

23, 1870.

DON
ENHAM



SERS.

ND.



ates. Her

states: "It

beverage,

with those

mbler of

sickness.

poonful

to the

uld be

if the

vers are

re were

der to

e.

with

dered

prac-

s, the

ional

ordial

brile

on

ided

in

ine

ason

larly

asure

nt of

tal to

saline

had

lastic

consi-

from

Registered for

(Transmission Abroad.)

The African Times.

"FOR GOD, AND GOOD TO AFRICA AND HER PEOPLE."

"Talk to me anywhere of Power, and I'll tell you of Protection. Mention a Magistrate, and the idea follows of Property. Show me any Government, and you are to see the proposed interest of those governed. Power constituted otherwise is a monster that is impossible in every system where there is any notion of the justice of God or the good of mankind."—EDMUND BURKE.

"If any Colonist suffers from injustice, whatever may be his class, his condition, or his colour, he has a right to redress at the hands of the Colonial Minister in this country."—EARL OF CARNARVON, SECRETARY OF STATE FOR THE COLONIES, AUGUST 2, 1866.

VOL. IX., No. 107.]

LONDON, THURSDAY, JUNE 23, 1870.

(PUBLISHED MONTHLY.
Subscription, 6s. per Ann.)

CONTENTS.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE		PAGE
West Coast Steamers	133	Proposed Transfer of the Gambia to France	137
The Proposed Transfer of the Gambia to the French	133	The Charges against Mr. Justice Huggins	138
A Cry from the Gambia	135	Official Reasons for Ceding the Gambia	139
Horrible Massacre—One of the Results of the Territorial Transfer	135	What Ought to be Done about the Pending Gambia Treaty	139
Reasons why the West African Settlements Should Not be Abandoned	135	A Noble Gift	140
Imperial Parliament	136	The Huggins Scandal—Statement of the Case—Debates in the House of Commons—Despatches from the Secretary of State	140

AFRICAN AGENCY

For Transacting Business in England for Native and other Traders on the West Coast of Africa.

IN consequence of wishes expressed from all parts of the West Coast, MR. FITZGERALD has made arrangements for selling produce consigned to him by ships to London or Liverpool; and purchasing, and shipping goods ordered against the proceeds of consignments or other effective remittances only, from either of the above ports, on a system by which the greatest possible advantage of the markets will be secured to the AFRICAN TRADER, who will not be charged one penny beyond what is actually paid, except only the commission openly debited in account.

All letters and bills of lading, whether the shipments be to or from London or Liverpool, to be addressed

F. FITZGERALD, Esq.,
121, Fleet-street,
London, W.C.

N.B.—Open Policies on Insurance for Produce from the Coast by the Mail Steamers; but intended Shipments should be advised if possible.

JULY, 1870.

BRITISH AND AFRICAN STEAM NAVIGATION COMPANY.

This Company's Steamers are intended to sail twice every month between GLASGOW, LIVERPOOL, and the following ports on the WEST COAST OF AFRICA—viz., SIERRA LEONE, CAPE PALMAS, ACCRA, LAGOS, BENIN, BONNY, FERNANDO PO, and OLD CALABAR.

The fine new Steamship CONGO is intended to be despatched from GLASGOW on the 30th JUNE, and from LIVERPOOL on the 5th JULY, at 10.30 A.M., for MADEIRA, GRAND CANARY, SIERRA LEONE, MONROVIA, CAPE PALMAS, CAPE COAST CASTLE, ACCRA, JELLAH COFFEE, LAGOS, BENIN, BONNY, FERNANDO PO, and OLD CALABAR.

GOODS will also be taken by this Steamer for GABOON, CONGO, and such other PORTS on the SOUTH-WEST COAST of AFRICA as may be arranged. Such Cargo to be transhipped at Bonny, and forwarded by Branch Steamer at Ship's expense, but Shipper's risk.

Goods to be at the Loading Berth in Glasgow up to noon on the 30th June, and at the Loading Berth in Liverpool not later than 10 P.M. on the 5th July.

Passengers will embark by Steam Tender from the Prince's Landing Stage at 10 A.M. on the day of sailing.

Arrangements will also be made for their calling at other Ports when inducement offers.

For Freight, passage, and other information apply in London to ALEX. WALKER, 158, Leadenhall-street; in Glasgow to TAYLOR, LAUGHLAND, and Co., 91, Buchanan-street; and in Liverpool, to ELDON, DEMPSTER, and Co., 2, Brunswick-street.

WEST COAST STEAMERS.

ARRIVALS.

Royal Mail Steamship Company's Ship Lagos, on the 28th May.

British and African Steam Navigation Company's Ship Congo, on the 11th June.

Royal Mail Steamship Company's Ship Benin was hourly expected when going to press.

DEPARTURES.

Royal Mail Steamship Company's Ship Athenian, on the 24th May, with the monthly mails.

British and African Steam Navigation Company's Ship Roquette, on the 4th June, with a mail and full cargo.

Royal Mail Steamship Company's Ship Lagos, on the 14th June.

The Royal Mail Steamship Company's Ship Biafra is appointed to take out the mails on the 24th June.

The British and African S. N. Co.'s Ship Congo will leave Liverpool on the 5th July, and the Loando on the 18th July.

THE PROPOSED TRANSFER OF GAMBIA TO THE FRENCH.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE AFRICAN TIMES.

Batburst, R.G., May 13, 1870.

Dear Sir,—I have not been able to write before because I was engaged about the enclosed petition, which I have been doing my best to get up in time, which was done, and the petition given to the Administrator here on the 18th April, who forwarded it to the Governor-in-Chief by the steamer of the 20th of that month. When it reached his hands he came up here by the bi-monthly

steamer of the 5th inst. from the Coast. Some of my friends and myself called on him without loss of time, when he inquired into the matter of the petition. We explained ourselves and strongly protested against the giving up of this place to the French. He then requested us to have our protest written and signed, which was done and given to him, and he promised to forward it at the earliest opportunity. But we are in doubt, as it appears from his statement that he has a hand in the giving up of the country by the English, and I therefore earnestly implore you to insert it in the *Times*, as I now send you both, and try to have it inserted also in the *London Times*, as many of my friends (Europeans who have the interest of Africans at heart) are not acquainted with the *African Times*. It is not only we alone who are troubled in mind, but also the native king, whose father was the possessor of the place; he says if the English Government is tired of the place and intends giving it up, they ought to let him know of it, as the place was not sold to the British Government, instead of giving it to the French; they had rather take it back than have the French to rule over it; all the native people who are from the interior, and who had located themselves here as farmers, at the rumour of this giving up are returning home, for they said it would be useless for them to do anything as soon as the French have the place, as there will be nothing but war; so you will perceive that the transferring of the place is only to our ruin. Though the Governor-in-Chief says our objections to be given over to the French are mere sentiment.

I hope you will do your best and assist us. I have more for insertion about this cruel matter, but it must stand over till another time.

All friends unite in regard to you.—Yours, &c.

A BRITISH AFRICAN.

To the Right Honourable Earl Granville, Her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for the Colonies.

The humble Petition of the undersigned Inhabitants of the Settlements on the Gambia.

Sheweth: That your petitioners are merchants, traders, mechanics, and other inhabitants residing in the settlements on the river Gambia.

That your petitioners being informed that negotiations are being carried on between Her Majesty's Government and the French Government for the abandonment of the settlements on the Gambia to the latter, feel that they cannot be silent and sit quietly when arrangements are being made which will eventually (if effected) launch them under a different government, manners, customs, and institutions.

Your petitioners are thus emboldened to approach your lordship not simply on the ground of the encouragement given to your petitioners, to suggest reforms and to complain, where there are grievances to complain of, but your petitioners at this crisis are aware that every step that is taken by Her Majesty's Government to abandon the settlements on the Gambia, and hand them over to the French Government, is a step tending to rid them of their ancient birthright and their own privileges, such as having been born, bred, and reared up under the flag of England, according to British laws, manners, and customs.

Your petitioners can assure your lordship that the love of country which is an inherent quality in every man's breast is the same—of the same degree in the breast of the colonist as in the breast of the Englishman; and just as the Englishman would feel if his country was on the eve of being handed over to another government, the Colonist has the same feeling. And the colonist, too, your lordship, have more to complain of; they are to be handed over to a foreign government by the very hands that have fostered and brought them to their present position; and, besides, these negotiations are being carried on without your petitioners (many of whom are natives of the Gambia) having an opportunity of expressing before the commencement of these negotiations their utter disapproval, and if it were not for rumours which have been afloat, your petitioners would not even have been privileged to express their humble disapproval of such an abandonment.

Identified with this love of country are the laws, manners, customs, and institutions. It is these that make the love of country dear to your petitioners, and if your petitioners are bereft of these old and accustomed privileges and thrown uncharitably in the midst of different manners and customs, with the institutions of their country withdrawn and overthrown, that love of country which your petitioners consider the dearest of all ties shall be wantonly encroached upon and your petitioners themselves sacrificed.

Your lordship must of course be aware that just the same feeling that would prompt your petitioners to withstand any foreign power who attempted to make war in Her Majesty's settlements on the Gambia, with the object of subjecting Her Majesty's subjects to its power and changing the laws, manners, and customs of the country, that same feeling would prompt them, and is now prompting them, in order to retain their own laws, manners, and

customs, humbly to pray Her Majesty, not by her own act to abandon her loyal subjects, and give them over to a foreign power with its own laws, and by her own act to ally your petitioners to a people in every respect foreign to them, in their habits and customs.

Your lordship's petitioners would humbly solicit your lordship's attention to another reason, why these settlements should not be given up to the French Government? At present, these settlements are in a position to be self-supporting, the population amounts to 20,000 inhabitants, and the revenue is 21,000*l*. It is true that 1,500*l*. is given annually by the mother country in aid of the general fund, but your petitioners would far rather acquiesce in the withdrawal of this sum than for the settlements to be abandoned by the English Government, if it be that the Imperial Government is no longer willing to pay over as usual this amount. Your petitioners add that some legislation would only be necessary, so as to make up the deficiency, if the sum already stated was withdrawn. Your petitioners would rather be put to an extra tax than the mother country should thus forsake them.

Furthermore, by the last Government Gazette published here by authority, your petitioners find that at the close of the present year, after all expenses have been paid, the estimated surplus money remaining in the Colonial Chest will be 7,919*l*., so that your lordship will perceive that apparently the settlements, if the Imperial Grant was removed, are quite able to support themselves.

Nothing can be more detrimental to the interests of your petitioners that the abandonment of the settlements on the Gambia to the French Government; and your petitioners can assure your lordship that there is not a native merchant or trader in these settlements, who does not look on such a step as fraught with the greatest evils.

Your petitioners can assure your lordship that since it has been rumoured here of the intended abandonment of the settlements, it has been a subject matter of regret by Her Majesty's loyal subjects, and your lordship can easily be convinced of this statement by the numerous signatures appended to this petition.

Your petitioners cannot help stating that a greater injustice could not be perpetrated than the transferring of twenty thousand of Her Majesty's loyal subjects by the act of Her Majesty's Government to a foreign potentate, and your lordship's petitioners beg to call your lordship's attention to the fact that many of them have been brought and made to settle within these settlements through the instrumentality of the said Government. Others have been induced as English subjects to settle in these British settlements and purchase property to a large extent, and others, too, have been born and bred up in these settlements under the gracious auspices of Her Majesty's Government.

Your petitioners humbly crave your lordship's further attention to what would essentially be the result if such an abandonment took place; those of your petitioners who have got large stakes in the settlements would either have to become subjects of the Emperor of the French, or sell out their property at a sacrifice and quit the settlements for some other country, where it would not be likely that British rule would cease therein in this or the next generation. Those of your petitioners who have nothing to sell even at a sacrifice would be compelled, however unwilling, to remain under French rule and become French subjects, having been ruthlessly thrown over by their own Government. These are grave considerations, which your petitioners humbly and respectfully crave your lordship's serious attention.

Although, it would be unnecessary for your petitioners here to comment upon the principle which binds the subjects to the sovereign on the relationship existing between them; yet your petitioners beg to call your lordship's attention to one constitutional maxim, an ancient and constant rule of law. It is "that the king cannot confer a favour on one subject which occasions injury and loss to other." Now, on the one hand, if the abandonment confers favour on the rest of Her Majesty's subjects by saving of a large outlay of money annually, and, therefore, it is thought advisable to confer this favour; on the other, great injustice is done to those who are more immediately connected with the abandonment; in other words, those, of course, who would be handed over as locatees. The loss and injury arising to that portion of Her Majesty's subjects whom your petitioners have designated as locatees, occasioned from this injustice, is quite palpable, and needs no further remark from your petitioners.

Your petitioners, in conclusion, beg to submit to your lordship this petition for your favourable consideration, and the consideration of all those under whose notice it may be brought, humbly hoping that Her Majesty's Government will not abandon these settlements on the Gambia, and Her Majesty's loyal and loving subjects,

And your petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

HARRY FINDEN, JOHN BOOCOCK, PROVIDENCE JURY,
and 600 signatures follow

Bathurst, Gambia, April 20, 1870.

To His Excellency Sir A. E. Kennedy, Governor-in-Chief, &c.
Bathurst, Gambia, May 6, 1870.

May it please your Excellency, in accordance with the leave given to us by your Excellency, we have put on paper our opinion with respect to the abandonment of the settlements on the River Gambia, as follows:—

- 1.—We humbly beg to protest against any such abandonment.
- 2.—We are of opinion that if a militia force were raised, and the police force increased in number, that we should be in a position to defend ourselves from any foreign aggressor.
- 3.—Let there be a reduction in the civil staff.
- 4.—We are willing to pay taxes adequate to the wants and requirements of these settlements.
- 5.—We humbly pray that Her Majesty's Government will only give us a trial, as we are quite sure we are able to meet the required expenditure.

We have the honour to be yours,

(Signed) H. FINDEN, THOMAS KING,
J. D. RICHARDS, JOHN BOOCOCK,

And others, in behalf of the native merchants and traders.

A CRY FROM THE GAMBIA.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE AFRICAN TIMES.

Bathurst, R.G., May 13, 1870.

Sir,—Some months back, we, the inhabitants of the colony, heard that the Gambia will be given over to the French Government, to which your paper, as read by us, says that if we object to this and fail to petition against it, when it comes to be late we must for ever hold our peace. This petition has been drawn up and sent forwarded to the Governor-in-Chief, Sir Arthur Edward Kennedy, for transmission to the Secretary of State for the Colonies. To our surprise, he (the Governor-in-Chief) arrived here on the 5th of May, with the petition, and on the morning of the 6th the inhabitants waited upon his Excellency. On this occasion after some palaver, he said that he and Admiral Patey had proposed that the colony should be given over to the French Government; he further said that the Gambia was intended for the French, and that the French will be of more service to us than the British. Is this a fact that he said? The whole of the Gambia population, already used to British laws and British manners and customs, how can we live with the French? Are we to become French subjects? Look at the Honourable Thomas Brown and Thomas Quin, and other British merchants carrying on large business here for years? Are they to come under French laws? Messrs. Brown and Quin are members of Council; why was it the Governor-in-Chief did not summon them to meet in council to lay the matter before them for their consideration? Previous to his Excellency's arrival here on the 5th, a French man-of-war or gun-boat arrived here on the 1st of May, proclaiming that the Gambia was to be given over to the French, which will take place in the month of August; they have been inspecting Government House, the barracks, and all of the government buildings, measuring the depth and shallow part of the river around Half Die, the Cape, and Fort Bullen, &c. We must certainly believe it. If such is the case, how about the inhabitants who do not wish to be under French laws, &c.? What will become of our lands and properties if we wish to remove to other British ports? Will they give us the price for them? Because many, many expensive buildings have been erected on our lots of town land. The inhabitants are crying bitterly against the cession of the Gambia to the French; is it right that the French flag should ever be displayed on the British staff? If so, after that time, there will be no peace for us here. Murder and cruel ways will be our lot; of this there is no doubt. Last evening, the 12th inst., five Frenchmen from their ships had been promenading in the evening till night; when returning on board they stabbed one man, a native of this place, without any cause; this man had been resting under a tree, as the moon shone very bright; is not this showing plainly that we cannot live in peace here with the French? This man, dangerously wounded, has since died.

The Governor-in-Chief, the Governor, and Admiral Patey have no lots here and no houses; they carry on no business here—that's why; had they been possessing large houses, as Messrs. Brown and Quin, and others carrying on trade here, they would not think or even dream to venture such proposals. The British Government pays them large sums of money yearly, and little do they care about the Gambia, as they can be promoted elsewhere.

Witnesses, INHABITANTS OF BATHURST, GAMBIA,
present at the Administrator's residence.

A very interesting ceremony took place on Sunday, June 19, at the Parish Church of St. Mary, Islington. Bishop Crowther, the native missionary bishop for the Niger Territory, acting under a commission from the Bishop of London, ordained his son, Dandison Costes Crowther, for missionary work in Africa.

HORRIBLE MASSACRE—ONE OF THE RESULTS OF TERRITORIAL TRANSFER.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE AFRICAN TIMES.

Cape Coast, May 20.

Sir,—At the time of the transfer of territory between the Dutch and English on the Gold Coast the province of Appolonia was handed to the Dutch. A British and a Dutch man-of-war rode in the roadsteads of Appolonia. Appolonia is divided into two districts—viz., Attawaboe and Baynia. The former were in close proximity with the Dutch territory of Axim, and accepted the flag; the latter were refractory, and refused to accept the Dutch flag. Their towns were bombarded, and the inhabitants sent adrift into the bush. The Baynians harboured since then a deadly hatred against the Dutch and the Attawaboes. They have lately called to their assistance the Wassaws under King Ofoe, and at the sight of their threatening numbers the Dutch abandoned their allies, the Attawaboes, to their fate. The commandant, after shipping his stores and men, locked the fort, handed over the key to the King of Attawaboe, and, embarking on board the Dutch man-of-war, steamed down to Axim, where he landed, telling his allies to settle their disputes the best way they could. The Baynians, assisted by the Wassaws, attacked the Attawaboes, defeated them, burnt their villages, cut off the heads of 100 men, and sent about 250 women as slaves to Wassaw. Appolonia now has declared its independence of the Dutch rule. The Attawaboes, who accepted from the commencement the detested flag, were left to their fate, and now the English flag is flying in Appolonia once more.

The latest report is that the Dutch have abandoned Axim, from the threatened attitude of the natives, but this has not yet been confirmed. Whatever *pros* or *cons* might be said about this exchange of territory on the Gold Coast, the Dutch subjects acquiesced readily in their fate when transferred to England, and appeared as contented as possible under English rule, but the Dutch had to dispute with the native inhabitants every inch of ground which, by a misnomer, was said to be transferred to them.

PATRICKIAN.

REASONS WHY THE WEST AFRICAN SETTLEMENTS SHOULD NOT BE ABANDONED.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE AFRICAN TIMES.

London, April 29, 1870.

Sir,—In your paper of the 23rd of April you allude to the prevalence of the opinion in some quarters at home that the Settlements on the African Coast should be abandoned by this country. I can hardly believe that any minister would be so ungenerous and so short sighted as to entertain and to recommend such a policy. The debt which England owes the African for the injury which she has done him is a strong moral, if not a strong legal, reason why we should not abandon the African Settlements on the West Coast. The slave trade was begun by Sir John Hawkins, under the expressed sanction and applause of the British Government; and the trade was carried on until 1,000,000 souls had been violently torn away from their homes in Guinea, and had been transferred to Jamaica alone. Grants of land were made in the West India Islands, on a condition imposed by Parliament that so many slaves should be placed on each acre; and I may remark, in refutation of the stupidity and indolence attributed to the Fantees and neighbouring tribes, that the preference was given to the Gold Coast for the stocking of our West Indian plantations with labourers, because the slaves of the Gold Coast were noted for their intelligence and industry. In 1728 the African was publicly sold in the streets of London.

I admit that this obligation of treating the African with tenderness and forbearance is not to go on for ever, and I admit that we have already partly indemnified him for the wrong endured by our instigation; but I cannot help thinking that England ought not to leave the people of the Gold Coast or of the Protected Settlements in a position more defenceless than that in which they would have been in their pristine state of barbarism. Had we not taken the settlements on the Gold Coast under our protection; had we not forced the King of Ashanti to forego his right of sovereignty over the Fantees—which was the origin of the war in 1824—the natives might have quietly remained in subjection to the kingdom of Ashanti, or might have formed themselves for self-defence into confederacies. By our presence, and by the establishment of our forts as a symbol of protection, as well as of government, we have called forth the passion of envy, and we have embittered the feeling of enmity between the inhabitants of the Protectorate and the Ashantees; and you may be sure that the Ashantees would not hesitate to inflict every conceivable atrocity on those tribes from which we withdrew the entire protection of our flag. Not only that, but what is to become of the partial civilisation which we have set up at such pains? What is to become of the British merchants resident in the settlements? Because, though I concede that the unfitness

of the local government has hitherto hampered the development of trade, I imagine that the complete removal of the flag would leave the merchants open to the rapacity or to the violence of the chiefs.

What is to become of the Christian work performed by the different missions? The Basle Mission, for example, which has its head quarters in the Eastern Districts, had when I was on the Coast, 6 stations, 25 missionaries, 548 children and youths in their schools, and more than 1,000 members of their Church. Our summary withdrawal from the settlements would throw their labour back by years and years, if not utterly destroy it. Then there is the Wesleyan Mission. When I was serving at Cape Coast, that zealous and capable mission had 14 chapels, 23 preaching-places, 10 missionaries, 2,000 full members, 250 members on trial, and 1,432 children in their schools. Here, then, are between 4,000 and 5,000 persons under the direct guidance of Christian precept, and there are and must be not less than double that number reached by the indirect influence of Christian intercourse and preaching. It must also be remembered that the Bible has been printed in the Accra or Ga language, and that a great part of it has been also printed in the Oyi language spoken by the Fantees, the Ashantees, the Akims, and the Aquisips.

I have thus far been dwelling on the objections to an abandonment of our West African Settlements in a fashion somewhat sentimental; but I will now endeavour to sketch the objections to their abandonment in a political and more material strain.

I may at once say that West Africa in commercial development may have disappointed many of us; but I urge that the older settlements are not fair specimens of what the commercial capabilities of the coast are. Several new settlements have been recently formed; and I shall select the Sherbro District, in the Government of Sierra Leone, as a type for studying the forces at present in action in the development of the trade and industry of that well abused coast.

The Sherbro District is about 100 miles to the south of Sierra Leone. It consists of a group of small islands, the largest of which is separated from the mainland by a lagoon, into which six rivers flow. The facilities offered by these rivers for the slave trade did not escape the notice of the slave-dealers, and the Sherbro had some of the most notorious slave depôts on the coast. When the oceanic slave trade was completely stopped on this part of the coast, no trade of any description was carried on until a coloured trader of the name of Meheux, and a white trader of the name of Nathan, established factories for legitimate commerce about twenty-five years ago. They were the first persons who shipped produce from the Sherbro; and I may state that about twelve or fourteen years ago, when Mr. Nathan had his stock taken, his property was valued by competent judges at 40,000*l*. I think that this is a most significant fact, because it must be recollected that his factory was upwards of 100 miles from the British territory, and that the surrounding tribes are reported to be the most turbulent savages on the coast. Many other traders flocked to this lagoon, until the interests involved were of sufficient importance to induce the Government to appoint a consul. In the year 1862, and owing to the unsettled state of the country and to the great losses entailed on the traders by the intestine feuds of the natives, the Sherbro was ceded to the Crown. Although the country around this new settlement has been devastated by a chronic war between the neighbouring tribes, the revenue, chiefly derived from duties on imports, amounted in the course of 1863 to between 6,000*l*. and 7,000*l*.* and the local expenditure to about 4,000*l*.; so that there was a surplus of between 2,000*l*. and 3,000*l*.

I may venture to call such a result astonishing, for we are bound to keep in view the trifling extent of the territory—only a narrow slice of the mainland barely thirteen miles in width—and also the very unfavourable events with which the traders had to contend. Here the interposition of the Government was judicious and became essential as a security for life and property, and the result is an absolute gain to the revenues of Sierra Leone.

The settlement of Bulama, likewise of recent date, presents the same features of prosperity as the settlement of the Sherbro.

The inference to which I am driven is that much impatience has been manifested alike by philanthropists, legislators, and cotton-brokers, at the sluggishness of the trade and at the lack of industrious habits of Western Africa. I think that the impatience is unreasonable, and certainly in regard to the settlements on the Gold Coast; for it is clear to demonstration that those particular settlements have not had a fair chance to apply themselves to morality, trade, or order from 1660 to 1870. In 1861, the first year of my residence at Cape Coast, when the country was in profound peace, the exports of cotton goods alone

* They now amount to from 12,000*l*. to 14,000*l*.—Ed. *African Times*.
† This is now to be restored to Portugal.—Ed. A. T.

to the settlements from Great Britain amounted to 95,390*l*.—only 5,000*l*. less than the value of the exports of cotton goods in the same year to Sierra Leone. In 1862 they had fallen to 77,877*l*.; and in 1863 to 30,124*l*., the famous Ashantee War having utterly distracted the Protectorate.

The cession of Sierra Leone itself to the English Crown dates back but seventy-five or eighty years; and where is there in the Tropics a spot of similar size to be compared to it in productiveness? Its rice and ginger have not been known to the English market for much more than ten years; and the rice is deemed by the medical officers on the Indian Staff to be more nutritious than the rice of India. Besides, the West Coast of Africa is the part of the tropical and sub-tropical zones lying nearest to England; and surely that circumstance is worthy of the attention of a commercial community. The existence of a chain of mountains running nearly parallel to the line of coast is proved by the numerous rivers and the prodigious volumes of water flowing into the Atlantic; and the western slope of this watershed evidently abounds in mineral wealth. We know that it is full of gold and copper. If utilised, the rivers would soon be converted into highways into the interior; and more particularly could they be thus utilised during the rainy season and at the beginning of the dry.

There cannot be a doubt but that good government, with its train of science and art, would quadruple the present productive wealth of Western Africa, and would at once give an impulse to commercial as well as to moral capabilities, not yet understood by us to belong to Africa and the African. At any rate, abandonment of the settlements should be the last thought to enter our heads, because it would merely involve an act of national dastardly, but it would involve, in a common-sense view of pounds, shillings, and pence, an act of thorough imbecility.

May, 1870. W. A. Ross.

IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT. HOUSE OF COMMONS, JUNE 10, 1870. TRANSFER OF GAMBIA TO THE FRENCH.

Mr. R. Fowler asked the Under-Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs whether it was true that negotiations had taken place with the view of the transfer of the settlement of the Gambia to the Emperor of the French.

Mr. Monsell replied that communications had passed between Her Majesty's Government and the Government of France, having for their object the determination of the limits of English and French influence on the West Coast of Africa, and the transfer of Gambia to France was one of the things under consideration in the course of that arrangement. It might be interesting to the hon. member to know, that in 1868 the numbers of European inhabitants in the settlement were thirty-nine males and eight females.

THE TRANSFER OF GAMBIA.

Sir J. Hay, referring to the answer which had been given by the Under-Secretary for the Colonies upon this subject, said that he wished to ask the head of the Government whether it was possible that the settlement of Gambia, and the great arterial communication of Africa, could be conveyed to France without the consent of Parliament. (Cheers.)

Mr. Gladstone said that, though he was taken by surprise by this question being put, still he might say that his impression was that such an arrangement could not be carried out without the consent of Parliament. He could not answer positively, but that was his impression and belief. A little later in the afternoon the right hon. gentleman added that what he had already said had reference to the power of the Government—to the question whether there was power in the Government or not. He added that there never had been the slightest intention of taking any proceedings of the kind without the consent of Parliament.

(Advertisement.)

COURT OF CIVIL AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE CAPE COAST.

FRIDAY, APRIL 22, 1870.

IN the matter of the Interdiction of WILLIAM CHARLES FINLASON, of Cape Coast.

Whereas, on the 10th day of August, 1866, in Her Majesty's late Supreme Court at Cape Coast, the said WILLIAM CHARLES FINLASON was, "for contempt of court, interdicted from ever practising in any of Her Majesty's Courts, on the Gold Coast, either as advocate, or as attorney, or agent, or in any manner whatsoever," and whereas the said WILLIAM CHARLES FINLASON did, on the 22nd day of April, 1870, make due and formal application for a reversal of said interdiction, it is hereby ordered, that the said interdiction be, and the same is hereby revoked, cancelled, and annulled accordingly.

C. S. SALMON,
Acting Chief Magistrate and Assessor.

The African Times.

PUBLISHED MONTHLY. PRICE 5*s*. STAMPED.

You are earnestly requested to allow your name to be added to the list of yearly subscribers. Price 5*s*. per annum for each copy, payable in advance.

NOTICES.

We have received the official remarks of his Excellency the Administrator of Lagos on the report of the Board of Inquiry held in Lagos to examine into the loss of the West African Company's steamer Thomas Bazley, Stott master, on the bar of Lagos, and regret that we have not space for its insertion in our present number, in justification of the comments of our Lagos Correspondent, which have been attacked as unjust and incorrect.

The African Times.

THURSDAY, JUNE 23, 1870.

PROPOSED TRANSFER OF THE GAMBIA TO FRANCE.

WE were certainly not prepared to believe that the British Government, supposed to represent the convictions, opinions, and feelings of the British people, who have so vehemently condemned the transfer of countries and peoples from one master to another, under the Vienna and other similar treaties, could be one of the foremost to revive so iniquitous a practice. It is one of the boasts of the present age to have attained to a higher standard of political morality than that by which such transfers were justified in the past. Great Britain has claimed to be one of the leaders in this moral progress; and yet we see her rulers ready on very slight pretext, without one iota of national advantage, and merely for some paltry official convenience or other unworthy object, to return to that low standard which we hoped had been left behind for ever, and declare, by international agreement, that people, with their interests, feelings, prejudices, passions, and attachments, may be ruthlessly turned over from one rule to another, as the cold heart of power may order and direct. Only two years have passed since we made nationally the first step in this retrograde course on the West Coast of Africa. There were Dutch and British settlements intermingled on the Gold Coast. This caused some inconvenience. Those who had thought that the feelings and affections of the people ought to be consulted in territorial arrangements between nations, proposed that the British Government should acquire the Dutch possessions for a small sum of money, which was possible, because the said possessions were valueless to the Dutch, and the people were ready to hail with acclamation the British rule. But the British Government preferred rather to hand over some of our possessions to the Dutch in exchange for some of theirs, so that the coast west and east of a certain point might be respectively Dutch and British. So entirely were the affections and prejudices of the people inhabiting the said possessions treated with contempt, that it was not deemed necessary to make the native kings and chiefs officially acquainted with the treaty of exchange that had been signed by the two Powers. The day of exchange arrived. The transferred people in the old Dutch town and districts welcomed eagerly the rule of Great Britain. Not so, however, the inhabitants of the old British towns and districts. These obstinately declined to be transferred to new masters, they would not accept the Dutch flag or Dutch Government. Commandah, one of these places, so obstinately refused the transfer, that a Dutch ship of war, on board of which was the British Administrator (who, it has been stated on good evidence, which has never been contradicted, counselled the barbarous act), bombarded it, entirely destroying all the habitations, and killing many of the inhabitants, the result of which has been war from that day to this between the Dutch and Fantee people, the Dutch having brought down the Ashantees as their allies, and hundreds of human beings having been cruelly slaughtered because they persistently refuse to be turned over from British to Dutch rule. See also, in a Cape Coast com-

munication in this present number, what has happened also in Apollonia from the same cause. We believed that these things must have produced their effect in Downing-street, and although we were well aware that the French Government had for more than ten years past been constantly endeavouring to obtain a cession of the River Gambia, and were still negotiating in that direction, it was in this belief that we ventured last month to write: "The British Government fully recognises that in territorial exchanges there is something more than the soil to be transferred, and that this 'something more,' consisting of human beings with interests, attachments, and desires, ought to be, and must be, more or less consulted in the matter. The recent experience in the Dutch and British exchange has shown that Africans under British rule or influence do imbibe or acquire very decided opinions and preferences as to the European nations having sway on the West Coast; that it is not a matter of indifference to them, either as regards their feelings or interests, whether the maritime key of the countries they inhabit, and which they at least think belong to themselves, be in the possession of Great Britain, France, or Holland. And we do not think that the British Government will deliberately disregard such opinions and preferences among people who have been under their protection or government." We knew at least that if this were not true it ought to be true, and we would not have believed it to be other than true, had not Mr. Monsell officially proclaimed on the 10th instant in the House of Commons that it was untrue; notwithstanding that the last mail had brought the news of a visit of survey and examination in the Gambia by French officials on board a French ship of war; that these officials had stated the transfer was to take place in August next; and that, to our poignant disappointment and sorrow, Sir Arthur Kennedy, the Administrator-in-chief, who had come up from Sierra Leone to meet the French officials, had stigmatised as "mere sentiment" the strongly-expressed objections of the 20,000 African British subjects on the river to be turned over to the French like so many head of cattle (*vide* letters and copy of petition, &c., p. 134.) Sentiment! We are aware that the rigid principles of a modern heartless political economy, the application of which, with that logical consistency which characterises the Anglo-Saxon race, is impelling Great Britain vigorously forward on the road to national ruin, ignore all other realities than material quantities and money values, but we have never before heard the attachment of a colonial people to the sovereign, language, liberties, laws, institutions, and religion of the parent state stigmatised as "mere sentiment." We do not doubt, however, that in this expression there was a faithful reflex of the mind of Downing street, since Mr. Monsell has so completely ignored in the House of Commons the existence of any other British subjects at the Gambia than a portion of the few Europeans, thirty-nine males and eight females, to whom he alluded, as if these were the only human beings whose destinies were to be affected or involved in the projected cession. But one at least of the letters which we this day publish puts forward other claims for the consideration of the British Government, should the Houses of Parliament, as representing the feelings and opinions of this country, endorse the stigma of "sentiment" on the heartfelt allegiance of these African colonial subjects to the British Crown. They do not believe in the possibility of their continuing to live in the Gambia under French rule; their proximity to Senegal enables them to form a correct estimate of the French colonial system as applied to the coloured people; they have, for the most part, been brought up in, and are strongly attached to, Protestantism in religion, and they feel—that is the educated Africans—that as regards language, liberties, religion, and other sentimental trifles, the Gambia will no longer be a place for them after the cession, and that they must remove to some other British possession on the Coast which the French do not at present covet, or of which they do not at present claim the transfer. They therefore ask who is to pay them the proper and present money value of their houses, lands, and industries, which they have followed, acquired, and built in the belief that Gambia was an inalienable British

possession, and that they should be always under British rule there, until the period contemplated by the late Parliamentary Committee, at which they might be deemed able to take upon themselves the charge of self-government. We venture yet to hope and believe that no British Parliament will sanction the cession of the Gambia to the French; but we say, unhesitatingly, that if the cession be made and sanctioned, this question of money, as distinct from sentiment, must be fairly dealt with, not only as regards the educated Africans, but also as regards the owners of the mercantile establishments, now of considerable value, who may not choose to carry on mercantile operations under the restrictions which French authorities are certain to impose, in their efforts to assimilate their rule in the Gambia with that in the Senegal. Either the treaty of cession will have to include the payment of a large sum of money by the French in purchase of all these mercantile establishments and native properties and interests, at a full value to be scheduled before the signing of the treaty, or the House of Commons will have to vote the necessary sum out of the revenues of the United Kingdom. Any other course than this would inflict indelible disgrace on the British nation and Government. It is bad enough to confiscate the *sentiment* of a colonial people, without confiscating also their possessions, and means of living, and sending them forth into the world to seek new homes and industries without full and adequate compensation. We earnestly call the attention of members of the House of Commons to this important point. In replying to Sir John Hay, Mr. Gladstone said "that there never had been the slightest intention of taking any proceedings of the kind (i.e., the cession to France) without the consent of Parliament." But with all due respect we venture to say that this is not enough. There is all the difference in the world between coming before Parliament for sanction of a course to be pursued, and sanction of a course already pursued; and there ought to be some understanding between the House and Her Majesty's Ministers that no treaty for the said object with France shall be signed at all without the previous sanction of Parliament had and obtained to all the conditions of transfer. A treaty for the cession to a foreign power of a portion of Her Majesty's dominions is a very serious matter; care should be taken that no British subject whatever shall be in any way damaged thereby, and that the treaty should not be a onesided bargain all to the advantage of the foreign power, because Her Majesty's advisers may have imbibed some sentimental idea of "determining the limits of English and French influence on the West Coast of Africa." If what we hear from Paris be correct, and we know that it is correct, a more unblushing evasion of the truth than is contained in the above words of Mr. Monsell has been seldom heard within the walls of the House of Commons. We will endeavour to justify this accusation in another leader.

THE CHARGES AGAINST MR. JUSTICE HUGGINS.

We have thought it our duty to insert the "Huggins scandal," because there are great principles at stake, and justice has not yet been done upon one whom we look upon as a grievous offender; and we regret that the urgent Gambia cession business should have made it impossible for us to comment upon it as its continued importance deserves.

OFFICIAL REASONS FOR CEDING THE GAMBIA.

We have said that a more unblushing evasion of the truth than is contained in the words uttered by Mr. Monsell on the 10th of June has seldom been heard within the walls of the House of Commons. Those words, as reported, were that the transfer of the Gambia to France was one of the things under consideration with the object of determining the limits of English and French influence on the West Coast of Africa. Now we will do the British Government the justice to admit that the idea of a cession of the Gambia to France did not originate with them. It was

a French idea, born of a French desire for French colonial extension, has been persistently adhered to during many years, has been the instigator of a very tortuous West African policy with the object of ultimately realising it, and was at first put forward by France with the Government of Great Britain, with some such excuse or subterfuge as that enunciated by Mr. Monsell. To obtain the cession of the Gambia from Great Britain has been the sole aim of French policy in all that the French have done or attempted during many years on the West Coast of Africa south of the Senegal. Of course it was ridiculous to suppose that the Gambia would be ceded for nothing. The proposal to Great Britain to make such a cession upon such conditions would have been an insult. France must have something to offer in exchange. She therefore set about acquiring. Manifestly the best possessions, or real or pretended claims to acquire, would be some in proximity to British settlements, or in which British subjects seemed to take interest. Thus she formed the small settlements of Grand Bassam and Assinee, in immediate proximity to the Gold Coast Protectorate. Then British traders had begun to manifest great interest in the Gaboon. France planted herself there, and Britain acquiesced. The Liverpool merchants, however, made some stir about it. In French eyes the coveted fruit seemed to be ripening, and the proposal was made to the British Government by that of France to transfer Grand Bassam, Assinee, and the Gaboon to Great Britain in exchange for the Gambia, which was from that time forward to be the southern limit of French action. The abandonment of our colonies and settlements abroad had not then, however, been elevated to the rank of a policy. Lord Palmerston, moreover, had formed just and great ideas of the future importance and value of African settlements. He remained always true to Africa, and the paltry offer of the Gaboon, Grand Bassam, and Assinee for one of the finest rivers of Africa, situate only a few days by steamer from England, was allowed quietly to sleep. France saw she had no sufficient inducement to offer, and set to work *de novo*. Soon after we had annexed Lagos in order formally to extinguish the slave trade there, she endeavoured to establish herself in the disagreeable proximity of Porto Novo. From this, however, she found it necessary to recede, the step was rather too bold a one, it was too much like putting a knife to the throat and demanding surrender. Then commenced the admirable policy of surrounding the Gambia and compromising the future of Sierra Leone by a network of French influence in the numerous rivers south of the Gambia, up to and in the immediate vicinity of Sierra Leone, rivers some of which were great feeders of Sierra Leone trade. She had ample opportunity for doing this, because, although the policy of colonial abandonment was not yet in the ascendant, that of abstention from further acquisition, its fatidical predecessor, had been fully acquiesced in by the magnates of the British political world. France was allowed quietly to establish herself by means of naval expeditions, sent to redress the concerted grievances of French traders in most of the rivers of the great watershed south of the Gambia, of which the Rio Nunez and Rio Pongas are of no mean worth. Great Britain, however, under the influence of the new abstention ideas, attached no importance to this—these were only African rivers—and nothing in West Africa was worthy of her high consideration; everything connected with West Africa was becoming an official bore; the people in the various settlements, notwithstanding their sable hue, were becoming educated through missionary zeal, and they dared to complain of the constant succession of official scum and filth that Downing-street persistently forced down their throats, to their great discomfort and injury; to the squandering of their resources and other shameful inflections. So France went on in her ingenious policy. Sierra Leone traders were developing an important ground-nut trade in the rivers Melicourie, Sarcies, &c., natural feeders of the Sierra Leone trade. The invading trade pioneers of French policy made their advent; some small French interests were created; French grievances followed as a

matter of course—gunboats made their appearance (we chronicled some atrocious acts of cruelty that were enacted)—land was bought of a rebel chief for a fort—and the whole machinery of aggressive annexation was set to work. The people of Sierra Leone took the alarm; we exposed what was going on; we published the treaty by which, many years before, the protectorate of these rivers had been ceded to and accepted by Great Britain—the British Government were compelled to take some notice of it; but the British Government only acts through its colonial officials in colonial matters. Blackall was at the head of affairs at Sierra Leone; Bravo, now of the Gambia, was his lieutenant; a French intrigue had obtained the ascendancy at Sierra Leone through the profligacy and indifference of rulers; and all that was obtained was, that the French were not to interfere with the British Sierra Leone trade in those rivers, &c. And now that all this has been done and permitted, or connived at, France puts forth anew and more vigorously her proposals for a cession to her of the important River Gambia. This brings us to Mr. Monsell's unblushing evasion of the truth. We learn from French official sources, and it has been confirmed at British ones, that France no longer treats as aforesaid for the determination of the limits of English and French influence on the West Coast by offering Gaboon, Assinee, Grand Bassam, and all these subsequent acquisitions south of the Gambia, so that French influence should in future be concentrated, and act only in and from the Gambia northward and eastward. Oh no; Sierra Leone interests in the Melicourie, the Sarcies, &c., having been betrayed, and the future peace and security, as well as trade and wealth of Sierra Leone, being thereby endangered whenever the threatened day of British abandonment of all the West African possessions shall arrive, France coolly offers to withdraw from the neighbourhood of Sierra Leone, in consideration of the transfer to her of the Gambia. Now, even if we could assent to the cession of the Gambia to the French, a more onesided operation than this was never before made voluntarily by the government of a powerful state. The least that one would have thought the British Government could for one moment have listened to, would have been that the French should have tacked on to their original offer all their since acquired rights, claims, and possessions in West Africa, limiting themselves in future and for ever to the Gambia northward—an African dominion when viewed in connexion with Algeria, and which must inevitably follow in the train of Algeria, that ought to satisfy the greediest aspirations of France or any other European power. But to commit the political and moral iniquity of ceding the Gambia, its countries, and peoples to France, for so paltry a consideration would justly cover the British Government with contemptuous ridicule as well as with deserved execration. If the iniquity be perpetrated let it at least be for what there is only a pretence of being secured now—viz., to determine, i.e., separate the limits of French and British interests along the West Coast of Africa. We have long since pointed out that we look upon the countries of the West African seaboard as future kingdoms; that they ought to be so regarded by British ministers and politicians, and that it is the duty of this country to refrain from doing or permitting anything that can jeopardise their position, and sow the seeds of conflict with a powerful European state. But we are not now to be told that because they have chosen to allow France wantonly, in pursuance of its selfish policy, to compromise the future of Sierra Leone, that therefore the Gambia is to be sacrificed, the loyalty of its people outraged, their nationality changed, their acquired language, with which all their advance in civilisation is associated, be made useless to them, their social status be lowered, as it would inevitably be in a French possession, or that they should be compelled, as they must be if they would avoid all this, to abandon their lands, houses, and industries for the paltry consideration that new French incomers would deign to give for them under such circumstances. No, the treaty, as proposed, does not define the future limits of French and English influence so that they should never in future be antagonistic or lead to com-

plications on the West Coast; and even were the conditions changed so that it would effect this, there would still remain its crying iniquity as regards the people of the Gambia, native and coloured, as well as European.

Since the preceding observations were in type we find the following in the daily papers: "Paris, June 15, Evening.—The object of the negotiations between the British and French Governments relative to Gambia is to establish a clear line of demarcation between their respective territories, each side relinquishing the land projecting into the other's territory. The negotiations were opened at the request of several merchants interested." Here we have the useful French merchants again! This has no doubt been put forth semi-officially in Paris to back up Mr. Monsell's evasion. On that ground we have thought it right to notice it, which we should not otherwise have done, because of its glaring absurdity as well as untruth. The Gambia is a *great river*, not a portion of British territory dovetailing with a portion of French territory, in relation to which *each side might relinquish "the land projecting into the other's territory."* We begin to have hope that the measures taken in England to stop the perpetration of so great an official iniquity and so imbecile a blunder as a cession of the River Gambia and its territories and people to the French, for considerations so unjustifiable and inadequate, will be successful, and that the Gambia and its people will remain among the possessions and people belonging and subject to the British Crown. The cause must be felt to be a very bad one by officials on both sides of the British Channel, when the only arguments (God save the mark!) in its favour, are those on which we have here commented, and the falsehood and absurdity of which we have herein exposed.

WHAT OUGHT TO BE DONE ABOUT THE PENDING GAMBIA TREATY.

WITH all due deference to our Parliamentary friends, we take the liberty of respectfully suggesting the following course—viz.: That Mr. Monsell and Mr. Gladstone having acknowledged that negotiations are pending between Her Majesty's Government and that of France for a cession of the River Gambia, its territories, and people to the latter, the subject be again brought forward in the House of Commons, and that Her Majesty's Government be asked to pledge themselves that no treaty with France, including a cession of the Gambia, &c., shall be signed on behalf of Her Majesty's Government without a copy of the said treaty, as conditionally agreed between the two Governments, being first submitted to both Houses of Parliament. To our friends and all interested at the Gambia we earnestly recommend—

That in order to be prepared, in the event of might overbearing right in this, to them vital matter, a competent committee be forthwith formed in Bathurst, for fixing the present value of all the lands, houses, warehouses, stores, &c., now owned there by British subjects, both European and African, and that such values be scheduled with a valuation of the goodwill of the respective businesses and industries of the owners and occupiers, in order that the same may be submitted to Her Majesty's Government and to the British Parliament in a claim for compensation for removal and disturbance.

Further,—That a similar schedule be prepared, setting forth the sums that have been spent out of the Colonial Exchequer during the past fifty years, in public works and buildings, in order that the same be also submitted to Her Majesty's Government, and to both Houses of Parliament, for consideration, in reference to any treaty that may be pending between the Government of Great Britain and France for a cession of the Gambia to the latter.

That petitions to both Houses of Parliament against any such cession be prepared and signed, and forwarded to this country without delay.

A NOBLE GIFT.—The sum of 1,000*l.* was a few days since left at the bank of Messrs. Ransom, Bouverie, and Co., "for the British Hospital for Diseases of the Skin, 56, Great Marlborough-street, W., and 13a, Finsbury-square, E.C., from V. S. T."

THE HUGGINS SCANDAL—STATEMENT OF THE CASE—DEBATES IN THE HOUSE OF COMMONS—DESPATCHES FROM THE SECRETARY OF STATE.

[Revised and amended from the *West African Liberator*, by the Editor of the *African Times*.]

THE HUGGINS SCANDAL—STATEMENT OF THE CASE.

The case of Mr. Huggins having once more been before the House of Commons, as public journalists we feel it our duty to state again the whole matter, on account of the different feature it has taken. In the year 1867 and the beginning of 1868 two petitions were sent to the Colonial office, in which Mr. Huggins was charged with having passed nineteen illegal sentences of whipping and excess of punishment on prisoners; whilst a communication was also addressed to that department by Mr. Rainy, dated the 11th of April, 1868, drawing attention to Mr. Huggins' conduct with respect to the salary of his clerk, Mr. Fyfe, which he withheld for three years, denying over and over again that he was owing it, and which he would not pay till he was forced to do so by an action being taken against him.

No notice being taken of these petitions, the matter was brought forward in the House of Commons by Mr. H. B. Sheridan, Member for Dudley, on the 22nd May, 1868, when Mr. Adderley stated—"That the charges in the petitions had been inquired into, and ascertained to be unfounded; and that the communication from Mr. Rainy had been inquired into and found not to contain facts." The authority on which Mr. Adderley made this unqualified accusation against the petitioners and Mr. Rainy has not yet been fully exposed, but the day is fast approaching when the rottenness of that authority will be shown to the world, and when Mr. Adderley will be convinced how greatly he has been misled. We are persuaded that this question will never die out till the really shocking misdoings of Mr. Huggins, and his deception of the Colonial office, are held up to public gaze in the same manner as the cruelties of Governor Eyre of Jamaica have been. He, too, for a long time hoodwinked the Colonial office, and was covered by it as long as it was possible, but justice reached him at last, and Downing-street, finding him too heavy a load, threw him over. A similar fate is reserved for Mr. Huggins, however secure he may now deem himself. The matter was again brought before Parliament on the 27th of July, 1868, by the same honourable Member for Dudley, and again Mr. Adderley replied in the same manner as on the former occasion. In consequence of the discussions on the matter in the House, the Colonial office condescended to reply to the petitions, and in a despatch dated 8th June, 1868, attempted to justify Mr. Huggins on the ground that the sentences he had passed were similar to those which had been passed by former judges of Sierra Leone. With all due deference to Colonial office despatches, we must say that we conceive it impossible that the reason assigned in this one for exculpating Mr. Huggins* can be regarded as a valid one. Because other judges passed illegal sentences and escaped impeachment, Mr. Huggins is justified in doing the same without being impeached! The petitioners, on receiving this extraordinary answer, addressed another petition to the Colonial office, in which they stated that Mr. Huggins had practised a very great deception on it, and showed that no judge of Sierra Leone had ever done what Mr. Huggins was charged with doing. In reply to this petition, in a despatch dated 26th February, 1869, the whole case was largely entered into, but Mr. Huggins had already been covered by the authorities, and it would not do to discard him now; he is still justified, but six of the sentences are condemned by Earl Granville as being unlawful. Meanwhile the petitioners were not idle, but addressed other petitions to the Colonial office, in which they clearly set forth how completely Mr. Huggins had misled the Minister by wilful misrepresentations. One of the prisoners referred to in a petition, on whom Mr. Huggins had passed an unlawful sentence of whipping, for stealing a coat, a shirt, and a pair of trousers, without any previous conviction being set forth in the information exhibited against him or proved at his trial, brought an action against the tyrannical judge, who was put in the witness-box, and was, in fact, the principal witness examined in behalf of the plaintiff; and although every opportunity was given him at the trial to show by what law he passed this, as well as the other unlawful sentences complained of, yet he could not do so; an office copy of the evidence in the case was forwarded at once to the Colonial office and to Mr. Sheridan by the plaintiff's counsel. Mr. Sheridan, being armed with this, and also with Earl Granville's despatch of the 26th February, 1869, in which six of the sentences were condemned as unlawful, brought the subject once more before the House of Commons in August last. The Colonial office, on this occasion, found itself so sorely pressed that it was forced to promise that the entire matter should be referred to

* Even if true, which it was not, but entirely at variance with fact.—Ed. A. T.

Governor Sir Arthur Kennedy, and pledged itself to lay the papers connected with the Huggins business on the table of the House of Commons after the termination of the inquiry. All this took place in August last. Here the matter rested; no official communication was made in reply to the petitioners, nor was an answer given to the communication of Thomas's counsel. But on the 11th April last Mr. G. H. Moore came to the aid of the petitioners, and moved for the production of the papers which had been promised, when, to the surprise of every one (not that the papers were refused, for this was always expected by those who had watched the progress of affairs), the Under-Secretary urged that Sir Arthur Kennedy had held Mr. Huggins not blameworthy. There must be some mistake; no one here knows of any inquiries being made by Sir Arthur, nor is it here believed, either that Sir Arthur has undertaken to report that Mr. Huggins is not blameworthy, or that he even thinks that he is not blameworthy.

The answer of the Under-Secretary induced Mr. Moore to give him notice that he would move for Sir Arthur's report at a future day. The lamented death of Mr. Moore has hitherto prevented the matter from again coming under the notice of the House of Commons.

Finally, we beg to subjoin the debate on Mr. Sheridan's motion on the 22nd May, 1868, when the Under-Secretary stated that the charges against Mr. Huggins had been inquired into and ascertained to be unfounded. Next, that of the 28th July of the same year, when the same answer was given. Then comes the despatch of the 8th June, 1868, alleging that former judges had done just what Mr. Huggins had been accused of, on which ground he was justified; and this is followed by the despatch of the 26th February, 1869, still attempting to justify Mr. Huggins, but at the same time condemning six of the sentences passed by him as being unlawful. After this we come to the debate on Mr. Sheridan's motion on the 3rd August, 1869, when the papers are promised; and lastly, to the motion of Mr. Moore, on the 11th April last, when the production of the promised papers is refused. Beldom has it fallen to our lot to observe such gross inconsistencies in high quarters; on two occasions the charges were unfounded; soon after, the charges are admitted to be true; for we are told that former judges did the same, and Mr. Huggins was only following their example. Finding, however, that such a plea could not satisfy the petitioners, six of the sentences are condemned, but Mr. Huggins is still screened; and, let it be well observed, all these concessions were made notwithstanding that it had been set up that the charges against him were unfounded.

(From the *Times* or the *Standard*.)
HOUSE OF COMMONS, MAY 22, 1868.

Mr. H. B. Sheridan asked the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether Mr. Horatio Huggins, recently appointed to the office of Assistant-Judge in the Colony of Sierra Leone, has ever been called to the English bar, and whether he is the same person whose judgments whilst sitting as sole judge in the Supreme Court at Sierra Leone were brought under the notice of the House last session. And whether the Colonial office has received a communication from Mr. Rainy, a properly qualified advocate practising at the bar of that country, setting forth further facts having reference to that gentleman and demanding an inquiry.

Mr. Adderley said that the hon. member has four or five times put notices of questions in the paper implying that appointments have been improperly made in West Africa by the Colonial office, without ever coming down to the House to receive answers to those questions. If the hon. member would state what the defects are of which he complains, he (Mr. Adderley) would give most ample explanations, but he deprecated innuendoes being kept on the notice paper from week to week without an opportunity being given of reply. (Hear, hear.) Mr. Huggins has been called to the English bar. Attention was called in this House last year to his judgments, but the allegations made against him were proved to be unfounded—(hear, hear)—and the communications from Mr. Rainy have been inquired into and found not facts. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. Sheridan said he would take an early opportunity of bringing the whole question of West Africa appointments before the House.

(From the *Times* of July 28, 1868.)
HOUSE OF COMMONS, JULY 27, 1868.

Mr. H. B. Sheridan asked the Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies whether petitions had not recently been received from the inhabitants of Sierra Leone against the appointment of Mr. Horatio James Huggins as Assistant-Judge of the Supreme Court of that Colony, and if so what course Her Majesty's Government intended to pursue relative to the facts set forth in the said petitions, and whether and what correspondence had arisen on the subject matters of these petitions between the authorities and influential persons resident in that colony and the Colonial office.

Mr. Adderley said memorials had been received from certain persons against the appointment of Mr. Huggins, but as he had informed the hon. member on a previous occasion the allegations in those memorials had been inquired into, and they had been ascertained to be unfounded.

Mr. H. B. Sheridan asked whether any fresh complaints had been received.

Mr. Adderley said no fresh complaints had been received.
Downing-street, June 8, 1868.

Sierra Leone 133.

Sir,—I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your despatch of the 28th April, inclosing the copy of a petition of certain inhabitants of the Settlement of Sierra Leone.

On that petition reference is made to a former petition signed by some of the present petitioners, which, as you may be aware, was irregularly transmitted to me through Mr. Rainy, and in which complaints were made of the appointments under the new system of Mr. Huggins and Mr. Montagu to be judges, those persons being alleged to be "notoriously unfit persons," and the petitioners go on to state that up to the present moment they have not been favoured with any communication from me on the subject.

Upon this I have to observe that the appointments referred to were only temporary appointments made until the permanent appointments were decided on, and that by my despatch of the 11th May, 1867, I confine myself to an approval of his having made a temporary arrangement for the administration of justice.

The only appointments which I have made are those of Mr. French to be Chief Justice in May, 1867, and of Mr. Huggins to be Assistant-Judge in the present year. I considered it unnecessary to send a separate answer to the petitioners, because the appointment of Mr. Huggins to be Assistant-Judge, after I had fully communicated with the Governor upon the subject matter of the former petition, sufficiently showed the conclusion at which I had arrived.

I may add, however, as to one part of the charges brought against Mr. Huggins, that the sentences complained of, and which were passed by him as Acting Chief Justice, in the absence of Chief Justice Carr, were passed in those cases only where the prisoners had been previously convicted, in one case as often as ten times, in several other cases as often as four times, and, further, that the sentences were strictly in accordance with sentences which had been regularly imposed for a long course of years by former chief justices at Sierra Leone, and against which, so far as I am aware, no remonstrance has been made.

I have to desire you to communicate this despatch to the petitioners.—I have, &c.,

(Signed) BUCKINGHAM AND CHANDOS.
Governor-Sir A. Kennedy, C.B.

Downing-street, February 26, 1869.
Sir,—I have had under my consideration the various charges against Mr. Huggins, the Assistant-Judge in Sierra Leone, which are to be found in the correspondence noted in the margin.

The questions out of which this correspondence has arisen relate, not to scandalous conduct in private life or to the omission to perform admitted duties, but to the correctness of certain judicial sentences, and, before proceeding to dispose of them, I think it useful to explain what does not appear to be clearly understood in Sierra Leone, the relation which, in this respect, the Executive Government (i.e., the Governor and Secretary of State) occupy towards courts of justice and the community in which they exercise their functions.

And, first, it cannot be too clearly explained that the Secretary of State is not a Court of Appeal against the decision of any competent court of justice. Any assumption of appellate function by the Executive Government would be an improper interference with the independence of the courts.

If, therefore, any person considers himself aggrieved by the decision of a competent judge, and desires redress, his proper course is to carry his case before a court of appeal. If there is no such court he is without remedy; except that in the case of a criminal, the Queen or the Governor may, to a certain extent, arrest the course of justice by remitting his punishment. Any petition for a remission of sentence should be addressed to the Governor; and may, if he should refuse to accede to it, and not till then, be brought through him before the Secretary of State.

The Executive Government, however, though subject to the above exception it has not the power of righting a complaint, yet has the power of dismissing the judge, and would properly exercise that power if a sufficient case of incompetency, ignorance, or carelessness were established against him.

If any persons suppose that they have such a case their proper course is to lay it in the first instance, not before the Secretary of State, but before the Governor. If the Governor entertains their charges it is open to him to proceed against the judge, with the advice of his Executive Council, either under his commission and instructions, by way of suspension, subject to the confirma-

tion of the Secretary of State, or under the Act of 22 Geo. III., c. 75 (commonly called Burke's Act), subject to an appeal to the Privy Council.

If the Governor refuses to entertain the charges, then, and not till then, the case may be brought through him before the Secretary of State.

I am desirous to explain this clearly to you and to the community of Sierra Leone, not only in order to prevent irregular modes of proceeding, which cause a great deal of unnecessary delay and trouble, but also to prevent the inhabitants of the colony from being led to spend their money and time in framing and forwarding to Her Majesty's Government petitions which cannot be of any use.

The present case, you will see, has not been dealt with according to the rules which I have here laid down. But I think it best to dispose of it, as far as possible, in the stage which it has reached, without taking notice of any past irregularity.

Two legal points appear to me to be brought under my consideration—

1. The Imperial Act 24 and 25 Vic. c. 96 is, among others, adopted in Sierra Leone by the Local Ordinance No 3 of 1862; "so far as local circumstances will permit." And the 116th Section of that Act provides the form of indictment for a subsequent offence after a previous conviction of felony or misdemeanour, in which form of indictment the previous conviction is specifically alleged.

It is stated that Mr. Huggins sentenced prisoners to the increased punishment due to a subsequent conviction, although such convictions were not stated in the informations, according to the form provided by Act of Parliament.

Mr. Huggins explains that it is for the judge to decide what parts of an Act thus adopted in a colony are really in force in them; he adduces what certainly appear to be very good reasons for thinking that this section of the Imperial Act is not applicable to the circumstances of Sierra Leone; and he has, therefore, treated it as not being in force. He adds that former judges have not thought it indispensable that prior convictions should be thus stated in criminal informations.

2. It is alleged that in certain instances Mr. Huggins has sentenced certain persons to greater punishments than the law admitted of.

To this Mr. Huggins replies by referring to the Act 7 and 8 Geo. IV. c. 28 sec. 11, which is in force in the colony, and which, I may observe, is not referred to by the petition.

The first point raised by the petitioners is one of form—this is to say, it is not denied that the prisoners were really liable to the punishment inflicted on them if only the proper forms had been observed.

I think it very undesirable that the Queen's prerogative of mercy should be used for the purpose of defeating substantial justice, and without expressing any opinions as to the correctness or incorrectness of Mr. Huggins' judgment, I consider the Executive Government should treat it as authoritative unless and until a contrary decision should be pronounced by some superior court.

I should, perhaps, add, with a view to future legislation, that the law as laid down by Mr. Huggins appears to me more suitable to the circumstances of Sierra Leone than the law as prescribed by the English Act of Parliament. The matter, however, is of no great consequence, as I take it for granted that future informations will be framed in such a manner as to avoid all possibility of cavil.

The second point is a more substantial one, the question being whether certain persons are not undergoing, or have not undergone, punishments which would not be warranted by law, even though they were guilty of the offences imputed to them; and whether this injustice, if it be one, ought not to be remedied by the exertion of the Queen's prerogative of mercy.

This is a question which the executive is bound to examine for itself, and to act on the judgment which it may form.

On this accordingly Mr. Huggins has furnished a report.

He is no doubt right in stating that the Act of 7 and 8 Geo. IV. c. 28 sec. 11 is in force in Sierra Leone, and that many of the sentences complained of are justified by that Act. But some of these sentences—viz., those marked J, M, P, Q, S, and T in the petition transmitted in your despatch of the 11th August, 1868, appear to me not to be so justified, as in all these cases the prisoners were charged and convicted of larceny only as the subsequent offence, and therefore did not come within the Act. I also entertain doubts as to the legality of the sentence in the case marked C in that petition. It will be your duty to request Mr. Huggins to explain this apparent excess of jurisdiction, and after receiving that explanation to consider, in conjunction with your legal advisers, and ultimately, of course, with the assistance of your Executive Council, whether the sentences were or were not warranted by law.

Any punishment which, in your opinion, is not so warranted

and not yet undergone, you will, of course, wholly remit. And if any person still in confinement has, in your opinion, already suffered a punishment not warranted by the nature of his offence, you will remit to him the rest of the punishment.

Thus much for the question of law.

There remains a charge against Mr. Huggins' veracity.

In contradiction to his statement, as to the usage of the court, certain forms of information are cited in which a previous conviction is regularly set forth according to the English precedent.

This is not inconsistent with the substantial correctness of Mr. Huggins' statements, in which, I may observe, he was corroborated by the sheriff, Mr. Meheux.

What is necessary for him to show is not that that English form was never adopted, but that the judges have not been in the habit of insisting upon its adoption. Mr. Huggins will probably be glad to have the opportunity of supporting his statement by reference to the records of courts of the colony.

You will communicate a copy of this dispatch to Mr. Huggins, and also to the petitioners against him.—I have, &c.,

GRANVILLE.

Governor Sir A. Kennedy, C.B.

MR. JUSTICE HUGGINS.

The *Times* of the 4th August says: The judicial malpractices of Mr. Huggins, Assistant-Judge at Sierra Leone, were next brought before the House by Mr. H. B. Sheridan, and Mr. Monsell promised to institute an inquiry.

The following is a report in the same paper:—

HOUSE OF COMMONS, AUG. 3, 1869.

Thomas v. Huggins.

Mr. H. B. Sheridan called attention to the case of Samuel Thomas v. Horatio James Huggins, Assistant Judge of the Supreme Court of Sierra Leone, a report of which appeared in the *African Times* of June 23, and generally to the conduct of the defendant in that case in his capacity of Judge. Thomas, it appeared, had been induced to plead guilty to a charge of having stolen a coat and a pair of trousers, although no evidence had been called to prove the offence, in the expectation that he would be leniently dealt with. The leniency, however, which was extended to him by Mr. Huggins was to sentence him to receive 150 lashes with a cat-o'-nine tails, to be imprisoned for a year, and to be kept at the hardest possible labour during that time. The trial had created the greatest interest at Sierra Leone, because the punishment was regarded as excessive, and as being altogether inconsistent with the law. Mr. Huggins was also accused of having been guilty of many offences of the same sort, and the action brought against him might be said to be the action of the whole community of the colony, because it was impossible for Thomas to bear the expense of such a proceeding. The decision arrived at was one which was not calculated to allay their anxiety, for it was to the effect, without any opinion being pronounced as to whether the punishment inflicted on Thomas was legal or not, that Mr. Huggins was not responsible for any act which he might do in his capacity. The only court of appeal from that decision was the Privy Council to whom an appeal would involve very great expense, or the Colonial-office, failing to obtain redress from which it only remained for the people of Sierra Leone to appeal to that House. That they had appealed to the Colonial-office was proved by the number of petitions which they had presented on the subject. The answer given by Huggins to the allegations contained in those petitions was that, under an old Act of the reign of George III., he was justified in passing such sentences as that which he had passed in the case of Thomas. It was, however, generally understood in Sierra Leone that that Act had been virtually repealed by what was called a General Ordinance of the Local Government, passed in May, 1862, by which the laws in force in England were made applicable to that colony. They contended, therefore, that the sentence in the case of Thomas was illegal, as the use of the lash was certainly repugnant to their feelings. Lord Granville, he might add, stated in a dispatch of the 26th of February that there were sentences pronounced by Mr. Huggins which could not, in his opinion, be in any possible way explained or justified. Several of the sentences passed by him were, the colonists complained, excessive. In some instances he had sentenced persons convicted on charges of simple larceny to be imprisoned with hard labour and to be whipped three times, while in other instances sentences of penal servitude had been passed for one, two, three, four, and as many as seven years beyond the period prescribed by the Act of Parliament for the offences of which they had been found guilty. The colonists, under those circumstances, earnestly prayed for inquiry into the subject. In a great number of cases it was alleged that punishments had been awarded in excess of the power conferred on the Judge. When the case of Thomas v. Huggins was tried, it was dismissed with costs, although, according to a statement in the *African Times*, the excess of punishment awarded by the defendant be-

yond what the law authorised was, in the aggregate of cases decided by him, no less than twenty-one years of penal servitude, six years of hard labour, and 2,200 lashes with the cat-o'-nine tails. In conclusion the hon. gentleman moved, "That, in the opinion of this House, a court of inquiry should be held at Sierra Leone to investigate the charges against Mr. Horatio James Huggins, the Assistant-Judge of the Supreme Court of Sierra Leone, contained in the petition from that settlement sent to the Secretary of State for the Colonies."

Mr. Monsell said that his hon. friend could hardly complain that the attention of the Colonial-office had not been directed to this subject, for three or four petitions in reference to it had been presented to the department. One of these was presented when the Duke of Buckingham was Secretary of State for the Colonies; it was referred to the then Governor of the colony, who, in reporting on it, stated that he had a very high opinion of Mr. Huggins, and that he acquitted that gentleman of all fault in the course he had pursued. After that petition had been so decided upon, the Duke of Buckingham promoted Mr. Huggins to the position he at present occupied. Hon. gentlemen would doubtless agree with him that it would not be a desirable thing for the House to require the Colonial-office to constitute itself a court of appeal in judicial matters. Nothing indeed could be more calculated to impede the course of justice. The real duty of the Colonial-office was as follows: In every colony where a complaint like the present was made against an official, a petition might be presented to the Governor, who was bound, after referring it to his council, to consider and decide upon it. If the Governor were of opinion that the judge was in fault he could suspend him and refer the case to the Secretary of State. That course was not pursued, however, in the present case, and his hon. friend might shorten matters very much if he would recommend the persons whose cause he was pleading to adopt that course. As to the law laid down by the judge, that was a question already *sub judice*. As his hon. friend stated it had been brought before the Chief Justice of Sierra Leone, and he understood it was now before the Privy Council in this country on appeal.

Mr. Sheridan said there had been no appeal.

Mr. Monsell said he understood that an appeal was contemplated, and at all events an appeal was open to the parties interested. In regard to the punishment referred to by his hon. friend, the simple question was whether the Act 22 and 23 Vic., cap. 67, was in force in the colony or not. If it was not in force there, the sentences were in accordance with law; if, on the contrary, it was in force there, the sentences were not in accordance with law. This was a point which neither the House of Commons nor the Colonial-office was the proper tribunal to decide. (Hear.) When Sir A. Kennedy arrived in England—and he was expected very soon—the case should be submitted to him, and he should be glad to lay upon the table the petitions, the reply of Mr. Huggins, and the remarks of Colonel Blackall, and the Governor, if the hon. gentleman would move for their production. All he could promise the hon. gentleman was that the whole question should be submitted to Sir A. Kennedy.

HOUSE OF COMMONS, MARCH 11, 1870.

Mr. G. H. Moore desired to know whether the Government would be prepared to lay upon the table the papers relating to a petition from the inhabitants of Sierra Leone, praying for the removal of Mr. Justice Huggins, on the allegation that he had passed an illegal sentence.

Mr. Monsell replied that the question had been brought before the House during the previous session by the hon. Member for Dudley, and he then promised that the whole conduct of Mr. Justice Huggins should be submitted to the consideration of the Governor-in-Chief of Sierra Leone, who was then coming to England. It was so submitted, and the Governor expressed his opinion that the conduct of Mr. Huggins was not blameworthy. Under those circumstances he thought it would not be advisable or useful to take any further steps in the matter. (Hear, hear.)

Mr. Rainy to his Grace the Duke of Buckingham and Chandos. Sierra Leone, April 11, 1868.

My Lord Duke,—It having been officially announced that your grace has appointed Mr. Horatio James Huggins to be Assistant-Judge of the Supreme Court of Sierra Leone, I feel it a duty incumbent upon me as a member of the English bar of fourteen years' standing, to submit for your grace's consideration the following circumstances, which have come under my professional notice in an action brought in the Supreme Court of this settlement by one Joseph Theophilus Fyfe against Mr. Justice Huggins:—

In the year 1865, Mr. Carr, the then Chief Justice, left for England upon leave of absence, and Mr. Huggins was appointed Acting Chief Justice. Mr. Fyfe, the Chief Justice's Clerk, was handed over to Mr. Huggins, and he continued to discharge for Mr. Huggins similar duties as for Mr. Carr. Mr. Huggins

adopted the same course as Mr. Carr did as to directing his Clerk to receive the aggregate amount of their joint salaries, but here, unfortunately, all resemblance, except for a few months, ceased between Mr. Huggins and Mr. Carr. Mr. Fyfe received the joint salaries, and by Mr. Huggins' order took the money to Mr. Huggins' banker; but Mr. Fyfe's salary was never paid in any form by Mr. Huggins, and after he had dispensed with Mr. Fyfe's services, he refused to pay him anything. Mr. Fyfe petitioned his Excellency the then Acting Governor upon the subject, who returned the following reply to Mr. Fyfe's petition:—

"The Acting Governor has received Mr. Fyfe's letter of this date:—

"The Acting Governor referred Mr. Fyfe's petition of the 26th November to the Acting Chief Justice, who informs His Excellency that Mr. Fyfe has received his salary."

"The Acting Governor can therefore pronounce no opinion in the matter; but will leave it for the information of his Excellency the Governor when he returns, as requested by Mr. Fyfe."

"Government House, December 22, 1867."

On my return from England to Sierra Leone, I was professionally retained by Mr. Fyfe to commence legal proceedings against Mr. Justice Huggins for the recovery of the salary received by him from the public treasury for my client.

Upon this I addressed the following letter to Mr. Huggins.

"Freetown, January 18, 1869."

"The Honourable Horatio James Huggins. Sir,—I beg leave to inform you that Mr. J. T. Fyfe has instructed me to take legal proceedings against you for the recovery of the sum of 18l. 16s. 8d. due to him by you, as per enclosed account."

"I should be glad to get your reply to this application with as little delay as possible.—I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

"WM. RAINY."

"Dr.—The Honourable Mr. Huggins to J. T. Fyfe. For this sum paid by the Treasurer to Mr. Fyfe for his salary as your Clerk, from 1st to 30th September, 1865, and which, along with your salary, you desired him to take to Mr. Huddle . . . £8 6 8 To ditto, ditto, from 1st Oct. to 31st Oct., 1865 . . . 8 6 8 To ditto, ditto, from 1st Nov. to 16th Nov., 1865 . . . 4 3 4

"Gr. . . £20 16 8 By Cash received from you in Oct., 1865 . . . £2 0 0

£18 16 8 My Lord Duke,—I beg leave to subjoin copy of a note which I received from Mr. Justice Huggins in reply to my application:—

"January 18, 1868."

"Sir,—I am not in Mr. Fyfe's debt.—Your obedient servant, HORATIO JAMES HUGGINS."

"Wm. Rainy, Esq." My Lord Duke,—I communicated Mr. Huggins' letter to my client, and having been assured by him that no portion of his salary for the periods set forth in the particulars of his claim was ever paid to him by Mr. Justice Huggins (except the sum of two pounds for which credit was given to Mr. Huggins as stated in the account), I was compelled to commence an action in my capacity of Advocate and Attorney of the Supreme Court against Mr. Huggins for the salary which he had received from the Public Treasurer for my client. Mr. Justice Huggins appeared by his Attorney to the action and pleaded—*Never indebted*. The cause was set down for trial at the March sittings, 1868, before his Honour the Chief Justice, and after remaining on the cause-list for several days, I received a letter from Mr. Huggins' attorney, copy of which I beg leave to set forth:—

"Gloucester-street, Freetown, March 10, 1868."

"Joseph Theophilus Fyfe v. the Hon. Horatio James Huggins. Sir,—I am instructed by the defendant to pay you the debt and costs in this action, and if you will have the goodness to let me know the amount, I will send it to you forthwith.—I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

(Signed) "A. MONTAGU, Defendant's Attorney."

"To William Rainy, Esq." My Lord Duke,—Mr. Justice Huggins has since paid, through his attorney, the whole of my client's claim with interest from the day he received the salary of my client from the Public Treasurer, and I now hold the professional undertaking of Mr. Huggins' attorney for the payment of the costs of the action.

It is unnecessary to say to your grace that if Mr. Justice Huggins is guilty of having withheld my client's salary for three years, of having informed the Acting Governor in December, 1865, that he was not indebted to my client; of having in January, 1868, made a similar statement in writing to myself; of having filed a plea in the Supreme Court of which he is one

of the Judges in which he denies the debt; and of having subsequently paid the whole of my client's claim with interest; then his Honour's continuance in office for a single day will be a flagrant insult to public justice.

At the same time, if Mr. Justice Huggins can clear himself of these charges, which in my opinion seriously affect his private honour as a gentleman, a great scandal will be removed from the public.—I have, &c., WILLIAM RAINY.

Sir A. Kennedy, Governor-in-Chief, to Mr. Rainy.

Government House, Sierra Leone, June 25, 1868.

Sir,—I have the honour to inform you that his Grace the Duke of Buckingham and Chandos has received your letter dated in April last, with reference to the case of Fyfe v. Huggins. Upon a consideration of all the circumstances of this case, his Grace is satisfied with the explanation offered by Mr. Huggins. His Grace is of opinion that the judges should have the power to appoint and dismiss their clerks, but he entirely disapproves of arrangements like that made by Mr. Huggins, which partitioned between two clerks the salary which had been assigned to the clerk whose name appears on the pay-list.

His Grace is further of opinion that the clerk whose name is on the pay-list should be entitled to receive the whole salary. There would be, of course, no objection in the case of his illness to his paying part of that salary to some one to do a portion of the clerk's work, as was done in the case of Mr. Joseph. Such an arrangement obviously differs most materially from the arrangement made by Mr. Huggins.—I have the honour to be, Sir, your most obedient servant,

A. E. KENNEDY, Governor-in-Chief.

In further correspondence between Mr. Rainy and the Colonial-office, Mr. Rainy showed that Mr. Huggins never partitioned the salary at all, but kept the whole; still the Duke saw no reason for altering his decision in the matter.

WHITE & CO.,

36, King Street, Covent Garden, London, W.C.,
TAILORS, &c.,

Furnish Articles of West-end quality and style, but at a fair moderate price.

Suits of Black; first quality, from £4 4s. to £6 6s.

Twined or Angola Suits, from £3 3s. to £4 4s.

SELF-MEASUREMENT.

First give the height of person in feet and inches. Then in inches and parts of an inch as follows:—

From bottom of collar to waist; from middle of back to elbow; from elbow to wrist; round the breast under the coat; round the waist.

WAISTCOAT.—Round the breast and waist.

TROUSERS.—Length from top to the bottom of the trousers outside; from the fork to the bottom inside; round the waist and hips.

TERMS, CASH. REMITTANCES MUST BE SENT WITH THE ORDER.

WHITE & CO.,

36, King Street, Covent Garden, London, W.C.

BRITISH AND AFRICAN
STEAM NAVIGATION COMPANY.

SHIPERS are respectfully informed that from and after this date this Company will despatch TWO STEAMERS MONTHLY to the WEST COAST of AFRICA.

The fine new Screw Steamers

BONNY ROQUELLE LIBERIA.
CONGO VOLTA.
Are intended to SAIL TWICE MONTHLY between GLASGOW, LIVERPOOL, and the following Ports on the West Coast of Africa (calling at MADEIRA)—viz., SIERRA LEONE, SHERBRO, CAPE PALMAS, CAPE COAST CASTLE, ACCRA, LAGOS, BENIN, BONNY, FERNANDO PO, and OLD CALABAR. The days of Sailing from Liverpool will be the 6th and 18th of each month.

For further information apply in London to ALEXANDER WALKER, 158, Leadenhall-street; in Glasgow, to TAYLOR, LAUCHLAND, and Co., 20, Oswald-street; and in Liverpool to ELDER, DEMPSTER, & CO Brunswick-street.

COTTON, WOOL, and other Material, PRESSED and PACKED by WALKER'S PATENT ROTATING PRESS, in HALF the USUAL TIME. Sugar Mills for Splitting the Cane, Palm Nut Sorters, Nut Crackers, and every kind of Machine for Africa or India.

43, MANSSELL-STREET, WHITECHAPEL, LONDON.

SYDENHAM HOUSE, 50, LUDGATE HILL, LONDON



SAMUEL BROTHERS,
MERCHANT TAILORS AND OUTFITTERS. SYDENHAM

On the System of Charging the Lowest Price possible for Ready Money.
LONDON CLOTHING.—Perfection in Style and Fit is supplied by the aid of the new Self-measure Rules, as given below.

During twenty-five years their Clothing has been celebrated for sound economy, perfect fitting, and the most gentlemanlike style.

THE WORLD-FAMED SYDENHAM SUITS AT 59s.

Are manufactured in suitable styles for all occasions, and in the various substances of cloth for ALL CLIMATES.

MORNING AND BUSINESS SUITS. 42s. to 84s. DRESS AND PROMENADE SUITS. 59s. to 114s.
TROUSERS. 14s. to 26s. TROUSERS. 17s. 6d. to 30s.

STATE, LAW, AND CLERICAL ROBES SUPPLIED AT VERY ADVANTAGEOUS PRICES.

THE NEW BOOK ON GENTLEMEN'S ATTIRE

Contains Forty-three Engravings to represent the Fashionable Styles.
Price 1s., deducted from a purchase (post-free).

Any garment can be supplied by sending the following measures: Give, IN INCHES, whole height of person. FOR A COAT: Round the breast, round the waist, from centre of back to the wrist, for length of sleeve, arm bent. FOR WAISTCOAT: Round breast and waist. FOR TROUSERS: Length outside seam from top to bottom, length inside seam from fork to bottom, round the waist, round the seat.

PATTERNS AND LIST OF PRICES POST FREE.
SAMUEL BROTHERS guarantee to supply, in every class, PERMANENT COLOURS, GENTLE-MANLY STYLE, SOUND WORKMANSHIP, and PERFECT FIT.

Messrs. Samuel Brothers find it necessary to state that the Postage of Letters must be Pre-paid, or they will not be received.

SAMUEL BROTHERS, 50, LUDGATE HILL, LONDON, ENGLAND.



LAMPOUGH'S

EFFERVESCENT

PYRETIC SALINE.



Important to English Ministers, British Consuls, and Europeans seeking to reside in safety in Tropical and Foreign Climates. Her Majesty's Representative, the Governor of Sierra Leone, in a letter of request for an additional supply of the Pyretic Saline, states: "It is of GREAT VALUE, and I shall rejoice to hear it is in the hands of all Europeans visiting the Tropics."

Half a teaspoonful, taken in a tumbler of water, contributes more to the refreshment of the body than any known beverage, invigorating and vitalising the blood, it alleviates thirst in a most agreeable manner, and furnishes the system with those saline principles that are essential to health.

SICKNESS, HEADACHE, and NAUSEA are in most cases immediately relieved by taking a teaspoonful in a tumbler of cold water; this can be repeated once or twice in two hours, if needful.

SEA VOYAGES.—It is a very valuable accompaniment, and should on no account be omitted; it instantly allays the sickness.

For BILIOUS CONSTITUTIONS, giving rise to vitiated Secretions, Indigestion, and Eruptions on the Skin—a teaspoonful should be taken daily, with the dinner, in a tumbler of water, and the same quantity on going to bed.

In cases of DIARRHOEA, put as much Magnesia as will lie on a shilling into half a tumbler of water, let this fall to the bottom of the glass, and then stir into it a teaspoonful of the Saline, and drink during effervescence.

In JUNGLE, YELLOW, SCARLET, TYPHUS, and GASTRIC FEVERS, and ERUPTIVE DISEASES, it should be given in teaspoonful doses every four hours, in a glass half full of water, or with an increased quantity of water if the patient suffers from thirst.

W. STEVENS, Esq., M.D. and D.C.L., in a work upon fevers, states that since its introduction the fatal West India Fevers are deprived of their terrors. In the Island of Trinidad alone, out of upwards of One Thousand treated on this plan, there were only eleven deaths.

It is particularly recommended to all who have at any period of life taken Calomel, or Mercurial preparations, in order to their removal. For such it is necessary to take the Effervescing Pyretic Saline for several months in small repeated doses.

N.B.—Keep the bottle well corked, use a dry spoon, and it will retain its valuable properties unimpaired by time or climate.

Dr. Septimus Gibbon, of the London Hospital, in his letter, states: "It is the best preparation of the kind I have ever met with. Its usefulness in the treatment of disease has long been confirmed by medical experience. Its superiority consists in its being rendered thoroughly anhydrous, &c. &c. I speak from adequate knowledge of the preparation, having been in the habit of using it in private practice for many years, and having taken a large quantity with me when I went as physician to the Smyrna Hospital. In hot climates, the preparation is of especial value.—August 7, 1857."

Dr. Sparks, Government Medical Inspector of Emigrants from the port of London, writes: "From my personal and professional use and knowledge of the value of Mr. LAMPOUGH'S PYRETIC SALINE, for many years past, I have great pleasure in bearing my cordial testimony to its efficacy in the treatment of many of the ordinary and chronic forms of Gastric Complaints and other forms of Febrile Dyspepsia.—August 6, 1857."

From G. D. Sawyer, Esq., M.D., 22, Guildford-street, Russell-square: "I do hereby certify with pleasure that I have tested, on several occasions, the efficacy of Mr. LAMPOUGH'S PYRETIC SALINE, in Gastric and Enteric Irritation, and also in Low Fevers, attended with Derangement of the Digestive Organs."

From Thomas Carr Jackson, Esq., F.R.C.S., and Surgeon to the Great Northern Hospital, London: "I have no hesitation in recommending the compound of Mr. LAMPOUGH'S SALINE PYRETIC. It is an admirable Febrifuge, and will be found an eligible Medicine where such remedy is indicated. I am in the habit of prescribing it largely, its composition being known to me; and I have every reason to be satisfied with it. It is beautifully prepared, and can be used at a moment's notice without trouble, and is therefore particularly adapted for use in public service."

From David Morgan, Esq., M.D., M.R.C.S., and L.A.C., &c., Medical Officer of the Clerkenwell Parish: "I have much pleasure in bearing testimony to the medicinal qualities of Mr. LAMPOUGH'S PYRETIC SALINE. I have used it extensively in the treatment of Diarrhoea and Febrile affections generally, and have found it an admirable Refrigerant Medicine, well calculated for diseases incidental to warm climates, more particularly in Cholera and Fever, as it possesses chemical properties capable of furnishing the blood with Saline matter.—Pentonville, August 8, 1857."

Messrs. Orr and Sons, of Madras, in a letter dated September 23, 1866, state Surgeon-Major G. Murray Duff, M.D., &c., had called for a further supply of all that we could give him, and spoke of its remarkable effects in the Jungle Fever in quite enthusiastic terms, directing a further supply to be sent overland, besides what had already been forwarded by the Cape.

A case of Jungle Fever had been treated with the partial contents of one bottle with perfect success; the medical attendant, of considerable repute, likes the medicine much, and wants more.

In another case of severe Vomiting, the patient was relieved after the third dose, and fell into a refreshing sleep.

Mr. Guthrie, Army Medical Director, became a warm advocate for its use in various diseases, and had the Pyretic Saline direct from the proprietor for personal and family use.

H. LAMPOUGH, 113, HOLBORN, E.C.

SPECIAL AGENTS FOR LAMPOUGH'S PYRETIC SALINE:—

Messrs. ORR & Co., Madras; Messrs. THACKER, SPINK & Co. Calcutta; Messrs. TREACHER & Co. Bombay.

CANTOR and CO., SIERRA LEONE.

Printed and Published for the Proprietor by WILLIAM JOHN JOHNSON, 121, Fleet-street, in the City of London.—JUNE 23, 1870.

Regist

T

"Talk to

m

th

"If any

th

A

Vol

West Afr
Substance
Progress o
Letter from
The Manch
Imperial P
Our Teeth
Opening of

For T

IN conse
produ
of consign
advantage
paid, exce
All l

N.B.—C

BRIT

Ship
month, w
of Steame
Africa.

The

W. S. F

despatches

MADEIR

AMBRIZ

GOO

JULY.

S.S.

GRAND

COFFE

GO

5th AUG

Good

hulk at B

Bills

D. MARPL

For f

and Co.; 2

The Ber
The Ma
The Bor
The Cal