The Friendly Societies (Quinquennial Returns) Bill, now passed through Committee, was read a second time and passed.

The Consolidated (No. 4) Bill was read a third time and passed.

THE SUEZ CANAL.

Sir. W. H. SMITH.—Before the sitting is suspended I wish to put a question to the Government. There is a rumour current that the Suez Canal is shaped, I suppose, passing through. I wish to know whether the Admiralty have any information with regard to it, and also, whether they have any information with regard to the reported boring of the ship Gleghorn? (hear, hear.)

Mr. CAMPBELL-BANNERMAN.—No such information reached the Admiralty, that to which the right hon. gentleman has alluded—to the effect that I think, a report of a boring machine in the Gleghorn, I obtained at two o'clock that we had been informed on good authority—in fact, the information came from the owners of the vessel—that the passage through the Canal. Since that time the owners have sent to the Admiralty to say they are not sure that she has passed through the Canal. I am bound, however, to say I am not fully satisfied that it is generally believed she has passed through. There the matter stands at present. I'll hear anything at a later period of the evening. I will let it be known if I can.

The sitting was suspended at Five minutes to Seven o'clock.

The House resumed at Nine o'clock, and went immediately into Committee of Supply on the

ARREARS (IRELAND) BILL.

The discussion on Mr. Healy's Amendment, which had been interrupted by the suspension of the sitting at Seven o'clock, was continued by Mr. BUTAPER, who opposed the Amendment, and by the SOLICITOR GENERAL for IRELAND, who contended that the principle of the Amendment was not an unreasonable one, modified by the Amendment which the Attorn ey General for Ireland had suggested.

Mr. HEALY had no objection to withdraw his Amendment, that to the effect of the Amendment as the suggested by the Attorney General for Ireland.

Mr. O'LEARY, so far as he understood the purport of the Clause which the Attorney General for Ireland was to bring up on Report, he could imagine a case in which it would be operative.

The Amendment was then withdrawn.

Mr. PARNELL moved to insert a new paragraph in the Clause, to which he (Mr. Parnell) thought it was evident from a holding to which the Act extended, for little purpose if not since the 1st May, 1880, to apply to the land Commission for an order enlarging the time during which the tenant might pay his arrears, and as the Commissioners being satisfied that the holding in question was at the date of such application unable to so tenancy evaded since the eviction took place, they might extend such order and afterwards a further order under the First Section of the Act, in such cases as if the tenant had been evicted. T hon. member pointed out that the evicted tenant was in a worse position than the ten ancy is ag in the neighbourhood of their former holdings, and that it was wrong, therefore, to deny them and, therefore, he hoped the Government would consider the matter, and, if conciliation compromise.

Mr. CHILDERS said this being a case where the Crown was absolutely cut off from his holding the Government could not accept the Amendment.

Mr. SHAW said that the hon. member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) would consent to insert in his Amendment that such sum of money as might be applied for with the consent of the landlord, then he could not see why the Government should not accept it. He knew that many cases the landlords would be glad to get their tenants back.

Mr. D. DICKSON stated whether it was a wise or politic thing to keep 6000 families out of their holdings in view of the fact that a very stringent Coercion Bill had been passed for Ireland. He thought the Government would do well to accept the Amendment on the Coercion Bill, and that the tenant would and that the landlord was willing to reinstate the ten ant.

Mr. CHILDERS said the Government had not shown him more than ever the necessity for adhering to the determination had to resist the Amendment.

Mr. PARNELL hoped that the Government would, before the report, consider the mans of in chasing the landlords to act on the voluntary part of the Bill.

The Amendment was negatived, and Clause 2 was agreed to, as was also Clause 3.

On Clause 4,

Mr. J. LOWTHER (in the absence of Sir M. Hilby) moved an Amendment, providing that the Commissioners should, of their own motion, and should on the application of any party to any proceeding, in Ireland, be considered with application Evidence and treatises, and to hear and decide all any questions of law for the Court of Appeal. He said the Amendment was a compromise between the Government and the Land Commission, because they sympathised with the spirit of the Land Act, which was a liberal and reform act. It was a particular subject.

Sir G. CAMPBELL hoped there would be no appeal. They had on the Land Commission a lawyer and two men of considerable ability.

Mr. SHAW said that the attacks of Mr. Lowther on the Land Commission had been most unfounded and unfeeling inconsistent with his position as a Privy Counsellor.

Mr. BULWER believed that one decision by a court of appeal would be far better than many. He thought it would be better.

Captain COLVILE was surprised that nothing had been said from the Government bench on this Amendment.

Mr. TREVELYAN said that if the Government felt a difficulty in accepting the Amendment, that difficulty has been increased by the tone of the speech of the right hon. and learned gentleman (Mr. Lowther). He had not that the Land Commission possessed the confidence of the people of Ireland, that difficulty believe that their confidence would be shaken by anything that the Government from the right hon. gentleman (hear, hear). The Government could not accept the Amendment, because it was not consistent, but rather under the Bill would not be consistent, but rather of an administrative character. If a case were taken up to the High Court some one must pay the costs. Who was to pay them? Which the person who could not pay their cost.

Mr. O'BRIEN and the hon. member for Cork did not believe in law and lawyers; he was the specific of remedy for the evil. The Amendment was not the Mr. Gibson, but by liked common sense accordingly to the Amendment of the Land Commission, and the tenant points of law, might arise under this Bill, and tenants would be ruined if the Amendment.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL for IRELAND said the jurisdiction under the Bill would apply to the cases which were dealt with under it were disposed of, and therefore, it would be regarded as a consolidating law for the future. If the Land Commissioners were not authorised to hear and decide questions which would arise more than from St. 50, he did not know what they were to do. The Land Commission were good in the Amendment were allowed it might not in dispute the Land Commission. Such a thing would be a practical denial of the relief to be given by the Bill. It would be a pity if it was there was no power whatever in the Amendment (hear, hear).

Viscount CRANBROOK said the whole case had been put aside because it was a question of cost. If an appeal was not to be allowed, the Land Commission would be bound at all, but a partisan tribunal. He should certainly feel it his duty to take the course of the Committee on his Amendment.

After some discussion in support of the Amendment, Mr. WARTON, who spoke amid cries of "Oh, and Divide," the Committee divided:—

For the Amendment	127
Against	177
Majority against ...	50

The result was received with Opposition cheers and counter cheers from the Ministerial benches.

Lord H. BRUCE moved to omit the concluding words of the Clause, "that the Land Commission shall not be subject to be reversed in the exercise of their powers under this Act by the order of any Court, but shall any proceedings before them be removed by certiorari into any Court."

After some discussion the Committee divided:—

For the Amendment	127
Against	159
Majority against	32

Sir M. H. BEACH moved an Amendment giving the Land Commission power to call for all books and documents in the possession of bankers, managers of joint-stoc, and savings banks, with the view of ascertaining the property of tenants.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL for IRELAND contended that every necessary power was included in the schedule which had been laid before the House.

The Amendment was negatived without a division, and the Clause having been agreed to, Progress was reported.

THE RUMOURED RESIGNATION OF MR. BRIGHT.

On the Motion for the adjourn ment of the House,

Mr. CALLAN said—Seeing our Cabinet Minister on the Treasury bench, I wish to ask the Right Hon. Gentleman the Treasury whether he can inform the House if the rumour is true that the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster has resigned his seat as a member of his Cabinet.

Lord R. GRAVENOR.—I regret that I have no information to give on the subject.

Mr. WARTON.—You say you regret you have no information (laughter).

The House adjourned, at Twenty minutes to Two o'clock, until Noon to-day.

THE INCREASE OF THE CARRIAGE DUTY.—A correspondence has taken place between the Cash Makers' Company and the Prime Minister with regard to the proposed increase of tax on carriages. The Company represented that the increase would cause many carriages throughout the country, in course of consumption, to be continued for a longer period than had been in their carriages to be to their seats instead out, so as to save the owners the extra tax, and to enable them to pay the higher rate of carriage tax, so that a system of economy would be established which a lessened demand for carriages would cause five per cent. of 50,000 artisans to be thrown out of employment. Considered as a tax on road repairs, private carriages do not wear and injure the roads as much as traction engines, waggons, and other heavy vehicles, all of which were free from such a special tax.—In reply to these and other representations Mr. Gladstone expressed his regret that the Company view with so much concern the effect of the proposal on their industry; but, after reminding them of the encouragement which the abolition of turnpikes has given to the use of carriages, he regrets the necessity of making the proposal to which the Company is taken. Since the above letters were written a deputation of coachmakers from all England waited on the Board of Inland Revenue, which undertook to represent their opinions to the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

LONDON AND THE PROVINCES.

The Merchant Taylors' Company celebrated last night the healing of a feud which the City Corporation had for many years been at variance with the Company. The feud arose from a small degree. In 1484 a great dispute arose between the Merchant Taylors' Company and the Skinners' in regard to precedence. From words they came to blows before the question was referred to a wise and judicious Chancellor who, after hearing both sides, gave a decision establishing between the liliipenots peace and a friendship which has never been broken. It is to be deplored that each should have precedence in turn year by year, and that the Lord Mayor of the year, when *ex officio*, that second Lord Mayor of the year, when, *ex officio*, that should be the Lord Mayor of the City of London to preside during his mayoralty. This notable instance of the value of judicious arbitration has lasted through four centuries, and is celebrated by an annual dinner, given alternately by the Merchant Taylors' and Skinners' last night it was the turn of the Merchant Taylors' to preside, and they did so in a manner worthy of the great style for which that ancient Company is famous. Some 400 guests sat down to a banquet in Skinners' and Skinners', Skinners' and Merchant Taylors', root and branch, and the toast of the day was drunk with great enthusiasm by the representatives of the two Companies and the distinguished guests who were assembled together for the occasion. The other toasts, continued with "Prosperity and Quiet," were drunk with social heartiness, and the work of the Navy before Alexandria was fitingly commemorated in a proof that is worthy of its old renown, though, as the gallant officer who acknowledged the toast, Admiral Sir E. Lyons, R.N., regretted, it had hardly found in the Egyptian campaign proof of its ancient. Lord Mayor of Manchester spoke for the House of Lords, taking occasion to gratefully acknowledge the recognition of the services rendered by his brother, Lord Charles Beresford, in the Soudan.

A Conference of Delegates from all parts of Yorkshire was held yesterday, at the Town Hall, Leeds, the Archbishop of York in the chair, the object being to discuss the Agricultural Holdings Bill. The Archbishop said the want of this measure made him to some extent a misanthrope. He was a Tory of the old school, but he should be glad to dedicate to joy, gladness, and the best interests. He had just written the three days' tour of York, and it had a very disturbing effect upon the population, because it was the first time that Government in making acquaintance with the numerous frequentators of Holkhamshire on Sunday, they found that they lived on the other side of York, and therefore it was the first time that the Sunday Bill was not updated as unfortunately Alexandria was at great sea on the Sunday; he had travelled 50 miles and found no proper accommodation. Another phenomenon singular to observe on Sunday, was the large number of people regardless of anything who had their coats off and appeared several before them walking upon their greens (laughter). In fact, the traveller was driven to his last entertainment when he reached his destination, and all was thereby made sacred to his having his refreshment (laughter). It was not a miserable thing to see the Sunday Bill was not passed, he said that the legislation of the country should be more than ever, and therefore he hoped the Bill would be passed, and therefore he hoped the Government would consider the matter, and, if conciliation compromise.

Mr. CHILDERS said this being a case where the Crown was absolutely cut off from his holding the Government could not accept the Amendment.

Mr. SHAW said that if the hon. member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) would consent to insert in his Amendment that such sum of money as might be applied for with the consent of the landlord, then he could not see why the Government should not accept it. He knew that many cases the landlords would be glad to get their tenants back.

Mr. D. DICKSON asked whether it was a wise or politic thing to keep 6000 families out of their holdings in view of the fact that a very stringent Coercion Bill had been passed for Ireland. He thought the Government would do well to accept the Amendment on the Coercion Bill, and that the tenant would and that the landlord was willing to reinstate the ten ant.

Mr. CHILDERS said the Government had not shown him more than ever the necessity for adhering to the determination had to resist the Amendment.

Mr. PARNELL hoped that the Government would, before the report, consider the mans of in chasing the landlords to act on the voluntary part of the Bill.

The Amendment was negatived, and Clause 2 was agreed to, as was also Clause 3.

On Clause 4,

Mr. J. LOWTHER (in the absence of Sir M. Hilby) moved an Amendment, providing that the Commissioners should, of their own motion, and should on the application of any party to any proceeding, in Ireland, be considered with application Evidence and treatises, and to hear and decide all any questions of law for the Court of Appeal. He said the Amendment was a compromise between the Government and the Land Commission, because they sympathised with the spirit of the Land Act, which was a liberal and reform act. It was a particular subject.

Sir G. CAMPBELL hoped there would be no appeal. They had on the Land Commission a lawyer and two men of considerable ability.

Mr. SHAW said that the attacks of Mr. Lowther on the Land Commission had been most unfounded and unfeeling inconsistent with his position as a Privy Counsellor.

Mr. BULWER believed that one decision by a court of appeal would be far better than many. He thought it would better.

Captain COLVILE was surprised that nothing had been said from the Government bench on this Amendment.

Mr. TREVELYAN said that if the Government felt a difficulty in accepting the Amendment, that difficulty has been increased by the tone of the speech of the right hon. and learned gentleman (Mr. Lowther). He had not that the Land Commission possessed the confidence of the people of Ireland, that difficulty believe that their confidence would be shaken by anything that came from the right hon. gentleman (hear, hear). The Government could not accept the Amendment, because it was not consistent, but rather under the Bill would not be consistent, but rather of an administrative character. If a case were taken up to the High Court some one must pay the costs. Who was to pay them? Which the person who could not pay their cost.

Mr. O'BRIEN and the hon. member for Cork did not believe in law and lawyers; he was the specific of remedy for the evil. The Amendment was not the Mr. Gibson, but by liked common sense accordingly to the Amendment of the Land Commission, and the tenant points of law, might arise under this Bill, and tenants would be ruined if the Amendment.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL for IRELAND said the jurisdiction under the Bill would apply to the cases which were dealt with under it were disposed of, and therefore, it would be regarded as a consolidating law for the future. If the Land Commissioners were not authorised to hear and decide questions which would arise more than from St. 50, he did not know what they were to do. The Land Commission were good in the Amendment were allowed it might not in dispute the Land Commission. Such a thing would be a practical denial of the relief to be given by the Bill. It would be a pity if it was there was no power whatever in the Amendment (hear, hear).

Viscount CRANBROOK said the whole case had been put aside because it was a question of cost. If an appeal was not to be allowed, the Land Commission would be bound at all, but a partisan tribunal. He should certainly feel it his duty to take the course of the Committee on his Amendment.

After some discussion in support of the Amendment, Mr. WARTON, who spoke amid cries of "Oh, and Divide," the Committee divided:—

For the Amendment	127
Against	177
Majority against	50

The result was received with Opposition cheers and counter cheers from the Ministerial benches.

Lord H. BRUCE moved to omit the concluding words of the Clause, "that the Land Commission shall not be subject to be reversed in the exercise of their powers under this Act by the order of any Court, but shall any proceedings before them be removed by certiorari into any Court."

After some discussion the Committee divided:—

For the Amendment	127
Against	159
Majority against	32

Sir M. H. BEACH moved an Amendment giving the Land Commission power to call for all books and documents in the possession of bankers, managers of joint-stoc, and savings banks, with the view of ascertaining the property of tenants.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL for IRELAND contended that every necessary power was included in the schedule which had laid before the House.

The Amendment was negatived without a division, and the Clause having been agreed to, Progress was reported.

THE RUMOURED RESIGNATION OF MR. BRIGHT.

On the Motion for the adjourn ment of the House,

Mr. CALLAN said—Seeing our Cabinet Minister on the Treasury bench, I wish to ask the Right Hon. Gentleman the Treasury whether he can inform the House if the rumour is true that the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster has resigned his seat as a member of his Cabinet.

Lord R. GRAVENOR.—I regret that I have no information to give on the subject.

Mr. WARTON.—You say you regret you have no information (laughter).

The House adjourned, at Twenty minutes to Two o'clock, until Noon to-day.

THE INCREASE OF THE CARRIAGE DUTY.—A correspondence has taken place between the Cash Makers' Company and the Prime Minister with regard to the proposed increase of tax on carriages. The Company represented that the increase would cause many carriages throughout the country, in course of consumption, to be continued for a longer period than had been in their carriages to be to their seats instead out, so as to save the owners the extra tax, and to enable them to pay the higher rate of carriage tax, so that a system of economy would be established which a lessened demand for carriages would cause five per cent. of 50,000 artisans to be thrown out of employment. Considered as a tax on road repairs, private carriages do not wear and injure the roads as much as traction engines, waggons, and other heavy vehicles, all of which were free from such a special tax.—In reply to these and other representations Mr. Gladstone expresses his regret that the Company view with so much concern the effect of the proposal on their industry; but, after reminding them of the encouragement which the abolition of turnpikes has given to the use of carriages, he regrets the necessity of making the proposal to which the Company is taken. Since the above letters were written a deputation of coachmakers from all England waited on the Board of Inland Revenue, which undertook to represent their opinions to the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

THE WIMBLEDON MEETING.

The full scores of the three hundred men who by their shooting at 200, 500, and 600 yards on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday respectively had gained the right to compete today at 500 and 600 yards to decide who shall be the "Sixty" to fire in the second stage on Tuesday next for her Majesty's *Prize of 300L*, together with the Gold Medal and Gold Badge of the Queen's Prize, and the Prize of 100L, and the Gold Medal, which, because moving, the staff in the Statistical Department, and on the Queen's Prize, are not given their work. An analysis of this document shows that in this number are 220 English, 61 Scotch (including Highlanders), 18 Welsh, four Irish, and three Colonial and two Indian Volunteers. The county most prominently represented is Lancashire, which has 27 men, and, though few in number, is celebrated by an annual dinner, given alternately by the Lancashire and Cheshire Regiments. last night it was the turn of the Merchant Taylors' to preside, and they did so in a manner worthy of the great style for which that ancient Company is famous. Some 400 guests sat down to a banquet in Skinners' and Skinners', Skinners' and Merchant Taylors', root and branch, and the toast of the day was drunk with great heartiness by the representatives of the two Companies and the distinguished guests who were assembled together for the occasion. The other toasts, continued with "Prosperity and Quiet," were drunk with social heartiness, and the work of the Navy before Alexandria was fitingly commemorated in a proof that is worthy of its old renown, though, as the gallant officer who acknowledged the toast, Admiral Sir E. Lyons, R.N., regretted, it had hardly found in the Egyptian campaign proof of its ancient. Lord Mayor of Manchester spoke for the House of Lords, taking occasion to gratefully acknowledge the recognition of the services rendered by his brother, Lord Charles Beresford, in the Soudan.

A Conference of Delegates from all parts of Yorkshire was held yesterday, at the Town Hall, Leeds, the Archbishop of York in the chair, the object being to discuss the Agricultural Holdings Bill. The Archbishop said the want of this measure made him to some extent a misanthrope. He was a Tory of the old school, but he should be glad to dedicate to joy, gladness, and the best interests. He had just written the three days' tour of York, and it had a very disturbing effect upon the population, because it was the first time that Government in making acquaintance with the numerous frequentators of Holkhamshire on Sunday, they found that they lived on the other side of York, and therefore it was the first time that the Sunday Bill was not updated as unfortunately Alexandria was at great sea on the Sunday; he had travelled 50 miles and found no proper accommodation. Another phenomenon singular to observe on Sunday, was the large number of people regardless of anything who had their coats off and appeared several before them walking upon their greens (laughter). In fact, the traveller was driven to his last entertainment when he reached his destination, and all was thereby made sacred to his having his refreshment (laughter). It was not a miserable thing to see the Sunday Bill was not passed, he said that the legislation of the country should be more than ever, and therefore he hoped the Bill would be passed, and therefore he hoped the Government would consider the matter, and, if conciliation compromise.

Mr. CHILDERS said this being a case where the Crown was absolutely cut off from his holding the Government could not accept the Amendment.

Mr. SHAW said that if the hon. member for Cork (Mr. Parnell) would consent to insert in his Amendment that such sum of money as might be applied for with the consent of the landlord, then he could not see why the Government should not accept it. He knew that many cases the landlords would be glad to get their tenants back.

Mr. D. DICKSON asked whether it was a wise or politic thing to keep 6000 families out of their holdings in view of the fact that a very stringent Coercion Bill had been passed for Ireland. He thought the Government would do well to accept the Amendment on the Coercion Bill, and that the tenant would and that the landlord was willing to reinstate the ten ant.

Mr. CHILDERS said the Government had not shown him more than ever the necessity for adhering to the determination had to resist the Amendment.

Mr. PARNELL hoped that the Government would, before the report, consider the mans of in chasing the landlords to act on the voluntary part of the Bill.

The Amendment was negatived, and Clause 2 was agreed to, as was also Clause 3.

On Clause 4,

Mr. J. LOWTHER (in the absence of Sir M. Hilby) moved an Amendment, providing that the Commissioners should, of their own motion, and should on the application of any party to any proceeding, in Ireland, be considered with application Evidence and treatises, and to hear and decide all any questions of law for the Court of Appeal. He said the Amendment was a compromise between the Government and the Land Commission, because they sympathised with the spirit of the Land Act, which was a liberal and reform act. It was a particular subject.

Sir G. CAMPBELL hoped there would be no appeal. They had on the Land Commission a lawyer and two men of considerable ability.

Mr. SHAW said that the attacks of Mr. Lowther on the Land Commission had been most unfounded and unfeeling inconsistent with his position as a Privy Counsellor.

Mr. BULWER believed that one decision by a court of appeal would be far better than many. He thought it would better.

Captain COLVILE was surprised that nothing had been said from the Government bench on this Amendment.

Mr. TREVELYAN said that if the Government felt a difficulty in accepting the Amendment, that difficulty has been increased by the tone of the speech of the right hon. and learned gentleman (Mr. Lowther). He had that the Land Commission possessed the confidence of the people of Ireland, that difficulty believe that their confidence would be shaken by anything that came from the right hon. gentleman (hear, hear). The Government could not accept the Amendment, because it was not consistent, but rather under the Bill would not be consistent, but rather of an administrative character. If a case were taken up to the High Court some one must pay the costs. Who was to pay them? Which the person who could not pay their cost.

Mr. O'BRIEN and the hon. member for Cork did not believe in law and lawyers; he was the specific of remedy for the evil. The Amendment was not the Mr. Gibson, but by liked common sense accordingly to the Amendment of the Land Commission, and the tenant points of law, might arise under this Bill, and tenants would be ruined if the Amendment.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL for IRELAND said the jurisdiction under the Bill would apply to the cases which were dealt with under it were disposed of, and therefore, it would be regarded as a consolidating law for the future. If the Land Commissioners were not authorised to hear and decide questions which would arise more than from St. 50, he did not know what they were to do. The Land Commission were good in the Amendment were allowed it might not in dispute the Land Commission. Such a thing would be a practical denial of the relief to be given by the Bill. It would be a pity if it was there was no power whatever in the Amendment (hear, hear).

Viscount CRANBROOK said the whole case had been put aside because it was a question of cost. If an appeal was not to be allowed, the Land Commission would be bound at all, but a partisan tribunal. He should certainly feel it his duty to take the course of the Committee on his Amendment.

After some discussion in support of the Amendment, Mr. WARTON, who spoke amid cries of "Oh, and Divide," the Committee divided:—

For the Amendment	127
Against	177
Majority against	50

The result was received with Opposition cheers and counter cheers from the Ministerial benches.

Lord H. BRUCE moved to omit the concluding words of the Clause, "that the Land Commission shall not be subject to be reversed in the exercise of their powers under this Act by the order of any Court, but shall any proceedings before them be removed by certiorari into any Court."

After some discussion the Committee divided:—

For the Amendment	127
Against	159
Majority against	32

Sir M. H. BEACH moved an Amendment giving the Land Commission power to call for all books and documents in the possession of bankers, managers of joint-stoc, and savings banks, with the view of ascertaining the property of tenants.

The SOLICITOR GENERAL for IRELAND contended that every necessary power was included in the schedule which had laid before the House.

The Amendment was negatived without a division, and the Clause having been agreed to, Progress was reported.

THE RUMOURED RESIGNATION OF MR. BRIGHT.

On the Motion for the adjourn ment of the House,

Mr. CALLAN said—Seeing our Cabinet Minister on the Treasury bench, I wish to ask the Right Hon. Gentleman the Treasury whether he can inform the House if the rumour is true that the right hon. Gentleman the Chancellor of the Duchy of Lancaster has resigned his seat as a member of his Cabinet.

Lord R. GRAVENOR.—I regret that I have no information to give on the subject.

Mr. WARTON.—You say you regret you have no information (laughter).

The House adjourned, at Twenty minutes to Two o'clock, until Noon to-day.

THE INCREASE OF THE CARRIAGE DUTY.—A correspondence has taken place between the Cash Makers' Company and the Prime Minister with regard to the proposed increase of tax on carriages. The Company represented that the increase would cause many carriages throughout the country, in course of consumption, to be continued for a longer period than had been in their carriages to be to their seats instead out, so as to save the owners the extra tax, and to enable them to pay the higher rate of carriage tax, so that a system of economy would be established which a lessened demand for carriages would cause five per cent. of 50,000 artisans to be thrown out of employment. Considered as a tax on road repairs, private carriages do not wear and injure the roads as much as traction engines, waggons, and other heavy vehicles, all of which were free from such a special tax.—In reply to these and other representations Mr. Gladstone expresses his regret that the Company view with so much concern the effect of the proposal on their industry; but, after reminding them of the encouragement which the abolition of turnpikes has given to the use of carriages, he regrets the necessity of making the proposal to which the Company is taken. Since the above letters were written a deputation of coachmakers from all England waited on the Board of Inland Revenue, which undertook to represent their opinions to the Chancellor of the Exchequer.

SUPREME COURT OF JUDICATURE.

COURT OF APPEAL.

(Before the MASTER of the ROLLS and Lords Justices BRETT and COTTON.)

IN RE H. W. PARKER, A SOLICITOR.—This case, which raises a question of great importance to electric agents, arose out of the candidature of Colonel Sartoris for a local division. In that capacity he employed Mr. Parker, who again, in their turn, had engaged Mr. Parker as a local division agent. In that capacity he had made various payments to canvassers and runners, and had also paid the expenses of the Colonel's journeys, and his bill to Colonel Sartoris' general expenses agent, he had refused to pay the ground part of it, and he consequently commenced an action against Colonel Sartoris to recover the money. The defendant, he said, upon obtained an ordinary order of course to tax Mr. Parker's bill, and in the interval after the step of proceedings in the action, and upon the taxation the Master taxed the charges, and the Taxing Master, Mr. Mr. Justice Chitty had reviewed the certificate, and disallowed the charges, and the plaintiff consequently has an appeal from his order.—Mr. Massingham, Q.C., and Mr. Willis, instructed by Messrs. Bell and Brodrick and Mr. Ince, Q.C., and Mr. A. Watson for Colonel Sartoris, appeared for the respondent. Under the provisions of the Corrupt Practices Act, 1883, which provides that "all bills and accounts for the election expenses of the candidate) shall be made by or on behalf of the agent, and the agent shall be responsible for the candidate's part to pay them, and they had therefore been paying the plaintiff's bill, and he came to the The result of the decision might, no doubt, be inconvenient for agents, but the judges had, in fact, very clearly counsel that the expenses agent alone should make payments on behalf of the candidate.

HIGH COURT OF JUSTICE.

CHANCERY DIVISION.

(Before Mr. Justice KAY.)

IN RE THE INDIA CIRCLE RAILWAY COMPANY.—This was a petition for the payment out of Court of the sum of 26,753L, being the balance, together with interest, of the Parliamentary deposit.—Mr. W. Pearson, Q.C., and Mr. Cozens-Hardy, appeared that if the railway should not be completed the Parliamentary deposit was to be forfeited. The company had, however, made the railway, but had been interfered with and rendered less valuable by the construction of railways in the neighbourhood, and by reason that might be left was to go to the Exchequer, and the Exchequer, however, was made by the Act of 1873, which provided that any balance should be paid to the Exchequer, and the Exchequer, the Chancellor Hall last August, when his Lordship derived no injury as to the petitioners, the company, and that inquiry had now been answered. The Chief Clerk found in the Parliamentary deposit was 26,753L, and that no other persons were entitled to compete with the petitioners. Then, however, "any" positive power to the Exchequer, and had any Exchequer, under the London Act, 1873, and that another