

The Examiner.

CHARLOTTETOWN, P. E. I., JULY 4, 1859.

THE NEWS BY THE ENGLISH MAIL.

The English Mail arrived here on Friday morning, with Liverpool dates to the 18th ult., by which we have detailed accounts of the battle of Magenta, of which we previously had intelligence by telegraph via New York and Newfoundland. The imperious "three days" menace from Austria to the Sardinians appears to have met with a fearful response, for the star of the House of Hapsburg has been ever since in the descendant, and the invincible army of Francis Joseph has been compelled to run, after sustaining unparalleled loss, from some of its great strongholds in Italy, pursued by an enemy whose numerical strength was such as to lead the Austrian General to believe that the vast horde under his command could easily exterminate them from the face of the earth.

We are not sorry to learn that the trucking Ministry of Lord Derby—who obtained power by an accident, and retained it under false pretences—has been deservedly knocked in the head by an adverse vote in the House of Commons; and Lord Palmerston, with a good Liberal Ministry, in which Lord John Russell is Foreign Secretary, is again at the head of affairs. We observe that the Duke of Newcastle has returned to the administration of the Colonial Office. His Grace was not particularly brilliant while at the head of this department in former years; but he had the good sense to leave the Colonies to manage their own affairs; he did not distinguish himself as an absurd and impracticable theorist like the late incumbent; and, so far as the Government of this Island is concerned, he did not appear to be under the influence of the absentee Proprietors. His appointment as successor to Sir Edward Bulwer Lytton will, therefore, be hailed with some degree of satisfaction by our fellow Colonists.

FALL OF THE DERBY MINISTRY.

INEFFECTUAL ATTEMPTS OF LORD GRANVILLE TO FORM A NEW ADMINISTRATION—LORD PALMERSTON SENT FOR BY THE QUEEN, AND TAKES OFFICE.

The No-confidence Debate ended at half-past two o'clock on Saturday morning, when Ministers were defeated by a majority of 13; the numbers being:—For Ministers, 310; against them, 323. It was nearly two o'clock when the Speaker rose to put the question, but he sat down again, a member having risen to address the House. Great excitement was provoked by this discovery, and tremendous shouts of "Divide!" drowned the voice of the hon. gentleman. After a minute or two he sat down, and the Speaker put the question. The response on either side was given with immense energy. After the usual interval of three minutes, the question was again put, with the same result as before. The House then divided, and the dense crowd slowly parted through the doorway on either side. A great crowd remained standing in the lobby and below the bar. When the tellers made their appearance Mr. Hayter was to the right—a symbol of success for the Opposition that was hailed with great cheering, which was repeated when the numbers were declared. Lord John Russell was observed to go over to Lord Palmerston, which was received by the minority with loud derisive cheering. It was then resolved that Lord Palmerston, Lord John Russell, Mr. Sidney Herbert, Mr. Milner Gibson, and other hon. members, should constitute the committee to prepare the Address. The mention of Mr. Gibson's name provoked some laughter, and cries of "Bright!" from the Ministerialists. The House then adjourned.

A Cabinet Council was held on Saturday, at the official residence of the Chancellor of the Exchequer, in Downing-street. When it broke up Lord Derby waited on Her Majesty at Buckingham Palace, and tendered the resignation of the entire administration. The Queen then sent for Earl Granville, who had an audience of Her Majesty in the course of the afternoon, and was invited by Her Majesty to form a Government. For nearly twenty-four hours the impression was that his lordship was to be the new Premier. But the noble lord, after consulting various political friends, again saw the Queen on Sunday afternoon, and was engaged for some time at the Palace. It is stated that Lord John Russell declined to serve under Lord Granville. He had no objection to take office under Lord Palmerston, but he would not be second to any one else. Lord Granville was therefore obliged to decline the task which he had expressed his willingness to undertake. After the departure of the noble earl, one of the Queen's messengers proceeded to Cambridge House, Piccadilly, requesting Lord Palmerston's attendance at the Palace. Viscount Palmerston, in compliance with Her Majesty's commands, attended at Buckingham Palace, and was occupied for a considerable space of time in consultation with the Queen. The noble Viscount did not leave the Palace till seven o'clock. He then proceeded to Pembroke Lodge, Richmond, to visit Lord John Russell.

THE NEW MINISTRY

We believe we are correct in stating that the following is the list of the New Ministry which is to be submitted by Lord Palmerston for the approbation of Her Majesty:—

First Lord of the Treasury, Lord Palmerston; Lord Chancellor, Lord Campbell; Foreign Secretary, Lord J. Russell; Home Secretary, Sir G. C. Lewis; Secretary for Colonies, Duke of Newcastle; Secretary for War, Mr. Sidney Herbert; Secretary for India, Sir C. Wood; First Lord of the Admiralty, Duke of Somerset; Chancellor of Exchequer, Mr. Gladstone; President of Council, Lord Granville; Board of Works, Sir B. Hall; Poor Law Board, Mr. Milner Gibson; Board of Trade, Mr. Cobden; Postmaster-General, Lord Stanley, of Alderley; Duchy of Lancaster, Mr. C. P. Villiers; Privy Seal, Earl of Ripon.

NOT IN THE CABINET.

Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, Earl of Carlisle; Secretary for Ireland, Mr. Henry Herbert; Attorney General, Sir R. Bethell; Solicitor General, Sir H. Keating; Attorney General for Ireland, Mr. J. D. Fitzgerald; Solicitor General for Ireland, Mr. Serjeant Deasy; Secretaries of the Treasury, Mr. F. Peel and Mr. Brand; Secretary of the Admiralty, Mr. R. Lowe.

UNDER SECRETARIES OF STATE:

Home, Mr. Massey; War, Lord Wodhouse; Foreign, Lord Shelburne; Colonial, Lord Bury; India, Mr. Digby Seymour; Lords of the Treasury, Mr. Hugeson, Mr. Cogan, and Mr. E. Elliot, jun.

It is further stated that Sir Alexander Cockburn is to be raised to the Peerage—that Lord Cranworth is to have the Chief Justiceship (vacant by the elevation of Lord Campbell) offered to him—that Sir William Hayter, though offered office, has declined to accept any place—and that Mr. Brand is to be the new Whipper-in of the House of Commons, in the room of Sir William Hayter.

Another account says that Sir A. Cockburn will take Lord Campbell's present place, and that Lord Cranworth will find in the Common Pleas a sphere better suited than the Woolsack for his character and powers.

THE WAR IN ITALY.

THE AUSTRIANS BEATEN EVERYWHERE, AND RETREATING!—PARTICULARS OF THE BATTLES OF PIAZZA AND MAGENTA—GEN. CANROBERT NOT WOUNDED—ANOTHER GREAT BATTLE AT HAND—PRUSSIA PREPARING FOR WAR.

The Cunard Steamship *Persia*, arrived at New York on 21st inst., bringing later intelligence from the Seat of War than previously received.

The vote of want of confidence in the House of Commons was carried 323 to 310,—but nothing was known of the change of Ministry when the *Persia* sailed. On the 9th Mr. Disraeli laid on the table the promised correspondence on the Italian question,—and on motion of Lord John Russell the following

given up to the colony, and the landlords having withheld the Quit Rent, and usurped the Fishery Reserves, the Liberals moved that the titles should be investigated in a Court of Escheat. I agree with the Liberals that the non-payment of Quit Rent, and the usurpation of the Fishery Reserves, is sufficient grounds for an Escheat, although the grants do not declare the breach of such conditions to be a forfeiture. But although I have supported the motion of the Liberals, yet to go by the grants, where a forfeiture is declared for non-settlement with foreign protestants, is—

My side of the question.—The grantees were bound to settle their grants, within ten years with Foreign Protestants, in the proportion of one person to every two hundred acres; but the words in the grants which declare the forfeiture are as follows:—"And if the said grantees shall not settle one-third of the said Lot or Township in the proportion aforesaid, within four years from the date hereof, then the whole of the said Lot or Township shall become forfeited to His Majesty, his heirs and successors, and this grant shall be void and of non-effect." Now, it must be evident to any person who will give the subject consideration, that as foreigners could not hold free land, and could only hold land as tenants to a British subject; the grantees were made expressly for the settlement of such persons. But it would have been unjust to place British subjects in the position of foreigners, because they had as good a right to a share of the public lands as the grantees, and a far better right when the grantees' title was forfeited. Nothing but the settlement of foreign Protestants could perfect the grantees' tenants—could perfect the grantees' title. The same condition which declared the land forfeited by the grantees, declared it to have reverted to the Crown, and consequently free for the settlement of British subjects. The conditions of forfeiture being in all the grants alike, is a proof of the intention of the Imperial Government, that unless the land was settled with foreigners it should revert to the Crown for the Government to settle the land with freeholders according to the practice in other colonies. Even the convicts that were sent to Botany Bay, at a great expense to the country, have been far better treated than the people of this Island; the convicts received grants of land when their servitude expired. But by the connivance of Ministers at the cupidity of swindlers, they have impoverished this Colony, and enslaved the inhabitants. These are the wrongs to which Lord Stanley refers in his speech to the Imperial Parliament when applying for a grant of money to settle the land question. We said, "that in assisting the Colony of Prince Edward Island to relieve itself from embarrassment, they were not granting any favor, or conferring any boon; but simply, in some degree, repairing a wrong which had been caused by an act of the Government of Great Britain, and for which they were in justice bound to provide a remedy. The proposal now made would relieve the Island from an embarrassment which it did not create for itself, and which had, indeed, been the direct work of the Imperial Government." This speech of Lord Stanley is a full admission of the wrongs which I have been exposing these many years; and I have no doubt, that matters were in a fair way for a settlement unless the proprietary majority returned at the late Election have prevented it.

Some of your readers would, no doubt, like to know why Lord Stanley should have made a speech to the British Parliament so favorable to the Island to obtain a grant of money to settle the land question? And why Sir Edward B. Lytton should send a despatch soon afterwards so very satisfactory to the Hon. Col. Gray and the proprietors? This sheet is full now, but I shall endeavour to explain matters in the next. Wm. COOPER.

Sailor's Hope, May 31, 1859.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE EXAMINER.

SIR,—An article in the *Islander* of the 13th May, under the heading:—"The Petition relative to the election of the Hon. Donald Montgomery," when compiled with the debate on that subject in the House of Assembly, as published, demands from me a passing notice, seeing that I was requested by Mr. Davies to accompany his agent, Mr. Ramsay, to St. Eleanor's on Declaration Day, to advise with him as to the proper course to pursue, under such circumstances as might there arise; and consequently I must consider myself included among those "scamps" who are said to have formed the idea of falsifying the poll book." Now, sir, I may state in the first place, in reference to our proceedings on that day, that on finding that Mr. Montgomery had succeeded in obtaining a majority of votes, we were determined to enter into a scrutiny, satisfied that enough of those votes could be set aside to give Mr. Davies a majority; but on enquiry, we found, to our surprise, that in no case did the poll book show on what persons claimed to vote; consequently it was useless for us to set about proving votes bad, when it was not stated on what property they had voted; and we at once gave up the idea of a scrutiny, and decided on protesting, to be supported by petition; and in due course that petition was prepared and signed by about 140 resident electors—nearly if not quite one-third more residents than Mr. Montgomery polled in all; and there were still several electors, who had voted for Mr. Davies, and would doubtless have signed it, but were misled by the parties who had gone to obtain signatures—eight electors signing it who had not, from various causes, voted, but regretted they had not done so.

On observing the proceedings of the House on the subject, I was not a little surprised at the manner in which the petition was dealt with; but that feeling was in part removed on noticing the remarks of the Hon. Mr. Montgomery—as no member of that honorable House could suppose for a moment that the Hon. the Speaker would rise in his place and deliberately state what he did not know to be true. But had those honorable gentlemen followed him throughout his canvass, as I have done, and there note the monster effort made by him to obtain that seat—to see the paltry means resorted to, to pirate votes from his opponent, and mark the elastic ingenuity exercised by him on that occasion—they would have been prepared to receive with more caution his assertions, when the validity of that seat was about to be questioned.

But passing over those objections for the present, and supposing for a moment that they were correct—that the poll book had really been altered or "falsified" (but we can prove that it was not)—how was that to effect the case of the petitioners? Here were about 140 electors, who, feeling themselves aggrieved by "the improper and illegal" proceedings of the Returning Officer, applying to the Legislature for redress, but because some other person or persons have or are supposed to have committed an illegal or criminal act, that respectable body of electors are to be insulted and their petition treated with contempt, while broad and barefaced assertions, without a shadow of evidence, are received as facts! Surely, if the oft reiterated desire to ascertain "the time and place, the person or persons" who committed that act were really felt, that was the time to do it. Why were not the parties at once summoned to the Bar of the House, and the matter there sifted to the bottom? But no, that course would not suit the views of at least one hon. member, (the Speaker). He would rather endeavour to quash the investigation, and attempt, by insinuation, to implicate parties in a transaction that he well knew they would not lend themselves to, lest that investigation might endanger that dear bought seat. If Mr. Coles's object was, as is "presumed" in the article in the *Islander* already referred to, "that their decision which he well knew would necessarily be favourable to Mr. Montgomery, might be paraded before the public as evidence of the injustice, partiality, and bigotry of the majority," verily his desire must have been gratified to the full.

In reference to the ground of complaint, as set forth in the petition, "that the particulars of property were not taken down," and the declaration of the Hon. the Speaker on the floor of the House, that "the Returning Officer was not requested to take them down," I would beg leave to remark, with all due deference to the experience of the Hon. the Speaker on those matters, that it is not the duty of the candidate or his agent to request them to be taken down; but so soon as a candidate expressed a desire to have an elector questioned as to his qualification, it then becomes the imperative duty of the Returning Officer to put such questions as will elicit the particulars of his qualification, causing the same to

be entered in the poll book, unless in the meantime the questioning candidate expresses himself satisfied, and permits him to desist; but should he still require him to be sworn, ere the oath can be properly administered, he must read, or cause to be read, to him the particulars of his qualification as taken down, as the words of the oath are, "You, A. B., do swear that you are by law qualified to vote, &c., in the right of the property and title which have now been taken down in the poll book and read to you."

There is still one thing more that I would notice ere closing, having reference to the remarks of Mr. Sinclair on that occasion, as reported, wherein he is made to state, "that, having been present at the Court on Declaration Day, he could not well have avoided hearing any request to recordly vote as objected, had any such request been made." Now, sir, Mr. Sinclair was not at St. Eleanor's at all on that day; and I feel satisfied that he did not make the statement referred to, but has been incorrectly reported, whether from being misunderstood or worse motives, I know not.

I am, Sir, yours, &c.,

H. S. McNUTT.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE EXAMINER.

SIR,—In looking over the debates of the House of Assembly while in Committee on the Petition against the return of the Hon. Donald Montgomery, I observe that it is there stated that there is a great discrepancy between the Poll Book kept by the Sheriff's and the one kept by Mr. Montgomery's Clerk—that there are 26 votes marked objected in the former and only 6 votes marked objected in the latter. If it be true, as there stated, my conviction is, there are more votes marked objected in the former than I objected to, and less in the latter, but I cannot presume to say the precise number I objected to, but I am satisfied that I objected to more votes than are marked objected in Mr. Montgomery's Poll Book. Mr. Montgomery has asserted before the Committee that he examined the Sheriff's Poll Book on Declaration Day, and compared it with the one kept by his Clerk, and that they corresponded. Now, the truth is, Mr. Montgomery did examine and compare the Poll Books on Declaration Day with reference to the total or aggregate of votes polled, which did correspond, but did not examine the Poll Book to ascertain the number of votes marked objected, which the Deputy Sheriff and his Clerk emphatically declared satisfied him that if Mr. Montgomery had examined the Poll Books, in the sense he wished to convey it before the Committee, he could not have any regard for truth, and make such a declaration; and the Editor of the *Islander* writes, that Mr. Montgomery emphatically declared that he was prepared to prove that the Poll Books were altered subsequent to the Election. Now, sir, I accuse Mr. Montgomery with asserting a falsehood, and I defy him to prove that the Poll Book had been altered or falsified subsequent to the Election or Declaration, or at any time previous or subsequent, except such votes as were marked objected by the Poll Clerk; and any discrepancy that may exist in the Poll Book is applicable to the inefficiency of the Poll Clerk, who marked all the votes, or nearly so, that were sworn objected on the day of election, and conceived it to be his duty to do so; and he told me since the election that he had marked all votes sworn objected, and several other persons will testify the same; and I am credibly informed that Mr. Montgomery has asserted and affirmed both in town and country that the Poll Book was altered on the day of declaration in his absence, during the hour that intervenes between proclamation and declaration. Now, if Mr. Montgomery is prepared to prove that the Poll Book had been altered at the time referred to, then it follows as a matter of course, beyond the shadow of doubt, that the Deputy Sheriff and Mr. McNutt and I must be guilty of the atrocious crime of falsifying the Poll Book; and I again defy Mr. Montgomery to prove anything of the kind; and if Mr. Montgomery possessed the spirit and the principle of a gentleman, he would scorn to make such a declaration, to impeach any person or persons without the shadow of proof to convict them. If Mr. Montgomery has made the above declaration, I feel in duty bound to say, in self-defence, and employ language which I do with great reluctance, that Mr. Montgomery asserts a falsehood, and I will prove it. Let him take up the gauntlet if he dares; and if I cannot prove to the satisfaction of the public, that he has asserted falsehood, then let me for ever be considered in the estimation of all honest and respectable persons an infamous public liar.

The Editor of the *Islander*, in his issue of the 13th of May, asserts that the agents of Mr. Davies, with the assistance of the Deputy Sheriff, formed the design of altering the Poll Book, and he believes they are guilty of the atrocious deed. As to what opinion the Editor of the *Islander* may form or entertain of me, I care not, for I assure him I neither covet his applause nor friendship, nor fear his frowns. But to assert that I, as one of the agents of Mr. Davies, or Mr. McNutt, solicited the assistance of the Deputy Sheriff, or any one else, or thought of falsifying the Poll Book, is as great a falsehood as is possible for the most degraded being to invent, or the power of darkness to devise. I have not seen the Poll Book from the day of election till I saw it on the day of Declaration, and I have not seen it from that day to this; and I can prove that the Poll Book was not altered on the day in question, nor at any other period. But if I have made a clumsy job of altering the Poll Book, as asserted by the Editor of the *Islander*, I assure him that I have formed the design, and will, with the assistance of others, endeavour to manage him more nearly at the proper time and place, when he will be called upon to prove that I have managed the falsifying of the Poll Book clumsily; and for the present I shall give him an idea of the opinion I entertain of him. I believe him to be a person possessed of such a deplorable propensity for low scurrility, and has acquired such a tact for dirty insinuations, that it is hardly possible for him to write or conduct his paper with the principle and conduct of a gentleman; for he is ever on the alert to grasp at shadows, and endeavour to palm them off on his readers for realities. It appears to me that he cannot entertain a charitable opinion of any person that may differ with him in politics. But the opinion I generally form of persons that are over hasty in impeaching others with crimes of a crimson dye, is, that if those persons were in similar circumstances or position, they might be guilty of those very crimes they are so ready to impute to others. I defy the Editor of the *Islander*, in conjunction with Mr. Montgomery, to impeach me with any thing of the kind, or lay it to my charge for a moment, for though I am a poor man, I hold my character yet unstained, and as sound as theirs, if not so tender, otherwise some of them are ill reputed in this section of the Island. It is true, I have opposed Mr. Montgomery at the recent election, but I have not had recourse to anything dishonourable in opposition to him—neither fraud, deception, nor lying—and I assure him, if he remain in the Speaker's chair or in the House of Assembly till I attempt to falsify the Poll Books, he will till his final dissolution. I have at all times endeavoured to carry truth and honesty with me, and while I do so, I neither fear the assertions of Mr. Montgomery nor the writings of the Editor of the *Islander*; and I trust that they also will admit that truth is mighty and must prevail, sooner or later, over the devil and all his lying imps.

The Editor of the *Islander* attempts, in his usual manner, to vindicate the conduct and course pursued by the House of Assembly relative to said petition. However, we shall endeavour to see how consistent their conduct has been, both in point of law and equity. Hon. Mr. Longworth, in the first instance, asserts that the petition contained allegations that were false, for though the qualification was not taken down in the Poll Book, as the law directs, it did not bar the petitioners from a scrutiny. We know, as well as Mr. Longworth, that as the law now is, a candidate or agent can demand a scrutiny if he is disposed to spend time and money to no purpose; but notwithstanding Mr. Longworth's great attainments and legal knowledge, we contend that the petitioners were barred from deriving any benefit from a scrutiny, in consequence of the qualification of the several electors whose votes were questioned and objected, not being taken down in the Poll Book, which shall be conclusive evidence against such electors. For what purpose is this, Mr. Longworth, and when is the evidence to be acted upon? Not on the day of polling certainly, it is not required.

[The remainder of this letter is deferred until next week.] I am, Sir, yours truly, Lot 18, June 21, 1859. JOHN RAMSAY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE EXAMINER.

SIR,—The large and beautiful block of granite, which is the corner stone of the new Chapel here, was not imported from New York, but a portion of a Boulder obtained from a farm lately in possession of H. W. Hele, Esq., at Kildare Capes, about five miles from the site of the new edifice. I am, Sir, your obed^t servant, Tignish, June 26, 1859. AN INHABITANT.

Friday was appointed to take the Queen's speech into consideration. The Paris Bourse was depressed and lower. It was reported that a British ship-of-war had been captured, and 107 lives lost. Seven British ships-of-war arrived at Naples on the 9th. A terrible storm had raged along the Indian coast. One French vessel passed 60 wrecks and a number of dead bodies.

THE WAR.

Details of the battle of Magenta are slowly received, and do not change the first complexion. It is reported, but not confirmed, that Gyal has been dismissed and Hess appointed Commander-in-Chief of the Austrian army.

All accounts give the glory of the day to McMahon. He had no orders to proceed to Magenta, but heard the roar of battle, rushed on, and saved the army. The Austrians are at Lodi, on which place the Allies are advancing.

The Paris correspondent of the *Times* says that the latest accounts from Italy state that both the Allied and Austrian armies are preparing for another general engagement.

Latest accounts say the Allies were advancing from Milan, and that Prussia showed signs of aiding Austria.

It is reported that the Prussian army is to be mobilized, and that Prussia will soon take part in the conflict.

It is also reported that Prussia is negotiating for the passage of troops through Germany.

Garibaldi was between Austrian forces and Brescia. The official Austrian Correspondence of the 10th states that the Austrian army was continuing its retreat beyond the Adda, its head quarters were at Cavatignani, before Crononi.

It turns out that Gen. Canrobert is not wounded. Military men are unanimous in their praise of the strategic combinations of the Emperor.

A Hungarian Legion has been formed at Turin. The intelligence of the battle of Magenta had caused great sensation at Vienna. Military men seem indignant that the first army Austria ever had should have been entrusted to such a bungler as Count Gyal appears to be.

SANGUINARY BATTLE AT THE BRIDGE OF MAGENTA.

DEFEAT OF THE AUSTRIANS. 15,000 KILLED AND WOUNDED, AND 5,000 TAKEN PRISONERS. THE EMPEROR OF THE FRENCH TO THE EMPRESS.

MAGENTA, June 5.—Yesterday our army was under orders to march on Milan across the bridge thrown over the Ticino at Turbigo. The operation was well executed, although the enemy, who had repassed the Ticino in great force, offered a most determined resistance. The roadways were narrow, and during two hours the Imperial Guard sustained unsupported the shock of the enemy. In the meantime General McMahon made himself master of Magenta. After sanguinary conflicts we repulsed the enemy at every point, with the loss on our side of about 2,000 men placed hors de combat. The loss of the enemy is estimated at 15,000 killed and wounded. 5,000 Austrian prisoners remained in our hands.

JUNE 5, Evening.—Resumé of the details of the battle of Magenta:—Austrians taken prisoners, at least 7,000. Austrians placed hors de combat, 20,000. Three pieces of cannon and two flags captured from the enemy. To-day our army rests for the purpose of reorganising itself. Our loss is about 3,000 killed and wounded, and one cannon taken by the enemy.

Magenta, which will henceforth become illustrious in story, is a small town of about 6,000 inhabitants, situated near Naviglio-Grande. It is the first stage on the road to Milan from Novara, by Buffalora. Three roads lead from Novara to the bank of the Ticino. The first and the most direct passes by Cameri, and ends at the bridge of Buffalora; the second, more to the north, passes through Galliate and descends to the river nearly opposite the village of Turbigo; and the third, still more to the north, passes through Cameri and Pievecheto, and by a curve joins the Ticino at some distance from the Galliate road. At the moment when the French troops crossed the Ticino, General Gyal, who was evacuating the Lomellina, had quitted Garlasco and transferred his headquarters to Abbiate Grasso, on the left bank of the river, a few kilometres above Buffalora. The passage of the French army was, therefore, effected in view of the Austrians, who endeavoured to oppose it, but were repulsed with considerable loss. That took place on Friday; and as the advance of the French and Piedmontese troops had evidently, from the simultaneousness of their late movements, been skillfully prepared beforehand, and formed part of a regular strategical combination, we may suppose that the allied troops, immediately on the banks of the Ticino becoming free, hurried forward by every available passage, so as the next day to be in as great force as possible at the opposite side of the river. The Austrians, on their part, seeing that their opponents would march straight for Milan, had concentrated their forces to prevent them, and the consequence was the series of combats of which the general results are so briefly but eloquently told in the telegraphic despatches. It is known from late telegrams that the operations of the army of General Gyal were directed by Baron de Hess in person; so that it is the best general in the Austrian army that has just been defeated in a battle where not fewer than from 160,000 to 170,000 men must have been engaged, the numbers being certainly the greater on the Austrian side. Magenta is only about 15 miles from Milan.

THE AUSTRIAN ACCOUNT.

VIENNA, Sunday, June 5.—Authentic communications of the details and result of the Battle of Magenta are still expected from the Austrian headquarters. According, however, to reliable news, the head quarters of the Austrian army have been transferred during the night from the 4th to the 5th inst. to Abbiate Grasso. The same news state that the combat was undecided, and that a further fight is expected.

AUSTRIAN OFFICIAL ACCOUNT OF THE BATTLE OF MAGENTA.

VIENNA, Monday.—A desperate combat took place the day before yesterday between the first and second (Count Clam's and Prince Edward Lichtenstein's) corps d'armee and the enemy, who had passed the Ticino with very considerable forces. The result of the contest was undecided. The combat continued yesterday (Sunday.) Our troops threw themselves upon the enemy's ranks with ardour, and showed a valour and perseverance worthy of the most glorious feats of arms of the Imperial army. Milan is perfectly tranquil. The head quarters yesterday were still at Abbiate Grasso.

THE AUSTRIANS KILLED AND WOUNDED.

VIENNA, Tuesday.—Amongst the wounded at the battle of Magenta are Baron Reissbach, three Generals, and three officers of the staff. Two officers of the staff are missing, and one major is killed. The loss on both sides is very great. Milan is entirely evacuated by our troops.

FURTHER PARTICULARS.

It is estimated that the Austrian forces concentrated at Abbiate Grasso were little short of 150,000. The French army crossed the Ticino at Buffalora, whilst the Emperor Napoleon had taken up his head quarters at Novara; General Gyal had made Abbiate Grasso his head quarters in order to oppose the advance of the allies, who threatened to divide the Austrian army and out off their retreat. The action therefore, was, it would appear, necessitated by the operations of the French.

The Emperor, it appears, was in the midst of the Imperial Guard during the stand they made for two hours against the Austrians, who, it appears, were aware of the fact. The