

that impression, his words were exceedingly strong, and were improper words to use before my constituents, with whom he has nothing to do, and to whom alone I am amenable. (Cheers.) The noble marquis might feel very strongly. So did I, and so does every man in this room, and it would have been base in me if I had said nothing, knowing that the sentiments I expressed were shared in by the great majority of the people of this country—and more than that, knowing they were shared in by some of the chiefest authorities in this country, as is proved by the fact that the very chiefest authority of the country has written to me approving of what I said, and stating that the conduct of Admiral Napier was most unaccountable. (Cheers.) But I must here utter my most indignant protest—and I am sure the protest will find a general echo—against the exertions which are being made by the gallant Admiral, whose failing intellect and shattered nerves make the effort even more deplorable, to lower the character of the British navy, the efficiency and discipline of the British sailors, by pandering to the power, and endeavouring to lend a helping hand to maintain the prestige, of him who was so recently our enemy. (Cheers.) I say that is conduct unworthy any man, and especially of one holding high rank in his country's service; and I am sure the noble marquis endorses this sentiment.

"The Marquis Townshend asked to be allowed one word of explanation. All he had said was, that he regretted a person holding the situation the hon. baronet did, should, in a public assembly, give utterance to things that ought to form the subject of a court-martial, and that he thought they came with a very bad grace from the hon. baronet, he being one of the Admiralty. He was ready to admit that Sir Charles Napier had, to a great extent, disappointed the country, though probably the country had expected too much; but a great deal too much had been already said, and he felt much for the painful position in which the gallant Admiral was placed. He (the noble marquis) was sorry Sir Robert had taken it in the way he had, and what he said was not intended to hurt his feelings.

"Viscount Raynham (son of the marquis) and the other member for the borough, next returned thanks for the honour done him.

"Sir Robert Peel then proposed "The health of the Marquis Townshend," and expressed his regret that there should have been cause for a momentary ebullition of feeling. What the noble marquis had said was accepted in thoroughly good part, though at the moment it had taken him by surprise.

"The Marquis Townshend made his acknowledgements in terms equally graceful. He had all along told Sir Charles Napier what a scrape he would get into through his eternal *cacoethes scribendi* and love of talking. (Laughter.)"

Sir Charles Napier has demanded of Lord Palmerston an investigation into his conduct, in consequence of the attacks of Sir Robert Peel, one of the Lords of the Admiralty, made in the presence of one of the Premier's colleagues. Lord Palmerston declines, and Sir Charles Napier replies, in a letter which he sends to the papers, apparently with a view of publishing the Premier's letter, setting it forth, paragraph by paragraph, in his rejoinder. These are given in inverted commas, but cannot be exact quotations, as he is made to address Sir Charles in the first person, speaking himself in the second. It would appear, however, that the noble Viscount has written to the gallant Admiral, saying he "had full reason to be satisfied" with Sir Charles' "judgment and discretion," and "estimated" (he does not say how) the services he had performed, and "highly respect the noble qualities" of which, in his professional career, the gallant Admiral had given such "frequent proofs;" but Lord Palmerston thinks such an investigation unnecessary, because he thinks the conduct of Sir Charles to have been judicious and proper, and to have been founded on a correct sense of public duty in the very responsible situation in which he was placed as Commander-in-Chief of the Baltic fleet. He has no doubt the gallant Admiral would have given a good account of either Cronstadt or the Russian fleet, but he was not in a condition to encounter the one after the other. His lordship, therefore, thinks "that in the then existing state of things, Sir Charles acted with sound judgment in refraining from attacking the batteries of Cronstadt with the fleet under his command; and that, in pursuing this course, he had performed the important and responsible duty which he had undertaken." So it is now and always has been the opinion of Lord Palmerston. This is exceedingly gratifying, but not sufficient. Sir Charles continues—

"I feel highly gratified that you entertain so high an opinion of my public services in general, and particularly of my conduct before Cronstadt. But I do not think, after what has passed, that even your good opinion will clear me in the eyes of the world.

"It was stated by Admiral Berkeley in 1856, that it was my fault Cronstadt was not destroyed."

"It has been stated at one public meeting, in presence of one of your colleagues, by Sir Robert Peel, another Lord of the Admiralty, that, 'had I done my duty, Cronstadt would have been crumbled into the dust.'

"This was confirmed at another public meeting, and it was stated by Sir R. Peel, that, 'what he had stated at Stafford was approved by the highest authority.' This has gone forth to the remotest corners of the earth.

"The 'highest authority' could not have been your lordship after what you have written to me. It could not have been her Majesty. Therefore I think the country has a right to know who this 'highest authority' is.

"Sir Robert Peel's opinion, my lord, on naval matters, is not worth much, nor, indeed, on any other. His want of judgment is proverbial, but his position gives him weight.

"The course he has pursued reflects little credit on your lordship's Government, and be assured, my lord, that he is not the Sampson to pull down the pillars of the State, and crush the Administration beneath its ruins.

"I therefore trust your lordship will reconsider your decision, and grant me the investigation I request.—I have, &c. CHARLES NAPIER.

"The Rt. Hon. Viscount Palmerston."

The following letters are appended:—

"Merchistoun, Dec. 7, 1856.

"My Lord—Since writing to your lordship on the 5th of December, I beg to send you a copy of the Grand Duke's reply, just received.

"It is for your lordship to judge whether a member of your lordship's Government, who has endeavored to ruin the reputation of an old officer, is fit to be one of his masters: and your lordship may, perhaps, be able to ascertain who the 'highest authority' is to whom Sir R. Peel alluded in his speech. I have, &c.

"CHAS. NAPIER.

"The Rt. Hon. Viscount Palmerston."

"Merchistoun, Oct. 29, 1856.

"Sir—I beg to send to your Imperial Highness a speech of Sir R. Peel, a Lord of the Admiralty, in which he accuses me of not doing my duty before Cronstadt.

"I also send your Highness my letter to him and two to Lord Palmerston.

"I think I have distinctly stated what passed between your Imperial Highness and myself relative to Cronstadt, which certainly does not agree with Sir R. Peel's statement.

"I shall make no apology to your Imperial Highness for writing to you. Your Highness is a frank open-hearted sailor. I therefore request you will be pleased to inform me whether I have correctly stated what passed between your Highness and myself when you honored me with an interview, and whether, as stated by Sir R. Peel, if I had attacked Cronstadt, I should have crumbled it to dust. I have the honor, &c.

"CHAS. NAPIER.

"His Imperial Highness the Grand-Duke Constantine."

"St. Petersburg, Nov. 25th, 1856.

"My dear Admiral—In answer to your letter of the 29th of October, I willingly affirm that you have quite exactly reported the conversation I had with you concerning Cronstadt.

"With respect to Sir R. Peel's statement, I consider it necessary to say that I spoke with him but once, viz., at his official presentation at Moscow; and that not a word concerning Cronstadt—not even the name itself—was mentioned by either of us. Yours affectionately,

"CONSTANTINE.

"Sir Charles Napier, Vice-Admiral."

We understand that Archdeacon Donison, acting on the advice of his counsel, Mr. Hugh Hill, Q.C., will apply to the Court of Queen's Bench at the commencement of next term for a *mandamus* to compel the Dean of Arches to entertain his appeal against the Bath Judgment.

Last night's *Gazette* announces the issuing of a *conge d'elire* empowering the Dean and Chapter of Ripon to proceed to the election of a Bishop, and recommending the Rev. Robert Dickersteth.

An Order in Council empowers the Ecclesiastical Commissioners to pay the sum of £2,500 per annum to the Bishop of Gloucester and his successors, in return for a certain portion of the manors, tithes, &c., belonging to his see.

The Earl of Ellmere, says the *Manchester Guardian*, is in a hopeless state; and it is said that he cannot survive many days, if even hours. His loss will be severely felt, and the more particularly so as his son and heir, Lord Brackley, has been for some time past a confirmed invalid.—[The London daily papers a few days back stated that the noble earl was recovering.]—*Guardian*.

Dr. Livingstone, the celebrated African traveller, is expected in London to-day. He arrived at Marseilles from Tunis on the 6th Dec., and was then in good health. His left arm is, however, broken and partly useless, it having been torn by a lion. When he was taken on board her Majesty's ship the *Felic*, on the Mozambique coast, he had great difficulty in speaking a sentence of English, having disused it so long while travelling in Africa. He had with him a native from the interior of Africa. This man, when he got to the Mauritius, was excited with the steamers and various wonders of civilization that he went mad, and jumped into the sea and was drowned.—Dr. Livingstone has been absent from England seventeen years. He crossed the great African continent almost in the centre, from west to east; has been where no civilised being has ever been before, and has made many notable discoveries of great value. He travelled in the twofold character of missionary and physician, having obtained a medical diploma. The injury to his arm was sustained in the desert while travelling with a friendly tribe of Africans. A herd of lions broke into their camp at night and carried off some of their cattle. The natives, in their alarm, believed that a neighbouring tribe had bewitched them. Livingstone taunted them with suffering their losses through cowardice, and they then turned out to face and hunt down the enemy. The doctor shot a lion, which dropped wounded. It afterwards sprang on him and caught him by the arm, and, after wounding two natives who drew it off him, it fell down dead. The wounded arm was not set properly, and Dr. Livingstone suffered excruciating agony in consequence.—*Guardian*, Dec. 10.

It is suggested that the British Arctic medal should be conferred on the United States crew bringing home the *Resolute* as a present from America. The *Times* urges that orders should be issued for the batteries to roar their loudest when the old ship heaves in sight.

A proposition has been made to raise the annual income of the Wesleyan Missionary Society to £150,000. It is suggested that each member of that body should give, as a minimum, a halfpenny a week, or 2s. 6d. per annum; then to find two persons who give a penny, or four who will give a halfpenny per week.

Some policies of assurance on the life of Sir John Dean Paul were sold at the Auction Mart last week; and in the course of the sale the auctioneer stated that the convicts were now at the Model Prison, Pentonville, and he had been informed, on what he believed undoubted authority, that they would not be sent out of the country, and no doubt would soon get a ticket of leave. Even policies of assurance were set up, and realised \$7,362.

Besides the reduction of duty upon tea, it has now been officially stated that the reduction on sugar and coffee will also take place for certain on the 6th of April next.

On Wednesday her Majesty held a Court and Privy Council. At the former the new Bishops of London and Durham had audience, and did homage. At the latter the Bishop of London was sworn in a member of the Board, and took his seat. Parliament was also then ordered to be prorogued once more till Tuesday, the 3rd of February, "then to meet for the despatch of business."

The most important news this morning is contained in a despatch from Naples, dated Dec. 8, announcing that at a review at noon on that day "while the troops were defiling, a soldier of the 3rd Battalion of Chasseurs rushed from the ranks and struck the King on the left side. The King was not wounded. The soldier was knocked down and seized by Colonel Latour. All is quiet in Sicily." A despatch in the *Post* says the soldier fired his carbine at the King, who was slightly wounded. The soldier was cut down on the spot. Naples is agitated.

The *Oesterreichische Correspondenz* says that "the bayonet of the soldier struck the King of Naples on the right side, above the waist."