

**THE CITY OF  
LONDON. "STRIKE,  
BUT HEAR." 1884**

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649254309

The city of London. "Strike, but hear." 1884 by Anonymouse

Except for use in any review, the reproduction or utilisation of this work in whole or in part in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including xerography, photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, is forbidden without the permission of the publisher, Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd, PO Box 1576 Collingwood, Victoria 3066 Australia.

All rights reserved.

Edited by Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd.  
Cover @ 2017

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form or binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

[www.triestepublishing.com](http://www.triestepublishing.com)

**ANONYMOUSE**

**THE CITY OF  
LONDON. "STRIKE,  
BUT HEAR." 1884**



The  
City of London.

"STRIKE, BUT HEAR."



1884.

London:

PRINTED BY BLADES, EAST & BLADES.

25, ARCHBISHOP LANE, LONDON, E.C.



DA

633

C49

## ❖ CONTENTS. ❖

	PAGES.
PREFACE . . . . .	v—viii
ANTIQUITY AND EARLY IMPORTANCE OF THE CITY OF LONDON . . . . .	ix—xviii
THE CITY CHARTERS . . . . .	xix
INTERNAL CIVIC POLITY, ETC. . . . .	xx
THE GUILDHALL . . . . .	xxi—xxiii

*Opinions of Eminent Persons respecting the  
City of London :—*

Speech of H. R. H. The Duke of Cambridge . . . . .	36, 41
„ Lord Chancellor Cranworth . . . . .	10
„ Lord Chancellor Campbell . . . . .	25
„ Lord Chancellor Westbury . . . . .	38, 47, 54, 58
„ Lord Chancellor Chelmsford . . . . .	64, 68, 70
„ Lord Chancellor Cairns . . . . .	83, 119, 125, 131, 132, 135
„ Lord Chancellor Hatherley . . . . .	89, 97, 101
„ Lord Chancellor Selborne . . . . .	107, 111, 141
„ Lord Chief-Justice Coleridge . . . . .	147
„ Lord Chief Baron Pollock . . . . .	6, 11, 14, 19, 28, 34, 40, 52, 57, 63
„ Lord Chief Baron Kelly . . . . .	66, 74, 85, 95, 99, 105, 114, 121, 128
„ Baron Pollock . . . . .	137, 144
„ Justice Grove . . . . .	152
„ Duke of Somerset . . . . .	22
„ Marquis of Salisbury . . . . .	134
„ Earl of Derby . . . . .	16, 119
„ Lord Brougham . . . . .	17, 33, 44
„ Bishop of London . . . . .	42, 150
„ Lord Colville . . . . .	37
„ Viscount Palmerston . . . . .	8, 37, 42
„ Earl of Beaconsfield (Rt. Hon. B. Disraeli) . . . . .	18, 140
„ W. E. Gladstone . . . . .	23, 31, 60, 98, 149, 153
„ Sidney Herbert . . . . .	22
„ Sir Stafford Northcote . . . . .	135
„ The American Minister . . . . .	88, 105
„ The French Ambassador . . . . .	30, 145
„ The Austrian Ambassador . . . . .	124, 132
„ M. Berryer . . . . .	60
APPENDIX . . . . .	155, 171

858605

## P R E F A C E .

---

FROM the speeches and threats of its enemies it would appear that this year 1884 is destined to see their attack delivered against the existence of the oldest institution remaining in this country next to the Throne itself, the Corporation of London. This attack comes under the very specious disguise of "extending the roof of the Guildhall over all London," which means the entire abolition of existing institutions in the city, the destruction of its traditions, and sweeping the entire body away with all its history and prestige. In its place is to be substituted one body, representing four millions of people, whose members will have no aptitude for, because no experience in, municipal life; and who, if they sit for eight hours every day, including Sundays, and allow themselves no holidays, will be unable to grapple with and keep up to the work of ruling over and providing for the wants of such a vast area, as is proposed to be included in their jurisdiction. The Corporation of London has long



ago been of opinion, that the government of the metropolis might be improved by the grant of municipal institutions to the various Parliamentary boroughs into which the metropolis is divided ; and that some, if not all of them, might be united with the City of London in the exercise of authority and power in matters of common interest, such as the gas and water supply and the main sewerage. This is said with the reservation of "some, if not all," because it is obvious that, although an Act of Parliament might, for example, call "Woolwich" the City of London, no one could ever regard it as such. It will be said that the Corporation has never taken any steps to give effect to its opinions, and for the excellent reason that the proper persons to ask for municipal institutions, if they are dissatisfied with existing arrangements, are those who will be affected by them. The great parishes of Marylebone and Lambeth, for instance, might well resent an attempt by the City of London to ask for a municipality for either of them, when the existing law authorises the inhabitants of either of those places, to make such an application, if they desire it, to the Privy Council.

There is no intention to discuss this question further here, the present object being to set forth

a concise statement of the antiquity of the Corporation, of the good deeds that have marked its history, and the testimony of eminent public men to its honourable career, and the unsullied integrity of its members, a testimony of such weight that the slanders of its maligners, who never even by accident appear to stray into the paths of Truth, will cease to be regarded, even by those prone to think evil of institutions because they are old.\*

---

\* A very striking example of this appears in a journal, which in satire calls itself "Truth." In its issue for 3rd January, 1884, appears this paragraph;— "The Corporation of the City is showing the cloven foot again in a very reckless way. They protested last year that they were not promoting or supporting the High Beech Railway, in Epping Forest, from any selfish motive. Happily, the Bill was thrown out, notwithstanding their protestations. Now, however, they have made public their real reasons, by giving out that they are going to build a monster hotel there, like that which has converted the Chingford part of Epping Forest into a Cockney bar-room. In fact, to put a few pounds into the pockets of the civic land-jobbers and lawyers, and parasites generally, the Corporation seem prepared to destroy the charms of the bit of country they made such a fuss about saving with other people's money. *Sic itur ad astra!*"

Will it be believed that the *facts* are, that the Corporation, having years ago out of the proceeds of the sale of other freehold property, purchased an old public-house at High Beech, with six acres of land attached to it, which is quite unsuited now to the public wants, have advertised it to be let for rebuilding as an hotel on a building lease. They have not cut off the six acres to let them for building purposes; but all is to go with the hotel as it did with the public-house. How this is to benefit "civic land jobbers, lawyers, and parasites generally," or to be "showing the cloven foot," the elegant and truthful writer must explain.

