

those towns alone now comprise more than fifty thousand inhabitants. It was arranged by the insurgents that on the night of Sunday the 3rd of November, three divisions from various points were to march upon Newport and take possession of the town while the inhabitants were asleep. The weather was such as to prevent the completion of these arrangements. The divisions from Nant-y-Glo and Pontypool did not join their leader at the time appointed, but after waiting till daylight he marched into the town with five or six thousand followers about ten o'clock. The mayor, Mr. Phillips, was very imperfectly prepared for resistance to this rabble, who came into the town five abreast, armed with guns, bludgeons, pikes, and pickaxes. Mr. Phillips, with his party of special constables and about thirty soldiers, had taken his position in the West Gate Inn, which stands in the market-place. The insurgents moved up to the door of the inn and called upon those within to surrender. The demand was of course refused. A volley from the street was then discharged against the bow-window of the room. The wooden pillars of the porch still show by bullet-holes the sort of conflict that here took place. Almost at the instant of the first street firing, the rioters broke open the door of the inn and poured into the house. There would have been a massacre of the civil and military guardians of the peace, had not the officer in command given orders to fire, as the Chartists were rushing down the passage. A volley soon put to flight the terrified assailants. The mayor distinguished himself by the gallantry which befits an English gentleman. He, with lieutenant Gray and serjeant Daley, fearlessly opened each one of the three shutters of the window that looked upon the street. A shower of slugs was immediately poured in upon them, and Mr. Phillips and several others were wounded; but the construction of the window enabled the military to pour a raking fire upon the mob, who soon fled in all directions. The soldiers then made a sortie and effectually cleared the streets. Frost and two other of the leaders, Zephaniah Williams and William Jones, were quickly apprehended. On the 1st of January they were tried at Newport, under a Special Commission before that able and constitutional judge, sir Nicholas Tindal. They were each found guilty of high treason, and received the capital sentence, which was finally commuted to transportation for life. Within the last few years the chief delinquent has been allowed to return. Sir Thomas Phillips was knighted by her Majesty, and was received at Court with signal honour.

CHAPTER XII.

The System of Penny Postage first comes into operation.—Mr. Rowland Hill.—Opposition to the proposed change.—Postage Stamps.—Marriage of the Queen to Prince Albert of Saxe Coburg.—Privilege of Parliament.—Stockdale v. Hansard.—Attempt upon the Queen's Life.—Prorogation.—Affairs of the Levant.—Treaty of Alliance.—Exclusion of France.—Prince Napoleon lands near Boulogne.—Failure of his attempt to produce an insurrection.—Differences of England and France on the affairs of the East.—War threatened.—M. Thiers and lord Palmerston.—Naval Successes against Mehemet Ali.—Interment at Paris of the remains of Napoleon.—Session of Parliament.—The Anti-Corn-Law League.—Declarations of the Ministry on questions of Free Trade.—Debates on the Sugar Duties.—Ministers defeated on the question of the Sugar Duties.—Meeting of New Parliament.—Amendment to the Address carried.—Resignation of Ministers.

On the morning of the 10th of January, 1840, the people of the United Kingdom rose in the possession of a new power—the power of sending by the post a letter not weighing more than half an ounce upon the prepayment of one penny, and this without any regard to the distance which the letter had to travel.* At this time, when the system of a universal penny postage has been in operation two-and-twenty years—when the number of letters transmitted by the post has increased from 76 millions in 1839 to 593 millions in 1861, an increase of 680 per cent.—it is more interesting to look back upon the difficulties of achieving such a result than to trace the gradual success which in a few years put an end to all opposition to a system so pregnant with national advantage. To the sagacity and the perseverance of one man, the author of this system, the high praise is due, not so much that he triumphed over the petty jealousies and selfish fears of the post-office authorities, but that he established his own convictions against the doubts of some of the ablest and most conscientious leaders of public opinion. The government adopted his views reluctantly, strengthened in their hesitation by such a clear-headed supporter of the government as Sydney Smith. Temperate opposers of the government, such as the duke of Wellington and sir Robert Peel, saw great danger and little good in the project. Mr. Rowland Hill in 1837 published his plan of a cheap and uniform postage. A Committee of the House of Commons was appointed in 1837, which continued its inquiries

* *Ante*, p. 213.

throughout the session of 1838, and arrived at the conviction that "the mode recommended of charging and collecting postage, in a pamphlet published by Mr. Rowland Hill," was feasible, and deserving of a trial under legislative sanction. The Committee examined a great number of mercantile and other authorities, the questions and answers contained in their Report amounting to nearly twelve thousand. There were necessarily strong differences of opinion amongst the witnesses, many even of the most favourable to a reduction to a uniform rate considering that a penny postage was too low. Lord Ashburton, although an advocate of Post-office Reform, held that the reduction to a penny would wholly destroy the revenue. Lord Lowther, the Postmaster-General, thought twopenny the smallest rate that would cover the expenses. Colonel Maberly, the secretary to the post office, considered Mr. Hill's plan a most preposterous one, and maintained that if the rates were to be reduced to a penny, the revenue would not recover itself for forty or fifty years. The Committee, after a long struggle between its members, negatived both a penny and a three-halfpenny rate as inadequate, and finally recommended the adoption of a twopenny rate. Public opinion, however, had been brought so strongly to bear in favour of a penny rate, that the Chancellor of the Exchequer, Mr. Spring Rice, on the 5th of July, 1839, proposed a resolution, "that it is expedient to reduce the postage on letters to one uniform rate of a penny postage, according to a certain amount of weight to be determined—that the parliamentary privilege of franking should be abolished, and that official franking be strictly limited—the House pledging itself to make good any deficiency that may occur in the revenue from such reduction of the postage." A Bill was accordingly passed to this effect in the House of Commons, its operation being limited in its duration to one year, and the Treasury retaining the power of fixing the rates at first, although the ultimate reduction was to be to one penny. This experimental measure reduced all rates above fourpence to that sum, leaving those below fourpence unaltered. With this complication of charge the experiment could not have a fair trial, and accordingly on the 10th of January, 1840, the uniform half-ounce rate became by order of the Treasury one penny. The final accomplishment of this great reform presented a signal example of the force of public opinion when brought to bear upon a subject unconnected with party feelings, and the demonstration of whose necessity had been established not by passionate appeals for public support and sympathy, but by patient investigation and conclusive reasoning. This was the high merit of the man who conceived the scheme of Post-office Re-

form; and the manifest earnestness of his character, and the invincibility of his logic, mainly conduced to establish those convictions in the public mind which eventually settled all doubts. Lord Melbourne, in moving the second reading of the bill, assigned as a conclusive answer to the question, how he could venture to tamper with so large a sum as that derivable from the Post-office revenue, that "there was such a general demand from all classes of the community for a measure of this nature, that it was a very difficult matter to withstand it."* In 1840 the number of letters sent through the post had more than doubled, and the legislature had little hesitation in making the Act of 1839 permanent, instead of its duration being limited to the year which would expire in October. A stamped envelope, printed upon a peculiar paper, and bearing an elaborate design, was originally chosen as the mode of rendering prepayment convenient to the sender of a letter. A simpler plan soon superseded this attempt to enlist the Fine Arts in a plain business operation. The plan of prepaying letters by affixing a stamp bearing the head of the ruler of the country, came into use here in May, 1840. The habit of prepayment by postage stamps has now become so universal throughout the world, that in 1861 the system was established in eighty different countries or colonies; and there were between six and seven hundred varieties of stamps known to the post-office authorities. Even in the Sandwich Islands the Postage Stamp was in use.†

On the 16th of January Parliament was opened by the Queen in person. The first paragraph of her Majesty's speech contained an announcement which had been previously made to the Privy Council. "Since you were last assembled, I have declared my intention of allying myself in marriage with the Prince Albert of Saxe Coburg and Gotha. I humbly implore that the Divine blessing may prosper this union, and render it conducive to the interests of my people as well as to my own domestic happiness, and it will be to me a source of the most lively satisfaction to find the resolution I have taken approved by my Parliament." The preliminary measures of the legislature for the naturalization of prince Albert, and for granting him an annuity, produced some discussion,—first, upon the subject of precedence, and next, as to the amount of the annual sum to be granted. The one question was settled by omitting from the bill of naturalization all mention of precedence; the other by a reduction of the ministerial proposition of an annuity of 50,000*l.* to one of 30,000*l.* The distresses of the country fully justified the decision of the majority who supported the grant of a

* Hansard, vol. xlix. col. 1214.

† Report of the Postmaster-General, 1862.

smaller sum. The good sense of the Queen and of prince Albert prevented the slightest expression of discontent at the vote of the House of Commons, which was carried by the union of the Conservative party with those generally classed amongst Radicals. The marriage took place on the 10th of February, and it was welcomed with general festivities throughout the country. There was a welcome of a higher kind from those who knew something of the character and acquirements of the young prince; from those who were aware that he had received a public education at the University of Bonn, and that his abilities were as conspicuous as his total freedom from all desire to find "a royal road to learning." But the people generally rejoiced in this union because it was understood to be one of affection, and which gave that earnest of domestic happiness which offered a solid foundation for the discharge of public duty. The modest answer of prince Albert to the congratulatory messages of the Houses of Parliament evidently expressed the feelings of one who was careful to weigh the words which he uttered. To the marquis of Lansdowne and other peers who had attended upon his Royal Highness with the congratulations of the peers, he said, "I return to the House of Lords my warmest thanks for the message which you have now delivered. I learn with lively satisfaction their approbation of the choice which her Majesty has made, and it will be the study of my life to justify the favourable opinion which you have now expressed."

There was a subject which occupied the attention of Parliament during this Session which excited considerable public interest at the time, but which must be dismissed by us as briefly as possible. It was the question of Privilege of Parliament. In 1837 the privilege of the House of Commons came into conflict with the jurisdiction of the Law Courts. There had been similar conflicts in earlier times, and the opinions of great lawyers were by no means settled as to the powers of Courts of Laws in matters of privilege. The words of the Bill of Rights would appear to have settled that "debates and proceedings in Parliament ought not to be impeached or questioned in any court or place out of Parliament." But since the Revolution there had been several occasions in which there was a clashing of jurisdictions. The House of Commons was probably taken by surprise when, in the case of Stockdale against Hansard,—which was an action for libel against the printer of the House of Commons, contained in a Report of the Inspector of Prisons, published by order of that House,—Lord Chief Justice Denman declared that the fact of the House of Commons having directed Messrs. Hansard to publish all their Parliamentary Reports was no

justification for them, or for any bookseller who publishes a Parliamentary Report containing a libel against any man. A Committee of Parliament was then appointed to inquire into this question. The House resolved that the publication of its Reports was essential to the constitutional functions of Parliament; that the House of Commons has a sole and exclusive jurisdiction to determine upon its privileges; and that for any Court or tribunal to assume to decide upon matters of privilege inconsistent with the determination of either House, is a breach and contempt of the privileges of Parliament. Stockdale was defeated upon the first trial. He commenced a second action, when the Queen's Bench again decided against the privilege of the House. Upon a third action, which was undefended, Messrs. Hansard were instructed by the House of Commons not to plead; judgment consequently went by default; and the damages were assessed in the Sheriff's Court at six hundred pounds. Then ensued a contest between the House and the Sheriffs. As in all cases in which personal interests are held to be arbitrarily attacked, the sheriffs had a large amount of public sympathy when they, as well as Stockdale, were committed to the custody of the Serjeant-at-Arms. The sheriffs were kept in close custody for having refused to obey the order of the House for restoring the money which they had levied upon Hansard, holding that they were bound by their duty to the Court of Queen's Bench to refuse their obedience to the order. There were other actions arising out of these vexatious proceedings; but the main question was finally settled by the passing of an Act, which received the Royal Assent on the 14th of April, 1840, by which proceedings, criminal or civil, against persons for publication of papers printed by order of either House of Parliament, were to be stayed by the Courts, upon delivery of a certificate and affidavit to the effect that such publication was by order of Parliament. Mr. May has very clearly stated the necessity for this measure, which was one of compromise. "No course was open to the Commons befitting their high jurisdiction and dignity, by which the obedience of courts and plaintiffs could be ensured: their power of commitment was at once impotent and oppressive; yet they could not suffer their authority to be wholly defied and contemned. Hence their proceedings were inevitably marked by hesitation and inconsistency. In a case for which the Constitution has made no provision, even the wisdom of sir Robert Peel, and the solid learning of Mr. Serjeant Wilde, were unequal to devise expedients less open to objection." *

* "Constitutional History," vol. i. p. 454.

The Houses of Parliament were proceeding in due course in the discussion of various important matters—such as a rupture with China, the reform of the municipal institutions of Ireland, measures for further carrying into effect the Reports of the Ecclesiastical Commissioners, and the Corn Laws—when they were startled by a circumstance which produced a similar amount of alarm and indignation throughout the kingdom. As the Queen, with prince Albert, was riding up Constitution Hill in an open carriage, a pistol was fired at them, and in about half a minute there was a discharge of a second pistol. Neither of the royal couple were injured, and they both preserved remarkable presence of mind. Lord John Russell, in moving the next day for a joint address with the House of Lords to congratulate her Majesty on her escape, stated that the Queen, immediately after the attempt, proceeded to the house of her mother to relieve her mind under the anxiety in which she might have been thrown by exaggerated reports; and that on her return her Majesty showed herself in her usual manner to her subjects, affording a proof at once of her safety and of the kindness and fortitude of her character.* The youth, named Oxford, who had committed this atrocious crime, was a barman at a public-house. He was tried at the Old Bailey on the 9th of July. Witnesses were produced to prove that he was insane. Dr. Connolly held that he was of unsound mind. Dr. Chowne considered the doing a criminal act without a motive was a proof to some extent of an unsound mind—what was called moral insanity. Chief Justice Denman cautioned the jury against the dangerous doctrine that the commission of a great crime without an apparent motive was in itself proof of insanity. Sir Benjamin Brodie has written some sensible remarks upon the acquittal of the boy Oxford upon the ground of moral insanity. We give these remarks of an eminent physiologist, because juries are too often embarrassed by opinions and arguments which, if taken without great qualification, would have the effect of impairing the safer belief that every person not absolutely a lunatic is responsible for his actions: “It seems to me that juries have not unfrequently been misled by the refinements of medical witnesses, who, having adopted the theory of a purely moral insanity, have applied that term to cases to which the term insanity ought not to be applied at all. It is true, that the difference in the character of individuals may frequently be traced to difference in their organization, and to different conditions as to bodily health; and that, therefore, one person has more, and another has less, difficulty in controlling his temper, and regulating

* Hansard, vol. liv. col. 1047.

his conduct. But we have all our duties to perform, and one of the most important of these is, that we should strive against whatever evil tendency there may be in us arising out of our physical constitution. Even if we admit (which I do not admit in reality) that the impulse which led Oxford to the commission of his crime was at the time irresistible, still the question remains, whether, when the notion of it first haunted him, he might not have kept it under his control; and thus prevented himself from passing into that state of mind which was beyond his control afterwards. If I have been rightly informed, Oxford was himself of this opinion; as he said, when another attempt had been made to take away the life of the Queen, ‘that if he himself had been hanged, this would not have happened.’”*

Parliament was prorogued by the Queen on the 11th of August. The Royal Speech touched upon some important points in the foreign relations of the country. Her Majesty congratulated the Parliament upon the termination of the civil war in Spain, the objects for which the Quadruple engagements of 1834 had been contracted having been accomplished. Differences with the government of Naples had been put into a train of adjustment by the mediation of France. Her Majesty was “engaged, in concert with the Emperor of Austria, the King of Prussia, the Emperor of Russia, and the Sultan, in measures intended to effect the permanent pacification of the Levant, to maintain the integrity and independance of the Ottoman empire, and thereby to afford additional security for the peace of Europe.”

The events which had rendered the intervention of the European powers necessary for the pacification of the Levant were these: Mehemet Ali, the pasha of Egypt, had in 1831 invaded Syria, in a war which he waged against the pasha of Damascus. Egypt and Syria were both integral parts of the Ottoman dominions, and Mehemet Ali was bound to yield obedience to the command of the sultan. He refused to withdraw his troops from Syria; and in 1832 the sultan Mahmoud and his powerful viceroy were at open war. The Turkish government was saved from utter ruin by the aid of its most formidable enemy, Russia. But the victories of Mehemet Ali had secured for him the possession of Syria, yet only as a vassal of the Porte. A war between the sultan and his viceroy was prevented for six years by the mediation of England, France, and Russia. But in 1839 the sultan could no longer endure the ambition of his great vassal, who evidently designed to subject all Arabia to his sway; and Mahmoud sent an army across the

* Brodie's “Psychological Inquiries,” 3rd edition, p. 98.

Euphrates to recover Syria. A signal victory of Mehemet Ali preceded the death of Mahmoud on the 1st of July, 1839. His successor, Abd-ul-Mejid, was only in his sixteenth year. The pasha of Egypt was encouraged in his resistance by the youth and apparent weakness of the new sultan, who was surrounded by treacherous officers. The influence of Mehemet Ali was so powerful at Constantinople that the Capitan Pasha (High Admiral) took the Turkish fleet through the Dardanelles to Alexandria and delivered it over to the sultan's rebellious viceroy. The strong will and propitious fortune of Mehemet Ali seemed to threaten the dissolution of the Turkish empire. The European powers tendered their mediation, which the sultan accepted. He offered Mehemet Ali the hereditary sovereignty of Egypt instead of remaining a vassal, but the ambitious pasha required to have Syria as well. France, although formally bound by a treaty of 1839 to act in co-operation with England, Russia, Austria, and Prussia, had her own policy as to a settlement of the Syrian question, and declined entering into the views of the other four powers. Lord Palmerston resolved to conclude a treaty for the maintenance of the Ottoman empire without the co-operation of France. The treaty of Alliance to which allusion was made in the Queen's speech was signed at London on the 15th of July, 1840.

The exclusion of France from the European alliance was very nearly precipitating us into a war with the government of Louis Philippe. M. Thiers, then president of the Counsel, evinced no desire to calm that passionate agitation which burst out in France in the belief that the nation had been insulted. The duke of Wellington, with his usual strong sense, rightly interpreted the disposition of the people and of the government of this kingdom. In a private letter of the 5th of October, he thus expressed himself: "God send that we may preserve peace between these two great countries, and for the world! I am certain that there is no desire in this country on the part of any party, I may almost say of any influential individual, to quarrel with, much less to do anything offensive towards France. But, if we should be under the necessity of going to war, you will witness the most extraordinary exertions ever made by this or any country, in order to carry the same on with vigour, however undesirable we may think it to enter into it."* Upon the conduct of lord Palmerston, then Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, there was some diversity of opinion at home. Even members of the cabinet were not wholly in accord with his policy, and many of the public held that he was

* Raikes's "Private Correspondence with the Duke of Wellington," &c., p. 156.

rash and obstinate. His policy was signally triumphant. Although the cry of the Parisians for a few months was, "Guerre aux Anglais," the French Government found that their country was not in a condition to go to war, and that the popular cry for hostilities had some association with revolutionary tendencies. After the lapse of twenty-one years, M. Guizot has published his Memoirs of that stirring time, when he was ambassador in England. His intelligent and candid revelations may present to those who are curious to trace the movements and counter-movements of two such adroit players in the great game of politics as M. Thiers and lord Palmerston, a juster view of the causes of this temporary interruption of the friendly feelings between the two governments and of the policy of the British Minister for Foreign Affairs, than they could otherwise derive from the contemporary expressions of opinion either in England or in France.

The Resolutions of the four powers upon which the treaty of the 15th of July was founded had become known in London on the 23rd. At the anniversary of the 28th of July, when sixty thousand men were under arms in Paris, the popular desire for war was shown in the most marked manner. M. Guizot was perplexed by the contrast of the uneasiness of Lord Melbourne and lord John Russell with the decided language of lord Palmerston. In answer to the ambassador's despatches, M. Thiers had only one word to reply—"tenez ferme,"* but the warlike minister invited him to a meeting with the king and himself at the Château d'Eu on the 7th of August. Guizot left London for this interview on the 6th. Whilst he was crossing the Channel to Calais another person was crossing the channel to Boulogne, to be the hero of what was then described as "a wild attempt to excite civil war made by a maniac of the Bonaparte family."† The maniac of 1840 became the emperor of 1852.

On the 7th of July the French frigate *La Belle Poule*, commanded by the prince de Joinville, had sailed for the purpose of receiving at St. Helena, and transporting to France, the remains of the Emperor Napoleon. To this somewhat strange request of the government of Louis Philippe made by M. Guizot, the English Cabinet accorded its consent, lord Palmerston giving a courteous reply to the demand, whilst he was unable to conceal a passing smile. At this time prince Louis Napoleon was residing at Carlton Gardens, in London, and M. Guizot had been required to keep an eye on his movements. The ambassador described the refugee as being constantly in the park; as frequently also at the opera, where

* Guizot—"Mémoires," tome v. p. 255.

† "Spectator," August 8.

aides-de-camp stood behind him in his box. In public they were bragging and ostentatious. Their private life was idle and obscure. In spite of their tall talk M. Guizot thought there was little of reality in their boastful projects. The French Foreign Office, however, believed that some attempt would be made by this party of Bonapartists, although their action would be confined to a very narrow circle.

On the 4th of August a steam packet, the *City of Edinburgh*, which had been hired as for a party of pleasure, left the port of London, bearing prince Louis Napoleon, count Montholon, and about forty officers and attendants. Arms and ammunition, military uniforms, horses and carriages and a large quantity of specie, had been previously taken on board; with a tame eagle that the prince had taught to feed out of his hand. The steam-packet dropped down the river; took a French pilot on board at Gravesend; and made for the French coast, where it arrived on the evening of the 5th. Between two and three miles to the north of Boulogne is the miserable village of Wimereux, around which, in 1803, a camp was formed of a portion of the Grand Army for the invasion of England. The country here is barren, and a few hovels lie between the sand hills on the shore. Here, at the mouth of a petty stream, Napoleon caused a port to be formed, which at the end of six months was capable of containing a hundred and seventy vessels. It is now choked up and altogether decayed. Here, then, surrounded by associations with the memory of the great emperor—in the harbour which his army had dug out of the sands, and in view of the column which they had raised to his glory—the nephew landed with his followers at four o'clock on the morning of the 6th. Those of military rank had exchanged their ordinary dress for the uniform then worn by French officers. The invading band, who had been joined from Boulogne by a young lieutenant of the 42nd, named Aladenise, and three soldiers, marched towards the town, bearing a tri-coloured flag surmounted by an eagle. There were few persons about at that hour except two or three officers of the customs, who were compelled to march with them. Upon arriving at the guard-house in the Place d'Anton, an attempt to seduce the soldiers failed, and the party marched to the Quai de la Caserne. The barrack there, now given up to peaceful purposes as a vast storehouse, was occupied by the 42nd regiment. The officers slept out of the barrack, and had not arrived at five o'clock, when lieutenant Aladenise called up the soldiers, ordering them to take their arms, and march with the nephew of the emperor to Paris; Louis Philippe, he told them, had ceased to reign. The proposed march

was, however, interrupted by the arrival of captain Puygellier and two other officers. To the splendid offers that were made to the captain and his companions they turned a deaf ear. The captain was as unmoved by the threats of some of his men as by the promises of the adventurers. To the shouts of *Vive le Prince Louis* he replied *Vive le Roi*. A scuffle ensued, when a shot was fired from a pistol which Louis Napoleon had in his hand, by which a grenadier was wounded. The prince was not absolutely charged with a murderous intention in thus discharging his pistol, but it was implied that this part of the affair was an accident, or at least unpremeditated. Immediately after this the barrack-yard was cleared of the intruders, and they marched to the Haute Ville, distributing proclamations and throwing about money. They fancied they could seize arms in the old château for the purpose of arming the population, but their course was stopped by the sub-prefect of Boulogne, who, in the name of the king, commanded them to disperse. He was answered by a blow on the head with the eagle which one of the officers carried. They tried to force the door of the château. During this time the *rappel* had called out the National Guard, who marched out towards Wimereux, to do battle with a large force which they were told had landed there. It was now six o'clock. Failing in the attempt to force the château, unsupported by any portion of the population, there was nothing left to the adventurers but flight to the place of their debarkation. With a mad movement of defiance they marched on the Calais road, and then stopped at the Napoleon column, instead of proceeding over the hill to Wimereux. The first stone of the column had been laid by Marshal Soult in 1804. Left unfinished under the Empire, it had been proceeded with under Louis XVIII., "as a monument of peace." Louis Philippe, whose doubtful policy was to revive the national appetite for glory which belonged to the memory of Napoleon, was in 1840 finishing this column. But the statue of the great Emperor by which it is crowned was not placed there till 1841. The prince and his party surrounded the monument, whilst the eagle-bearer entered the column to plant the standard on its summit. He was left to mount the dark stairs whilst his leader and his companions made a hasty retreat before the large force that was now coming against them. The soldiery, commanded by captain Puygellier, with the National Guards and gendarmerie under the orders of the sub-prefect and the mayor, rendered resistance vain. Some fled into the fields. Louis Napoleon and five or six others got down to the sands to the north of the harbour. The prince threw himself into the sea and swam to a little boat. The National