

name of Gerard was everywhere pronounced—and his conduct was afterwards followed by other officers. But Gerard led the way—and aided therefore, in overturning that Government which had been imposed by foreign troops—and which had maintained itself against the sensibilities and wishes of a whole population. Yet though Gerard has died poor—though his widow has but an inadequate pension—and though to honour the Revolution of July, that widow was entitled to the protection and smiles of the Chamber—yet her pension was rejected by 170 against 63—and the pension of Daumesnil's relict in like manner refused by 145 against 104; while the pension of Jourdan was carried by 214 against 83—and that of Decaen by 190 against 86. You perceive then that Jourdan's widow, was dear to the Restoration, had her pension voted (justly I admit) by 213—Decaen's widow's pension (not offensive to the Restoration) voted by a few less, namely 190—Daumesnil's widow obnoxious to the Restoration, because her husband opposed the Allies and Louis the XVIII., refused by 145—and Gerard's widow who represented the Revolution of 1830, refused her pension by the greatest number, viz. by 170!!! Yes! yes! we are marching rapidly towards a *bond fide* Restoration.

The Electors are imitating their Deputies, as the Deputies are imitating the Ministers of the Royalty of 1830. It is essential, however, that you should understand that the electors in France are a small body, a very small body, only two hundred thousand out of thirty-three millions of souls. The electors, then, are not France—but they are *rentiers*, proprietors of landed and other property, are manufacturers and shopkeepers, and have a marked, a decided influence over those who depend on them as workmen, labourers, and apprentices. Well, then, it is a fact, and a fact which we would do ill to conceal, that the elections of Deputies during the past year have been Restoration elections. The men of July have been rejected. The men of the Doctrinaires have been accepted. "Order—Order"—has been the password at the Electoral colleges—and the Carlists and Royalists candidates have in very many cases been nearly elected. In 1830 and 1831, the disciples and agents of the old regime hid themselves in the vales of the rocks, and no darkness was too obscure for their suspicious fears and alarmed consciences. But now it is just the reverse, now a candidate who declares himself Carlist is far better received by the monopoly of electors than one who declares himself a Patriot; and if any one should dare to show "the Cross of July" at his breast, or the ribbon of the Cross in his button-hole, he would hardly find in many colleges an elector to name and another to second his nomination. The Royalist electors of 1831-32—and a portion of 1833—did not dare to go to the elections. They said, "We shall be laughed at, spit upon, and made a jest of—as belonging to an old and exploded faction; but now, the *Gazette*, the *Quotidienne*, and the almost innumerable Royalists prints in the Departments which have sprung up, counsel the Carlists to hasten to the ballot; and, in spite of the oath of allegiance required, to take that oath with a mental reserva-

tion, meaning all the time to insure the triumph of Henry the Fifth and Legitimacy.

Turn from electors to the National Guards—and they also are marching with rapidity towards a Restoration. The king of Belgium, because he is a Revolutionary King, or born of the Revolution of Brussels, was treated with neglect and contempt by the National Guards of Paris. The officers of the National Guards, elected by themselves, are no longer selected by the privates for their aptitude and military knowledge—but for their political opinions; and those who belong to the Revolution—who opposed the Restoration—who during the Jesuitical Government, remained in obscurity, preferring to eat their dry crust, and assuage their thirst with cold water, to serving a Government, and a family imposed on them by foreign troops—are now once more sent back to their retreats—are now looked upon as dangerous men, because they have served the Revolution—and are now supplanted by those who praise Louis the Eighteenth as the best Monarch France ever knew—and speak of the Restoration as the period of national glory, prosperity, and honour!!! The officers of the National Guards are now *en masse* (I know there are exceptions), all marching towards a Restoration!!! And then look at the Theatres!! pieces are there represented which in 1831 and 1832 would not, could not have been performed, for the people would have torn up the benches, and insulted, nay, attacked the actors—so manifest are the allusions to Legitimacy and the eldest branch of the House of Bourbon.—But now, Henry the Fifth appears really on the stage, and the boxes and galleries applaud the Restoration.

Look at the print-shops! Not a caricature of the eldest branch, but thousands of the Orleanist family! No purchasers of prints of the Citizen Royalty! but thousands sold of Henry the Fifth—the sister of the young Prince—his "good!!" mother—(what next?)—and even the Duke and Duchess of Angoulême are sold on the boulevards by hundreds—whilst for months you may perceive the likenesses of the family of the new monarchy neglected and unsold.

And then turn to the "music" and the "songs" of France in January 1834! Do we hear the *Marseillaise* and *Parisienne*? No, on the contrary, the licensed musicians in Paris are prohibited by the police from playing them, and even the little Savoyard lads, with their blind mice in their cages and their "hurdy gurdies" are commanded by Monsieur Gisquet not to sing or dance to any "but the genteelst of tunes!!!" or in other words, to abstain from all airs which are Revolutionary!!! So the songs which are published no longer contain any appeals for liberty, for Poland, for Italy, so fair and yet so enslaved; but the romances speak of "Henry" of the "absent" of the "proscribed" and no "gentlewoman" or "girl of expectations" would dare, in society, to sing an air, or utter words which were ever known to be popular with, or admired by the mass of the nation. Believe me, I am recording facts. I know what is passing in society. I neither live in a cellar nor a garret. I know what is doing in the salons of the capital, as well as in those of the provinces, and I tell

you that a "Man of the Barricades" a "Hero of July" one who had "taken any part in the Revolution of 1830" would be "scouted" from "genteel society," and might sue in vain for the hand of even the daughter of a captain of the National Guards.

I must close. I ought not to do so—but I must close. On some other day, when nothing of more immediate importance demands my notice, I will conclude my proofs: but in the meantime you will, I think, admit, that already I have made out a *prima facie* case—and that we are marching, and that with rapidity, towards a Restoration. I am, Sir, very obediently yours, O. P. Q.

**FEMALE PRECEDENCE.**—The order of precedence as it affects the daughters of Peers, has something very strange in it. It may not, perhaps, be generally known that unmarried daughters have always the same rank as their eldest brother, during the lifetime of the father; and this independent of the particular title which by courtesy the brother may bear. For instance, a Duke's eldest son ranks as a Marquess, consequently all his sisters unmarried have their rank of Marchioness, though he himself should be nominally but an Earl or Baron; for the title of Marquess being less ancient than the latter, is not the second title of the oldest and highest Dukes of the realm. The Duke of Norfolk's eldest son is only Earl of Surrey, and the Duke of Somerset's eldest son but Baron Seymour. Still their daughters would rank as Marchionesses till they married, and, under particular circumstances, even afterwards: which forms one of the strongest anomalies of all. For if a Duke had ten daughters, three of whom were to marry Earls, three Viscounts, three Barons; and the tenth and youngest should marry her father's footman, the latter would retain the rank of Marchioness, and go before all her eldest sisters, though every one of them be Peeresses. Let us suppose the youngest son a Duke, Lord Francis, should marry the daughter of a Duke, Lady Frances—being a commoner, his Lordship's rank, as the youngest son of a Duke, would be below a Viscount, while her Ladyship, continuing a Duke's daughter, might assume the rank of Marchioness; all depending upon the retention of a single letter, little *e* or *i*! If, after her marriage, her Ladyship should choose to call herself by the name of her Lord, Lady Francis, she would go below Viscountesses; if, which she would have a right to, she should retain her own name, and call herself Lady Frances, she would precede not only Viscountesses but Countesses. The confusion, however, might not stop here. Let us further suppose that His Majesty should be pleased to call the Noble Lord up to the House of Peers, by the title of Baron So-and-so—how strange would the state of things be now! By their elevation to the Peerage (for so it must be regarded), his Lordship would absolutely lose one step, and her Ladyship three, in order of precedence—

*Manual of Rank and Nobility.*

Frederick the Great, of Prussia, used to say that the French fight for glory, the Spaniards for religion, but the Irish are the only people in the world who fight for fun.