VALUE OF LAND AT NORTH LOWESTOFT.

ARBITRATION CASE.

At the Royal Hotel on Saturday Mr. A. Saville (Saville and Sons, 39, New Broad Street, London, E.C.), sat as umpire to determine the price to be paid for land taken in Lowestoft and Gunton by the Great Eastern and Midland and Great Northern Railway Companies for the construction of the new joint line from Lowestoft to Yarmouth. A portion of the land in question is held by trustees of the will of Mrs. Georgiana Fowler. The greater part, on which the North Lowestoft Station is being constructed, lies in Lowestoft, and the rest in Gunton. The adjoining land, held by trustees under Mr. and Mrs. Edward Fosbery's marriage settlement is in Gunton, and through this the railway also runs.

Mr. Balfour Browne, K.C., and Mr. J. Roskill (instructed by Messrs. Rowcliffes, Rawle, and Co., 1, Bedford Row, London) appeared for the trustees; Mr. Edward Boyle, K.C. (instructed by Mr. G. B. Parkes, assistant solicitor for the Great Eastern Railway), was for the companies. The arbitrators who had acted were Mr. W. C. Elwell, land agent for the G.E.R. (who was also present), and Mr. E. Tewson, of London, for the trustees.

Mr. Balfour Browne, in opening, said the question to determine was the value of the land taken up, and the damage done by reason of severance. Lowestoft was a growing place. It had a population of 30,000. The southern portion of the town had been almost completely built upon, and building operations were going on with rapidity in the neighbourhood of the property in question. Along the sea front houses had been built, and a large hotel had been in course of erection. The next land to come in was undoubtedly the land at the back of the Corton Road. Witnesses had put the value of this land at £500 per acre, and they had also placed the damage caused by the severance and the proximity of the line. The umpire had seen the station. He (the learned counsel) did not know why the companies had taken such a large piece of land, seeing that the station occupied a small area. He concluded they were going to lay it out for sidings and shunting, and that would deter people buying land for building purposes. He did not say the whole of the land was of equal value throughout, but near the borough boundary, where the strip became narrower, and there was a deep cutting the damage would be considerable by reason of the severance. Two acres of frontage next the Yarmouth Road were cut off, and that, as well as the property fronting the Corton Road would be seriously depreciated. As to the value of the land held by Fowler's trustees, that had been placed by witnesses he should call at £500 per acre for the part in the borough boundary, and £250 per acre afterwards, and then there was the damage done by severance. One of his witnesses would place the total value and damage at £15,303, and another at £14,863. There was a boat and shipbuilder's yard, in the occupation of Messrs. Chambers and Colby, facing the Inner Harbour. The line would cut a corner of this off. It was not the small portion that was taken away which had to be considered, but the damage done to the whole. The result would be that baulks of timber would have to go across the railway, and there would be a level crossing. With regard to the land coloured blue on the plan (Fosbery's trustees in Gunton), one of his witnesses would place the value and damage by severance at £2,805, and another at £3,490. The timber had been agreed to at £59, and as to minerals, which were mentioned in the notice to treat, they had put a nominal value of £250.

Mr. Daniel Watney, Past President of the Surveyors' Institute, of the firm of Daniel Watney and Son, 33, Poultry, examined by Mr. Roskill, stated that with regard to the land of Fowler's trustees, 12a. 2r. 10p. within the borough were taken, and this he valued at £500 an acre; and the 2a. 0r. 10p. outside he estimated at £250—or a total value of £7,510, after adding 10 per cent. for compulsory acquirement. The damage to the remainder of the land by reason of severance, extra outlay on sewerage necessitated by the deep cutting, grubbing fence, and £250 nominal for minerals, he placed at £7,793, or a total of £15,303. With regard to the boatyard in the occupation of Messrs. Chambers and Colby, he said it had a frontage to Lake Lothing, and had been let on a seven years' lease. During that time extensive buildings had been put up. Long baulks of timber were carted to the yard, and the place over which they were taken would be cut off and a new entrance made. This would be a very serious inconvenience. The value and the damage he placed at £750. The land taken from Fosbery's trustees he put down at £1,155 value and compulsory sale, and £1650 for severance and consequential damage, a total of £2,805.

Cross-examined by Mr. Boyle, witness said the boatyard was let at £60 a year, but that was fixed seven years ago, and since then the various shipbuilding premises had been put up. He did not admit that the property would only be worth £1,200, reckoning 20 years' purchase.

Coming to the Fosbery land, witness said he knew it let for £1 an acre, and at 25 years' purchase that would be £25 an acre; but he had placed it at £150 an acre.

Mr. Boyle—What is the reason?

Witness—It is building land.

But it has been building land since the time of William the Conqueror?—Yes, and before.

It has always been building land and yet not built on?—Yes.

The railway coming has made all the difference—Perhaps.

As to the Fowler land, is it not a fact that some of the plots of land adjoining have been sold since the railway was projected?—Very likely.

Some of the adjoining land was put up in 1893, and only two plots were sold to adjacent owners?—Yes.

And since then you haven't sold a beggarly one?—Why beggarly?

Because you have to go begging to sell it. Why have you put £500 an acre on this back land?—It is part of the whole.

You know the rates in Lowestoft?—6s. or 7s. in the £.

Are they not 7s. 6d.?—Yes, perhaps.

And you know there is a proposal to make a tramway which will put the rates up to 11s.?—I have heard something, but I don't know whether it is passed.

Don't you think people would go south to build?—No.

But there are ten times more houses there than in this particular neighbourhood?—But a number of houses have been built.

Since the railway came?—Yes.

And you say a railway would not improve the land?—No.

And you wanted a goods station placed near for the protection of the trustees?—It was said you were going to make a goods station at Gunton, and I said "put it in."

You thought it an advantage then?—Yes.

And a disadvantage now?—Yes. It will be a disadvantage. (Laughter.)

With regard to the difficulty of drainage caused by the railway, Mr. Watney said that when the drain was made, to meet that to be constructed by the Corporation, it would be necessary to make a syphon. He contended that would depreciate the estate, and he had put down £60 an acre for that.

Mr. Boyle—What £60 per acre for the drainage?

Mr. Watney—I lumped it in.

Mr. Balfour Browne—As this land is in the vicinity of Lowestoft would you call it agricultural land?

Mr. Watney—Certainly not.

As to the boatyard, would that be let to-day for £60 a year?—Certainly not.

Sir John Rolleston, M.P., president of the Surveyor's Institute, estimated the value of the 12a. 2r. 10p., taken at £500 an acre with 10 per cent. for compulsory acquirement. He considered the North the best part of Lowestoft. The Corporation had made a fine Esplanade, and electric trams would pass the land. This made it worth £500 an acre. In his opinion a syndicate would give that for the building land. He placed the value of the whole of the Fowler land at £6,900, including 10 per cent for compulsory sale, and the damage and depreciation at £7,959—a total of £14,868. The value of the 13 perches taken from the shipbuilding yard, and the damage done to the whole he estimated at £710. The Fosbery land he valued at £1,149, with £1,875 consequential damage—£3,024 in all.

Mr. Boyle—Do you suggest that any syndicate, with any judgment, would be idiots enough to come down and give £500 an acre, and develop this end? I say you can only grow grass upon it?

Sir John Rolleston—Oh, no.

Where are the people coming from to inhabit these houses that are to be built?—More people than ever go to the sea coast every year. Look at the coast of France.

Oh let us stick to England. It is good enough for me. (Laughter). Do you think a syndicate would come here to speculate?—Yes; I do. Lowestoft is a growing place and where this land is situated is the best part of the town.

Mr. Garrett Taylor, of Trowse House, agent for Mr. Colman's estate, said the land in question was not in any sense agricultural land. He was of opinion that the land near the station would be covered by houses. He put the value of the Fowler land taken at £7,210 10s., with £7,750 17s. 6d. consequential damage; of the boat yard at £485 16s. value and damage, and the Fosbery land, £2,860 value and damage.

Mr. William Roberts, architect and surveyor, of Lowestoft, said he had had great experience in land values in Lowestoft. The Fowler land was ripe building land. Development was going on rapidly at this part, and there was a great future before it. The land stood well above the sea, and was very attractive. The value of the Fosbery land taken he estimated at £1,073, with £1,630 consequential damage—£2,703; for the Fowler land, £7,390 value, and £7,402 depreciation and damage—£14,793; and the value of and damage to the boat yard £489.

Mr. Boyle contended that what the Umpire had been listening to were mere fairy tales. He would ask the Umpire, when taking the value of the land into consideration, to have regard to the fact that Lowestoft was only a town of under 30,000 inhabitants. He called

Mr. James Green, F.S.I. (Weatherall and Green, Chancery Lane, London), one of the consulting surveyors to the Treasury and War Office. He expressed the opinion that the value of the Fosbery land, with 10 per cent. for compulsory sale, was £502, with £412 for severance and depreciation—£914; for the Fowler land £3,722 value and sale, and £765 damage and depreciation by reason of severance—£4,487. The value of and damage to the corner taken off the boatyard he put at £100.

In answer to Mr. Balfour Browne, the witness said he could not consider the land building land; but it was something more than agricultural land. He had allowed for that in his estimate, but it really was nothing more than agricultural land at the present time. It was land that had a very remote potentiality of being built upon.

Mr. J. C. Miles, of the firm of Miles, Maddison, and Miles, of Yarmouth, placed the value and sale of the Fosbery land at £446 17s., with £806 10s. for severance, and depreciation £1,053 7s.; of the Fowler land £3,724 sale and £637 severance and depreciation £4,461, and of the boatyard £100.

Mr. William Waters Spelman (Spelman and Sons, Yarmouth), said he estimated the value of the Fosbery land at £484, with £460 for severance and damage—£944; of the Fowler land £3,855 value, and £687 damage—£4,542; and of the boatyard £120, of which £30 was for damage.

Mr. Boyle, in dealing with the figures which had been given by the witnesses for the other side, stated that 162 acres of the land facing the sea were bought for £7,466 a few years ago by Mr. Colman, who wanted it to join on to his estate. That was at the rate of £45 an acre. Now they had the value of the back land placed at £500 an acre. As to £750 for the boatyard piece, he characterised it as fanciful and fictitious. The Fowler land, he contended, could not be called building land. It was said that houses were going to spring up like mushrooms, whereas the land was only fit for growing grass. He contended that the figures given by Mr. Green and the other witnesses were fair, reasonable, and full.

Mr. Balfour Browne having briefly replied, the proceedings closed, the Umpire announcing that he would give his award in due course.

LOWESTOFT TRAMWAYS.

THE SELECT COMMITTEE.

The Select Committee of the House of Commons, presided over by Sir Frederick Godson, considered on Tuesday the Lowestoft Corporation Tramways Bill, which had previously passed through the House of Lords. Counsel for the Corporation were Mr. Freeman, K.C., and Mr. Moon. The petitioners against the Bill were Mr. Archibald White Maconochie and another, for whom appeared Mr. Littler, K.C., and Mr. Maconochie.

Mr. Freeman said this was a Bill which sought powers for the construction of tramways, for street improvements, for the provision of electric light, and other purposes. He was happy to say that the committee would not be troubled at any great length upon it, because there was very little opposition. Lowestoft had a population of about 30,000 persons, and it depended for its prosperity upon two things, namely, a fishing industry, which was largely carried on there, and a large pleasure traffic during the summer months. The town was incorporated as a borough in 1885, and among other things it had taken over the electric lighting of the borough. In connection with that electric lighting, electric tramways suggested itself to the Corporation. The town was a very long and narrow one, fronting the sea, and the people who lived at the two ends of it frequently wanted to get to the heart of the town. Visitors also wished to be carried along the front, and for this at present there was most insufficient accommodation. People now had to depend upon vehicles called "jingles," this name having been given to them because the horses drawing them used to wear bells, but these vehicles were a considerably inconvenient mode of progression. Another reason why the time had now come to deal with tramways was because it would be a saving to the Corporation, having its electric light, if they could have a day load as well as a night load, and they could in this way work their tramways in an exceedingly economical way. In 1898 a company applied for power to construct a tramway from Yarmouth, through Lowestoft, to Kessingland. That was opposed by the Great Eastern Railway Company on the ground of competition. The result was that a part of the scheme was refused and the other part sanctioned. Subsequently negotiations took place between the Corporation and the company, and finally an arrangement was come to which was very advantageous to the Corporation, the result of which was that the company agreed to withdraw their application for the confirmation of their light railway order, so far as it applied to lands within the borough, and the Corporation to apply for power to construct a tramway between the borough boundary on the north and the borough boundary on the north. They were now asking for power to construct a tramway along the whole front of the borough, and it would be in immediate connection with the tramway outside. Originally it was proposed to construct more tramways than shown on the plan, but a part of the scheme had been taken out, thereby considerably reducing the borrowing powers which were now required. The Bill dealt with various other matters, such as arrangements for public lands and streets, but he proposed to deal first with the tramways and the opposition to them. The original amount proposed to be expended was £140,000, but the amount now proposed to be spent was £50,000. The opponents to the Bill contended that the financial position of the town did not justify the borrowing of this money, but the financial position of Lowestoft was exceedingly good. It was also contended that there was not a sufficient guarantee against grievous loss, but it would be shown in evidence that there could not be a loss; on the contrary, the scheme would be a remunerative one.

Mr. Robert B. Nicholson, the Town Clerk of Lowestoft, was the first witness. The Corporation of Lowestoft proposed if this Bill was passed to lease the tramway undertaking to a company, and the latter would be obliged to take their electricity from the Corporation. This agreement would be conditional upon the company raising the necessary capital. A meeting of ratepayers was held on the 15th of April last, and that meeting gave the Corporation authority to promote this Bill. There was no opposition to the tramways at that meeting, but a certain number of people objected to the Corporation leasing the tramway to a company instead of working it themselves. The debt of the borough was £106,000, and of that £35,000 was for the electric lighting undertaking. About £5,200 was for technical schools, £2,300 for the purchase of certain lands, £4,667 for municipal offices, and £1,820 for the purchase of South Beach. For a long time there had been a great need for a vehicular service along the coast; the present vehicular traffic was irregular and unsatisfactory. In his opinion the town generally was in favour of the tramways. Even Mr. Maconochie, who was opposing the Bill, was in their favour, but he thought the Corporation ought to work them themselves. But the Corporation had satisfied themselves that it would be more to their advantage for a company to do it.

Cross-examined—It was not proposed to hand the tramways over to a company until they had shown their ability to work them. On the 18th inst. witness had the traffic of Lowestoft counted at four different places between 8 o'clock in the morning and 8 o'clock in the evening. At the top of Lord Nelson Street 1,912 vehicles passed, 5,960 passengers were carried by the vehicles, and there were 11,623 pedestrians; at the Post-office in London Road 2,617 vehicles passed, 6,905 passengers were carried, and there were 16,065 pedestrians; at the Swing Bridge 3,790 vehicles passed, 8,111 passengers were carried, and there were 25,445 pedestrians.

Mr. Littler—Why did you chose the 18th of July for counting the traffic?—That was the only time available.

Mr. Littler—Is there a festival at Sparrows' Nest Park on that day?—There was a fete at night after the period of this count.

Mr. Littler—Is it not a fact that more people come into Lowestoft on that day than on any other day in the year?—No, certainly not. He admitted that a large number of people in the vehicles came from Yarmouth. He could not say what was the capital of the company referred to because he did not think it was yet formed.

Re-examined—The Corporation would be assured that the company were in a position to work the tramways before they handed them over; and failing their being handed over there would be a remunerative undertaking in the hands of the Corporation.

Mr. Walter Beer, C.E., said he was engineer to the Bill for the Lowestoft Corporation; he was also engineer to the East Anglian Light Railway Company. The tramway lines would be 7½ miles in length wholly within the borough. The estimated sum required for the tramway undertaking was £60,000 and the expenditure on street improvements. The gauge of the tramway would be the same as the gauge of the East Anglian Company, so that they could have a continuous run from one to the other. It would be a single line, with frequent passing places. He believed the undertaking would be remunerative to the Corporation. The district through which the tramway would pass had a large population, and was rapidly developing.

Mr. John Edward Waller, C.E., said he thought Lowestoft was a town which would prove remunerative for tramways. It was a long and narrow town, consequently it was obvious that people needed some ...

... would be no greater than it was with the "jingles."

Frank Stebbings, a property owner on the proposed line of route, said he was against the tramways. Their streets were very narrow. The Town Clerk's figures of the traffic was taken on a day when they had the most successful fete of the season.

Mr. Frederick John Perks, solicitor for Mr. Maconochie, the petitioner against the Bill, also gave evidence.

Mr. Maconochie, the petitioner, said it was not until this week that he heard the Corporation proposed to reduce the expenditure from £140,000 to £60,000. He did not object to tramways if it could be shown that they would pay, and he thought if that could be shown the Corporation should work them themselves, and not lease them to a company. Cross-examined—If the tramway undertaking was the means of raising the rates it would reduce the value of his property.

Mr. Littler addressed the committee on behalf of the opposition, contending that Lowestoft's liabilities were quite high enough already, and he asked that they should not be increased, as would be the case if this tramway scheme passed.

The committee found the preamble proved.

CORRESPONDENCE.

LETTERS ADDRESSED TO THE EDITOR OF THE "LOWESTOFT JOURNAL."

THE STAGE, CHURCH, AND TEMPERANCE.

Sir,—I read in your last week's issue the report of the application by the lessee of the Lowestoft New Theatre for a license to provide refreshments on the premises during the hours of performance, and, sir, it was with feelings of bitter disappointment that I laid aside your paper, which formerly has at all times given me the greatest of pleasure to read and re-read.

Now, sir, I do not wish in this letter to impute a want of duty or a blame to you nor to your reporters—one and all on your staff, in my humble opinion, do, and have ever done, your work fearlessly, impartially, and well; and I for one fully recognise that if I want the honest truth about any local matter I have but to seek the "Journal" and there it will be found.

But I digress. The proprietors of the new Theatre have brought to the town, what many people argue is (whether rightly or wrongly I am not now prepared to discuss) a desirable acquisition, and a great attraction. The proprietors naturally desire a return—in the shape of profits—to place in their own pockets after they have paid their increased rates (which by the way seem likely to soon exceed 10s. in the £), and the interest on their outlay of capital.

The proprietors naturally wish to cater for the interests of all their patrons alike. How have they done so? That question, sir, is better answered by a visit to the place in question than by a statement from your humble servant.

To argue a question one must start on facts. And it must be admitted that "licenses granted to theatres have been successful throughout the kingdom." It must be admitted that this privilege "when granted has hardly ever (if ever) been abused. But it is arguable whether a license is detrimental, advantageous, or a necessity to a theatre. It must be admitted that "the new Theatre is a benefit to the town," if only by reason of the increase to the rates, the labour employed, and the attraction offered. It must be admitted that "if the question of 'License or no license' were put to common vote and argued publicly, as at Hastings, the voting returns would be overwhelming in favour of its being granted." Therefore, it seems, the Bench of Magistrates did the right thing by granting the license, properly safeguarded as it was by restrictions; which, by the way, appear to have been suggested by the applicant himself.

What puzzled me was a statement to the effect that "this license was only granted by a majority."

What astonished me was to hear that prominent advocates of temperance shamed their cause and themselves by sitting assumingly as *impartial* judges on the application.

What pained and grieved me was to hear of guardians of our religion allowing a chance of their habiliments being trailed in the mud of possible public contempt, in the mire of possible public disgust, and in the gutter of possible public abhorrence (all of which may be stirred) by their repeatedly appearing thus in the Police Court in person to voice such arguments in opposition, which, read in your report, are as absurdly prejudiced and ignorant as they are lacking in weight of conviction.

To take these matters *seriatim*. If it was proved to the satisfaction of the Bench that the license was wanted, would be a convenience to many, and would help and assist the inhabitants of the town, it was the bounden duty of the Bench to grant it, and in this, I submit, on the evidence reported, the Bench should have been unanimous.

As to avowed temperance advocates sitting in judgment upon such a case, I say, sir, that, unless they can conscientiously stand up before their fellow-men, anywhere and at any time, and publicly declare that when they sit on licensing applications they do so with an open and unbiased mind, and that they are ready, willing, and desirous to grant licenses where the necessities of the district or place require—unless they can do this, sir, the position they hold and take up is too utterly base and contemptible to discuss.

As to the practice which I have nowhere seen or heard of being carried to such extremes as at Lowestoft, of "ministers of religion (worthy of the name) appearing in person to oppose seemingly all and every application for licenses," such action is *per se* as serious a blow at the welfare of religion, as it is futile in attempt to promote the temperance cause.

The Police Court is not the place for the Curé of our souls to appear, unless he come to visit the repentant sinner in the cells, or to redeem some poor waif and stray to purer paths of life.

Has anyone, a minister of religion or of other denomination, at any time in our town, ever touched this work? I think not! And why not? Is it because there are no reporters lurking behind the iron gates? Or is it because such deeds might not be proclaimed from the housetops? Or is it because the atmosphere of the cells is unpleasant to their refined nostrils?

But I forget myself. I am trying to discuss transgressions—not omissions. Alas! sir, I tremble, when I think of the position of the Church. It sleeps, lulled in a dream of self-satisfied and complacent security, whilst the volcano of education simmers beneath its foundation. *Tempora mutantur, et nos mutamur in illis.*

Education is opening the eyes of the masses to see and realise "the men" who are called to point the finger above, and who beckon to be followed. Can it be wondered at that most of them beckon in vain? It is essential that these men, our clergy and ministers, should win our esteem, our respect, and our love, by their good words and by their better deeds, before they can hope for our confidence, our support, and our following.

Englishmen can be led anywhere, but they cannot be driven. To run the risk of raising possible disgust or abhorrence in the minds of broad-minded men and women by an interference in the administration of justice, in politics, and in other matters which do not concern, can do no good, and may in all probability bring the trespasser into odium, hatred, or contempt, bring a reflection upon the Church, and bring a danger to the State.

I can understand men of weak intellect (like the flatterers of King Canute in the days of olden time) conscientiously believing that by their appearance at licensing sessions they are trampling down the demon "drink," and are doing good noble work. ...

CYCLING NOTES. LOCAL AND GENERAL.

By "CLINCHER."

Contributions for this column, in the shape of letters, suggestions, descriptions of club runs and doings, and comments generally, are welcomed. All communications should be sent early in the week to "CLINCHER," "Journal" Office, Lowestoft.

LIGHT YOUR LAMPS—

			p.m.
Friday	July	26	8.57
Saturday	"	27	8.55
Sunday	"	28	8.54
Monday	"	29	8.52
Tuesday	"	30	8.51
Wednesday	"	31	8.49
Thursday	Aug.	1	8.48
Friday	"	2	8.46
Saturday	"	3	8.44

LOWESTOFT NORTH ROADERS C.C.

Headquarters—Crown Hotel, High Street, Lowestoft.

Captain—Mr. H. Platten, Oxford Road; Secretary—Mr. E. Platten, Oxford Road.

Runs in July—

July 27th, Cromer Night Ride. Start 6 p.m. sharp.
August 1st, St. Olave's ... ... 7 p.m.

A prize will be given at the close of season to the member who succeeds in obtaining largest number of new members during the year.

OULTON BROAD AND DISTRICT C.C.

Headquarters—Waveney Hotel, Oulton Broad.

Hon. Secretary—F. M. Whittaker.

Runs in July, starting from headquarters at times stated—

Saturday, July 27th, Beccles and St. Olave's 3 p.m.
Tuesday, " 30th, Wrentham ... ... 7 p.m.

LOWESTOFT AND KIRKLEY C. AND A.C.

Headquarters—Marquis of Lorne Hotel, Kirkley.

Hon. Secretary—Mr. George Simnett, London Road South.

CYCLE AGENTS, MAKERS, AND REPAIRERS.

BIRD AND BOARDLEY, Alma Street, and Alma Road, Lowestoft.

A. J. DAKELEY, 61, London Road, South Lowestoft.

HOWES BROS., 67, London Road North, Lowestoft.

A. PARR, Park Depot, High Street, Lowestoft.

DICKENS AND BLUNDESTON.

With the sky as of brass, the sun pouring down with forty horse power, and the roads inches thick with hot white dust, it was not very enticing for a week-end spin; but, nevertheless, many were awheel, and very hot and tired they looked. I was doing it quietly on the Yarmouth Road, intending to turn off to Lound, when there rushed by a motor tricycle at a furious rate, followed by a kind of whirlwind of dust, which, when it had passed, turned out to be caused by four cyclists, who were evidently trying to beat time or break their own necks. They crouched down level with the top bar, and so scorched along. While it lasted it was a veritable cyclone. I hardly knew what to do—whether to pity the poor deluded mortals on the bicycles, or wish they might break their necks. I am no faddist, but for a motor tricycle and cyclists to tear along the road at such a pace is out of all reason.

Turning down to Blundeston and Lound, it was much cooler than on the high road, and the going was not half bad considering. But it was thirsty work, and it was made much worse by the dusting given by the idiots to whom allusion has been made. Under the circumstances it was not at all surprising to find yours truly, on reaching Lound, saying "How do you do?" to the Village Maid, which, to those who do not know, is a famous pub, and not a buxom or any other lass. Very cool was this place, and very refreshing the liquid imbibed.

Then a quiet pedal to Blundeston Church, which ...

A ROMISH RELIQUIARIUM.

"While on the subject of spiritual and supernatural protection it may be added that firm faith was placed in the wearing a "relic," a medal of the Virgin, her rosary, or scapulary. Thus the Duchess of Abrantes this very autumn (1845) hung the *Virgin del Pilar* round the neck of her favourite bull-fighter, *who escaped in consequence.* Few Spanish soldiers go into battle without such a preservative in their *petos*, or stuffed waddings, which is supposed to turn bullets, and to divert fire like a lightning conductor, which probably it does, as so few are ever killed. . . . . These talismanic amulets are selected from the Saint or relic most honoured, and esteemed efficacious in their immediate vicinity. Thus the Santo Rostro, or Holy Countenance of Jaen, is worn all over the kingdom of Granada, as the Cross of Caravaca is over Murcia; the Rosary of the Virgin is common to all Spain."

R. FORD, "Gatherings from Spain," 1846.

RELICS AS DEFENCES!

73.

When the "Ultimatum" came
In the Transvaal little game,
And Kruger followed quickly to Natal;
We could soon have damned his hope,
By a "relic" from the Pope,
And at once upset the Africand Cabal:
For we're told that Constantine
Hit upon a grand design
When his city was by enemies alarmed—
Built the corpse of Holy James
In its walls, and it became
A Talismanic fortress, free from harm!

74.

But a better case to cite, is
Saint Simeon Stylites,
And the chain he always bound himself withal:
For they of Antioch
Had his body, stock and lock,
And it served the place of rampart, ditch, and wall!
And 'twas never in default,
At the enemy's assault,
However fierce the onslaught of the foe;
And the more that Leo, grim,
Tried to get at Holy Jim,
The greater his repulse and overthrow!

75.

In Philippicus' short reign—
'Twas the same year he was slain—
And about to make a conquering expedition;
He thought he might insure,
Safer issue to the war,
If he held some "holy relics" in commission;
But the Pope, in whose safe care,
The said "holy relics" were,
Of Simeon Stylites, chain, and clothes;
Refused to loan the lot,
And so, leave those on the spot,
Unprotected while away, from other foes!

76.

Here another case avails,
Of one Gryffin, King of Wales,
Who with a mighty army came to Chester.
'Twas the fashion of those days
To possess a warlike craze,
And Gryffin too was crazy to invest her.
But Chester had a "line,"
A "protectress" in a shrine,
Saint Werbergh was she, hight "of gentil kynd."
So they placed her on a wall,
Within the sight of all,
And Gryffin and his army were struck blind.

77.

You may think it strange, no doubt,
When a fire once broke out,
That a "rag" upon a pole had power to quench it;
But you may read and see,
In the "Breviaire de Paris,"
A full account, which ought I'm sure, to clench it.
One night at Porte Royale
In a wind—perhaps a squall,
By carelessness, a fire burned and raged,
And the breeze, when this took place,
Spread the flames abroad apace,
And could not by the "pompiers" be assuaged.

78.

As the fire burned and spread,
And was getting quite ahead,
It seemed as though all Paris was afire; ...

The most delicious.
The most nourishing.
The most economical.
Drink van Houten's Cocoa
It is THE BEST.
It contains all the elements of a perfect food in an easily digestible form.

LOWESTOFT VISITORS' GUIDE.

Below visitors will find particulars of trips and daily events, and a perusal will save them the necessity of hunting through time-tables, peering at posters, and the rest. A glance will show where to go, how to get there, and what is doing:—

MONDAY.

Rail excursion to Cromer by ordinary trains before 4 p.m., returning on same day by any train after 12 noon. Fare, 2s. 3d.

Circular rail and boat trips to Wroxham *via* Yarmouth and River Bure; to Norwich *via* Yarmouth and River Yare. ...

... boats to Yarmouth, by rail any train before 3 p.m.; back by boat at 10.30 a.m., and 12, 3, and 4.45 p.m.

Rail excursion to Southwold, leaving Lowestoft at 7.55, 10.15, and 11 a.m. Return fares, 4s. 8d. and 2s. 6d.

Rail excursions to Beccles by trains at 7.55, 10.15, and 11 a.m., and 12.55 p.m. Fares, 1st, 2s.; 3rd, 1s.

Country drives by Newruck's waggonettes, leaving the Royal Plain at 3 p.m. Fare, 1s.

Drive to Southwold and back by brake, leaving the Royal Plain at 10.15 a.m. Fare, 2s. 6d.

Drive to Yarmouth and back by brake, leaving the Royal Plain at 10.15 a.m. Fare, 2s.

Sea trips to Yarmouth, leaving the Inner Pier at 12 noon and 5 p.m., and returning from Yarmouth at 3 p.m. Fare, 1s. 6d.

River trip by steam yacht Atalanta to Beccles, leaving the South Quay at 10.30 a.m. Return fare, 2s. 6d. ...

Image © THE BRITISH LIBRARY BOARD. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.