

would make a difference in the decisions of the judge—whilst, on the contrary, it is evident, that the different decisions can only arise out of the diversity of crimes.

The whole, therefore, is reduced to the verification of the title of the accusation of which we are the object, whether it is criminal, or correctional.

We maintain, that it is purely correctional, the *mandat de depot*, by virtue of which we remain in prison, containing only these words, "accused of having assisted in the escape or concealment of the condemned Lavalette." The escape or concealment (even supposing these words to be applicable to the fact with which we are charged) constitute merely offences purely correctional, according to Articles 240 and 248 of the Penal Code.

It is true, that the Ordinance of January 30 attempts to add to offences purely correctional aggravating circumstances, which would have the effect of transforming them into crimes.

But what are these circumstances of pretended aggravation? They would be, 1st. Having used corruption or complicity with the Gaolers.

2d. Having manifested by acts or writings the intention of an attempt or conspiracy against the Government.

We may make, upon these circumstances so called aggravations, a general remark and particular observations.

The general remark applicable to both is, that these pretended circumstances are not stated even by the Judges who have issued the Ordinance.

In fact, if they had, as to those, in that respect the least conviction, they would not have limited themselves to saying, that there was no reason at present to state them; they would not have joined the provisory demand *au fond*, but they would have refused the demand in an absolute and definitive manner, as in their opinion it would then be no longer a simple correctional offence, but an actual crime.

As they have not pronounced this refusal, it must, therefore, be concluded with certainty, that there does not exist against us any charge founded upon these pretended circumstances.

It is not only in its communication that the present Ordinance is vague; it is also in its motives; thus we read, "in the mean time, the accusation ought not to be fixed till the preliminary process shall be terminated, because it is only then that the Tribunal can with certainty reject the demand, if there is a sufficient presumption of crime, or, in the case of a simple offence, use the power given to it of granting or refusing the liberation on bail."

Considering it, therefore, concluded, that there is not even a sufficient presumption of crime, we have a right to be acquitted, that provisory liberty has been refused us. As to any thing further, if it is truly stated, that the presumption is not to be definitively fixed until the preliminary process shall be terminated, it is not to say, that there must necessarily be a delay till the preliminary process is terminated, before the demand of provisory liberty can be determined upon, though, according to Article 114, "the setting at liberty, provisorily, may be demanded and granted in every stage of the cause," that is to say, as well before as after the preliminary process is terminated. And the very simple reason for this is, that correctional offences can only draw with them the penalty of imprisonment. If, therefore, those accused of them were not allowed to be released upon bail, they would be irrevocably subjected before-hand to the only penalty to which they could be ultimately condemned, and it is contrary to all justice, that the punish- ment should commence before sentence, and that the penalty should be inflicted before it has been pronounced.

It is, therefore, contrary to all equity to decree, that vague presumptions or conjectures, hazarded upon possibilities which the preliminary process may not realize, should serve as a basis for refusing the enlargement. If the proof of the fact is still vague, the title of the accusation is not so; that is fixed; it announces nothing but offences purely correctional, and, therefore, it is a case in which our provisory liberty ought to be granted.

But if it is not enough to show, that the pretended aggravating circumstances have no foundation in the opinions even of the Judges, we shall go much further by showing, that they cannot exist in fact.

They dare not say openly, that we have corrupted the gaolers of Lavalette, nor can they reach us with connivance; they know well, that we are nothing, absolutely nothing, that presents the slightest proof of this corruption, of which the Ordinance with respect to us is nothing but a mere calumny. The expressions of the Ordinance, a little embarrassed in this particular, give only the idea of facts of corruption or connivance imputed either to the gaoler or the turnkey of Lavalette, and which would be of a nature to carry with them the most infamous punishment, as well against the gaoler as the turnkey.

It is, therefore, whether the gaolers of the prison are accused of corruption or connivance, or whether we are accused of having used corruption or connivance with them.

It is, however, that, although the terms of the Ordinance do not state an opinion that we have corrupted the gaolers, yet we are included in the hypothesis of Article 242 of the penal code; and thus we are excluded in the conclusion, although we are not included in the premises.

Admitting, however, that the Ordinance states clearly, that we have corrupted the gaolers, and that thus we are brought within the penalty designated by Art. 242.

This accusation is denied by our consciences, which at once presents as a calumny an accusation,

supported by no document, either verbal or written, and respecting which the Ordinance itself acknowledges that it has not even hitherto a sufficient presumption. This accusation, we say, can no longer, so far as respects us, be regarded but as a vain pretext, since Madame Lavalette has obtained her liberty provisorily.

In fact, it is impossible to conceive, that we have corrupted the gaolers, in order to allow Madame Lavalette to escape, when it is not pretended, that we knew that he was to escape; impossible that we should be accused of his escape without our knowing the day, the hour, the moment, the mode of escape—without being, in a word, in concert with Madame Lavalette (whom none of us have ever seen); impossible, in that case, that Madame Lavalette herself, the virtuous and honourable author of the safety of her husband, should not know that the gaolers were gained and corrupted, and that they would shut their eyes; impossible, quite impossible, for any reasonable man to conceive, that the gaolers should be corrupted by us in the interest of the Sieur Lavalette, without Madame de Lavalette being informed of it.

In this state of the affair, however, Madame de Lavalette has obtained her liberty provisorily.

It was undoubtedly well done to grant her that liberty; but it is, at the same time, the strongest evidence, that it ought not to be refused to us from a motive, which, if it be at all probable with regard to us, must have a much stronger relation to her.

We are Englishmen, but, on account of the peace and good understanding which prevails between France and our nation, we ought to be treated in France like the most favoured Frenchmen; and it is with grief we find ourselves compelled to notice the difference of treatment our demand has received, under circumstances which we might call similar, if all the shades of variation that separate them were not entirely to our advantage.

It remains for us to combat another motive of the Ordinance drawn from this—"the manoeuvres practised in order to withdraw from the operation of the law an individual condemned for the crime of High Treason, ought not to be considered as constituting an ordinary offence, nor can they so consider it under the circumstances, and according to the intention manifested by the acts and writings of the accused, which present the character of an attempt, and a conspiracy against the Government, and consequently of a fact qualified as a crime by the law, there existing already in the proceedings documents sufficient to impress that character on the existing charges against the exhibitors."

We have already replied to the last part of this motive, that if there had existed in the proceedings documents sufficient to transform into a crime a correctional offence of which we are accused, the Council would not have limited itself to joining the incident *au fond*, and deciding, that there was no reason at present to point them out, or have founded on Article 113 an evasion of our demand without determining it.

We shall add to this (in order to combat more directly the motive), that the tribunals cannot judge us by our thoughts, but by our acts; and that if Englishmen, momentarily residing in France, are obliged to conform their exterior actions to the existing laws, nothing ought to hinder them from thinking as freely on the banks of the Seine as on the banks of the Thames. Thus, whatever may have been our secret sentiments, our conversations with our friends, or our confidential correspondence with our fellow-countrymen, it is not such circumstances upon which we ought to be judged.

We ought not to be judged by the intentions or thoughts which we are supposed to have, but by the nature and quality of the facts imputed to us.

If we were accused of having killed a man, our provisory liberty could not be granted to us, but we are accused of having sated a Frenchman.

We will adhere to the title of this accusation, and if it is true that it is there an offence, it cannot be a crime. Let us hope, therefore, that the Court will do for us Englishmen what it has done for Madame de Lavalette, a native of France, that it will use the sovereign power which the King has given to it for the purpose of reversing the Ordinance which excites our just complaints.

Ross. Fines, Wilson, Mj. Gen. Mic. Bruce, J. H. Hutchinson, Capt. 1st Guards. Paris, February 5, 1816.

LAW INTELLIGENCE.

COURT OF COMMON PLEAS, WESTMINSTER, FEBRUARY 13.

LIBEL.
WENDELL D. BALDWIN.

This was an action brought by Mr. Wedderburn Webster, and Lady Caroline Fines, his wife, to recover damages for a series of libels, imputing to Lady Webster a criminal intercourse with the Duke of Wellington, which libels appeared in *The St. James's Chronicle*, a Newspaper of which the Defendant is Proprietor.

Mr. Campbell opened the pleadings, and stated, that the Plaintiff, Lady Frances Webster, had always preserved an unsullied reputation, and that the Defendant had published in a Newspaper, called *The St. James's Chronicle*, several libels upon her, imputing to her that she had been guilty of adultery with the Most Noble Arthur Duke of Wellington.

Mr. Serjeant Best stated the case. He described Mr. Wedderburn Webster as a gentleman of large fortune, and allied to some of the first families in the country. His Lady was the daughter of the Earl of Mountmorris, about 24 years of age, of great personal beauty—but that beauty was lost sight of

by those who were acquainted with her virtues. In the commencement of the year 1815, during the short period of the peace with France, Mr. and Lady Webster proceeded to Brussels, in the neighbourhood of which city they resided. The Earl of Mountmorris, the father of the Lady, and many other families of distinction, also lived there. At this time, in consequence of the landing of Bonaparte in France, an army was assembled near Brussels—and, happily for the repose of the World, that army was commanded by the Duke of Wellington. It was natural that a Nobleman of his rank should visit families of corresponding quality—amongst which were those of the Earl of Mountmorris, and Mr. Wedderburn Webster, particularly as both the individuals he had mentioned were previously acquainted with the illustrious Duke; but it would appear in evidence, that he was never in his life alone with Lady Webster. The period at which those parties met together at Brussels was about the time that the battle of Waterloo was fought. At that time, Mr. Wedderburn Webster was obliged to leave the Continent, in order to attend to some family affairs in his country. On that occasion, Lady Webster lived in a place the most proper of all others for a person in her situation—she lived with her father, in the city of Brussels. Mr. W. Webster returned, after the battle of Waterloo, just in time to accompany the Earl of Mountmorris to Paris, whither he was going to provide suitable education for his unmarried daughter. It was most important to observe, with reference to damages, that at this time, Lady F. Webster was seven months advanced in her pregnancy; and she never had an opportunity of speaking to the Duke of Wellington prior to her being in that situation. That the Defendant was acquainted with her situation could not be doubted—for he notified the fact in one of his papers. Being aware of this fact, she should have been the last person to be held up to public ignominy, as guilty of a criminal and adulterous intercourse. Before he called the attention of the Jury to the first paragraph, it would be necessary to bring to their recollection the situation of Brussels, immediately after the battle of Waterloo. There the wounded of the British army were carried, and all were delighted to hear of the attention that was paid to them. It was stated in the papers of that time, that the Duke of Wellington, after the battle, repaired to Brussels, in order to visit his wounded troops. Sorry he was, that there should be, in this country, any mind so given to slander, as to impute a criminal offence to an illustrious individual, who acted from the most humane impulses. But so it was. The following paragraph appeared in the Defendant's paper:

"It was said, at Brussels, that, when the Duke of Wellington returned after the battle of Waterloo (which, *en passant*, ought to be called the battle of Mont St. Jean), he came to visit the wounded—perhaps the wounded he meant. A word to the wise."

This was a loose and vague paragraph. It did not point to any particular person; but the following doggerel lines, which appeared in a subsequent number of the paper, fully explained who was meant—

"In the letter *W. there's a charm half divine—*
War, W. Wellington, W. Webster, W. Fine."

Soon after, another paragraph appeared, which still further developed the slanderous intention.—It stated—that

"The cessation of warfare has, in Paris, enabled scandal to resume her usual influence on the public mind; a report is very prevalent, in the first Parisian circles, that a distinguished Commander has surrendered himself captive to the beautiful wife of an officer of rank, in a manner that renders a very serious investigation necessary; but it is hoped that this will turn out nothing but a tale of malice-legend."

In a day or two after, however, the Defendant treated this tale of malice-legend as an absolute fact. He published another libel. The Learned Serjeant here read the paragraph, which stated—

"That the amour did not take place at Paris, but at Brussels, a day or two after the battle of Waterloo. The husband had laid his damages at £50,000, which the fortunate lover offered to pay—but the business was too notorious to be compromised—or the injured party had too much sensibility to wear gilded boots."

In a succeeding publication, the Defendant had copied into his paper, from an Evening Journal, a sort of contradiction of these slanders—but, to mark his own feelings on the subject, he placed a paragraph beneath it, stating, that the Lady implicated in the amour with a distinguished Officer was of Irish extraction, evidently pointing at Lady F. Webster, who was the daughter of an Irish Nobleman.

Mr. Henry Nott proved, that the names of Messrs. Baldwin and Moody were entered at the Stamp-office, as Proprietors of *The St. James's Chronicle*. He also produced the papers containing the libels.

The Duke of Richmond, who was examined from the Bench, stated, that he was at Brussels at the same time with Mr. and Lady Webster. During the absence of Mr. Webster from Brussels, she lived with her father, and was married to her. He was intimately acquainted with the Duke of Wellington, who came to take the command of the British army while he was at Brussels. He could not state the exact day when Lady Webster became acquainted with the Duke of Wellington. He asked the Duke to dinner, and he (the witness) invited Lady Webster to the same party.—Lady Webster was much to the habit of visiting the Duchess of Richmond. The Duchess and herself were always happy to entrust their daughters to her. Her general deportment and character were excellent. He

first saw the paragraph in *The St. James's Chronicle* in Paris. After the paragraph appeared, he saw Lady Webster at the house of the Duchess of Wellington, in Paris. If he had any suspicion that those paragraphs were true, he would not have suffered any intercourse between Lady Webster and his family.

Mr. Serjeant Best was about to call the Rev. George Griffin Stokes, to speak to similar facts as those deposed to by the Duke of Richmond—but the Court held it to be unnecessary, since the character of Lady Webster must be considered as unimpaired, unless the Defendant chose to advance some charge against it.

Mr. Serjeant Best addressed the Jury on behalf of the Defendant, who, he observed, felt since contained for his error. In appointing the damages, he called on them to leave out of their consideration every thing that his Learned Friend had introduced relative to the Duke of Wellington, who was no party in this cause.

The Chief Justice summed up the evidence. The Jury retired, and, after a short consideration, returned a verdict for the Plaintiff. Damages, £2000.

LONDON.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 17.

Stocks this day at One o'Clock.

3 per cent Consols 64	5 per cent 90
Du. for Acct 915 1/2	On (money) 18 1/2
3 per cent Red. 61 1/2	Ditto (payment) 18 1/2
4 per cent 77 1/2	India Stock

No Paris Papers have arrived this morning, but we have received some communications from our private Correspondents. They agree in stating, that the public mind has assumed greater tranquillity; but they still think, that a change will take place in the French Ministry, and that the Duke de Richelieu will be forced to resign—a circumstance which we should very much deplore.

The English newspapers are prohibited with more rigour than ever; and this measure is said to have been the result of a Cabinet decision.

The Minister of Police, de C. Z., is stated to have declared, that there were only 311 persons in prison for political offences. The report was, that there were a vast number more, which, says M. de Caze, "I did not contradict, because it satisfied the minds of the well-disposed, that the Government were active and kept the restless and turbulent in awe." The answer to this report must have been obvious to M. de Caze. If the report were so beneficial to its effect, why contradict it now?

The Prince Regent of Portugal has issued a Decree, dated Rio Janeiro, Dec. 16, by which he gives to the dominions of Brazil the title of Kingdom, and directs that the kingdoms of Portugal, of two Algarves, and Brazil, shall in future form a single Kingdom, under the title of *United Kingdom of Portugal and of Brazil and the two Algarves*.

MIRROUR, FEB. 12.—Put in the Royal Sovereign, Ann, and Perseverance, transports, from Bristol, bound for Cork. Sailed from Bristol to the 8th inst. the latter vessel, with 18 horses belonging to the 16th Regiment or Queen's Light Dragoons. At 6 P. M. on the following day, a tremendous gale of wind from the S. W. the horse broke loose and laid the vessel on her beam end, when they were, for the preservation of the vessel and lives of the crew, obliged to kill and throw them over-board.

COIN EXCHANGE, FEB. 16.—The navigation being now open, business was resumed upon our market this morning; but having few buyers of wheat, sales were rather heavy at last week's prices. Oats were in tolerably bad demand, as well as fine barley and white peas, which are in less support their prices. In Beans and other articles there is no alteration.

Waterford Chronicle.

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 22.

The London Journals have given some extracts from their contemporaries of Paris, but they are miserably poor, both as to the transaction of business and the manifestation of talents, as to be totally unworthy of attention. Every proposition, which is discussed in the Chamber of Deputies, originates at the Thuilleries, where the heads of the intended speeches are also arranged. The *Ultra Royalists* have acquired the ascendancy, enjoy the highest favour at Court, and possess all the places of trust and profit. The Carrier speaks of the public mind having become tranquil, and seems to insinuate, that all is going on favourably for the cause of the Bourbons, and for the prosperity of the Nation. It was but lately, that the same Journal spoke of discontent, and even anticipated rebellion, and it is difficult, indeed, to conceive whence this sudden change could have arisen. It is a mere spirit parvalli in the ruling party, and the same measures are pursued—measures which indicate nothing either of a wise or liberal policy. The system followed is not of an open and manly character; it is founded on intrigue and dissimulation, pillars upon which no Throne can long last for safety. The existing Rulers have but a nominal, not a real power. As far as can be judged, they and the King are desirous to establish something like a fair and equitable Government, but the *ancien regime* appears to be the only article in the political creed of the adverse faction, which they opposed to this cherished doctrine, and is error, already more than once produced ruin, and is now in the most perilous position, it resisted in the beginning, and rejected in the end. Governments are only to be sustained when they identify themselves with the interests of the countries over which they bear sway.

when they are guided by no partial motives, when they embrace the general good with an ardent and equitable zeal, and when their penetration searches out suffering, and their power redems from oppression. Hitherto, the ruling party in France, we do not speak of official authorities, has displayed nothing but that policy of a remoter age, which gradually led to the ruin of the Monarchy, and which, if preserved in will once more conduct to a similar consequence. On the state of France, we have looked with much anxiety for information from the British Ministers, and especially from Lord Castlereagh, but nothing has transpired from them which could tend, in the slightest degree, either to establish, or to overthrow, the unfavourable impression existing in the public mind with respect to the conduct of the Bourbons. Private letters from Paris represent matters according to the political sentiments of the writers, and the Paris Journals have nothing to boast of, but timid silence, or subservient misrepresentation. Under these circumstances, truth is of difficult attainment, and the course of events can alone unravel the mystery.

The *Memoir* of Sir Robert Wilson and his friends, which we have given at full length, is an important and interesting document. It gives a complete history as to the question of their liberation upon bail, and it is drawn up with singular precision and ability.

Rumours are still current, that affairs have not yet been amicably settled between Austria and Bavaria, and that the former Power had refused to accede to the propositions of the latter.

The widow of Marshal Ney has, it is said, received a letter from the Prince de Metternich, announcing to her, that the Emperor, his Master, had restored to her children the estates which the Marshal possessed in the territories, that are now under the Austrian dominion. This letter also contains, it is added, expressions stating, that the Emperor of Austria considers with the liveliest interest, and the greatest benevolence, the situation of the widow and children of the Marshal, to whom he offers a residence worthy of them in his States.

Fouche was still in Dresden, but divested of his diplomatic character. In order not wholly to neglect passing events, we have been induced to be brief in the Report of some Parliamentary proceedings, and to postpone others. On Thursday, a long discussion took place relative to the conduct of Ferdinand towards the Spanish Patriote. Mr. Brougham laboured to induce the British Government to interpose in behalf of these sufferers, but it appeared from Lord Castlereagh's answer, that the British Government had already exercised itself in favour of the individuals alluded to, and that it had even gone beyond the line of its duty upon the subject. Mr. Brougham's motion was rejected by 123 against 42.

Lord Gower, Member for Stafford, sat and voted in the Commons without having taken the oath required by Law, by doing which his Lordship vacated his seat.

The mail of Sunday was due when we went to Press.

A meeting of the Catholic Association took place in Dublin on Saturday last. The chief object of attention was the Petition lately agreed to at Lord Fitzgibbon's. Several speeches have been published as having been delivered on the occasion by Mr. Mahon, Mr. O'Connell, Mr. O'Gorman, and Mr. Mac Donnell. These we have not inserted, as the credibility of the Report has been impeached, as they consisted almost entirely of recitations against those who had met at Lord Fitzgibbon's, and as we cannot conceive it possible, that those to whom they are attributed could have uttered sentiments so full of misrepresentation, so disrespectful to the Legislature, and so strongly calculated to inflame the passions, and to endanger the common peace. Every thing that can give real strength and solid hope to the Catholic Cause shall, at all times, have our best assistance; but we cannot become the instruments of public delusion and public mischief. It was more than intimated in the meeting, that Counselor Bittow had officiously sent a Copy of the Petition adopted at Lord Fitzgibbon's to the Association. That Gentleman has addressed a letter to the *Evening Post*, which fully explains the matter, but which, and we regret it, our space does not permit us at present to publish at large. The following extract, however, will be satisfactory:—

"Having on Saturday, a little after three o'clock, accidentally gone into Mr. Fitzgibbon's shop in Canal street, in the course of conversation, asked Mr. Fitzgibbon, just whether there was a full meeting above stairs. And he, in consequence of the question, stated, among other things, that the Gentlemen were waiting for *Carroll's Daily Advertiser*, in which that morning been published; and having mentioned, that a Gentleman of the Association had just sent for it, I said, I had a printed copy of the Petition in my pocket, and would give it to him, and that he might give it to the Gentleman who were waiting, or to those to do so, which I understood, on his coming back to the shop, he had done."

It is clear, as Counselor Bittow states in another part of his letter, that it was no formal communication from him of the Petition, and we need not say, that it ought not to have been so represented. An Aggregate Meeting was appointed for the 29th inst.

Mr. Coxe has had an interview with the Lord Lieutenant, at which he presented his Memorial, and was graciously received.

We regret, that we are forced to delay those articles to which we alluded in our last publication, and also some articles of local intelligence. They must not be forgotten.

Committed to the County Gaol, on Monday last, by Richard English, Esq.—John Cowhen and Michael Neil, charged on oath with having unlawfully assembled in arms on the night of Wednesday, the 3d of January last, and feloniously entered the dwelling house of Thomas Keating, of Killogher, in this county, and robbed him of money, clothes, &c.—also, James Leary, charged on oath with burglariously and feloniously entering the dwelling house of Jeremiah Ryan, of Tour, in said county, levelling a part of said house, and firing shots therein—and with forcibly and feloniously carrying away Catherine Ryan, daughter of the said Jeremiah Ryan, without her consent.

Same day, by Michael Keane, Esq.—Patrick Roche, charged on oath with having, on the night of Saturday, the 3d, or morning of Sunday, the 4th of February instant, illegally entered an office at Mount Rivers, in said County, and having feloniously stolen thereout different articles of wearing apparel, and committed other illegal acts.

RELIGION.

[FROM CARROLL'S POST.]

This word has for ages afforded a cover to men, often the basest and most wicked of mankind, whereby to impose upon the credulous and unenlightened, the better to effect their concealed purposes, whether of worldly aggrandisement, or secret pillage, or a vicious and debasing lust of popularity.—True Religion is alone to be discovered in a man's acts. The man who is punctual to his word, who, in his conduct, is governed by principle and honour, who pays his debts, who fulfills his duties, who seems to love or publish a falsehood, who seeks not to injure or oppress his neighbour, from motives of private malice or selfish interest—in a word, the man who fulfills the great Christian precept, "do as you would be done by"—Such a man, it may be said, is truly religious, as far as at least as religion can direct his conduct towards his fellow-men. The hypocritical and knavish pretender to religion may be easily distinguished, by his having always the *cant* in his mouth, whilst his *acts* are the reverse of what we have above described.

These reflections have been forced upon us by some circumstances which have lately occurred.—Several of the most respectable of the Irish Catholics, distinguished for rank, talent, and understanding, and strict moral conduct, have agreed to petition Parliament for a repeal of those laws, the existence of which contributes so materially to destroy the peace and happiness of this country. They speak to the Parliament in the spirit of peace; they say, "we are satisfied that you should remove all cause for apprehension (if you entertain any) that the granting of our claims may be dangerous to your religion, provided that you will at the same time take care not to interfere with ours." The security thus proposed is reciprocal. Can any thing be more reasonable?

It is quite sufficient to mention the name of one who has signed this Petition, to prove to the Public at large that it is perfectly proper—we mean Mr. Rindall Mac Donnell. Yet an outcry is attempted to be raised against these Gentlemen. It is said, that they are about to hinder their attractions for political advantages. The persons who are thus engaged in the work of exciting popular ferment and animosity against men of the first character in the country are the remnant of a party, whose character the readers of this Paper must be well acquainted. Sunk to the earth, they once more attempt to raise themselves into notice by the cry of danger to their "holy religion." No doubt, the reader will expect, that those who are thus so trebly alive to the purity of their religion, should have learned from the baseness and cowardice of imposing upon the multitude a *whisper* of fraud, fabricated with a view to injure their neighbour.—No doubt, the reader would expect this effect to be produced by their religion—for, it may be asked, of what use is religion, if not to render men wise and good?

We shall enable the Reader to judge for himself, whether or not this be the fact, by laying before him an extract from the *Dublin Chronicle*, better known by the designation of the *Official or Leader's Gazette*, published on Friday last. We are instructed to say, that the *whole* of the account there given, of what occurred at the Meeting at Lord Fitzgibbon's, is, from beginning to end, an absolute fabrication!!! All pure invention!!! We see, that this Paper will compel all its patrons to follow the example of some, who, as we are informed, have been forced, on a late occasion, to do so.

The article we allude to is the following:—

SECRET FETTERING MEETING.

Notwithstanding the pains taken to keep the proceedings of the Secret Meeting from the public eye, some sketches were made out, which enable us to frame a tolerably accurate notion of the manoeuvres of the *Constitutionals*. It appears, that Mr. John Lett, of Killogher, in the County of Wexford, to Eliza, eldest daughter of Mr. Luke Murphy, of Dunmore, in the County of Waterford.

MARRIAGES.—On the 20th inst., in St. Thomas's Church, Dublin, by special licence, Sir Francis Howard, Recorder of Wexford, to Anne, eldest daughter of the late James Johnston, Esq. and only daughter of the late Charles Hudson, Esq.—On Monday, Mr. John Lett, of Killogher, in the County of Wexford, to Eliza, eldest daughter of Mr. Luke Murphy, of Dunmore, in the County of Waterford.

DEATHS.—On Monday, in this city, Mr. Michael Byrne—At Fourbridge place, R. host Ingram, Esq. formerly of Booter's square, London.—At Jamaica, Richard Spear, Esq. Secretary to Rear Admiral J. E. Douglas, Commander in Chief of the ships of that station.

BIRTHS.—In London, the Lady of the Hon. Henry St. John, of a daughter.—In the same City, Lady Harriet Paget, of a son.—At Brussels, of a daughter, the Lady of Captain Charles Napier, of the Royal Artillery.—At Craugh, in the County of Tipperary, the Lady of Edmund Power, of Gurteen, in the County of Waterford, Esq. of a son and heir.—At Clonmel, the Lady of Joseph Bowman, Esq. Artillery Barrack Master, of a son.

MARRIAGES.—On the 20th inst., in St. Thomas's Church, Dublin, by special licence, Sir Francis Howard, Recorder of Wexford, to Anne, eldest daughter of the late James Johnston, Esq. and only daughter of the late Charles Hudson, Esq.—On Monday, Mr. John Lett, of Killogher, in the County of Wexford, to Eliza, eldest daughter of Mr. Luke Murphy, of Dunmore, in the County of Waterford.

DEATHS.—On Monday, in this city, Mr. Michael Byrne—At Fourbridge place, R. host Ingram, Esq. formerly of Booter's square, London.—At Jamaica, Richard Spear, Esq. Secretary to Rear Admiral J. E. Douglas, Commander in Chief of the ships of that station.

BIRTHS.—In London, the Lady of the Hon. Henry St. John, of a daughter.—In the same City, Lady Harriet Paget, of a son.—At Brussels, of a daughter, the Lady of Captain Charles Napier, of the Royal Artillery.—At Craugh, in the County of Tipperary, the Lady of Edmund Power, of Gurteen, in the County of Waterford, Esq. of a son and heir.—At Clonmel, the Lady of Joseph Bowman, Esq. Artillery Barrack Master, of a son.

MARRIAGES.—On the 20th inst., in St. Thomas's Church, Dublin, by special licence, Sir Francis Howard, Recorder of Wexford, to Anne, eldest daughter of the late James Johnston, Esq. and only daughter of the late Charles Hudson, Esq.—On Monday, Mr. John Lett, of Killogher, in the County of Wexford, to Eliza, eldest daughter of Mr. Luke Murphy, of Dunmore, in the County of Waterford.

DEATHS.—On Monday, in this city, Mr. Michael Byrne—At Fourbridge place, R. host Ingram, Esq. formerly of Booter's square, London.—At Jamaica, Richard Spear, Esq. Secretary to Rear Admiral J. E. Douglas, Commander in Chief of the ships of that station.

BIRTHS.—In London, the Lady of the Hon. Henry St. John, of a daughter.—In the same City, Lady Harriet Paget, of a son.—At Brussels, of a daughter, the Lady of Captain Charles Napier, of the Royal Artillery.—At Craugh, in the County of Tipperary, the Lady of Edmund Power, of Gurteen, in the County of Waterford, Esq. of a son and heir.—At Clonmel, the Lady of Joseph Bowman, Esq. Artillery Barrack Master, of a son.

MARRIAGES.—On the 20th inst., in St. Thomas's Church, Dublin, by special licence, Sir Francis Howard, Recorder of Wexford, to Anne, eldest daughter of the late James Johnston, Esq. and only daughter of the late Charles Hudson, Esq.—On Monday, Mr. John Lett, of Killogher, in the County of Wexford, to Eliza, eldest daughter of Mr. Luke Murphy, of Dunmore, in the County of Waterford.

DEATHS.—On Monday, in this city, Mr. Michael Byrne—At Fourbridge place, R. host Ingram, Esq. formerly of Booter's square, London.—At Jamaica, Richard Spear, Esq. Secretary to Rear Admiral J. E. Douglas, Commander in Chief of the ships of that station.

BIRTHS.—In London, the Lady of the Hon. Henry St. John, of a daughter.—In the same City, Lady Harriet Paget, of a son.—At Brussels, of a daughter, the Lady of Captain Charles Napier, of the Royal Artillery.—At Craugh, in the County of Tipperary, the Lady of Edmund Power, of Gurteen, in the County of Waterford, Esq. of a son and heir.—At Clonmel, the Lady of Joseph Bowman, Esq. Artillery Barrack Master, of a son.

prehenlions for the mob or its factious leaders.—The Doctor was over ruled, upon the principle, that the word "Arrangements" expressed their desires for a Veto equally well as if the word "Veto" itself was introduced.—Another discussion, of a very animated nature, now arose, as to a choice between the two forms of expression, "the grievances which aggravate us," and "the grievances by which we are aggrieved." Some objected to the first form, some to the second, and some to both, according to their notions of delicacy and good taste. On this occasion, one of the leading Counsel delivered a speech, recommending, above all things, good sense and moderation, a total abstinence from irritating topics, or harsh complaints. There was a time, when strong language was justifiable, but Napoleon, said he, is now no more; England has triumphed over her enemies; and, therefore, we must use a very different language from that which we used when Napoleon was Emperor of France, and threatened the existence of Great Britain.—The Learned Gentleman proceeded in this strain to urge a strict regard to moderate language, at least, until some new danger to British ascendancy should arise. This sentiment obviated approval, and it was therefore resolved, that no flourish or indelicate expression should be admitted into the Petition. The aid of the English and Irish Vetoists was resorted to, and the *iter of securities* and arrangements was confined to such as could be conceded, consistently with the purity and discipline of their holy Religion—*their holy Religion!!!* Yes, these good souls readily admit the propriety of degrading the Irish Catholic Priestry; they have no objection to have them branded as persons unworthy of trust or confidence; they feel no discrimination, that those venerable Pastors should be compelled to give security for keeping the peace and avoiding blood; they are ready and willing to place the Ministers of God under the control of corruption, provided it may be done without injuring the purity or discipline of their holy Religion! Scandalous hypocrisy!!!—Oh! Shame, where is thy blush??

We shall make no other comment upon this singular article, than merely to repeat its concluding words, "SCANDALOUS HYPOCRISY!!!—OH! SHAME, WHERE IS THY BLUSH?"

We shall detain the reader for a few words more. In last evening's publication of the paper above named, there is an article purporting to be a report of some speeches delivered by two of these Gentle men in a room in Mr. Fitzgibbon's house in Canal street. We cannot take for granted, that they are genuine, upon the authority of a print thus detected in so gross an imposition upon its readers (if it have any). We are inclined, however, to doubt the authenticity of the report, for another reason. It is there said, that Counselor Bittow "sent up" to the Association, a copy of the Petition agreed to at Lord Fitzgibbon's. Now, we venture to say, that this is not true. We venture to say, that *no such circumstance has occurred*, as the Counselor believes "sent up" a copy of the "Vetoist's Petition." We predict, that this statement is as false as the wretched