclude the speech was the act of the Executive—[The Hon. Mr. Swabey, "Yes, you are right."] an increase of some of the salaries was recommended. I will now take a comparative view of the Salary of the Attorney General and that of the other officers of the Government. In the first place, I would allude to the Master of the Rolls and Assistant Judge, who has a salary of £500 currency, and whose successor is to have only £400. This, considering the extensive practice he had to give up, is low indeed, and I think the proposed salary of the Attorney General is far superior to that of the Judge. I next take the salary of the Colonial Secretary, which is £400 currency, and out of this he has to pay a Deputy—I consider the Attorney General's salary superior to this. I come then to the Treasurer, who also gets £400 and has also to pay a Deputy—next is his Honor at the other end of the Board (Mr. Swabey)—he has to pay a Deputy out of his £200 a year. In short, when I compare the salaries of all these officers with that of the Attorney General it is quite evident that he has the best office under the crown. And now that the office of the Attorney General is brought under review by this Bill, I must take the opportunity to express my opinion upon a subject in relation to that office, to which my attention has been directed elsewhere. I take the matter up on public grounds, and on those alone, and wish to avoid all personality; but what I am going to say must strike every unprejudiced mind. I allude to the incompatibility of the officer of Attorney General and the business of a Banker, or Bill Broker. For instance, what would be the position of the crown prosecutor in the event of his having to proceed in cases in which his own interests were involved against parties with whom he had been engaged in his capacity of Banker or Bill Broker? I consider it highly improper—alike injurious to the public interests as it is derogatory to the dignity of the office of Attorney General. It is foreign to the intentions of the Constitution; and if fairly represented would not be allowed. I state this advisedly, and feel that I should be wanting in my public duty and highly culpable were I not to call your Honors attention to such an impropriety. I have already shewn that the Salary of the Attorney General is sufficient as compared with other offices, but it must also be remembered that his Honor is also the Judge of Probate, and derives from that source large fees in addition to those arising out of his other office—and here I must remark it was always understood that under the system of responsible Government there was to be an end to plurality of offices. I merely mention this to show, that the acts of the party at present in power are not very consistent with their profession. With these few observations I beg to move that the Bill be read a second time.

The Hon. Mr. Hensley. After the observations that have been made by hon. gentlemen who have proceeded me, it will not be necessary for me to say much upon this question. The opinion that a fixed salaryt and not fees, is the more proper way of paying public officers is now almost universally admited, and I think there can be no manner of doubt that it is. In the case of his Hon. the Attorney General, he has been accused of making his fees as large as possible, and therefore I consider that the mode now proposed for remunerating him for the services he performs will relieve him from all imputations of this kind. I am free to admit that the salaries are below what they ought to be, but so long as the scale established under the present system exists, I confess I cannot see why the Attorney General should be placed in a better position than the other officers of government. By and by, it is to be hoped that the Legislature will take another view, and see the propriety of raising those salaries; but, be that as it may, nothing has pleased me so much, for a length of time, as the line of conduct the members of the government in the other House have pursued, with respect to the salaries in question. They have not failed to give the matter their almost unanimous support. They have discharged the trust committed to them by the public, with great fidelity; and, at the same time, manifested a disinterestedness that reflects on them the highest honor; but, on the other hand, I do feel surprised that the only two members of the government that are in this House should adopt a different course, and give their opposition to the Bill in question. [The Hon. the Attorney General, "How do you know whether I shall do so or not?"] The members of the government in the other House did not hesitate to give their vote in favour of it, and are therefore supposed to be satisfied with their salaries, but while I am on this subject, I cannot refrain from observing that there is no office under the government, in my estimation, so underpaid as the Postmaster General, is, and whose arduous and important duties demand his constant attendance in his office, from an early hour in the morning until 10 at night The Postmaster General has more reason to complain of his being inadequately paid than any other officer in the Colony. I second the motion of my friend Hon. Mr. Holl, that the Bill be read a second time.

The Hon. Mr. Swabey. I understand my learned and hon. friend does not intend to address the House on the subject of this Bill. Great praise has been given to the members in the other end of the Building for their almost unanimous support of the Bill now under consideration. [The Hon. Mr. Holl referred the hon. gentleman to the Journals of the House of Assembly.] I maintain that you are not aware, from a mere reading of the Journals, of what took place in committee on the discussion, nor of the opposition that the Bill met with, from several hon. members. Look at our own Journals. I would like to know what sort of an idea would any one get from a perusal of them, but the fact is, there was only a majority of one in the other House. It has been alleged that the office of Attorney General so far from circumscribing has on the contrary a tendency to increase his other practice, but I am sure that any person in this building who sees what he has to do on behalf of the Government must conclude very differently, for the fact is, he is so situated that he really has not time to attend to other business. It is not the fact that it brings what is termed grist to the Mill, it rather takes it away. It has been insinuated that the Governor in his opening Speech said nothing about diminishing fees, and most assuredly he did not. Moreover, I assert that the House of assembly has no power to attack my salary and it could not lessen, but it might to increase the salaries that are attached to those offices. It has been very justly said that the salary of the Master of the rolls is fixed at a very low rate, and that it is prospectively lower. I recollect, when that salary was under the consideration of the legislature, that his Honor said he gave it a very reluctant consent, and I hope the time will come when it will be raised—but the Master of the Rolls has plenty of leisure time—he is not required to keep an office, and besides he is paid in proportion to what he has to do. It is not because the master of the rolls is ill paid that another should be so—the argument is not a good one at all. In respect to what has been said as to the impropriety of the Attorney General engaging in any business whereby he might by possibility have on the part of the Government to proceed against parties with whom he had transacted business, I have only to say that this is quite an imaginary fear and an argument that is baseless! What, I should like to know is done in the case of Judges or Magistrates who are placed in such positions, why, of course as every body knows, others on such occasions officiate in place of them—it is the practice in England and in every other part of the world. The fact of the Attorney General being Judge of Probate has been brought forward with the view of shewing that as he derives certain fees and emoluments in that capacity that these should be taken into consideration in the apportioning of his Salary as Attorney General. This also I maintain is not a fair argument, inasmuch as, the two situations have no relation to each other, the appointment of Judge of Probate having taken place under peculiar circumstances and not at all concomitant with the Attorney Generalship. You must look at the office of Attorney General just as it is in itself, and that is the only fair way viewing it, and all I shall now say is that if you think the salary enough, you judge very differently from what I do.

The Hon. Mr. Holl. With respect to some of the observations that have fallen from the hon. gentleman who has just sat down, I feel it to be my duty to reply, as I conceive they require some explanation. His Honor has said, that the Attorney General was fully occupied in his official duties,—that he had no time to attend to any thing else. How is it then, I would ask, that his Honor has time sufficient at his disposal to conduct the business of Banking, which must occupy a very large portion of his attention. In regard to what has been said about the situation of the Master of the Rolls, the case has not been so clearly stated as it should have been. The fact is, the Salary of the Master of the Rolls is small in comparison with the importance of the situation and the duties he has to discharge; and you must recollect, too, that he was restricted by an Act of the Legislature from holding any agency or engaging in any kind of business whatsoever. [See 11th Vic. chap. 6 sec. 5. [The Hon. Mr. Swabey. But he was told so before he accepted the situation.]

True, but does not the same principle apply in the one case as in the other? And why was such a thing done? Why was there such a restriction, but because it was thought the two offices would be incompatible with each other, and who can doubt the soundness of the principle? I rose only with the view of explaining with regard to what the hon. gentleman (Mr. S) said on this one point.

The Hon. Mr. Swabey. You will recollect that the Master of the Rolls had the opportunity to refuse, if he did not like the condition that was attached to it.

The House then divided.

Contents, for the second reading—The Honbls., the President, Holl, Hensley, Birnie, Haythorne.

Non-contents—The Honble. Swabey, Dingwell, Beete.

The Hon. the Attorney General. As it was a question in which he was personally interested he had come to the determination not to take any part in the discussion, nor to vote upon it, unless any thing very extraordinary took place.

The Bill was then read a second time.

The Hon. Mr. Holl then moved that the Bill be committed to a Committee of the whole House; observing, at the sametime, that he felt it to be a matter of extreme delicacy, and that if he had only consulted his own feelings and wishes, he would much rather that any other hon. gentleman had led in the matter, but as he (Mr. Holl) was the Senior Member at the Board and had already moved the second reading of the Bill, he felt that it would avoid placing any other member in a position that might appear invidious, and assume a character of personality; and, therefore it was, that he had come forward in the manner he had done, to discharge a high public duty.

The Hon. Mr. Haythorne I beg it to be understood that I voted for the second reading of the Bill only on the pledge given by his honor Mr. Holl that he will advocate by another Bill, if necessary, the same principle as applicable to the office of Queen's Printer. I do not see why it would not be advisable to include that officer in the present Bill; but, with the pledge of his Honor, to bring in a Bill for that purpose, I will support the committal of the Bill.

The Hon. Mr. Swabey. Perhaps his Honor would do wrong in not bringing it forward at the present time.

The Hon. Mr. Holl. I shall propose it as a suggestion to the other branch of the Legislature, in the shape of a Bill.

The Hon. Mr. Haythorne. It appears from the debates elsewhere, that it has been a very difficult matter to decide upon; but however painfully I may have felt in giving the vote I did, personal considerations I hope will never affect my public duty.

The Hon. Mr. Birnie. It will be difficult to get what we require, in order to arrive at a satisfactory determination in the case of the Queen's Printer.

The Hon. the President. I should at all times, be sorry to see a public servant paid below what he should have. But there is a Fee Act, and when I look at it and then at the Attorney General's accounts, it is evident that the Fee Act has been departed from, and I regret to say, too, that it is also set aside by the Courts. By this Fee Act, we are told that no other fees shall be taken; therefore, seeing that they have departed from it, I consider it fair that they should be circumscribed by such a Bill as the present; and on that ground I support it.

After a few further but desultory remarks, by hon. members, the House formed itself into a Committee—the Hon Mr. Holt being called to the Chair—

ATTORNEY GENERAL'S SALARY.

The Hon. Mr. Hensley moved that the Salary of the Attorney General should be £350, inclusive of all fees of office.

The Hon. the President. I am glad that the matter is assuming so fair an aspect. I am sure that there is no wish on the part of any hon. gentleman to injure any Officer.

The Hon. Mr. Birnie. I move that the Salary of the Attorney General be £400. I believe the fees of the late Attorney General amounted to about £450.

The Hon. the President. If you disallow his Honor the Attorney General his fees under the Land Assessment Act, I will not object to the amendment.

The Hon. Mr. Birnie. A fair and just salary should be given both to the present Attorney General and his successors. We ought to bear in mind that the Attorney General has various and very important duties to perform, and that out of his salary he has to pay his Clerk. I do not believe that there is any other Attorney General in the Colonies who has so small a Salary. Many Banking Clerks in the Old Country receive a much higher salary, and, in my opinion, he certainly ought to have £250 in addition to his present salary. It should by no means be lowered. Besides, when a Government has entered into a Compact, they are bound in honor, not to diminish it. In another year we might have another Bill sent up—there is no saying—how can we tell. The fact is, all the salaries are fixed at far too low a rate.

The Hon. Mr. Beete. What we have now to consider, however, is the relative amount or value of the salaries now in existence.

The Hon. Mr. Swabey. I think if the discussion is to take that turn that there shall be no fees, there will be very little difference of opinion, for every body seems to allow that the public officers receive far too little salary. His honor the President very properly suggested that there should be no fees receivable by the Attorney General under the Land Tax Bill; and I should have no objections, if his Honor Major Beete would embody, in his motion, that all fees should be done away with.

The Hon. Mr. Hensley. I think it very probable that such amendments might be agreed to in this House, but I do not think that they would be agreed to in the House of Assembly.

The Chairman explained, that the Bill, as it stood allowed that the fees under the Land Tax Bill, should go to the Attorney General.

The Hon. the President did not wish that the fees in the Admiralty Court should be meddled with at all.

The Hon. Mr. Birnie. I understand that the sum of £400 was what was agreed to in the House of Assembly at one time, but then it was altered when it was determined upon that the Attorney General should have the Land Tax Fees.

The Hon. Mr. Hensley. Let us by all means confine ourselves to an object that is attainable. I would recommend that, instead of £150, we should say £200, in lieu of all fees, except those under the Land Assessment Act.

The Hon. the Attorney General. I do not mean, in the slightest degree, to interfere in the discussion; but just allow me to explain to you, that if you include the land tax fees, of course the Attorney General will have to hand these over to the Government; but the people proceeded against, cannot, thereby, be in the slightest degree, relieved.

The Hon. Mr. Dingwell thought that the proposed suggestions would be agreed to by the House of Assembly.

The Hon. Mr. Hensley.—I shall only say, that every officer is shamefully underpaid.

The Chairman again explained, that what the Committee had to consider, was the relative value of the salaries of public officers.

The Hon. Mr. Swabey.—I consider that it would be a good thing, to get rid of fees altogether; and I therefore second the motion of my hon. friend Mr. Beete.

The Hon. the Attorney General,—again expressing his determination to abstain from mingling in the discussion, observed, that various fees might afterwards arise, but that their Honors should properly define what they meant.

The Hon. the President.—I would include all fees, except the Admiralty.

The Hon. Mr. Hensley.—When other fees arise, it will then be time enough to pass an Act respecting them.

SOLICITOR GENERAL'S SALARY.

The Hon. the Attorney General.—Before you pass the clause relating to the Solicitor General, allow me to say, that I most cheerfully support it. I have long thought that some such provision should have been made. The very idea of giving the paltry sum of about £20 a year to such an officer, is rather ridiculous. If the Government wish to have a Solicitor General, as a matter of course, they ought to give him a sufficient remuneration. I think it was only last year that, in a conversation I had with a certain gentleman, I expressed my opinion that the Solicitor General should receive a hundred pounds a year; but I reserve my vote. I think it just; and such an arrangement will be found highly beneficial;—but the more dignified course for me is, I think, to be silent. As regards the history of this Bill, I both know the motive of it, and I fully appreciate those who have supported it; but as to this particular clause I support it;—and as regards the clause respecting the Clerk of the Crown, I shall make some observations upon it when it comes under discussion.

The clause was then agreed to.

CLERK OF THE CROWN.

The Hon. Mr. Dingwell. I do not see the justice of reducing the Salary of the Prothonitary merely because it has been thought right to reduce that of the Attorney General, and therefore, propose that the said Salary be increased to £170.

The Hon. Mr. Hensley. I meant to have proposed £170 and my reason is this that having understood that such was the amount at one time entertained in the lower House I think our wisest plan is to make our suggestions of such a character as that they will likely be agreeable to that House; and therefore, as the hon. Mr. Dingwell has proposed it, I beg leave to second it.

The Hon. Mr. Birnie.—A great many years ago, I accidentally discovered, while residing in England, that there had been a sum of £90 stg. charged in the annual Estimates of Britain for the Clerk of the Crown of this Island for a number of years, but that there had been no person to receive it. I wrote to the late Mr. Goff on the subject, and recommended him to send home a life certificate, which he did; but when I applied at the proper office, I was told that it was a Clerical error. I then saw Lord Bathurst, and I told him that it was an office of very great importance; and after considerable difficulty, I obtained for Mr. Goff a year of back salary. The present Clerk of the Crown's father performed the duty for many years.

The Hon. the President.—I suppose the Prothonotary will be satisfied with an addition of £20.

The Attorney General. I think Mr. Hodgson had about £975 a year under the old system, as Clerk of the Crown. Last year he received something about £843, and this year £193 3s 6d; and out of which he had to pay his Deputies. It seems to me to be an act of injustice to take £193 and give him £170, and whether such a thing would meet with his views or not, I cannot take it upon me to assert, but I will venture to say that there is not a more efficient officer under the government than the present Clerk of the Crown. I think £190 would be a fair equivalent. Giving him £150 is virtually giving him £110 because he has to pay £20 a year to each of his Deputies in King's County and Prince County. He has to attend the Courts twice a year, and his duties are very laborious. If you strike out £170 and insert £190 it will be coming to a fair thing.

The Honorable Mr. Hensley. If you consent to £170 you will be doing a friendly part. I think that sum will be more likely to be passed by the other House than that proposed by the Hon. the Attorney General.

The Hon. the Attorney General. I have seen the Prothonotary within the last few minutes and he says that he will not be satisfied with the £170 but that he would with the £190; and as possibly some misunderstanding might arise, to prevent any thing of this kind, I move that the word "fifty" be struck out, and that of "Ninety" inserted in its place.

The Hon. the President. I second it, but let it be distinctly understood at the same time that if it cannot be got, I will not peril the Bill on that account.

The Amendment of £190 was lost on a division—the Honble. the President, Attorney General and Beete voting for it.

The Hon. Mr. Swabey. I must explain myself. I do not at all wish to cut down the fees of the Prothonotary; but I think we had better fix a sum likely to be carried in the other branch.

The clause as amended by the original motion, viz., £170 was then agreed to.

On the motion that the Bill be agreed to with the suggestions made in Committee and that a Conference be asked with the House of Assembly, It was carried, the Hon. Mr. Swabey, dissensient.

April 12

The Hon. Mr. Holl, from the conference on the Salaries Bill, reported, that the House of Assembly had disagreed to the suggestions of the Council.

The Council then proceeded with the discussion of the Salaries Bill, and Tenant compensation Bill, with closed doors.

April 13.

After certain Bills, &c., had been disposed of

The Hon. Mr. Holl rose to enquire in what state the Salaries Bill and the Tenant Compensation Bills were.

The Hon. the President then asked the Clerk of the Council in what positions the Bills were—

Mr. Desbrisay then stated that on each motion the division was equal.

The Hon. Mr. Swabey then moved that the Council adhere to its suggestions.

To which the Hon Mr. Holl proposed an amendment, that they be not adhered to, which being put—

For not adhering—The Honbls. The President, Mr. Holl, Mr. Hensley, Mr. Birnie, Mr. Haythorne,

For adhering—The Honbls. the Attorney General, Mr. Swabey, Mr. Beete, Mr. Dingwell, Mr. Beaton.

On the original motion—

For—The Honbls.—The Attorney General, Mr. Swabey, Mr. Beete. Mr. Dingwell, Mr. Beaton.

Against—The Honbls.—The President Mr. Holl. Hensley, Mr. Birnie, Mr. Haythorne,

The Hon. Mr. Holl. Then these Bills are still in existance

The Hon. the Attorney General. I think his Honor will remember that there was a case somewhat similar. I allude to the Fishery Reserve Bill, in which there was also an equal division. This was upon the second reading, and the Bill was lost. I recollect distinctly, the occurrence, for I took an interest in that Bill, for his Honor the President, and I came to a misunderstanding, which led to our being put in custody—

The Hon. Mr. Hensley. The question before us is simply can these Bills be taken up again in the course of the Session. [The Hon. the Attorney General—"no, they cannot."] There appeared to be an unusual canvassing for sick and absent members, and I therefore see no impropriety in proceeding with the Bill, For if such a course be admissable, it is certainly so on the present occasion.

The Hon. the Attorney General. With regard to sick members I never asked the attendance of one, nor knew that the one referred to would be present, until I saw him within those walls; nor do I think that any other members tried to influence him. There was a call of this House, and when I saw him, I thought he came to vote upon the Tenant compensation Bill.

The Hon. Mr. Holl. In consequence of the business of yesterday having been conducted with closed doors there is nothing on our Journals to shew what action has been taken on the Bills in question nor is any thing known as to what took place in debate. I can only say that, I felt much pained at circumstances attending the discussion, and feel perfectly justified and imperatively called upon to take up the Bill.

The Hon. Mr. Swabey suggested that the President should inform the House as to the proper course of proceedure.

The Hon. Mr. Holl. If there be a doubt in the minds of your Honors it would be better to adjourn for half an hour and search for precedents.

Upon the House resuming the Hon. the President reported that he had seen the late President who declined being the arbitrator in this matter.

The Hon. Mr. Swabey. I did not expect nor require him to be an arbitrator.

The Hon. Mr. Holl. As I am given to understand that the course we propose to pursue is the correct one, and as it is besides, in accordance with the practice of the House of Assembly, I therefore move that the next stage of the Bill be proceeded with.

The Hon. Mr. Swabey. I must say, Sir, that it has always been the custom and it is one of great propriety that there should be no advantage taken of absent members. And I know of none that ever has been attempted to be taken until the present moment. This very Bill came before us with a full House, every member that could be brought having been in his place. Those were the circumstances yesterday. In respect to Mr. Beaton, I requested him to come on the compensation Bill nor had I with that hon. gentleman any conversation with regard to the Salary Bill. I therefore hope you will not deviate from what has hitherto been the practice of this House. As for precedents the only one we can find is the Fishery Reserve Bill in 1842 which is in my favor.

The Hon. Mr. Holl. I feel it incumbent on me to press this motion. Had Captain Rice, who is so indisposed as to be unable to attend, been present it is not improbable that he would have voted for the Bill. It must be observed in answer to what the hon. Mr. Swabey has stated, that if parties interested in particular measures choose to absent themselves they must take the consequences if any unforseen accidental circumstances should occur as in the present instance, which might place those measures in a position different to that in which they had supposed them to have been when they took their departure: Nor could we have known that Mr. Dingwell would not have been in his place this day.

The Hon. the Attorney General. When I heard this morning the advantage that was intended to be taken with regard to the absence of the hon. Mr. Dingwell the indignation I felt I could not describe, and I move that there be a call of the House

The Hon. Mr. Swabey. I have often put off motions to accommodate parties but never have taken the advantage of the absence of any man.

The Hon. Mr. Holl. If you put it upon that ground, I at once move that the Bill be recommitted

The Hon. the Attorney General. As the question has now assumed a somewhat novel aspect and some temper has been exhibited, it would be better to postpone the further consideration of it until to-morrow.

Here the proceedings were abruptly brought to a close, it having been discovered that two of the members had suddenly absented themselves and thus left the house without a quorum

(To be continued)

THE EARTHQUAKE IN THE INDIAN ARCHIPELAGO.

The *Singapore Free Press* of the 17th of February contains the following further interesting particulars:—"In connexion with the earthquake which took place in Java on the morning of the 21st December last, we have been furnished with the following extract from the log of the ship A. J. Kerr, Captain Gardner, then on her way from Lombok to Singapore, from which it will be seen that a severe shock was experienced on board that vessel. The position of the ship at the time is given as being in lat. 9 48 South, and long. 103 15 East: 'December 21, 1852.—At 1 a. m. was awakened by a tremulous motion of the ship, my first impression being that she had struck on a reef. All hands were roused by it and much alarmed, the vessel trembling violently for about three minutes, when it subsided. Attributed it to the shock of an earthquake.' The following additional particulars regarding the fearful convulsions of nature which occurred at Banda, &c., in November and December last, are taken from the report of Captain Van Romer, of H. N. M.'s brig de Haai:—"At 7 o'clock in the morning of the 27th of November, had a shower of rain from the S. W.; at half-past 7 weather was fair, with light clouds and a fair breeze from the W.; the ship lay in six fathoms of water, with thirty-five fathoms of the larboard chain out, with the head to the E. S. E.; felt a vertical seaquake, with an undulating motion running from the S. E. to the N. W., the sensation was, as if the ship had been lifted up, the deck surged under our feet, and everything loose on board shook; this trembling lasted for two minutes (on shore five minutes). From the deck directing our eyes to the islands surrounding us (Banda, Neira, and Louthoir), we saw columns of dust rising up everywhere, arising from the destruction of buildings. At the moment of the earthquake, the barometer stood at 27.62, and the thermometer at 85 deg., thus denoting something unusual; Gunong Api gave out very little smoke. At eight I sent a boat to the shore with Midshipman der Berger, with a commission to the Resident to ascertain the result of the earthquake, and if I could be of any assistance. At ten minutes past eight noticed the water rise at once, but shortly thereafter, with a wave from the N. W., it ran out with an indescribable rapidity. The ship was then laid with her head to the N. W., and as the water ran out more and more, I let out chain to 19 fathoms, and when the water stopped falling, we found only 3¾ water on sounding; the reef was entirely uncovered at about a brig's distance from us. The water now rose with still greater rapidity than that with which it had fallen, and it was astonishing to see how it surmounted everything on the shore and threw back on the beach the 65 prahus which had been set adrift and thrown together by its falling. Between the commencement of the recess of the water and the moment when it reached the highest point, when we sounded in seven and a quarter fathoms, there was an interval of twenty minutes, and the water immediately ran out again with astonishing rapidity in a frightful wave, which carried away with it and destroyed everything. The vessel swung frightfully and rapidly; twenty minutes more elapsed, until the water reached its highest point, when we sounded in eight fathoms. The water having now risen higher, the wave was so much stronger and more terrible; it reached to the roof of the covered quay, under which a number of persons belonging to the prahus had sheltered themselves, but who were swept away by the wave and met their deaths; a number of prahus, large and small, were tossed over the quay and destroyed; the quay and that of the residency house were washed away. The fall of the water was now reckoned at 26 feet. Four times the water fell and rose in this frightful manner, always in the same direction and in the same interval of time. At half-past ten it began to abate, and for an hour more it took place at longer and longer intervals.'"

Life (!) in Australia.—The gold diggings in Australia must be a very pleasant place for the residence of a quiet family, if the following extract from an Australian letter published in the English papers be true:—

"Murders in the bush are said to be on the increase; but I think this is only because more bodies have been discovered. There always have been and there continues to be, many murders at the different diggings and in their vicinity which are never known. A murder is easy anywhere, in England or anywhere in the world; the difficulty is to dispose of the body. At the diggings especially among the isolated tents, and in the solitude of the bush, there is no further difficulty than that of digging an 'unprofitable' hole. The 'profit' being found out in the pocket of the deceased. A gentleman is seldom murdered; first, because he almost always makes a desperate resistance to the last drop; secondly, because he is sure to be inquired for and his murderers pursued, thirdly, because he is sober and not to be entrapped into drinking, more wary, active, armed, and better practised in the use of arms. They know that it is likely to be a very serious business to murder a gentleman. But, with the ordinary run of the working men diggers, especially if a single man, with no wife to cause any vigorous search or inquiry after him, what more easy than to make him drunk or catch him ready drunk at their hands, and then, if he has gold about him, he is sure to boast of it, and his murder often follows as a matter of course, and nobody ever hears anything of the matter."

Distance to the Sun.—Dicken's Household Words gives the reader a graphic idea of the distance of the sun from the earth, when it says:—"Imagine a railway from here to the sun. How many miles is the sun from us? Why if we were to put a baby in an express train, going incessantly a hundred miles an hour, without making any stoppages, the baby would grow to be a boy—the boy would grow to be a man—the man would die, without seeing the sun; for it is distant more than one hundred years from us. But what is this compared to Neptune's distance? Had Adam and Eve started by our railway to go from Neptune to the sun at the rate of fifty miles an hour they would not have got there yet, for Neptune is more than six thousand years from the centre of the system."