

John Barnard, Vicar of Yatton, Somersetshire, to Helen Otway, dau. of the late Charles Otway Mayne, esq., of the Manor-house, Stanmore.

At Little Portland-st. Chapel, London, Samuel Roberts, esq., of Nottingham, to Mary Ann, only dau. of the late Rev. Richard Astley, of Shrewsbury.

April 15. At Bath, Austin Chamberlain, esq., of Elm-pl., to Julia, 2nd dau. of Capt. Peach, Treasurer of the city of Bath.

At Kestleton, Lord Arthur Edwin Hill, M.P., to the Hon. Mary Catherine, youngest dau. of the late Hon. and Rev. Alfred Curzon, and sister of Lord Scarsdale.

At the Roman Catholic Church, Clapham, John J. T. Somers Cocks, esq., youngest son of the Hon. Philip James Cocks, late of the Grenadier Guards, to Ann, eldest dau. of the late Rev. Joseph Simpson, Rector of Little Horsted, Sussex.

At Brighton, Andrew Alfred Collyer, esq., of Bedford-row, Gray's-inn, London, to Elizabeth Farquhar, eldest dau. of Alexander Crowe, esq., of Woodcote-grove, Epsom.

At Stone, near Aylesbury, Bucks, William Henry Flower, second son of E. F. Flower, esq., of the Hill, Stratford-upon-Avon, to Georgiana

Rosetta, youngest dau. of Rear-Adm. Smyth, K.S.F., D.C.L., &c., of St. John's-lodge, Stone.

At Brighton, the Rev. Christopher H. Oldfield, Perpetual Curate of the Quinton, Worcestershire, to Elizabeth Charlotte, second dau. of Richard Bevan, esq., of Brighton.

At Wombourne, the Rev. E. W. Stubbs, Curate of Luddenham, Kent, and eldest son of Edward Stubbs, esq., of Woolferton, Salop, to Ellen, eldest dau. of Whitmore Jones, esq., of the Heath, Wombourne.

At the Castle Chapel, Dublin, Greville Richard Vernon, esq., son of the Right Hon. R. Vernon Smith, M.P., to Susan Caroline Cockerell, step-daughter of the Earl of Eglington.

April 17. At Putney, Thomas Cundy, jun., esq., of Chester-sq., to Catherine, only dau. of the late Thomas Gwyn Elger, esq., of Bedford, and niece of John Elger, esq., of the Heath, Putney.

April 20. At St. Peter's, Eaton-sq., Thomas Fuller, esq., eldest son of the Rev. Thomas Fuller, of Eaton-pl., Belgrave-sq., to Eliza, youngest dau. of Lieut.-Col. Edward Osborn, late of the Madras Army.

OBITUARY.

THE EARL OF MORTON.

March 31. At the family residence in Brook-street, after a short illness, George Sholto Douglas, Earl of Morton, Lord Dalkeith and Aberdour in the peerage of Scotland, of which peerage he was a representative peer in Parliament.

The deceased peer, who was eldest son of the Hon. John Douglas, by Lady Frances Lascelles, eldest daughter of Edward, first Earl of Harewood, was born Dec. 23, 1789, and married, July 3, 1817, Frances Thedron, eldest daughter of the late Right Hon. Sir George Rose, G.G.H., and sister of the gallant officer serving with the Bombay army in India. On the death of his grandfather, the fourteenth earl, in July, 1827, he succeeded to the family honours. The deceased earl was attached to the mission in Spain in 1811, and was appointed secretary of legation at Stockholm in July the following year. Subsequently, in 1814 and 1816, he filled the same capacity at the Courts of Florence and Berlin; the latter post he filled up to January, 1825, when he obtained his diplomatic pension. The noble earl was a lord-in-waiting to the Queen from September, 1841, to January, 1849. In November, 1856, he was appointed vice-lieutenant of the county of Mid-Lothian, of which county he was made deputy-lieutenant in 1848. He succeeded in the family honours and estates by his eldest son, Lord Aberdour, born 13th April, 1818, and formerly in the 71st Foot. The present peer married, in 1844, Miss Watson, daughter of Mr. Jas. Watson, of

Saughton, Mid-Lothian, who died in 1850; and secondly, in 1853, Lady Alice Lambton, third and youngest daughter of the late Earl of Durham.

LORD DUNFERMLINE.

The Hon. James Abercromby was the third son of the lamented Sir Ralph Abercromby, who fell at Alexandria in the moment of victory. Among the distinguished names of our recent military history, none is surrounded with a purer glory than that which encircles the memory of that most estimable officer. It was to his meritorious exertions that the safety of the British army, during the unfortunate retreat in Holland, is chiefly to be ascribed; and the victory in which he perished was the first success by which, during the course of the late war with France, the British arms asserted by land their ancient superiority over their enemy. But the name of Sir Ralph Abercromby is yet more illustrated by the humanity and judgment which he exhibited in command of the troops during the unhappy insurrection in Ireland, and the firmness with which he checked the previously unbridled licence of the military and volunteers.

James Abercromby was born on the 7th of November, 1776, and after finishing his education, applied himself to the study of the law. He was called to the English bar at Lincoln's Inn in 1801; and before long, the interest of his friends procured him a Commissionership of Bankrupts, but

his subsequent appointment as steward of the Duke of Devonshire's extensive estates drew him in a great measure out of the ordinary business of his profession. In 1802 he married Mary Ann, daughter of Egerton Leigh, Esq., of High Leigh, in Cheshire, who survives him as his widow after a union of nearly sixty years.

It was not until 1807 that he entered the arena of political life. At the general election in that year he was brought into Parliament, through the influence of the Earl of Egmont, as M.P. for the borough of Midhurst. He immediately joined the Whig opposition, with which party he steadily acted for half a century. At the next general election, in 1812, the Marquis of Lansdowne brought him in for his pocket-borough of Calne, and he continued to represent that place—for we can hardly term it a constituency—until his elevation to the judicial bench of Scotland.

His first speech in Parliament was delivered on the 15th of February, 1808, on moving for papers respecting the expedition against Copenhagen, under Lord Gambier. This act was reprobated by Mr. Abercromby and the party with whom he acted, as an undisguised breach of the law of nations; nor would they admit the validity of those pleas of necessity and self-defence which the ministry of the day urged in favour of the infraction of the rights of a weak and neutral power.

From this time we find him taking an active and always a useful part in the general business of the opposition. He took part chiefly in debates arising upon questions relating to Scotland, and in those connected with the administration of justice. It should be mentioned, to his honour as a lawyer, that he proposed the reform of the bankruptcy jurisdiction and the reduction of the number of bankruptcy commissioners. He supported the proposals made from time to time for the mitigation of the criminal code, and frequently directed the attention of Parliament to the penal system as exhibited both in transportation and in the working of the penitentiaries. He opposed the Frame Work Bill in 1812 and the Alien Act in 1814. We find him also expressing very plainly his opposition to the enactment of the Corn-Laws, which he characterised as a measure framed for the special purpose of keeping up the landlords' rents at the expense of the consumers. In 1815 he took a rather prominent part in the opposition to the renewal of the war with Napoleon on his return from Elba, and made a motion for papers connected with the subject, in proposing which he impugned the bad faith observed towards the Emperor by

the ministry in co-operation with the allied sovereigns. On more than one occasion, too, he gave very effectual support to his friend, Mr. Henry Brougham, against the attempts made by the Tory ministry of Lord Liverpool and Mr. Spencer Perceval to thwart his motions for enquiry into the state of national education.

During this period of his life, however, we find Mr. Abercromby occasionally taking rather a less decidedly popular course than many Whig leaders to whom he subsequently shewed himself greatly superior in true liberality of sentiment. Thus in 1819 he supported the "Seditious Meetings Bill," though only as a temporary measure, and even others of the famous "Six Acts" and coercive measures of Lord Castlereagh's Government. He also at that time opposed even the motion of Mr. Lambton for an extensive Parliamentary reform, upon which he looked, from the proud position of a seat for Calne, as "revolutionary" in its tendency. But it is pleasing and also singular to observe, what is not frequently the case, that with the increase of years and experience, the liberality of Mr. Abercromby's views was constantly upon the increase, and that a practical testimony is hence afforded, by the conduct of at least one sober and sagacious politician, in favour of the growing necessity of popularizing the institutions of the country. Another occasion on which he differed notoriously from his party was the motion of Mr. Hume relative to the abolition of the office of Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. Without at all entering into the arguments in favour of such a step, or against it, it cannot be denied that in his management of the Duke of Devonshire's Irish estates, he must have gained some little insight into the character of the Irish people, and that on this ground, in all probability, he was led to oppose a change.

But it was on questions connected with his own native Scotland that Mr. Abercromby displayed the greatest activity. The violent conduct of the Tory Government in attempting, by every conceivable abuse of the existing law, to restrain all expression of public opinion, had been carried nowhere to such excess as in Scotland; and 1822 Mr. Abercromby brought before the House of Commons the conduct of the Lord Advocate, who, while prosecuting to the utmost rigour every offence of the liberal portion of the press, had given every encouragement to the Tory newspapers, which carried the "liberty of the press" to the very extreme of licence. It was on the first of these occasions that some strictures made by him on the character of the Lord President of the Court

of Session, and of his son, Mr. Hope, drew forth from the latter a pamphlet containing terms of such violent personal abuse that Mr. Abercromby was led to leave London for the purpose of a hostile meeting. This unavoidable consequence of the attack having been noticed, in conjunction with Mr. Abercromby's sudden absence from the House of Commons, measures were instantly taken by the House to prevent the apprehended duel. Mr. Abercromby, as it happened, was obliged to go out of his direct road in order to see Lord Althorp, at his seat in Northamptonshire, for the purpose of requesting him to act as his second. He found, accordingly, on his journey further north, that the messengers of the House of Commons had actually got before him on the road to Edinburgh, and he was consequently obliged to return to his place in the House, where his attendance had been ordered. Mr. Hope was brought to the bar of the House; but after his assurance that the quarrel would be carried no further, and an expression of regret that he had violated the privileges of the House, it was resolved that the House did not feel itself called upon to proceed any further in the matter.

In 1823 Mr. Abercromby presented from the city of Edinburgh a petition complaining of the state of its representation in Parliament. The single member returned for the populous, intelligent, and flourishing metropolis of Scotland, was then elected by the narrow and self-elected corporation; which, in consideration of a large share of patronage, was in the habit of returning the nominee of the powerful house of Dundas. Mr. Abercromby brought this glaring abuse formally before the House of Commons, and in a manner well calculated to draw public attention to it very strongly. In 1824 he moved for leave to bring in a bill to give effective representation to the city of Edinburgh, but was defeated on a division by 99 to 75. He renewed his attempt again in 1826, but was negatived by 122 to 97. But the purposes of the reform cause were fully served by the discussions to which his motion gave occasion; and the absurd anomalies of the existing system, and the fallacy of the arguments by which it was upheld, were effectually exposed in this most striking abuse of the electoral representation.

During this period, also, Mr. Abercromby was earnest in lending his aid to every attempt made to reform the Court of Chancery. In consequence of a speech made on this subject in 1824, he subjected himself to a most intemperate attack,

made on him by Lord Chancellor Eldon in the Court of Chancery, and of which he complained to the House of Commons as an undoubted breach of its privileges.

On Irish questions, also, the acquaintance which his management of the Duke of Devonshire's extensive estates in Ireland necessarily gave him with the state of that country, induced him to take an active part. In 1823 he made a motion on the subject of Orange Lodges, which he withdrew after compelling Government to discountenance the existence of those bodies. In 1825 he opposed the suppression of the Catholic Association, and supported the disfranchisement of the forty-shilling freeholders, which was proposed as an accompaniment of Catholic emancipation.

The parliamentary career of Mr. Abercromby had been thus usefully and honourably passed in opposition, until the rupture between Mr. Canning and the ultra-Tories; when, on the accession of the great body of Whigs, that minister offered him the office of Judge-Advocate-General, which he accepted. This office he resigned on the accession of the Duke of Wellington, in January, 1828; but he was almost immediately after, on the retirement of Sir Samuel Shepherd, elevated to the place of Chief Baron of the Exchequer of Scotland. Of this office he continued to discharge the duties, to the general satisfaction of the public, until 1832; when, the Government having determined to abolish the Court of Exchequer of Scotland, and transfer its business to the other tribunals, he retired on a pension of £2,000 a-year. In the December of that year, the Reform Act having at length given the people of Edinburgh a voice in the election of their representatives, his early exertions for this object were rewarded by his return for that city as the colleague of Mr. Jeffrey.

It was at this time that the idea of placing Mr. Abercromby in the chair of the House of Commons seems to have been first entertained. In the former portion of his parliamentary career he had constantly taken part in all discussions respecting questions of order and privilege; and had shewn himself thoroughly acquainted with the forms of the House. His absence from the political arena during the stormy discussions on the Reform Bill, his consequent disconnection from party, and the judicial office which he had filled with so much credit, pointed him out as a fit person for the somewhat arduous task which it was supposed that the Speaker of the first Reformed Parliament would have, and which Mr. Manners Sut-

ton had formally declared his intention of not undertaking; he having served during a period quite as long as that by which former Speakers had earned their retiring pension and peerage. Mr. Littleton (now Lord Hatherton), the member for Staffordshire, had also been mentioned among his friends as a fit candidate for the Speakership; and though there is but little doubt that in the event of a contest he would have been the successful candidate, promises of ministerial support appear to have been made by different members of the government to each of the rivals. When this came to be understood, the ministry could find no way out of their difficulty except by inducing both candidates to withdraw their pretensions in favour of a third party. Great stress, therefore, was laid by them upon the necessity of having an experienced Speaker to manage the "Reformed" Parliament, which met in January, 1833. Mr. Manners-Sutton was induced to withdraw his resignation; and being proposed by the ministers themselves, was chosen by an immense majority.

Re-entering Parliament after a brief tenure of his high legal position in Scotland, unconnected with the government, though its general supporter, Mr. Abercromby became an object of confidence to that large body of Reformers who, though supporting the administration of Earl Grey against the Tories, were dissatisfied with its somewhat retrograde policy, and more especially with the spirit in which Irish affairs were administered by Lord Stanley, now Earl of Derby. He justified the confidence of such men by the manly part which he took against his Whig friends against the court-martial clause of the Irish Coercion Bill; and though that clause was carried by 270 against 130, his opposition on this one point may be thanked for having induced the House of Commons to modify some of the worst features by which the bill was marked when it came down from the House of Lords. From this time forth Mr. Abercromby was regarded with something more than confidence by all the more decided and advanced Reformers. His appointment as Chairman of the Committee on Municipal Corporation was received as a pledge of that thorough enquiry which was amply redeemed by the commission appointed on his recommendation to carry out, in the most effectual manner, the enquiries of the Committee. His accession to the cabinet as Master of the Mint, on the retirement of Lord Stanley and Sir James Graham in May, 1834, was generally hailed as a proof of the

more decidedly liberal course which was thenceforth to be pursued by Earl Grey's Government. These expectations formed respecting Mr. Abercromby were amply justified on the only occasion on which the public could learn what course was taken by a minister whose office gave him but little opportunity of indicating it in Parliament. In the explanations which followed Lord Grey's retirement from the Government, it appeared that in the discussions which took place in the cabinet, Mr. Abercromby had supported Lord Althorp in contending for the omission of its harsher provisions from the renewed Coercion Bill.

After the sudden dismissal of Lord Melbourne's Ministry in November, 1834, it became obvious that the choice of a Speaker would present the first occasion of a conflict, on the meeting of the new Parliament, between the ministry of Sir Robert Peel and the reforming party, all shades of which would be united in opposition. The strong and somewhat unseemly part which the Speaker, Mr. Manners Sutton, was generally supposed to have taken in the arrangements for the formation of a Tory Ministry, and above all the advice which he was said to have given in favour of the dissolution of Parliament, excited against him a strong opposition from the Liberal party. Such, however, was the influence which he had obtained by the blandness of his manners, and his long services in the Chair, and such the accession of strength recently acquired by the Tory party, that it became obvious that in order to have a chance of success, the Liberals must be united as to the person to be proposed. Such was by no means the case with either Mr. Littleton or Mr. Spring Rice; and eventually Mr. Abercromby was selected. Great difficulty is said to have been experienced in obtaining his consent; but this having been surmounted, letters were despatched by Lord John Russell, as the acknowledged head of the Liberal party, requesting the attendance of all those members on whose votes the ministers thought they could rely, to support Mr. Abercromby's election as Speaker.

Public attention was now fairly riveted on the coming contest, and the merits and demerits of the rival candidates were freely canvassed and scrutinized, and became a general subject of discussion from the palace downwards to the village ale-house. Mr. Abercromby was assailed as an ultra Liberal, and held up to reproach by the Tories as favourable to the Ballot and Triennial Parliaments, and by some of the extreme Radicals on account of the retiring pension which he drew as a judge.

Lord Stanley and Sir James Graham supported his opponent, as also did a considerable number of hungry expectants, who waited to see whether the Tory Ministry would stand or fall, and were prepared to trim their sails accordingly. In spite, however, of this drawback, which left the issue of the contest uncertain to the very last moment, on the 19th of February, Mr. Abercromby was supported by 316 votes against 310 delivered for Mr. Manners Sutton, in the fullest House ever known, and was accordingly led to the Speaker's Chair.

The four years and a half during which Mr. Abercromby presided over the deliberations of the Lower House, afford little subject to the biographer. Though they were years when party-spirit ran high, and parties were very evenly balanced; still his career as Speaker was marked by no incidents which called for the exercise or display of those qualities by which the office acquires importance in peculiar emergencies. It may be said that, if Mr. Abercromby did not entirely repress that disposition to disorder which had grown up under the good-natured rule of his predecessor, his impartiality was never disputed, whilst his disposition to exercise his authority for fitting purposes was unceasingly manifested. But it is for his exertions in the more private department of his duties that the public is chiefly indebted to Mr. Speaker Abercromby. His efforts in reforming the abuses of the private business of the House were unremitting; and it was mainly by his exertions that those improvements were made in the conduct of private bills in the House of Commons, which have given somewhat of a character for integrity and efficiency to the discharge of a duty in which the House had certainly allowed much jobbing and confusion.

In spite of his advanced age and impaired health, Mr. Abercromby continued to discharge the duties of the Speakership down to the month of May 1839, when he resigned his post, in which he was succeeded by Mr. Shaw Lefevre, now Viscount Eversley. On the 28th of May in that year he was gazetted a Peer by the title of Baron Dunfermline, of Dunfermline, in the county of Fife. He was succeeded in the representation of Edinburgh by Mr. T. B. Macaulay.

The late Lord Dunfermline was created an Honorary D.C.L. of Oxford in 1810, and was elected Dean of Faculty in the University of Glasgow in 1841, and for many years previous to his death was one of the Benchers of Lincoln's-Inn. From the time of his elevation to the peerage,

he took little or no part in public business, but lived in retirement at his country seat near Edinburgh.

He is succeeded in his title by his only child, the Hon. Sir Ralph Abercromby, K.C.B., now second Lord Dunfermline. His lordship is married to a daughter of the Earl of Minto, and has been Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary at the Hague since November 1851.

LOLD CLIFFORD OF CHUDLEIGH.

Feb. 28. At Rome, aged 67, from the effects of a wound in the ankle, which ultimately turned to mortification, the Right Hon. Hugh Charles Clifford, eighth Lord Clifford of Chudleigh.

The deceased nobleman, eldest son of Charles, seventh Lord, by a daughter of Henry Benedict, eighth Lord Arundell of Wardour, was born in 1790, and received his early education at the Roman Catholic College of Stonyhurst. He afterwards travelled for some years upon the Continent, and attended Cardinal Consalvi to the Congress of Vienna in 1814; and subsequently accompanied the Duke of Wellington's army as a volunteer through a large portion of the Peninsular campaigns. Owing to the operation of the existing laws, he was of course excluded by his religious tenets from all possibility of obtaining a seat in the House of Commons, to which his tastes and ambition when he was young would have led him to aspire: and he did not take his seat in the House of Lords until 1831, when he succeeded to his father's title and estates. For some years he lent the support of his vote or his proxy to the ministry of Lord Grey, and subsequently to that of Lord Melbourne; but he seldom took a part in the debates or proceedings of Parliament, except when the religious body of which he was a zealous and attached member was attacked, or felt itself aggrieved. On one occasion, we believe in 1839, he published an elaborate answer to the Bishop of Exeter, who, in his place in the House of Lords, had accused those Catholic peers who supported Lord Melbourne's measures in regard to the established Church in Ireland, of violating the terms of the Roman Catholic oath. Of late years Lord Clifford had lived entirely in Italy, dividing his time between Rome and his residence in the neighbourhood of Tivoli; and not even the outcry and agitation consequent on the "Papal Aggression" in 1851 could induce him to return to England. Two of his Lordship's brothers were priests in the Roman Catholic Church, and one of them died whilst exercising his functions as a missionary in India in 1843.