tion unless it was prepared to perform that duty. But the Lord Lieutenant and the Chief Secretary for Ireland confirmed every statement made, and sympathised deeply with the deputation, and then asked, "But you do not sympathise with us? (Laughter.) He considered the lives of honest men, who asked nothing more from the Government but protection from assassination in carrying on their affairs, more precious than the reputation of a statesman, and if members of the Government had made mistakes in the past, the sooner they came forward and made full confession, the easier would be the task of reparation. The hon gentleman proceeded to narrate the stringent acts of coercion passed by the Liberal Government of 1868, how for these the Conservatives substituted in 1874 a milder Act, and how the Liberals, despite all warnings, determined not to re-enact it when it recently expired, with the result which is now so lamentably apparent in Irish affairs. But there was one point in the Irish agitation on which plain speaking was necessary. The Prime Minister, in one of his unhappy speeches, stated that the disestablishment of the Irish Church would not have been possible, or have come within the range of practical politics, but for the outrageous attempt to blow up Clerkenwell Prison, and the shooting of some policemen. Though the right hon. gentleman would himself disclaim such a meaning, impression had got abroad in Ireland that deeds of violence would force the Government to pass a measure of confiscation for assisting the Irish peasant. The Government should at once make it perfectly clear that they would never consent to any such measure, and that those who thought by such deeds to carry out their wishes would find the only result to be still coercive legislation for Ireland. It was a distinct feature of the present agitation to drive out from Ireland "the English garrison," and it was the bounden duty of any Government, whatever its political constitution, to afford adequate protection to those who were the friends of the unity of the empire against those who would sever and dis-unite it. After a few remarks on the prospects of the Conservative cause, the hon. gentleman concluded amidst loud applause.

The Sandwich Commission.

On the resumption of this inquiry on Saturday, Samuel Loyns, draper, of Walmer, was called. He said that a day or two after he had promised his vote to Mr. Crompton-Roberts he received an order from that gentleman's committee for ribbons, &c.

The President: Sir Julian Goldsmid, in his evidence, says that you replied to him when he came to canvass you, "If you came to Walmer, I hope you will not forget the house of Loyns."

Witness: I simply told him that if he came to Walmer I should be very pleased to serve him. I was not exhibiting blue colours in any way at the time.

The President: Sir Julian says your children were wearing blue bows?

Witness: They were dressed as they always are.

The President: Sir Julian Goldsmid also states that a day or two afterwards you had an enormous Conservative flag out of your window, and red bills in your windows?

Witness: I had no bills, but shortly afterwards a flag was hung out of my window.

The President: Sir Julian Goldsmid suggested that you, having been a Liberal, changed your opinion and went Conservative because you had an order from Mr. Crompton-Roberts.

Witness: That is totally unfounded. My only order from Mr. Crompton-Roberts was one of about 5s. 6d.; but I supplied Conservative ribbon, &c., to the amount of upwards of £39.

Mr. R. Gillow, brewer, of Sandwich, said he gave Joseph Noure, foreman at the Oil Mills at Sandwich, £60. Witness asked Noure if he had twelve men on whom he could rely, and Noure replied that he had. Noure gave him to understand that they would want four or five pounds each, and he gave him £60. That was two or three days before the election. Mr. Edward Terry, of Sandwich, knew that witness was going to bribe. Witness expected to be repaid by Sir Julian Goldsmid, because he thought he would want to win. He also spent between £10 and £20 treating voters. He treated everyone he saw (laughter). To anybody whom he thought was going to vote Liberal he gave refreshments (Laughter).

R. S. Wyborn, brewer, of Sandwich, said he received £18 from Hughes, a grocer, with which to bribe. He gave four men £3 each, kept £4 himself, and returned the remainder. He also treated a little.

James Brett, builder, Sandwich, said he had £24 from Hughes, which he distributed among eight voters at the rate of £3 each. Witness received £11 more from Hughes, and spent it on refreshments.

George Simpson said he received £20 from Mr. E. Hill, brewer, and giving five persons £3 each, kept the remainder himself; he also had £1 from George Porter. On the day of the election he received £2 from somebody he did not know at the Fountain Hotel. The gentleman was sitting at a table paying voters as they went in.

Edwin Goldfinch said he received 15s. from Minter for showing blue colours on his premises. Minter knew he always supported the Liberal candidate, but if he (witness) had known they were going to have such a humbug as Sir Julian Goldsmid he should not have supported him this time. He "would give a plumper to throw him into the sea."

MONDAY, October 18th.

This inquiry was resumed at Deal on Monday for the twelfth time, Mr. W. H. Holl, Q.C., again presiding. The Commissioners have already examined fifty witnesses, each of whom had received money for his vote from one side or the other. None received less than £3, and many had £5 and £6 some receiving money from both sides. On Monday the first witness called was Mr. C. Goldfinch, who said that some time previous to the election he received £3 from Trollope, and a few days afterwards Mr. Lounds engaged a room at his house for £5.

J. Wilkins had £3 from the Conservatives for his vote, and made a quantity of flags and rosettes, for which he charged £6 15s., for Mr. Usher. That was a fair price.

W. H. Quested, a post messenger, said he received £6, "without asking." Mr. East gave him £3.

The President: What was that for?

Witness: I do not know—a gift, I suppose. He asked me if £3 would be any good to me, and I said, "Yes, I should think it would; it'll do me a lump of good" (Laughter).

Was not it for your vote, sir?—Perhaps it was. Witness further stated that he had £2 for two of his boys as messengers, and £1 "for walking the streets all night" (laughter).

The President said that in future they would refuse their certificate to any witness who prevaricated and trifled with the Commissioners as Quested had done.

William Brown said he received £3 from the Conservatives.

Ralph Mariner complained of being summoned a second time as a witness, and said he should expect to be paid for loss of time.

The President: If you will take money for your vote you must put up with the consequences, whatever they may be. You may think yourself lucky you are not in a worse position than you are.

Charles Patling, an accountant at Sandwich, said he received £7 10s. from Hughes, a grocer, expended in treating, and £5 from Olds for his services. He spent the £7 10s. amongst those he met. The President: You talked politics, and tried to make them vote Conservative?

Witness: I tried to make them vote right (Laughter).

W. Gambrill, at Sandwich man, had £3 from each side.

The President: Who did you vote for?—Witness: Well, that's a secret.

Oh, no, it is not.

Witness then said he voted for Mr. Crompton-Roberts.

T. Pearson had £3 for his vote from the Liberals and £1 for watching. He also had £3 from Brett.

The President: What was that for?

Witness: Brett said he had got plenty of money, and that I might as well have some (Laughter).

You took it?

Well, he forced it on me like (Laughter).

Some 50 Sandwich voters were then examined, nearly every one of whom confessed to having taken bribes from both sides, and several said they should like to have another job like it to-day.

Thereupon the President remarked that they ought to be ashamed of themselves for saying so.

Mr. Edward Terry, hop merchant, Sandwich and London, was called, and said he was asked to get his men at the mills to vote for Sir Julian Goldsmid. Witness spoke to his foreman, Norris, who said he thought he could get twelve of the men to vote for Sir Julian, and that they would want about £60 between them. Mr. Dillon then arranged for that sum to be provided for the men.

The President: You were aware of that being done.

Witness: Yes. I saw it pass. I should not have taken any interest in the election at all but for the fact of Sir Julian Goldsmid being a very mean and unpopular man. (Slight applause.)

Several of the witnesses subsequently examined were bribed by Joe Brown and Jack Elliott, the former for the Liberals, the latter for the Conservatives, both of whom had decamped, and were supposed to be in America.

Edward Redsell said he received "two threes." (Laughter.)

The President: Was that £3 from each side?

Witness: Yes. To vote for both candidates—I knew I could only vote for one.

But you took money from each side?

I did. (Laughter.)

At least a score of other witnesses made similar confessions, many of them in the most unblushing manner.

W. T. Hookham had £3 from Spears (Conservative) for a committee room. He found a neighbour had let a room to Sir Julian Goldsmid, so he thought he should like to have a committee room at his house. (Laughter.) His neighbour promised to bring Sir Julian to see the room, but meanwhile witness fell in with Spears. (Laughter.) Afterwards Sir Julian came, and was in a "great passion" because the room had been let. Mr. W. H. James, M.P., also came about the room, and when Mrs. Hookham said her husband was a Conservative Mr. James said "A bad job for him." Witness denied that the hiring of his room was for his vote, but admitted that the room was very little used.

W. Sharp said he had three separate sums of £3, two from the Liberal, and one from the Conservative. (Laughter.)

The President: We have already ticked you off twice, and now we will put a third tick to your name. You are not likely to come again, I suppose?

Witness: I think not. (Laughter.)

W. Nicholas, publican, had £18 from Mr. Evans to distribute to voters, £6 for canvassing, and £5 for a committee room. He was to use his influence on the Conservative side.

H. D. Axon, mariner, had £29 from Rose (Liberal) for himself and his boat's crew. They were down in the west of England, and found a letter there asking them to come home and vote. It cost them £9 for travelling expenses. Witness said the money they had was for detention at home, and no amount was specified. He did not know how the £29 was arrived at.

From the evidence of a large number of voters examined it appeared that Messrs. Ralph and Watts (Conservative and Liberal respectively) kept time remarkably well, each bribing the same men. Ralph, however, was more prompt than Watts in "paying up," and thus succeeded in securing the votes for Mr. Crompton-Roberts. Watts's bribes were paid after the men had voted.

The inquiry was again adjourned.

TUESDAY, October 19th.

The Commissioners resumed this inquiry on Tuesday in the Town Hall, Deal.

Joseph Lee, ironmonger, Sandwich, stated that on the morning of the election Lock gave one of his brothers a packet containing £9. His brother brought it to witness, saying he did not know what to do with it, and their elder brother coming in just then, they gave it to him, as he said it would do him a great deal of good.

George Goodban, labourer, received £3 from East (Conservative) and £5 from Joseph Noure (Liberal).

George Ellis East received £3 from East and £2 2s. from Slaughter for acting as personating agent on the polling day.

Mr. Jeune: Did you know that a person employed as a personation agent had no right to vote?

Witness: No, Sir; I was not aware that that was the case, and no one told me it was illegal.

Charles Long, labourer, of Sandwich, also had £3 from Locke, and £5 from Benjamin Parker, publican, to induce him to vote for the Blues (Liberals).

William Edward Eppe, a freeman of Sandwich, had £6 from Locke—£3 for himself and a similar amount for his father. Witness also had £5 from a person whom he thought was Baker.

The President: At the trial of the election petition you were called and asked whether you received any money from any one at all. You replied in the negative. Then that is untrue?

Witness: No, Sir. I was not asked that question at all.

The President: But we have the shorthand writer's book before us. You were asked whether you received any money from Hooper, and you replied that you had not. To the next question, "Or from Mr. George Locke?" you replied, "No, sir; I had nothing to do with it whatever." You were also asked, "Did you get any money at all from anybody?" and replied, "No, none whatever."

Being pressed, the witness said that George Lock told him to keep back the information.

The President: Are you quite sure that nobody else asked you not to tell the petition judges of your having received money.

Witness: Well, I think George Hooper spoke to me about it, but I really cannot recollect what he said. I believed he asked me if I had received a subpœna, and I replied "Yes." I am certain that he did not tell me not to tell the judges about my having received money for my vote.

Thos. Epps, father of the last witness, stated that he gave evidence on the petition trial. Witness then denied that he had ever received a penny for his vote. That was true. He did not have the £3 from Lock. Besides, if he had, he could vote either way he liked. He had voted for 60 years for the Liberals. When two candidates offered themselves he gave each of them one vote. His son never asked him which way he was going to vote, and witness at first decided not to vote at all.

The President: When you got the money you changed your mind?

Witness: Yes, sir. (Laughter.) I voted for Mr. Crompton-Roberts.

The President, in dismissing the witness, told him he did not consider that his evidence at the trial of the petition was as straightforward as it should have been.

George Lock was re-called.

The President: Now you have heard what William Edward Epps says, that it was at your request that he denied having any money at the trial of the election petition?

Witness: Yes, sir. I heard what he said. It was not at my request that he did so. Why should I?

Mr. Turner: But did you.

Witness: No, sir.

The President: We can easily imagine why you should. Then what he stated is untrue?

Witness: It is quite untrue. It would be no benefit to me to advise the man to do so.

An army pensioner, named Knowler, belonging to Sandwich, deposed that he received £3 from Hooper for his vote. He was one of the witnesses examined at the trial of the election petition. He then denied that he had had anything given him for his vote. He did so because he did not want to injure the man.

Mr. Turner: What man?

Witness: Mr. Crompton-Roberts. Nobody asked him not to say that he had received money. Witness was quite sure of that. Nobody said anything to him about it.

Marie Henry Read had £3, which he believed came from Hughes, and £5 from Noure.

Thos. Langley, Sandwich, received £9 from Hughes. He kept £3, and gave each of his two brothers £3.

James John Wood had £5 from Noure (Liberal), and £3 from Hughes.

A butcher, of Sandwich, named Mantle, had £3 from Hughes, and £4 from Mr. Henry Baker.

William Thomas Port received £3 from Hughes, £1 from Coleman, and £3 from Rea.

Henry John Ellis received £3 from Hughes, and was promised £2 more if Mr. Crompton-Roberts was returned, but did not get it.

A large number of persons of the lower class of voters belonging to Sandwich, who had received bribes, having been examined,

The Court adjourned till Wednesday.

WEDNESDAY, October 20th.

The Commission was resumed for the fourteenth time.

The first witness called was Mr. Edwin Hills, of Deal, who stated that he was the principal brewer in the town. Witness owned between thirty and forty public-houses, the larger portion of which were situated in Deal, some in Walmer, and others in Sandwich. As soon as Sir Julian Goldsmid came down, about a week before the polling, witness began canvassing. The first thing voters asked when he spoke to them about their votes was what he would give them. There was scarcely an exception. Almost everyone asked for money. He first heard that anybody was paying, or preparing to pay, money in bribery on the Friday or Saturday previous to the election. The only person witness knew of as being engaged in bribing voters was Outwin. Witness had spoken to Outwin about spending money. He could not get votes without money. Nobody suggested to him that he should expend money in bribery. He did not commence bribing until the morning of the election. Witness expended about £40 in bribery, and also spent about £7 in treating. The whole of it was his own money. Several of the men witness paid subsequent to the election. He gave a man named Simpson £20 to give to voters.

Mr. Edmund Brown, of Deal, said he was expenses agent for the Liberal candidate in May last. Witness examined the accounts, but none of the money passed through his hands. The accounts were handed in to witness in the month of September last. He did not know until some weeks after the election that he had been appointed expenses agent. Witness did not know that it was illegal for any money to be spent unless it went through the hands of an election agent. He had on several occasions acted as expenses agent to oblige Mr. Emmerson. He went through the accounts with Mr. Emmerson at that gentleman's office, and Mr. Emmerson told him that there were some claims which he believed referred to rosettes and colours which he would not ask him to sanction.

The President: But did you not know that by Act of Parliament you were bound, as expenses agent, to return all moneys in connection with the election?

The witness said he was not aware of that. He relied entirely upon the advice given him by the agents of the party—namely, Mr. Emmerson and Mr. Edwards. He expected that they, being experienced solicitors, would advise him what to do. He simply passed by those accounts which he thought illegal, and made no order in respect of them. He was not aware that he was bound to take any notice of them. Witness acted in exactly the same way at former elections.

Mr. Edwards was recalled. He stated that he acted as agent for the Liberal candidate at the general election in 1880 for Deal. The returned expenditure included all claims of which he was aware. It was rumoured that several hundreds of pounds came down, and were expended illegally, but witness did not believe that was true; he knew nothing of it.

Mr. Henry Minter Baker, of Dover, said he, being a voter, went to Sandwich on the polling day. He saw Coleman there and said to him, "I suppose if I spend a little money I shall get it back again?" Coleman replied in the affirmative, and witness subsequently spent about £10 which he had in his pocket in bribing. When he had expended that he went to a friend of his, a resident at Sandwich, and borrowed £30. He gave a number of men sums of money varying from £3 to £5. The little money witness did not expend in bribery he expended in treating.

Mr. Emmerson was called. He said he was election agent for Sandwich at the last unopposed election. He did not know that any other money than the returned expenses was spent on that occasion. He wished to correct a statement he made the other day. He was asked whether the 1874 election was a pure election or not, and being under the impression that the question related to the unopposed election of 1880 he replied in the affirmative. Questioned as to when the money was brought down from Rochester by Mr. Ford, witness said he believed it was on the Friday previous to the election; it could not, he thought, have been on Saturday, as stated by Sir Julian Goldsmid, as that was the day of nomination. It was witness's impression also that Sir Julian Goldsmid was labouring under a mistake when he said he told Mr. Edwards that the money was coming. He believed Sir Julian Goldsmid told witness, and not Mr. Edwards. He was almost certain that was the case.

Richard Baker stated that when Hughes offered him money he refused to accept it, but his wife took it. Witness told her to take it back, but she did not do so.

The President told the witness he did not think that he had been as candid with the Commissioners as he should have been. When he was examined before he denied that he had received any money.

Witness: Then I am to be considered as having received the bribe?

The President: We will consider what is to be done with you and your certificate. You can go, but you certainly will not get your expenses (laughter).

Samuel Olds was recalled, and questioned by the President relative to the bag of gold which he received at the time of the election.

The President: When you were examined before you told us you thought that the bag contained £1000. Now you must know there was more money than that, because, according to your own statement, you have spent £1224 besides the £480 which you sent to Sandwich.

The witness replied that he said £1000 because he was under the impression that the person who brought it to him said there was that amount of money in it. He had no chance of counting it. He had not the slightest conception who the man was that brought the money.

Frederick Baker, Ramsgate, deposed to having received £6 from Hughes; £3 was for himself and the remainder for his brother, Richard Baker. His brother would not accept the money, but witness gave it to his wife.

Edward Griggs, mariner, Deal, said he received £108 from Olds to distribute. Among others he gave 36 men £3 each.

A publican, named Griggs, stated that he received £5 from Olds in payment for a room in his house, which was hired as a Conservative committee-room. He also received £3 from Edward Griggs, his brother, for his vote. His room was not used at all. (Laughter.)

Several more voters, a great many of whom belonged to Ramsgate, who had received bribes were also called, and the Court adjourned.

THURSDAY, October 21st.

This inquiry was resumed on Thursday.

Several Sandwich men acknowledged receiving money for their votes—some from both sides.

The Commission was opened on the 5th of October, and has sat day by day ever since. There have been nearly 1000 witnesses examined, and for some six or seven days as many as 120 have been taken at each sitting. Contrary to the practice pursued at some of the other inquiries, the Commissioners have refused to allow the expenses of any witnesses except those who have been improperly summoned. In consequence of this decision, the cost of the inquiry to the ratepayers will be considerably less than had been anticipated; but even then the burden will be sufficiently heavy to cause the inhabitants of the united boroughs to remember for a long time the Commission of Inquiry into the deep-seated political corruption of the constituency.

DEATH OF A CHILD FROM WANT AND NEGLECT.

An inquest was held at the Guildhall, Deal, on Monday afternoon, before Geo. Mercer, Esq., the Borough Coroner, and a jury of seventeen ratepayers, of which Mr. Frederick Augustus Chennell was foreman, to inquire into the circumstances which led to the death of Eliza Minter, aged five years, the illegitimate daughter of Rebecca Minter.

It appeared from the evidence adduced that in February, 1876, the child was born in the Union Workhouse at Eastry. When about five weeks old the mother brought the child to Deal. Since that time until the day of its death, which took place on Sunday morning, the child was in the custody of its grandmother.

The grandmother, who is 63 years of age, in her evidence said that the child was always weakly. About a fortnight ago she discovered that the child's head was found to be covered in vermin. She washed the child's body, but not its head. Did not consult a medical man, although the child got weaker every day. The mother had not visited the child for about a twelve-month, and had only contributed 1s. 6d. towards its maintenance, but had sent some clothes for her. The grandmother was quite impoverished, but had been supported by her son, aged 20 years, who is a labourer in a brick-field at Walmer. On Saturday evening the child got worse, and the grandmother sent to Mr. Clarabut, dispensing chemist, for some cordial, which was supplied, and some of which was administered to the child, who died at an early hour on Sunday morning.

Dr. Mason saw the child after it was dead; and in his evidence he said he found the child in a most emaciated condition in a very dirty room. Consequently he refused to give a certificate of death; when the police authorities were communicated with, and hence the present enquiry. The child, which was five years of age, was in a dreadful state and weighed only 17¼lbs. He found it necessary to have some part of its body washed before he could examine it. It was removed to a store in the wood yard hired by the Council for such purposes, where he made a *post-mortem* examination. He found that a great portion of the hair was off the scalp, and what portion of the locks remained perfectly heaved with a mass of vermin. The left hand had evidently been broken, and had not been reset by a medical practitioner. There were no external marks of violence. On opening the body he found that the child had not been properly fed. The intestines were empty with the exception of gas. He had weighed the body and found it weighed only 17¼lbs. His opinion was that the deceased had not had sufficient food of the proper character.

The mother of the child was in Court, and said she was servant at Prebble's Temperance Hotel, Ramsgate, and received 3s. a week as wages. She was very reluctant to give her evidence, stating that she could not remember. She said she could not afford to bury her child, and was referred to the Relieving Officer. She had been in Chartham Asylum nearly two years, and had been out about a twelve-month.

The Coroner having summed up the evidence, pointed out to the jury the law bearing upon the liability of persons in charge of young children, and stated that the grandmother of the deceased, the child being illegitimate, was not legally responsible for its maintenance and due care, and could not, therefore, be held liable for the consequences of any breach, even if the jury were satisfied there had been such breach. That the case was one of a distressing character, and that no doubt the death arose from the weak condition of the child from its birth, accelerated by want and neglect. That the grandmother herself was in poor circumstances, dependent entirely on her son, her husband being in the Union.

The Jury were unanimous in a verdict to the effect that the child died from natural causes, accelerated by neglect and want.

Will of the Late Mr. Peter Marten.—The will (dated November 3, 1864), with three codicils (dated April 9 and November 15, 1875, and June 13, 1878) of Mr. Peter Marten formerly of Chilham, Kent, and Beach-house, Deal, but late of Bridge-street, Canterbury, who died on June 29th last, was proved on the 23th ult. by Mrs. Benedicta Marten, the widow, and John Marten, and Peter Lonbert Marten, the sons, the executors, the personal estate being sworn under £35,000. The testator leaves to his wife £150 and his household furniture and effects absolutely, his residence at Canterbury, and the rents of his freehold property at Canterbury and Littlebourne for life, and an annuity of £300 during life or widowhood. There is a bequest in favour of his bailiff, William Coulthup; and the residue of his real and personal estate he gives to all his children by his present and former marriages in equal shares.

The Municipal Elections.—The following gentlemen have been nominated—for the North Ward: James Robert Lush, Richard Gibbons, John Watson Eastes, and George Coombs Haines. For the South Ward: Alfred Edwards Ralph, William Henry Hayman, John Ernest Wellard, and John Thomas Ostwin.

Killed in a Threshing Machine.—On Friday last a man named George Wilson, aged 53 years, of Custom House Lane, Deal, was engaged in threshing wheat at Sholden, on the premises of Mr. George Hooper, when by some means which have not been elucidated, he fell into the machine and was killed. He was removed as quickly as possible to the "Sportsman Inn." An inquest on the body was held on Monday before Mr. Deputy Coroner Johnson, when a verdict of "accidental death" was returned.

Deal and Sandwich Teachers' Association.—At the annual meeting of the Deal and Sandwich Teachers' Association, held in the Central Schools, Deal, the secretary read his report, which showed that the Association was well supported by several influential ladies and gentlemen, who took an interest in the teachers and their work. The President, Mr. Mugford, Wesleyan School, Deal, then addressed the meeting, maintaining that the code was worked in such an exacting manner that it forced the teacher to work for high percentages and results, and left no time to inculcate those moral principles which are indispensable in order to make the children good and useful men and women in after life. He spoke in favour of retaining Schedule IV., and deprecated the practice which is much resorted to by some teachers of working their scholars after school hours, that they may obtain good results.—Messrs. Jolliffe and Denigan discussed the addresses.—The officers for the ensuing year having been elected, the meeting considered the recommendation for the remodelling by the executive of the N.O.E.T., the executive being informed that the Government probaby intend to make some important alterations of the code during the next few months. The members subsequently adjourned to the tea table, and were joined by the Misses Edwards, of Deal, and Dr. Bruce-Payne.

The Walmer Readings.—The first of the Winter Readings at the Theatre, Walmer, was given on Tuesday, and was exceedingly successful. The singing was very good, and the readings decidedly so. Sergeant Bocock read with his usual marked ability, and Sergeant Arnold provoked a deal of laughter by the story of the Frenchman whose whole theme was "I vant to fly." The handbells manipulated by Sergeants Dow, Miller, Johnston, and Butterworth, were a novel and interesting feature of the programme, and the *encore* vouchsafed to the ringers expressed an applause well deserved. "Poor Thomas Day" was a laughable round, made more amusing by the singers (Messrs. Botting, Davies and Johnson) appearing in the garb of old women; the house made a unanimous demand for another appearance, and "Chairs to mend," another round of similar style, was given by the trio. Sergeant Johnson's song "Jack's Yarn," offered a capital chorus for the men, and all joined in it heartily. Sergeant Davies sang two songs of serio-comic character in very effective style. The second part of the programme consisted of a laughable farce entitled "Peace and Quiet," in which the characters were represented by Messrs. Botting, Bocock, Holland, and Coulter, Mrs. Brown, Mrs. Waller, and Mrs. Nisbett, taking the female parts. The nervous fidgety old gentleman, Mr. Twitterly Fluttersome, was thoroughly interpreted in the acting of Mr. Botting, while the opposite character—a noisy, musical individual who plays on the cornet, was accurately rendered by Sergt. Bocock. Indeed the acting of the whole of the performers in this farce was without a fault. It is a most amusing dramatic sketch, and just of the kind to be selected by amateurs. A similar entertainment is announced for next Tuesday.

The Lord Chancellor has appointed Mr. Thomas Viney Brown to be a magistrate for Dover.

Tourist Notes.—We extract the following from "The Free and Open Church Advocate":—Thanet, &c.: St. Andrew's, Deal.—Open seats, appropriated; free seats at west end of church, under gallery, and four last in centre aisle at the west end; also in S. chapel. A. & M. Daily service, choral and hearty. Open all day. Sholden.—Church locked; could not find out where keys kept. Mongeham—Pretty restored church, restored; open seats, appropriated. Minster.—Large fine church, restored; open seats, all appropriated. Very old box, with hole for "Peter's pence"; cover and chain of old lectern Bible, &c. Had to find woman and pay her for seeing over the church, which is kept locked. Sandwich (Old) Church.—Very large and beautiful, most carefully restored, and well kept. Partly open seats and partly chairs; former appropriated. Not always open; keys close by. Interesting parish register dating from 1590. St. Martin's Canterbury.—Most carefully restored and kept. Open seats, appropriated. A. & M. Not open all day. (N.B.—Hardly a single church in Canterbury is open all day).

Births, Marriages, and Deaths.

BIRTHS.

Deal—October 11, at 14½, Coppen-street, the wife of William Budd, jun., of a son.

Ramsgate—October 15, at 19, Artillery-road, the wife of T. Lawrence, of a daughter.

MARRIAGES.

Ramsgate—October 16, at St. George's Church, by the Rev. E. Ball, Alfred Mills, to Rose Daile, both of Ramsgate.

DEATHS.

Deal—October 22, at the "Eagle Inn," Stephen Pritchard, aged 56 years.

Walmer—October 18, William, infant son of George Easton, aged 5 months.

Deal—October 18, at 16, Gladstone-road, Frances, widow of Silvester Eastes, aged 89 years.

Ramsgate—October 13, Arthur Chittenden Lucas, aged 1 year.

Ramsgate—October 14, at 14, West Cliffe-road, Mary, the wife of E. Haynes, aged 78 years.

To the President of a Conservative Club, on being asked to Stand as a Parliamentary Candidate for a Borough.—Ex *Punch*, 23/10/80

My Dear Sir,

Who the deuce are you? However, passing over that question for the present, I beg to assure you that you have about as much right to ask me to stand as a candidate as you have to make the same request of the Prince of Darkness himself. But I *will* stand, and you can consider your corrupt little hole-and-corner borough honoured by my consenting to represent it. Mind, if I don't get in, I'll bring down a Commission, and disfranchise the place. You are far too corrupt to deserve a representative; but if you return me triumphantly, why "dence tak it!" I'll say no more about *that*.—N.B.—Not more than £50 a head for watching poles. That ought to bring me in at the *head of the poll*. Do you see the joke, stupid?—Yours devotedly, ——

HERNE BAY.

The Mutilation of an Infant.—On Thursday last, before J. W. Z. Wright, Esq., at the County Magistrates' Office, Canterbury, the woman, Elizabeth Greenwood, a domestic servant, aged 24, was brought up on a charge of concealing the birth of her male child at Herne Bay on the 27th September. The prisoner had been in the service of a Mrs. Hutchinson, a lady residing at Richmond in Surrey, and had been with the family at Herne Bay. She was left behind on the 27th September to send off the luggage and to hand over the charge of the house to Mr. Hogbin, house-agent. James Chapman, porter in Mr. Hogbin's employ, went to the house in the afternoon to go through the inventory of the goods with the prisoner. On going into the servants' bedroom, Chapman observed signs which aroused his suspicions and he informed his master of what he had seen. Mr. Hogbin went to the house and found that a knife was missing. He asked the prisoner where it was, and she said it was somewhere about. Search being made it was discovered in a closet. The accused appeared ill and asked Chapman to do up a bundle for her. The parcel did not appear, in Chapman's opinion, to contain clothes. Prisoner subsequently went off by train taking her box with her, and shortly after her departure Instructing-constable Page, K.C.C., was communicated with. He visited the house, and on the following day went to Cardigan villas, Richmond, where he found the prisoner. He searched her box and found the headless body of a new-born child. Prisoner at first told the constable on his remarking that she appeared ill, that she had met with an accident on going to the railway station at Herne Bay, the wheel of the omnibus coming off and the 'bus being turned over. Afterwards, however, when the body of the infant had been discovered, she said that the head would be found in the grate in the house at Herne Bay where she had been staying, and she admitted that she had cut the head off the body of the infant. Page on his return to Herne Bay searched the house and found the head of an infant in the kitchen grate where the plaintiff said it was. The plaintiff had been in Richmond hospital since, and having recovered she was brought to Canterbury and charged as above stated. The coroner's inquest, held at Richmond, resulted in a verdict that there was no evidence to show that the infant had a separate existence.—Prisoner, who was defended by Mr. Lay, of Richmond, was committed for trial at the next Assizes.

ASHFORD.

A Boy Plunderer.—A boy named John Noakes between 12 and 13 years of age, was taken into custody on Saturday, and remanded, charged with breaking into the stores of Mr. Rabson, general merchant. The prisoner was seen getting over a wall surrounding the stores, with a sack, early in the morning, and it was subsequently found that the premises had been entered in the rear, and a quantity of horsehair and rags stolen. The prisoner had disposed of the hair at Mr. Ashbee's stores, and the rags he had "planted" in a dry ditch. It was ascertained that he had, on two previous occasions, within about a week, disposed of articles for which he received nearly a pound. About a month ago, he, with other boys, was fined for a depredation at Kennington.

DOVER.

Generous Benefactions.—Legacies have been left by the late Mrs. Susan Gorery, of Maison Dieu, to the following charities:—To the Margate Seabathing Infirmary, £5,000; the Dover Hospital, £1,000; the Dover Sailors' Home £1,000; the Dover Orphanage, £500; the National Refuge for Homeless and Destitute Boys, Bloomsbury and St. Giles's, £3,000; the Hospital for Diseases of the Throat, Golden-square, London, £500; the Kent County Ophthalmic Hospital, £1,000; the Corporation of the Sons of the Clergy, £3,000; King's College Hospital, £5,000; the Kent and Canterbury Hospital, 2,000; the Church Missionary Society, £2,000; and to the Ragged School Union, £2,000; To the incumbents of St. James's, Dover; St. Mary's. Dover; Charlton, Dover, Christ Church, Dover; and of Trinity Church, Dover, £500 each, to be applied towards the education of poor children in their respective parishes.

EASTRY.

On Thursday morning as Mr. Wilson, of Statenborough, was passing Cross Farm, near the Union, in the occupation of Mr. W. Pittock, he discovered a large fodder stack to be on fire. He gave the alarm, and steps were at once taken to prevent the fire spreading to the adjoining stacks and farm buildings. The fire engine and brigade at Sandwich were telegraphed for and were quickly on the spot, but the fire had obtained such a hold that it was some time before it could be subdued; and even then it was considered to be unsafe, and the brigade, with their engine, remained on the spot all night. The fire was caused through the overheating of the stack. The amount of damage done is estimated at £200, but this, we understand, is covered by insurance.

ARMY CONTRACTS.

TENDERS will be received at the under-mentioned Office, until 12 o'Clock Noon, on the 28th October, for the supply of

BREAD AND MEAT

For the use of Her Majesty's Land Forces (including Bread and Meat for Hospitals and Military Prisons, where required) from 1st December, 1880, to 31st May, 1881, at the following places:

SOUTH EASTERN DISTRICT.

1. Blatchington Battery, and Newhaven.
2. Brighton.
3. Canterbury.
4. Chichester.
5. Dover.
6. Dungeness and Batteries.
7. Eastbourne and Langley Fort, with adjoining Towers.
8. Fort Montcrieff and Dymchurch Redoubt.
9. Littlehampton.
10. Maidstone.
11. Rye Battery and Tower 28.
12. Shoreham Redoubt.

BREAD AND MEAT.

FLOUR, LIVE CATTLE AND SHEEP.

13. Shorncliffe.

Forms of Tender, and Conditions of Contract, may be obtained on application at this Office, by Letter addressed to the Senior Commissariat Officer, or in person between the hours of 10 and 4 o'clock, and no Tender will be entertained unless made upon the Form so obtained.

Tenders must be properly filled up, signed, and dated, and no Tender will be noticed unless delivered at the undermentioned Office, before 12 o'clock Noon on the 28th October, under closed envelope, marked "Tender" on the outside.

Commissariat Office,
10, Esplanade, Dover,
9th October, 1880.

EASTRY UNION.
PARISH OF NORTHBOURNE.

NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN, that at a meeting of the Guardians to be holden on the 9th November next the Board will appoint a Collector of Poor-rates and Assistant Overseer for the Parish of Northbourne.

Candidates must be competent to keep the books and accounts and discharge the duties prescribed by the Orders of the Local Government Board.

The person appointed will receive a poundage upon the amounts collected, and will also be paid a salary of £5 per annum as Assistant Overseer. He will be required to enter into a Bond (with two Sureties) in a sum to be fixed by the Guardians for the faithful performance of the duties of the office.

Applications, with Testimonials, to be sent to me on or before the 1st day of November next.

FRED. S. CLOKE,
Clerk to the Guardians.

Sandwich,
October 19th, 1880.

Image © THE BRITISH LIBRARY BOARD. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED