



The Elizabethan.

Vol. XI. No. 12.

WESTMINSTER, MARCH 1905.

Price 6d.

THE LATEST DISCOVERY IN THE MUNIMENT ROOM.

LACK of space unfortunately prevented us from printing the following letter in our last issue, and, owing to the extremely interesting nature of its contents and the celebrity of its author, we take the liberty of publishing it in the earlier columns of THE ELIZABETHAN:—

Muniment Room,
Westminster Abbey,
January 24, 1905.

DEAR MR. EDITOR,—I venture to think it will be a pleasurable surprise to all old and present members of your famous school to learn that among the series of accoimt-books, called 'Day-books of the Receivers-General of the Dean and Chapter of Westminster,' I have just found one MS. which has nothing whatever to do with them, but is the accoimt-book of the great Headmaster, Dr. Richard Busby, for provisioning the school under his charge for three and a

half years, from A.D. February 18, 1672-3, to September 28, 1676, including ten weeks spent at Chiswick, from July 17 to October 11, 1675, during the migration of the scholars thither, I presume on the scare of the prevalence of plague at Westminster.

The volume in question is a tall, narrow octavo of sixty-five leaves, written on both sides and bound in parchment covers. Up to folio 14 there is no entry for Sunday, but the items on Saturday are double those of other days of the week. Afterwards the accoimts of 'Saturday and Sunday' appear together. The diet was most generous, including beef, veal, calves' feet, mutton, lamb, bacon, rabbits, chickens, larks, partridges, pigeons, mallards, whittings, plaice, trout, flounders, salmon, ling, red and white herrings, cod, pike, mackerel, lobsters, smelts, shrimps, oysters, anchovies, turnips, carrots, rice, asparagus, oatmeal, lemons, almonds, figs, raisins, caraway comfits, turkey eggs, cinnamon, mace, nutmegs, cloves, currants, onions, peas, an invariable entry of 'Bever-bread.' Potatoes seem to be conspicuous by their absence. The above weekly charges occupy the first fifty-five leaves, and then begin miscellaneous entries of payments for the boys' dress, household necessaries, tobacco-pipes, and grim insertions of

'Switches' and their necessary corollary 'Diacolon' plaster.

On folio 63 are payments by Dr. Busby during his ten weeks' stay at Chiswick in the year 1675 for coach and horses at a cost of forty-seven shillings a week, so that apparently he came up to Westminster and back each day.

On ff. 56, 58b and 59 are curious entries of hirings of coaches generally at one shilling a head by different gentlemen, among whom constantly occurs 'Mr. Dryden,' from October 5, 1674, to October 18, 1676. Finally, on the last page are payments by the benevolent old doctor on July 14, 16; August 3, 4, 1675, for teaching for four months ten poor children at Chiswick.

The above is but a poor sketch of a most intensely interesting book, which ought to be reproduced in facsimile or completely edited, as a daily compendium of the expenses of the greatest school of the seventeenth century in England.

EDWARD J. L. SCOTT, D.Litt.

Historical Notes.

LETTERS TO BUSBY.—IV.

REVND S^R MY MOST HONOURD MASTER,

We have now finished our accounts and much sooner than usual, as well because in this juncture prudence obliged us to make what dispatch we could, as also because our Receiver, Mr. Healy, kept so exact a diary of [*word worm-eaten, perhaps* his] receipts and disbursements and drew up the whole account in so clear a method that all was in a manner don to our hands before we began our audit. We thank you for your entertainment in your Canonical hours where we daily remember'd wth honour our entertainer.

Mr. Healy hath sent you your account which we have carefully examin'd. In his discharge you will find some general sumes w^{thout} mention of the particulars whence those generals arise, but I have perused the bills and find they amount to so much in the whole. He adventurs still to beg your allowance of the gratuity to the Library-keeper hoping you will not w^{thdraw} your favour till he hath comitted something that may forfeit it. I am inquiring for a safe conveyance of your mony, which I hope will in a few days come to your hands. That don you may give the Receiver a discharge, but you cannot do so to mee, I remain your debtor still, I have ben your debtor from my childhood, to you I ow my education and my childs, my fortune, my fellowship in Cambridge, my Lecture there, my travaills, my station in this church, this Dividend, my selfe, all, except my

infirmities. Revnd S^r accept in part of pay the acknowledgement of

Y^r very obliged servant and scholar
ROB. CRYGHTON.

Wells: Dec. 15
1688.

[This letter is addressed :—

These
To the R. v. r. nd D^r Richard
Busby at his house neer
Westminster-Abby
Westminster.

It would seem that when Busby's work at Westminster prevented his taking his turn in residence as a Canon of Wells he provided a substitute together with means of entertainment for the resident members of the Chapter. The implication that the Library-keeper was likely to commit a serious offence is probably not intended, though the Librarian might have liked the phrase to be otherwise worded. It is also probably an accident that lower down 'Dividend' has the dignity of an initial capital and 'church' has not.]

School Notes.

THERE will be no Exeat this term.

The Mission offertory on the Feast of the Purification amounted to £4. os. 8d., and that on St. Matthias' Day to £3. 9s. 5d.

The promised lecture on Thibet was given up School by Mr. Sargeant from notes supplied by Sir Clements Markham, who was unable through illness to give it in person. It proved interesting in the extreme, and was illustrated by excellent slides. We cannot adequately express our appreciation of Sir Clements Markham's kindness in not disappointing our hopes when we remember that he was constrained to write and arrange his lecture while confined to bed. In return we wish him a speedy recovery.

Sir Clements Markham has kindly presented to the School the following interesting documents relating to Mr. Bogle's expedition to Thibet in 1774:—

(1) Letter of Warren Hastings to Mr. Bogle congratulating him on the success of his mission; (2) translation of a letter from the Teshoo Lama to Mr. Bogle; (3) translation of another letter from the Teshoo Lama to Warren Hastings; (4) invoice of presents intended to be given by Mr. Bogle to the Deb Rajah of Bhutan; (5) two French maps of Thibet supplied by Warren Hastings to Mr. Bogle.

The original of one of the Lama's letters was pro-

duced at the lecture, but Sir Clements had promised to give it to the Victoria Memorial Museum at Calcutta.

The School witnessed the opening of Parliament on February 14 from the Green outside Henry VII.'s Chapel.

A field-day was held on Wimbledon Common on February 17. It turned out to be the most enjoyable the Cadet Corps has undertaken this year.

Col. Rawson and Col. Vyvyan came down to inspect the Corps on February 24 and at the same time to present the cup for Inter-House Drill, which was given by the Elizabethan Club. Col. Rawson expressed himself extremely pleased with the Corps, and three cheers for himself and Col. Vyvyan brought the day's proceedings to a close.

The Sports this year are to be held on April 7 and 8. Holders of Challenge Cups are requested to return them forthwith to The Captain, St. Peter's College, Westminster.

The following is the Football Card filled in to date:—

		1904.	
Sat.	Sept. 24	v. Clapham Rovers.	(Lost, 1-2.)
"	Oct. 1	v. Old Malvernians.	(Lost, 1-3.)
"	"	8 v. Royal Engineers.	(Won, 4-0.)
"	"	2nd XI. v. Clapham Rovers 2nd XI.	(Scratched.)
"	"	15 v. Beckenham.	(Lost, 0-6.)
"	"	2nd XI. v. Guy's Hospital A.	(Lost, 0-7.)
"	"	22 v. Casuals.	(Lost, 0-2.)
"	"	2nd XI. v. St. Bartholomew's A.	(Lost, 2-3.)
"	"	29 v. Old Reptonians.	(Lost, 0-5.)
"	Nov. 5	v. Old Harrovians.	(Scratched.)
"	"	2nd XI. v. Old Westminsters 2nd XI.	(Won, 2-0.)
"	"	12 v. Emeriti.	(Lost, 1-3.)
"	"	2nd XI. v. St. Thomas's Hospital.	(Lost, 1-3.)
Wed.	"	16 v. Old Westminsters.	(Drawn, 3-3.)
Sat.	"	19 v. Old Felstedians.	(Drawn, 3-3.)
"	"	2nd XI. v. Emeriti A.	(Lost, 0-7.)
Wed.	"	23 v. Hertford College.	(Lost, 3-4.)
Sat.	"	26 v. Brasenose College, Oxon.	(Drawn, 2-2.)
"	"	2nd XI. v. Old Westminsters 2nd XI.	(Lost, 3-6.)
"	Dec. 3	v. Kenley.	(Won, 3-2.)
"	"	10 v. Barnes.	(Lost, 2-3.)
		1905.	
Sat.	Jan. 21	v. Clapham Rovers.	(Lost, 0-3.)
"	"	2nd XI. v. Old Foresters.	(Lost, 0-4.)
Wed.	"	25 v. Casuals.	(Lost, 2-5.)
Sat.	"	28 v. Clare Coll., Camb.	(Won, 3-2.)
"	"	2nd XI. v. Clapham Rovers A.	(Scratched.)
"	Feb. 4	v. Hampstead.	(Lost, 0-3.)
"	"	2nd XI. v. Old Westminsters 2nd XI.	(Lost, 1-3.)
"	"	11 v. Christ Church.	(Scratched.)
"	"	2nd XI. v. St. Thomas's Hospital 2nd XI.	(Lost, 0-1.)
"	"	18 v. Pembroke Coll., Camb.	(Lost, 0-2.)

Sat.	Feb. 18	2nd XI. v. St. Bartholomew's Hospital	2nd XI. (Won, 4-2.)
Wed.	"	22 v. Old Westminsters.	(Lost, 0-2.)
Sat.	"	25 v. Univ. Coll., Oxon.	(Scratched.)
"	Mar. 4	v. Charterhouse (at Godalming).	
"	"	11 v. An Eton XI. (at Vincent Square).	
"	"	18 v. L. A. M. Fevez's XI.	
"	"	25 v. Old Etonians.	
"	April 1	K.S.S. v. T.B.B.	

The following is the Card of the Debating Society filled in to date:—

January 26.—‘That this House deplores the action of the Russian Government in dealing with the popular agitations.’ Proposer, H. I. P. Hallett; Seconder, W. R. Birchall. Opposer, G. R. Y. Radcliffe. Ayes, 12; Noes, 2.

February 9.—‘That this House would welcome a reform in the powers of Local Bodies to impose Bye-laws.’ Proposer, H. D. Adrian; Seconder, A. E. Spencer; Opposer, E. N. R. Trentham. Ayes, 2; Noes, 12.

February 16 and 23.—‘That this House approves of Mr. Chamberlain's Fiscal Proposals.’ Proposer, A. H. Aglionby; Seconder, H. I. P. Hallett; Opposer, G. R. Y. Radcliffe. Ayes, 12; Noes, 5.

March 2.—‘That this House would approve of a National Theatre subsidised by the State.’ Proposer, A. P. Waterfield; Seconder, F. Worlock; Opposer, A. H. Aglionby. Ayes, 15; Noes, 2.

‘That this House would deplore the Abolition of Greek as a compulsory subject in the University Matriculation Examinations.’ Proposer, R. Hackforth; Seconder, G. B. Wilson; Opposer, J. M. Craig.

‘That this House considers the maintenance of the Auxiliary Forces indispensable to the safety of this country.’ Proposer, E. F. C. Mosse; Seconder, H. L. Geare; Opposer, F. H. Budden.

‘That this House approves of the Alien Immigration Bill laid before Parliament last Session.’ Proposer, G. B. Wilson; Seconder, R. C. Le Blond; Opposer, O. Lewis.

‘That this House would welcome an increase in the Taxation of Land Values in London.’ Proposer, P. T. Rawlings; Seconder, F. Worlock; Opposer, H. G. F. Longhurst.

‘That, in the opinion of this House, the past year has been eminently satisfactory.’ Proposer, S. F. Johnson; Seconder, R. Hackforth; Opposer, W. F. H. Waterfield.

THE LEAGUE.

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	Pts.
A	—	L 0-1		L 0-3	D 0-0	D 0-0	D 1-1	3
B	W 1-0	—	L 0-2		L 1-2		D 1-1	3
C		W 2-0	—	W 1-0	W 4-1	W 2-1	W 5-0	10
D	W 3-0		L 0-1	—	D 2-2	W 2-1	W 4-3	7
E	D 0-0	W 2-1	L 1-4	D 2-2	—	W 2-1		6
F	D 0-0		L 1-3	L 1-2	L 1-2	—	W 4-0	3
G	D 1-1	D 1-1	L 0-5	L 3-4		L 0-4	—	2

Captains of Leagues.

A.—G. B. Wilson. D.—W. F. H. Waterfield.
 B.—J. W. Geddes. E.—G. Hepburn.
 C.—M. T. Maxwell. F.—J. E. Rodocanachi,
 G.—E. A. Rice-Oxley.

THE FIELDS.

WESTMINSTER SCHOOL *v.* HAMPSTEAD.*(Lost, 0-3.)*

PLAYED up Fields on Saturday, February 4. The School won the toss, and the visitors kicked off from the church end at 2.30 P.M. The School forwards ran down, but their shooting was wild. Hampstead retaliated, and after some even play, scored, McKenna unfortunately putting through his own goal. The School forwards now got going, but the visitors' left-back cleared. Vernon made several useful runs, but was weak in front of goal. After about thirty minutes' play Vernon headed a second goal for Hampstead, who led by two goals to love at the interval.

In the second half the School had more of the game, but were unable to score owing to the visitors' good defence, while Hampstead scored once more through their centre forward.

The ball was not round, and did not bounce at all true, perhaps accounting for the inaccuracy of the play.

The following were the teams :—

WESTMINSTER SCHOOL.

G. Hepburn (goal); S. McKenna and W. R. Birchall (backs); F. H. Budden, S. M. Craig, and H. L. Geare (half-backs); W. B. Harris, E. Coleby, H. Walker, O. H. Walters, and S. F. Johnson (forwards).

HAMPSTEAD.

E. W. Treleaven (goal); F. Parker and P. F. Davey (backs); W. A. Chaplin, W. Ross, and S. Chalk (half-backs); H. W. Gregory, L. G. Kirkpatrick, C. Lanel, J. C. Vernon, and W. S. Chalk (forwards).

WESTMINSTER SCHOOL 2ND XI. *v.* OLD WESTMINSTERS 2ND XI.*(Lost, 1-3.)*

This match was played up Fields on Saturday, February 4. The Old Westminsters turned up three men short, and were provided with substitutes. Harrison scored for the visitors in the first half, and Lee equalised. In the second half they had most of the game, and Harrison scored again with a really fine shot (1-2). After some play Turner (sub.) scored again. This was the extent of the scoring. O. Lewis kept goal well, and was much safer than usual.

The teams were :—

WESTMINSTER SCHOOL 2ND XI.

O. Lewis (goal); J. C. Davidson and H. D. Adrian (backs); S. C. Edgar, J. E. Thoresby-Jones, and R. C. Le Blond (half-backs); E. R. Mason, T. E. Rodocanachi, K. E. Newman, A. G. Lee, and R. W. Reed (forwards).

OLD WESTMINSTERS 2ND XI.

H. C. G. Pedler (goal); M. Pemberton, L. Connor (backs); S. Oldham, A. W. Matcham, and F. G. Turner (sub.) (half-backs); Davis, J. Harrison, Holiday, Summerhays (sub.), and E. R. Ratchiffe-Cousins (sub.) (forwards).

WESTMINSTER SCHOOL *v.* CAMBRIDGE OLD WESTMINSTERS.*(Won, 7-0.)*

Played up Fields on Wednesday, February 8. Cambridge Old Westminsters brought down a moderately strong team, but were soundly beaten. This was the first time that the School forwards really showed up to advantage. Soon after the start Johnson ran down and centered, and the ball came back to Craig, who, taking it on the volley, scored with a good shot (1-0). The School forwards ran down again, and Kent saved a shot from Walters, only to find Johnson waiting to put it through (2-0). The game now opened up, the School still keeping on the offensive. After some even play Walker added another goal for the School (3-0). Vernon had hurt his knee and gone into goal. Walker ran through again and hit the post with his shot, but scored from the rebound (4-0). Bonser, in attempting to clear, headed through his own goal (5-0). The School gained several ineffectual corners, which were at last followed by another goal (6-0). The visitors now ran up, but failed to score; the School retaliated, and Walters scored with a good shot (7-0). The School pressed to the end, but failed to score again. For the School the forwards were much improved, and the defence proved equal to the little they had to do.

The teams were :—

WESTMINSTER SCHOOL.

G. Hepburn (goal); S. McKenna and W. R. Birchall (backs); F. H. Budden, J. M. Craig, and H. L. Geare (half-backs); G. F. Johnson, O. H. Walters, H. Walker, E. Coleby, and W. B. Harris (forwards).

CAMBRIDGE OLD WESTMINSTERS.

C. Kent (goal); W. J. Winfield Bonser and R. G. Gardner (backs); F. W. Hubback, C. Powers, and F. S. Fleuret (half-backs); J. S. Clark-Kennedy, J. C. Vernon, R. W. Geddes, J. G. Kirkpatrick, and H. B. Philby (forwards).

WESTMINSTER SCHOOL 2ND XI. *v.* ST. THOMAS'S HOSPITAL 2ND XI.*(Lost, 0-1.)*

This match was played up Fields on Saturday, February 11. Owing to the 1st XI. being scratched

the School 2nd XI. were represented by a strong team, but lost by 1 goal to love. In the first half the School played with the wind and pressed the whole time, but the shooting was exceedingly weak. Rawlings shot into the net once from a pass by Newman, but he was ruled off-side. Several corners were gained by the School, but were not improved upon. In the second half the game was more even, neither side having the advantage to any great extent. The shooting on both sides was very poor. Just before time St. Thomas's forced a corner, and from the ensuing kick rushed the ball through. Time came immediately afterwards, with the score (1-0) against us. For the School the forwards did not play as well as usual, especially when in front of goal, Newman's shooting being very erratic.

The teams were :—

WESTMINSTER SCHOOL 2ND XI.

G. Hepburn (goal); S. McKenna and W. R. Birchall (backs); H. L. Geare, F. H. Budden, and S. C. Edgar (half-backs); R. W. Reed, P. T. Rawlings, K. E. Newman, E. Coleby, and W. B. Harris (forwards).

ST. THOMAS'S 2ND XI.

R. W. Hibbert (goal); Dalglysh and Bennett (backs); F. R. Wright, E. Prape, and H. Verdon (half-backs); S. H. Bowel, S. P. Chan, G. L. Layton, A. B. Petch, and C. Turkerd (forwards).

WESTMINSTER SCHOOL *v.* PEMBROKE COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

(Lost, 0-2.)

This match was played up Fields on Saturday, February 18, and resulted in a win for the visitors, who brought down a strong team, including P. R. May and F. W. Roberts. Craig lost the toss, and the School kicked off from the hospital end. Pembroke broke away from the start, but Hepburn saved. Davey then ran down and put in a good centre, which their goalkeeper ran out and saved. Pembroke forced a corner, but without result. May tried a shot from a free kick, but the ball went wide. Davey had the misfortune to hurt his ankle, and was forced to leave the field. The School were now playing ten men and were kept mainly on the defensive. Shortly before half-time the visitors scored with an excellent long shot (0-1). In the second half the School forwards went to pieces, and Pembroke pressed almost the whole time. They tried several shots, but were unable to score till just before the end, when Roberts made an individual effort and scored from close range (0-2). Pembroke pressed till the end, but were unable to score again.

The teams were :—

WESTMINSTER SCHOOL.

G. Hepburn (goal); S. McKenna and W. R. Birchall (backs); F. H. Budden, J. M. Craig, and H. L. Geare (half-backs); S. H. Johnson, O. H. Walters, P. T. Rawlings, E. Coleby, and A. P. Davey (forwards).

PEMBROKE COLLEGE.

O. S. Flinn (goal); C. H. Eyre and P. R. May (backs); M. Hills, C. B. W. Magnay, and E. T. Carver (half-backs); G. Mills, R. Bilby, C. Matthews, F. W. Roberts, and M. R. Lennant (forwards).

WESTMINSTER SCHOOL 2ND XI. *v.* ST. BARTHOLOMEW'S A.

(Won, 4-2.)

Played up Fields on Saturday, February 18. The School kicked off from the pavilion end at 2.35. Each side pressed in turn. Walker ran down and scored the first goal for the School after about ten minutes' play. However, the visitors soon forced a corner and equalised. They forced several corners, but did not turn them to account. Before half-time they ran down, and their centre forward placed them ahead (1-2). Shortly after resuming, Walker scored with a good shot (2-2). The School now had most of the game, and Walker scored again (3-2). After some even play the School forwards attacked, and Walker scored once more (4-2). This was the extent of the scoring. For the School, Walker was very good, and succeeded in scoring all four goals.

The teams were :—

WESTMINSTER SCHOOL 2ND XI.

O. Lewis (goal); J. C. Davidson and R. C. Le Blond (backs); S. C. Edgar, E. R. Mason, and J. E. Thoresby-Jones (half-backs); W. B. Harris, A. G. Lee, H. Walker, K. E. Newman, and R. W. Reed (forwards).

ST. BARTHOLOMEW'S A.

A. Downes (goal); A. Barber and F. L. Nash-Wathan (backs); E. A. Sturdee, S. Nangbord, and W. M. Glenlister (half-backs); F. Salc, R. G. Riches, S. Tucker, S. Upton, and A. Forrester (Captain) (forwards).

WESTMINSTER SCHOOL *v.* OLD WESTMINSTERS.

(Lost, 0-2)

Played up Fields on Wednesday, February 22, and resulted in a win for O.WW. by two goals to love. A strong wind was blowing the whole time and rendered the play rather difficult. Almost immediately after the kick-off H. G. Barnett ran through and scored. O.WW. had most of the game, but were unable to score again before half-time. Anderson now left the field and his place was filled for the remainder of the time by H. Whitton. In the second half the game became more even, and Beasley and Barnett having changed places, a combined movement on the part of O.WW. forwards resulted in Barwell scoring from close range with a shot which gave Hepburn no chance (0-2). The game continued to be very fast, but no further addition was made to the score.

The following were the teams :—

WESTMINSTER SCHOOL.

G. Hepburn (goal); S. McKenna, W. R. Birchall (backs); F. H. Budden, R. C. Le Blond, and H. L. Geare (half-backs); S. F. Johnson, P. T. Rawlings, H. Walker, E. Coleby, and O. H. Walters (forwards).

OLD WESTMINSTERS.

G. L. Crowe (goal); L. A. M. Fevez, S. Wynter (backs); R. Chatterton, A. Milne, C. H. Longhurst (half-backs); R. S. Summerhayes, K. B. Anderson, L. Barwell, H. G. Barnett, and H. O. C. Beasley (forwards).

The following have scored goals for the School :—

P. T. Rawlings, 9; K. E. Newman, 9; H. Walker, 6; A. P. Davey, 5; E. Coleby, 2; O. H. Walters, 2; J. M. Craig, 1.

THE DEBATING SOCIETY.

THE House met on Thursday, December 8, to discuss the Motion: 'That this House would welcome the formation of a Westminster School Shooting Eight.'

The PROPOSER (G. R. Y. Radcliffe) said a dull debate seemed expected, but the subject was really one of very great importance. The formation of a shooting eight would be good from three points of view :—(1) From a national point of view; (2) from a School point of view; and (3) from a point of view of the members of the eight. The navy might be a good first line of defence, but it was folly to have no second line. Nelson defended the Channel miles away from it. A tiny mishap could make land defence imperative. Five hundred years ago everyone could shoot in defence of his land; everyone ought to be able to now. He did not believe that the fact of eight people devoting themselves to shooting would hurt other branches of school sports. It was a discredit to the School that we have no eight. It would be good for the members of the eight because they would have to train hard to get steady hands.

The OPPOSER (O. Lewis) had no wish to oppose the formation of an eight, if there was any probability—which there was not—of our being able to form a good one. Frequent practice would be needed, and Bisley was the only possible range. This would be a great expense. How could it be covered? Who was to pay the necessary subscriptions? Were there enough good shots in the corps?—the general standard was very low. Very likely two or three of the eight would be Pinks. It would cause great interference with the School games. An unsatisfactory eight would be worse than no eight at all. Mr. Lewis concluded a short speech with a third reference to the interference it would cause with school games, and a fifth or sixth to the question of expense.

The SECONDER (H. G. F. Longhurst) replied in a maiden speech, which showed traces of nervousness.

All schools which have a cadet corps have an eight. Naturally it would not be good until it had had training. The Elizabethan Club had offered to pay the expenses at Bisley. The proposal would encourage competition and so improve the corps shooting. In every debate that term the same arguments had been brought up of time and money. They were really very mean ones. Mr. Lewis's speech had been one monotonous cry of 'expense.' If there were difficulties we should try and overcome them.

J. M. CRAIG said Mr. Lewis was quite right in thinking 'Pinks' would be members. We had been unfavourably compared with other schools. Let us remember they had far better facilities. The expense would be considerably greater for us because of distance.

The PROPOSER replied: Expense should not be urged as an argument. As to time, elsewhere the members of the eight gave their whole time to it. The football team improved, why not the eight? There were no greater difficulties in that than in football and cricket.

H. I. P. HALLETT said that the Opposer said we should not try to form a shooting eight because we could never hope to be good. He might as well argue that the small boys should not be compelled to play football because they could never hope to become 'Pinks.' How could we know what the eight would be like till we tried? Ambition to get into the eight would be the best incitement to good shooting in the corps.

The OPPOSER said Mr. Radcliffe's statement that people would not be both members of the team and of the shooting eight was a good argument for the Opposition. Mr. Hallett's parallel was no parallel. You could have shooting without a shooting eight.

J. M. CRAIG reminded the House that some schools, such as Malvern, had their range so near that they could utilise odd moments to shoot in.

H. V. ARGYLE remarked that a good first eleven and a good eight could exist side by side.

The PROPOSER argued that Malvern and Charterhouse had both good elevens and good eights. Why could not we? The loss of ten fellows, the maximum required, could not possibly interfere with cricket or football. People must learn to shoot or be prepared for conscription.

H. I. P. HALLETT said it was as much against human nature that much shooting should be done and no shooting eight formed, as that much football should be played and no 1st XI. exist. The authorities of the corps had investigated the question of expense, and found it surmountable. Who was Mr. Lewis to over-rule their decision? He had previously advocated conscription for the very reason that men like the Opposer made moderate measures such as this one impossible. The present state of affairs imperilled the country. Efforts were being made to remedy this. Let Westminster not lag behind.

The OPPOSER asked Mr. Hallett if house com-

petitions would not afford the desired stimulus. Charterhouse, which had been so freely cited, had more fellows than Westminster. Mr. Hallett had quoted the Elizabethan Club. Had they promised all the necessary money?

The PROPOSER answered that the Elizabethan Club had promised to help. He brought forward a proof that members of the eleven at Charterhouse were not in the eight.

The OPPOSER doubted the Proposer's statement that the numbers of a school did not affect the eight. How was the balance of the money to be raised?

H. I. P. HALLETT wound up the last debate of the term by a challenge to the Opposer to produce a single decent answer to the national argument in favour of the Motion.

The House divided, and voted :—

For the Motion, 13 ; against, 4.

The Motion was therefore carried by 13 votes to 4.

The House met on January 26 to discuss the following Motion :—

'That this House deploras the action of the Russian Government in dealing with the popular agitations.'

The PROPOSER (H. I. P. Hallett) asked the House to regard the late massacre as but the culminating act of a long series of oppressive measures. The Press had sufficiently dealt with the massacre, and he wished to deal more particularly with the measures that led to it. Ever since the murder of Alexander II. the Russian Government had adopted a reactionary policy. It was the hopelessness of reform which caused any popular excesses. Nihilists had nothing to do with these agitations. They were atheists, whereas the procession was headed by two priests. The future results of this action of the Government were the most serious features. Reverence for the Czar was gone. He had had a great opportunity, but had thrown it away and given in to the reactionaries ; the result was the desperate expedient and pathetic petition which had resulted in the massacre. The Polish demands were a fair example. The Proposer showed how they were moderate and contained nothing to hurt the Czar's pride, nothing revolutionary, but merely social reforms. The last hope of the people, the Czar, had failed them, and the result might be too terrible to contemplate. He instanced the wantonness of the official behaviour. The action of the Russian Government was unjustifiable and cruel.

The OPPOSER (G. R. Y. Radcliffe) complained that all England was anti-Russian. There was not a single paper which tried to learn the Russian side of the case. The Russian people were barbarians, and not fitted for greater liberty. To yield an inch would be to yield an ell, and monarchy would be thus overturned. The preponderant agricultural population were taking no part in the agitations. To grant the demands of the workmen would be to ruin

trade. Abuses were being reformed ; for instance, corporal punishment. Polish had no claims to support. The natural laziness, drunkenness, and ferocity of the Russian people were the strongest arguments against granting self-rule.

The SECONDER (W. R. Birchall) pointed out the Opposer's complacency towards oppression. The troops who fired were Cossacks, not Russians, as Mr. Radcliffe stated. There was no free press in Russia. Russians naturally wished their freedom and had a right to obtain it. The procession was a peaceful effort to show peaceable intentions. He defended at some length the literary value of Polish.

The PROPOSER denied that we are unfair to Russia. Inquiries were made at their Embassy for their version, but they had none to give. The popular demands were not Socialistic. If one had been granted the rest would have been withdrawn. The crowds were not led by professional agitators, but by working men. Intellectual people, barristers for instance, were joining the movement. Monarchy would not be saved by 'firmness' of this character. What authority had Mr. Radcliffe for asserting that there had been progress? There had been none for thirty years. The manufacturers were being ruined by heavy taxes and official corruption, not by workmen's demands. Soldiers had to obey orders, but as a matter of fact the pure Russian troops did refuse to fire. Duke Sergius had given express orders to kill as many as possible.

The PRESIDENT concluded the debate. Even France, Russia's ally, had condemned her. Even 'barbarous' people had a right to freedom. The strike was spreading. Soon the military communications would be endangered—and what then?

The Motion was then put to the vote and declared carried by 12 votes to 2.

The House met on February 9 to discuss the following Motion :—

'That this House would welcome a reform in the powers of local bodies to impose bye-laws.'

No debate ensued worthy of the name, for the PROPOSER misunderstood which side he was speaking on and argued accordingly, and the SECONDER was again inaudible for the most part.

The PROPOSER (H. D. Adrian) opened his speech by a few remarks on ancient bye-laws, of which he gave some instances. He then gave a long list of matters dealt with by these regulations under the Public Health Acts, and especially those dealing with new streets and buildings. Though there were eccentric people who built huts in ridiculous ways, there were other reasonable folk who wished to build wooden bungalows or thatched cottages, but were prevented by oppressive bye-laws requiring them to be made of incombustible substance. Local councils, however, were often within their rights, but were too poor to obtain advice about enforcing or making bye-laws. This was chiefly so in the country, while in

towns there were numerous instances of favouritism. In former times the Acts were precise in details and local councils were not needed. But we were told that a Bill—one, for instance, elaborating a building code—could not now be passed. If this was so, the blame must lie with Parliament.

The OPPOSER (E. N. R. Trentham), in a maiden speech, complained of the trivialities the Proposer had introduced into his speech. He had no doubt that in Mr. Justice Grantham's case the bye-laws had had a most salutary effect. In many directions these bye-laws had done much good; for instance, the regulations regarding cemeteries had actually reduced death rates in recent years. It was impossible to please everybody, but in many cases the authors of these bye-laws were public benefactors, and should be treated as such. Cast-iron regulations were obviously unsuitable to individual cases, and local authorities must necessarily have most knowledge of local needs. Decentralisation must to a great extent be the main principle in modern life. This principle the Proposer wished to entirely ignore.

The SECONDER (A. E. F. Spencer) said that Mr. Trentham had failed to grasp the point of the Motion; he did not object to bye-laws but to the present bye-laws. He quoted instances of unfairness from the bye-laws concerning railways, ponds, and bicycles. Bye-laws applying to public matters such as traffic should be the same all over England, and a man who in Middlesex is allowed to ride a bicycle for an hour after sunset without a light should not be liable to be arrested the moment he crosses Putney Bridge into Surrey. An old law dating from Queen Elizabeth says that private bye-laws are binding except when contrary to law or unreasonable. Who is to decide what is reasonable or not? Petty guilds and councils are too apt to assert their authority by absurd and gratuitous interference, and some limit should be imposed on their powers.

H. I. P. HALLETT pointed out that the Proposer had so effectually demolished the Seconder's arguments, and *vice versa*, that there was little left for him to do. However, he would add one or two arguments against the Motion. First, building regulations could only be made by means of bye-laws. They were absolutely necessary for public health and safety, and surely the best judges of their need were the local authorities. Of the eight kinds of authorities, he dealt with two, the Urban District Councils and County Councils, and showed that each of their powers were necessary for the public weal. These authorities were not unreasonable. He cited statistics to prove how rarely they took extreme measures to enforce their regulations. The laws they made could not be made haphazard, they had to be submitted to various high administrative departments of government, such as the Board of Education, the Board of Trade, the Local Government Board, and these bodies published model bye-laws. The Proposer, if he had known which side of the Motion he was speaking on, could have made a good case by citing

individual oppressive actions, but these could not prove his case.

The TREASURER complained that only the last speaker had been intelligible. But he believed no one had shown how impossible it would have been to sanction Mr. Justice Grantham's plans.

A dull debate was then concluded, and the Motion declared lost by 3 to 12.

House Notes.

K.SS.—Our first duty is to congratulate Birchall, Rawlings, Budden, Walters, and Geare on representing us in the Charterhouse match. We notice with pleasure that Mr. J. R. Trench (O.W.) and Mr. A. G. R. Henderson (O.W.) are included in the Christ Church II. boat, the latter as cox; but we have to condole with Mr. E. W. Lane-Clayton (O.W.) on his unfortunate illness, which has brought his scientific studies to an abrupt and untimely conclusion.

Chess ties are progressing favourably, and the Literary Society has finished 'Hamlet' and the 'Rivals,' and has already had one reading of 'Romeo and Juliet.' Members of the corps have already started their training for the Inter-House Drill. On going to press we must congratulate Mr. S. D. Charles (O.W.) on his appearance in the 'Clouds' at Oxford.

A.H.—We have little to chronicle. Our hearty congratulations are due to Mr. S. S. Harris on being elected to captain the English XI. *v.* Wales, also to Mr. H. W. Beveridge on his successful reappearance at golf. W. B. Harris has played for the School several times with great credit. Our football prospects are only moderate; we have had two House games so far, but are unable to gather much confidence from them for the forthcoming House matches; the defence in particular seems to lack stamina. However, we are blessed with the acquisition of one or two promising Juniors, and hope to give any House a good game. The Fives Ties are at a standstill owing to an obstinate obstruction in the first round, but Racquets Ties are making satisfactory progress. A squad of the Cadet Corps, under Corporal Treatt, has made its appearance in Yard at an early hour for several mornings; we hope that they will bring the cup to Ashburnham, and that it will stay there.

GRANT'S.—There is little to chronicle this month, for we have scarcely written the notes for one month before we are asked for those of the next. After finishing 'Much Ado about Nothing' the Literary Society has started to read 'She Stoops to Conquer.'

The Debating Society has discussed the question of a general conscription in this country, which was thoroughly disapproved. Fresh Yard Ties have been started this term, from which Reed and Nott-Bower have already been eliminated. We hear that H. Logan (O.W.) has left England on a voyage round the world. Certain members of the Cadet Corps up the House are to be seen in the mornings manœuvring in Dean's Yard, as the House Yard has proved too small for their various movements. Rumour has it that they are practising for the Inter-House Drill Competition.

H.B.B.—Our football prospects have just received a severe blow in an injury to his ankle suffered by A. P. Davey, who, it is feared, will be unable to play until the K.S.S. match. We sincerely condole with him on his enforced absence during his last term at school. In view of this loss our chances of defeating Rigaud's in the Shield Matches are not very bright. In the first round of the Fives Ties A. E. Spencer and A. J. Circuit have beaten H. G. F. Longhurst and N. E. Bartlett, while D. G. McLaren and T. E. Laing have succumbed to G. Circuit and D. L. Summerhayes. We are more than glad to see that our staircase has been repaired; it was sadly in need of renovation. The Debating Society continues to flourish with more success, we think, than during its last period of fitful existence. We are sorry to see that colds are so rife, especially amongst our junior members. A. P. Davey has been made a House-monitor.

RIGAUD'S.—Congratulations are always a welcome factor in our monthly House Notes, and we are glad to be able to offer them to G. Hepburn on his 'Thirds,' and to Mr. A. T. Willett upon his inclusion in the Christ Church lacrosse team. We must condole with J. M. Craig upon a strained back, which deprived the team of his presence against O.W.W., but are glad to say that his absence will not be prolonged. We have been continually well represented in the School matches, and hope to send down a strong contingent to Godalming. Interest in the Cadet Corps continues up Rigaud's and the House squad makes up for its paucity of numbers by its ready and untiring enthusiasm. We were pleased to see several old Rigaudites in the Cambridge Old Westminsters' team, and again in the O.W.W. XI. An Oxford correspondent tells of the prodigious amount of work which Mr. D. Clark is accomplishing; we wish him all success in getting through 'Mods.' Our last care must be to rectify an omission in our last notes by congratulating E. Coleby upon his most lucky escape from the recent train smash upon the Midland Railway.

Old Westminsters.

In answer to an inquiry we may say that the oldest Westminster seems to be the Rev. Frederick Luttrell Moysey of Wiveliscomb Court, Somerset, who entered his ninetieth year last November. Next come the Rev. Charles Abbot Stevens, Mr. George Henry Drew, and Mr. William Augustus Tollemache, who were all born in 1817.

By the late deaths of Bishops, the Bishop of Bangor becomes entitled to a seat in the House of Lords. He was consecrated in 1899.

All Westminsters will regret the retirement of Sir Robert Penrose Fitzgerald, who has been for many years M.P. for Cambridge. Sir Robert's state of health will not allow him to contest the borough at the next General Election.

Mr. R. R. Campbell has for some time been doing work in the Education Office. His services have been so valuable that the authorities have induced him to accept a permanent post in the Office.

Mr. S. S. Harris was chosen to captain the English Eleven against Wales.

Birth.

On February 21, at 3 Sydney Place, S.W., the wife of N. J. McCaskie, M.A., M.D., of a daughter.

Marriage.

ROGERS—TAYLOR. On February 18 James Arthur Warrington Rogers, son of the late James C. F. W. Rogers, to Josephine Caroline Gilbey, eldest daughter of George Taylor, of Bromley, Kent.

Obituary.

WE have to record with much regret the death of ROBERT HENRY HURST, of Horsham Park. Born in 1817, he was admitted in 1831 and went to Cambridge in 1836. There he was a Wrangler in 1840 and was called to the Bar two years later. He became Recorder of Hastings in 1862. From 1865 to 1874 and again in 1875 he sat as Liberal M.P. for Horsham, as his father and grandfather had done before him. He married in 1859 a daughter of James Scott, of Rusper, and sons of his were at the School from 1879 to 1888. In all Sussex no man was

better known or more respected than Mr. Hurst. He was active to the last. In January he took the chair at a dinner given to the Liberal candidate in the last Horsham election, and within ten days of his death he presided at a meeting of the County Council. He died on February 12. [See the *Times* of February 13.]

We have also to regret the death of JAMES CHARLES FRAMPTON WARRINGTON ROGERS, who was born in 1840 and admitted in 1852. He became a solicitor in 1866 and practised in Westminster. He married about thirty years ago, and his son was at the School in the early nineties. He died after a long illness on January 26.

O.W.W. of recent years will learn with much regret of the death of CHARLES FRANCIS PROBY ARMSTRONG, who was 'up Rigaud's' from 1896 to 1899. Soon after leaving School he entered the Egyptian Coastguard Service, and, as has already been recorded in THE ELIZABETHAN, served with distinction in various parts. Although he was only twenty-three at the date of his death, he had already obtained his captaincy. Armstrong had just reached Alexandria, on his return after three months' leave in this country, when he contracted scarlet fever, from which he was gradually recovering. But before he left the hospital he caught small-pox there, and he died on December 11 very suddenly. He was especially beloved by the men in his Service, as was testified by the sorrow evinced in all ranks on the announcement of his death, while the high value in which the Administration held him has been fully shown by the many kind and appreciative letters of the superior officers to his parents.

Correspondence.

To the Editor of 'The Elizabethan.'

DEAR SIR,—Reading Mr. W. W. Read's 'Annals of Cricket,' I found two references to Westminster School cricket which may be of interest to you. Here is the first. It is taken from the *Morning Herald* of July 30, 1789, and refers to a match on the 28th:—'An excellent game of cricket was played in Tothill Fields on Tuesday between the King's Scholars and the Town Boys of Westminster School, which ended in favour of the King's Scholars, who had three wickets to go down. Mr. Forester, Mr. Brice, and the elder Tufton distinguished themselves as excellent batsmen among the Town Boys, which was opposed to the equally good bowling of Mr. D'Oyley.'

This is taken word for word from the book, even the 'which was.'

The other comes from the *St. James's Chronicle*, July 26, 1796:—'Yesterday a cricket match was played on Hounslow Heath between the Westminster Scholars and those of Eton for 100 guineas aside, which was won by the Westminster Scholars.'

WESTMINSTER.

<i>First Innings.</i>		<i>Second Innings.</i>	
Stevens, c. Lamb	33	c. Neild	2
Caulfield, b. Marsh	0	c. Brook	41
Ridley, c. Lamb	6	c. Brook	19
Drake, b. Marsh	15	c. Lamb	0
Curteis, b. Snowden	16	c. Lamb	14
Butler, b. Frederick	0	b. Frederick	5
Laye, b. Frederick	3	run out	5
Thompson, b. Snowden	0	c. Snowden	8
Kelly, c. Don	1	c. Frederick	0
Longlands, not out	3	not out	0
Grise, b. Snowden	6	c. Lamb	3
Byes	17	Byes	0
Total	100	Total	97

ETONIANS.

<i>First Innings.</i>		<i>Second Innings.</i>	
Snowden, b. Stevens	23	b. Drake	4
Lamb, b. Caulfield	21	b. Stevens	1
Frederick, b. Caulfield	0	c. Ridley	6
Marsh, c. Ridley	0	c. Butler	0
Neild, b. Caulfield	0	b. Drake	0
Thornhill, not out	26	b. Stevens	2
Shadwell, c. Thompson	2	run out	14
Don, b. Caulfield	0	b. Caulfield	0
Bayly, run out	11	c. Caulfield	1
Brook, c. Ridley	0	not out	13
Lawrell, c. Drake	0	b. Caulfield	0
Byes	6	Byes	1
Total	89	Total	42

Total Westminster, both innings 197

Total Eton, both innings 131

Westminster majority 66

Yours truly,
GRYLLUS.

To the Editor of 'The Elizabethan.'

SIR,—I am sorry that I appeared to misunderstand Sir Henry Waterfield's correction of my mistake. What I meant was that it made no difference whatever to my case whether Fleshings were an innovation of the last twenty years or were as old an institution as the Play itself.

Mere tradition is not sufficient reason for wearing them now, if for other reasons they are undesirable.

I am, Sir, yours faithfully,
A.D.C. Cambridge, February 1905. A. S. GAYE.

To the Editor of 'The Elizabethan.'

DEAR SIR,—I am indebted to Mr. Gaye for the pains he has taken to elucidate his own arguments on the question of 'fleshings,' and though I plead guilty to a slight misunderstanding of one of them, I am bound to say that his last letter was very far from convincing.

Mr. Gaye mentions the fact that 'it is not a little incongruous that Davus should have the face of a slave and the limbs

