

An enterprising publisher at the present moment, might profitably invest in several thousand copies of a pamphlet on "The Curiosities of the Wallace Monument Enterprise." If at all cleverly got up, it might prove a formidable rival to Disraeli's "Curiosities of Literature." Of course, the subject would require to be considered in connection with the Rev. Charles Rogers, LL.D.; and the writer would be expected to trace, with mathematical nicety, how many of the "curiosities" were inherent to such an "enterprise," and how many sprung from its connection with the rev. doctor. We say its connection with Dr R., not Dr R.'s connection with it; for of late we have begun to accept it as an axiom that, the Wallace Mania would long ago have died a natural death, but for the absurd efforts of the secretary to keep it alive. We have no wish, however, to throw cold water on the commendable efforts of gentlemen who, now that the national credit is considered at stake in the matter, are doing their best to drag the enterprise out of the Slough of Despond, in which it has been floundering since the day of its birth. And it is just because we wish to see a respectable memorial of the great patriot erected in a creditable manner on the top of the Abbey Craig, that we enter our protest against his memory being any longer burlesqued, and his name used as a stalking-horse, for the begging absurdities of mere adventurers. We consider it most intolerable, and a public scandal, that any person should be allowed to advertise for monies in aid of the Wallace Monument, and disburse those monies at pleasure, when there is a lawfully constituted body already existing for that very purpose. It is an anomaly that ought at once to be put down; and if the Acting Committee do not move quickly in the matter, Dr Rogers bids fair, with his Supplemental Fund, to bring the whole movement into contempt. It may be recollected that in July last—shortly after the change of secretaries was brought about—the public were not a little amused by the announcement that a Supplemental Committee had been formed, with Dr Rogers as secretary, to raise funds in behalf of the Wallace Monument, by a separate course of action from the Acting Committee. The Acting Committee very strenuously protested against this uncalled for organization; but as most people looked on the affair, as nothing more than the last dying gasp of one, suffering from disappointed ambition, the Supplemental Committee was soon forgotten. The subject, however, is rather unexpectedly revived this week, by the publication of a printed statement of receipts and disbursements of the Supplemental Fund, during the first half-year of its existence. We have been at the trouble to examine its contents, and as it unfolds some very interesting arithmetical "curiosities," we shall give the public the benefit of our analysis. And, at the outset, we remark that the absence of any auditor's name to the statement, is enough to make every straightforward business man pitch it into the waste-basket. It is signed "Charles Rogers, LL.D., secretary." Who appointed him secretary? Who form this Supplemental Committee, and if such a body really exists, how often has it met during the half-year? But to proceed, as the statement is entirely an arithmetical one, we naturally expected that some attention would be paid

to a few of the well-known rules of "Coker," and other ancient authorities—but nothing of the kind. The rev. secretary, unlike our burly friend Michael Cassia, is "no mathematician," and consequently jumbles things together in the most incomprehensible way imaginable. Two great facts, however, stand broadly out in the midst of all the confusion, and these are that, he has received during the six months £242 0s. 7d., and that he has expended the enormous sum (enormous, when contrasted with the receipts) of £228 17s. 6d.! The process by which this state of things is brought about is not so clear. But that there should be such a large expenditure on such a small amount of receipts appears, at the very first glance, altogether monstrous; and we shall briefly show that the whole statement is even more discreditable than it at first sight appears. It will scarcely be credited, we think, that in this £228 17s. 6d. of expenditure there are the following items:—

Dr Rogers' Half-year's Salary,.....	£75	0	0
" Expenses,.....	8	8	0
" Clerk's Expenses,.....	3	1	10
" For Postage Stamps,.....	19	4	0
" For Incidental Expenses,.....	4	13	8
" Account with Alex. Grant, printer, Edinburgh, (we presume for printing an account of the Proceedings on 24th June,).....	65	19	8

Total,.....£176 7 8

We like that now. There is something so smart, clever, shrewd, and calculating about it. So coolly impudent too—the Dr is truly a great man! Let us linger a little over his share of the £242 0s. 7d.—something may be learned by way of moral. Observe, ladies and gentlemen, the appropriation of the half-year's salary, mark the expenses, the number of letters posted, and the printers bill for that pamphlet of his which—like many other volumes from the same source—appears to have fallen still-born from the press! And the total of the whole is, one hundred and seventy-six pounds seven shillings and eightpence sterling! Who would not like to be in the Dr's shoes! But supposing we turn from this £176 7s. 8d. and glance at the other items, we shall find that the £242 0s. 7d. of subscriptions received, dwindle away in the most incomprehensible manner, till all the money that is left on hand only reaches the paltry amount of thirteen pounds three shillings and a penny! And, "the fly Jack and be gone" process is accomplished after this fashion. Mr Seringsour (we know nothing about him) is paid £18 15s. for collecting the sum of £17 15s.! That is to say, the secretary pays him one pound sterling for making the two ends meet. Clever collector—generous secretary! But the secretary's generosity does not stop here; he adds by way of postscript that £2 3s. 8½d. (for which sum he takes credit in the £18 15s.) will be carried to Mr Seringsour's credit in his next account. This reminds us strongly of Handy Andy's memorable attempt to "dot and carry two." John Halket follows close upon the heels of Mr Seringsour. "John" appears to have collected six shillings and sixpence in behalf of the Supplemental Fund, which sum the secretary munificently returns to him as a slight compensation for his trouble in collecting it! Drop a tear ladies and gentlemen over the unfortunate six and six. Thomas Hislop gets twenty shillings for collecting nothing; rather a hard task, so we must not grudge the poor man his commission. Mr Tweed is paid £12 3s. 6d. for collecting subscriptions that have been paid over to the Acting Committee. The inference from this is either, that the Acting Committee have no funds to pay Mr Tweed, or that shrewdly suspecting the Dr. to have plenty, they commissioned him to pay the collector! Such reciprocity in business-matters, between two opposing bodies, is truly delightful. This same Mr Tweed, we observe, is also paid twenty-five shillings for receiving a five pound note from a gentleman at Loudoun Castle! We shall drop dreaming about emigrating to the "gold fields" when such tit-bits as these may yet be picked up in the old country. Various other small items for printing, advertising, and stationery, swell the minor disbursements to £52 11s. 10d., which, added to the Secretary's share, as above noted, bring up the expenditure to £228 17s. 6d.—leaving, as we have said, a balance on hand of £13 3s. 1d. But after all we question very much if there is really a surplus. £242 0s. 7d. is stated as the amount of subscriptions received in behalf of the Supplemental Fund; but from this we suspect will yet require to be deducted £5 received from the Sandwich Islands, and £23 11s. 3d. from New South Wales. These sums must have been collected in those countries long before the Supplemental Fund was ushered into existence; and by nothing else than a breach of good faith, on the part of Dr Rogers, can they be added to the Supplemental Fund. The Acting Committee would do well to look sharply after their interests. If, therefore, we deduct this £28 11s. 3d. from the amount of subscriptions received, Dr Rogers's balance-sheet will stand thus—

Dr.		Cr.	
Total subscriptions received,.....	£242	0	7
" Out of Pocket on the half-year,	13	3	1
	£228	17	6
		By Dr R.'s share as above,.....	£176
		" Minor disbursements,.....	32
			17 6d

In place, therefore, of having a balance on hand, the Dr will ultimately find that the half-year's expenditure exceeds the amount of subscriptions received by £15 8s. 2d. It is impossible that the public can look upon such a Statement with anything but disgust. How any person, professing to take the management of public funds, could unblushingly come forward with such a discreditable account of his stewardship for one short half-year, passes our comprehension. And as difficult is it to comprehend how such a person can be entitled to a salary at all. It is an abuse of the confidence reposed in him by the public, for Dr Rogers to appropriate £75 of salary (independently of his expenses) for raising £213 9s. 4d. during the past six months. If the public after this, contribute anything towards this precious Supplemental Fund, all we can say is that they richly deserve to have their subscriptions squandered in the manner this £228 17s. 6d. has been.

We understand the Secretary gives out that Mr Pagan of Cupar, Mr Morrison, and others, are members of this Supplemental Fund. We can hardly believe that gentlemen of their standing and respectability would lend their names to such a concern. But if they really and truly have anything to do with it; in justice to themselves and the public, they cannot too soon bring it to an end.