

[From the Illustrated News of the World.]

M memoir of Lord Macaulay.

The distinguished statesman, orator, poet, essayist, and historian, Thomas Babington Lord Macaulay, was born at Rothley Temple, in the county of Leicester, on the 25th of October, 1800. He is grandson of the Rev. John Macaulay, A.M., Presbyterian minister of Inverary, and son of the celebrated philanthropist, Zachary Macaulay, whose great exertions to ameliorate the condition of the African race, and unceasing labors to effect the suppression of the slave trade, won for him an enduring fame and a monument in Westminster Abbey.

One of the sisters of the eminent man just named, married Mr. Thomas Babington, a rich English merchant, and the name of "Thomas Babington" was bestowed upon the nephew—the subject of our present memoir.

Early in life he was sent to Trinity College, Cambridge, where his career was one of high distinction. Before he had reached his 19th year, he won the Chancellor's medal for a poem entitled "Pompeii;" two years afterwards he gained the same Chancellor's medal for another poetic work, entitled "Evening." These poems were both published, and served to bring the author prominently into notice. Soon after the issue of "Evening," he was elected to the Craven Scholarship, and in 1822 he graduated Bachelor of Arts, and was elected Fellow of Trinity College. In 1825 he obtained his Master of Arts degree, and, adopting the law as his future profession, he underwent the usual course of study, and was called to the bar, at Lincoln's Inn, in February, 1826.

In the meantime the young student began to develop a taste for literary pursuits. He commenced by contributing essays and ballads to a periodical of limited circulation, called Knight's Quarterly Magazine; his papers, always looked for with much interest, speedily became the attraction of the magazine. Principally from the tone and weight of Macaulay's contributions, this review was looked upon as a work of considerable literary importance. Professor Wilson used to say that its four or five volumes (beyond which the work did not extend) equalled in talent any other four or five in the compass of periodical literature. But Macaulay's genius soon found a wider field.

In August, 1825, some six months before his call to the bar of Lincoln's Inn, and while still under 25 years of age, he contributed to the Edinburgh Review his famous essay on "Milton." This was the first of that long series of brilliant essays with which, during 20 years subsequently, he enriched the pages of the Review.

The Whig party then in power were not slow to recognise the merits of the son of Zachary Macaulay. They gave him a lucrative appointment (a commissionership in bankruptcy,) and in 1830 introduced him into the House of Commons, by placing the "pocket-borough" of Calne at his disposal. As a member of the legislative body, Mr. Macaulay distinguished himself by a zealous devotion to the business and debates of the time. He became Secretary to the Board of Control, and figured prominently in the protracted parliamentary discussions on the reform bill. Mr. Macaulay's speech on this question created a degree of interest sufficient to warrant its republication in the form of a pamphlet.

In December, 1832, he was returned to the first Reformed Parliament as member for the borough of Leeds. He continued to represent the constituency of this important borough, until February, 1834, when he resigned his seat and his appointment at the Board of Control, to go out to India as a member of and legal adviser to, the Supreme Council of Calcutta. He remained in the East about three years; during his stay he acquired a handsome independency by the lucrative nature of his office, and at the same time he continued to perform his duties as one of the Edinburgh Review staff. Some of his most elaborate articles, we are told, were then written and sent over from Calcutta. On his return to England, Mr. Macaulay turned his acquaintance with the affairs of India to account in his brilliant essays on "Lord Clive" and "Warren Hastings."

In the year 1839, Mr. Macaulay again accepted office under Government. He became Secretary at War, and was soon afterwards elected Member of Parliament for the city of Edinburgh. The right honorable gentleman retained this position in the Government until September, 1841, when the Whig ministry in which he served gave way to the second Cabinet of Sir Robert Peel, and he (Mr. Macaulay) was consequently deprived of office.

The general election, which followed immediately afterwards, did not disturb Mr. Macaulay in the possession of his seat for Edinburgh. He was re-elected, and continued to sit for that city.

During the whole time of Sir Robert Peel's rule, he was conspicuous as an active member of the Whig Opposition, and as a consistent advocate of free trade and other liberal measures.

In 1846, Sir Robert, having carried his great measure of Commercial Reform, succumbed to the unceasing attacks of the "country party" and made way for the return of the Whigs, under Lord John Russell. Mr. Macaulay resumed office in this administration as Paymaster General of the Forces, with a seat in the Cabinet; and he fulfilled the duties of the position until 1847, when he unexpectedly lost his seat in Parliament. The majority of the constituents of the Scottish capital disagreed with the right honorable gentleman on the subject of the Maynooth grant, and took the op-

portunity of the general election to oust him in favor of Mr. Cowan, a citizen, whose theological bias and ecclesiastical views were much more in favor. The rejection of so distinguished a man, under such circumstances, caused great surprise, and was warmly discussed all over the country.

Regret at so untoward an event was generally expressed that Mr. Macaulay might easily have found another constituency anxious for his services, but he preferred availing himself of the opportunity thus presented of withdrawing altogether from the duties of Parliament.

At the next general election, the citizens of Edinburgh recovered their credit by replacing Mr. Macaulay in his former position, although the right honorable gentleman declined to come forward to canvass, or in any way to solicit the favor of the electors. During the next three or four years he continued their representative in Parliament, but the state of his health prevented him from attending the House with his accustomed zeal.

At length, in 1856, he resigned his seat, and at the same time, intimated his intention of not again resuming public or Parliamentary life.

It is, however, in the world of literature that Mr. Macaulay has won his great fame. As an essayist he had established a brilliant reputation long before his history was commenced. Some years after his return from India, he continued as sedulously as ever his contributions to the Edinburgh Review.

In 1842 he published his "Lays of Ancient Rome;" in 1843 he issued a collected edition of the more important of his "Essays;" and in the following year he made his last contribution to that particular form of literature in the paper, "The Earl of Chatham." It appeared in the Edinburgh Review and was included in the first and second volumes of Mr. Macaulay's great work, "The History of England, from the Accession of James II.," were published in 1840, and their appearance excited unusual public interest. Edition after edition was printed, and as rapidly consumed. An extraordinary degree of eagerness was manifested for the continuation of the History; and when, in 1855, the third and fourth volumes did appear, they caused a *furor* of excitement in the publishing and reading world of Britain, "to which," observes a good authority, "the annals of Paternoster Row hardly furnish any parallel."

A collected edition of Macaulay's "Speeches, Parliamentary and Miscellaneous," was published in 1854; the "Speeches," however, did not prove so popular as the "Essays."

In September, 1857, the historian received the dignity of a peerage in the acknowledgment of his great literary services; in addition to this he has at different times received other honors, to which we must make a brief allusion. He was elected Lord Rector of the University of Glasgow in 1849; in the same year he was elected a bencher of Lincoln's Inn; in 1850 he was appointed to the honorary office of Professor of Ancient History in the Royal Academy; and in 1853 he received the Prussian Order of Merit.

Interesting Reminiscences of the Early History of the Union.

The Constitution of the United States was adopted by the unanimous consent of the States present in the Convention that framed it, September 17, 1787, and went into effect on the first Wednesday (4th) of March, 1789.

It was ratified by Delaware, December 7, 1787; by Pennsylvania, December 12, 1787; by New Jersey, December 18, 1787; by Georgia, January 9, 1788; by Connecticut, January 9, 1788; by Massachusetts, February 6, 1788; by Maryland, April 28, 1788; by South Carolina, May 23, 1788; by New Hampshire, June 21, 1788; by Virginia, June 26, 1788; by New York, July 26, 1788; by North Carolina, November 21, 1789; by Rhode Island, May 29, 1790.

The Constitution provided that the ratification of it by the conventions of nine States should be sufficient for its establishment between the States so ratifying the same. It will be seen that it took nearly twelve months to secure the assent of nine States, and over seventeen months to get it into operation after its adoption by its framers. Two States did not ratify it until many months after it went into effect—North Carolina in eight months, and Rhode Island in fourteen. These States found the commercial regulations of the Union operate so hard on them, that they were finally glad to come in.

The first Congress under the Constitution began its session in the city of New York on Wednesday, the 4th of March, 1789, though the first President, Washington, was not inaugurated until the 4th of April following.—There being no Chief-Justice at that time, the oath of office was administered to Washington by the venerable Chancellor, Livingston, of New York.

The great and most agitating question before the first Congress under the Constitution was the permanent location of the seat of Government, a question that produced so much acrimony and bad feeling as for a time threatened to dissolve the Union just formed. Three points were urged: the banks of the Potomac, the banks of the Delaware, and the banks of the Susquehanna. Some far-seeing and sagacious members suggested that neither of these places was central enough for the population that would be, in a few years by the settlement of the West. The idea was ridiculed, and one hundred years was the time fixed by some before the population of the West would be worth considering, in the settlement of such a question. It was finally settled by fix-

ing the location temporarily at Philadelphia for ten years, and permanently on the Potomac. The northern members were brought into that arrangement, by connecting the settlement of the funded debt with the location of the seat of Government.

Sectional feeling was almost as strong at that days as at this. John Adams, who succeeded General Washington, received but four electoral votes—and those from old companions in arms—south of the Potomac, and Jefferson, his competitor, not that many in the North. The contest appears to have been purely sectional.

The first member of Congress from the West was a Representative from Kentucky, who took his seat in 1792, and the next was from Tennessee, in 1796. General Jackson took his seat as a Senator from Tennessee in 1798, John Adams being President, and Thomas Jefferson Vice-President. A majority of the Senate is now from the West.

The first serious resistance to the laws of the United States, under the present Union, was in 1793-4, when opposition was made to the revenue laws imposing a tax on whisky, in Western Pennsylvania. General Washington, then President, called out an army of the militia of the neighboring States, of fifteen thousand men, which was headed by the then Secretary of the Treasury, General Hamilton. That act of the Secretary was severely commented on by the Democratic press of the day. Mr. Jefferson ridiculed and censured the act.

In the year 1798, party feeling ran so high that all social intercourse between the families of the Democrats and Federalists was measurably abandoned. It was in the midst of that embittered feeling that the patriotic song of "Hail Columbia, Happy Land," made its appearance and exerted such a happy influence over the public mind. The author of that immortal song was a Mr. Hopkins.

The first serious attempt at secession from the Union was in 1809, in the New England States, when the British Government sent a special agent—one Henry—to make the arrangement for taking the seceding States under the protection of the British flag. The alleged cause for the secession was, that the embargo laws bore heavily on the commerce of the Eastern States. It was designed to establish a Northern Confederacy. John Q. Adams, in speaking of the affair, said:

"This plan was so far matured that the proposal had been made to an individual, at the proper time, to be placed at the head of the military movement, which, it was foreseen, would be necessary for carrying it into execution."

"The interposition of a kind Providence averted the most deplorable of catastrophes, and, turning over to the receptacle of things lost on earth, the adjourned convention from Hartford to Boston, extinguished (by the mercy of heaven, may it be forever!) the projected New England Confederacy."

The Union has gone through some pretty severe ordeals since 1789. It has, however, weathered the storm, and showered unnumbered blessings on those who desired so much to get rid of it. We have no doubt it will be as kind in the future to its enemies, as it has been in the past. Let us all cherish it as the great source of our prosperity as a nation and happiness as a people.—[Exchange.]

A BURIED CITY AND ITS TREASURES.—The New Granada grave excitement having pretty well died out, the restless treasure-seekers have taken it into their heads that the old city of Port Royal, which was swallowed up by an earthquake in 1692, and over the ruins of which now dash the waters of the Bay of Kingston, Jamaica, if its deluged secrets were explored, would pay for the risk and trouble and expense with untold. Such an expedition is already projected, and with marine armor, it is the ranges of modern possibilities that it will result in something practical.

When the city was sunken it was large, populous, well-built, and wealthy, and, when the earth opened and the waves of the sea engulfed it, it became the coffin of thousands, and in its ruins, yet to be seen in a clear, sunny day, as the vessel glides over the smooth waters of the bay and over the house tops and streets of the once gay metropolis of the island, many of its ruins having yet resisted the action of the waves and wear of time, there can be no doubt that great wealth lies buried, and is probably accessible to the approach of modern arts and adventures. More improbable expeditions have been started, resulting in some instances with success.—[New Orleans Bulletin.]

THINK BEFORE YOU SPEAK.—Think twice; think *what* to speak, *how* to speak, *when* to speak, to whom to speak; and withal hold up your head, and look the person to whom you are speaking full in the face, with modest dignity and assurance.

Some lads have a foolish, sleep'sh bashfulness, sheer off, hold down their heads and eyes, as if they were guilty of sheep-stealing! Never be ashamed to do right.—[Adapted.]

THEOLOGICAL.—Jo. Cose having had the question propounded to him whether he believed in "original sin," replied that, so far from it, he had found sin to be the least original thing in the whole world.

PICKLES.—For one half barrel of pickles, make a brine of two quarts of salt with half a pound of alum. Keep the barrel covered tight. Pickles preserved in this way require only to be soaked over night to be ready for use.

LONDON SNAPS.—One pound flour, four ounces butter, one cup full common sugar, half pint molasses, third cup full ginger, with a little saleratus.

Gibraltar and Malta.

The English strongholds in the Mediterranean are Malta and Gibraltar. Gibraltar was captured by the British from Spain in 1704, and though many efforts have been made since to retake it, Great Britain has held possession of it ever since. In 1782, a combined attack by the French and Spanish was made upon it with an army of 40,000 men and one thousand pieces of artillery; forty-seven sail of the line, all three-deckers; ten floating batteries, carrying two hundred and twelve guns; frigates, xebecs, bomb-ketchers, cutters, and gun and mortar boats. General Elliot beat the land forces in a sortie, and the naval forces were dispersed, and floating batteries destroyed. Gibraltar has long been considered impregnable. Regular siege lines cannot be opened against it, for the simple reason that there are no materials for earth-works within battering range; and even if they were once erected, there is nothing to batter but solid rock, a breach in which would only render the storming more impracticable than ever.

Moreover, owing to the immense elevation of the place, it is impossible to prevent assailants from any quarter from being completely overlooked and exposed to the vertical fire of the garrison, without a possibility of returning to it.

Malta is also considered impregnable against any attack by sea by any armament in use.—It was captured, as alleged, by the treachery of one of the Knights of St. John, by Napoleon, when on his way to Egypt, in June, 1798, but continued in the possession of the French but a short time, having been blockaded by a British squadron, and taken by Gen. Pigot in 1800.

Malta has ever since been in the hands of Britain, and was guaranteed her by the treaty of Paris.

The Ionian Islands, situated along the Eastern coasts of the Adriatic, were captured from France, in 1809, by a British fleet. In 1815, the islands were placed by the Congress of Vienna under a British protectorate, in which condition they have ever since remained. On the island of Corfu, there is a fortress of very great strength, supposed to be next to impregnable. France will have to dislodge England from these possessions before the former can make the Mediterranean a French lake; the supposed object of Louis Napoleon's ambition, and the purpose probably of the great naval preparations which are being made in France.

THE REVOLVER QUESTION.—PRENTICE RELATES HIS WASHINGTON EXPERIENCE.—Prentice, in the Louisville Journal of the 14th, in the course of an article upon Mr. Haskin, and that revolver, relates his own experience in the national capital, as follows:—

When we were in Washington two or three weeks ago, we heard from all quarters that the great mass of the members of both sections were heavily freighted with all sorts of portable facilities for letting blood. We believe we were rather a pet of both sections, and we hope we betray no sacred confidence in saying, that whenever Northern or Southern members got a little maudlin and threw their arms affectionately around us (of course to steady themselves) we almost invariably felt the butts of pistols and the hafts of Bowie knives press against our shrinking frame.

One morning, we put our overcoat in the rack at Brown's Hotel and went in to breakfast. When we returned, our coat was gone, but another somewhat resembling it lay near. We took up the latter, but put it back with horror on finding a big, frightful looking revolver in one of the pockets. With some misgivings, such as a man might be supposed to feel in opening what he suspected to be an infernal machine, we took up the next, and lo, there was a big pistol in one pocket, and something in the other that we didn't stop to examine.

Finding the rack to be a well-furnished arsenal, we withdrew, and the day being cold, we remained an hour and a half in the hotel, carefully scrutinizing the integuments of every gentleman that seemed to have a particularly genteel overcoat. At length we turned to the arsenal, and the coat first examined by us still remained there. Concluding that even a fire-eater couldn't have been breakfasting so long, unless on burning coals and aquafortis tea, we were about calling a servant to take the firearm out of the pocket, (we have a moral antipathy to touching such things ourself) intending to wear the coat, for it was a very handsome one. At that moment, a very mild mannered Western member of Congress stepped up with an embarrassed look, and seeing at once that we looked like gentlemen who had lost something, remarked that he really believed he had got somebody else's overcoat. The matter was all made right at once, but we couldn't help thinking how awkward and insecure the member must have felt, when, in the very act, perhaps, of walking about among other Congressional belligerents, he had thrust his hand into what he supposed to be his pocket, and found nothing there more dangerous to life than a dozen pretty notes from a dozen pretty poetesses.

—It is said that Iowa has the tallest set of officers of any State in the Union: John W. Jones, Treasurer, is six feet three; Jonathan W. Cattell, Auditor, six feet two; A. B. Miller, Register, six feet; and Thomas H. Benton (not old Bullion), Secretary of the Board of Education, is also six feet. The Secretary of State, Elijah Sells, makes up in width what he lacks in length.