

Philippine

The Waterford Chronicle



No. 2121.

TUESDAY, APRIL 1, 1854.

Price 3d.

IMPERIAL PARLIAMENT.

HOUSE OF COMMONS—TUESDAY. (Continued from Saturday's Chronicle.) BISHOP VESSELS' VIZED.

Sir J. TYRELL inquired of Lord Palmerston what had been done in the case of four fishing smacks that had been seized by the French on 20th July last; and the noble lord replied that the subject was under discussion, and trusted that the affair would be settled satisfactorily, and that before long arrangements would be made between the British and French governments, which would effectually prevent the recurrence of such cases.

Sir JAMES GRAHAM was understood to say that the English boats in the late affair were not out of bounds.

The report of the eschequer of receipt bill was further considered; and the bill ordered to be read a third time on Wednesday.

The Roman Catholic marriages (Scotland) bill went through committee.

REPEAL OF THE UNION.

Mr. O'CONNELL presented eighteen petitions from places in Ireland, praying for the repeal of the legislative Union.

THE POLISH EXILES.

Colonel EVANS presented a petition which he was anxious to call the serious attention of the house to. The petition which he held in his hand was agreed to at a public meeting held some time ago to consider the state of the unfortunate Polish exiles now resident in this country. A society had been formed a considerable time back for the relief of those unhappy victims of despotism, and by its means relief had been afforded to an extent which went to alleviate the sufferings of many of them, but the funds of that society were now completely exhausted, and there was no resource left to the friends of those exiles, but to come forward, as the petitioners now did, to entreat the sympathy and consideration of that house to their case.

The French Government had fully recognized the principle of giving relief from the public purse to those Polish exiles who had sought a refuge in that country, though it could not be said that France was better able than this country financially or politically to grant such relief. The government of this country had on many occasions established the principle of giving aid to foreigners who were driven by political causes to seek an asylum amongst us. Without going back to the instances in which protection and relief had been given to the Huguenots and the Flemings, he might mention that in the early part of the French war, we received and pensioned a large number of refugees who were driven from their country, and in 1823 we received and relieved by public money a large body of the Spaniards who sought refuge here. We were, as contracting parties to the treaty of Vienna, in some sort guaranteeing to the government which was at that time established in Poland, it was too well known that the dominating influence of Russia in the Courts of Europe was every day becoming more serious.

Heard—and though he would not say that we had failed in that instance, yet he must assert that the present government still more their proceedings in office, had deferred more to their becoming in the government of these kingdoms.

Sir H. VERNY said that he was glad to find that the alleviation of the unfortunate Poles could never be mentioned in that house, without calling forth the strongest sympathy for those victims of Russian oppression. (Hear, hear.) It had been said that the late discussion in that house had excited great anger in the Court of St. Petersburg. He was not surprised that it should, Russia would, no doubt, if she could, endeavor to stifle the voice of freedom in every country.

Mr. SINCLAIR gave the prayer of the petition his most cordial support.

Lord PALMERSTON said that every person of a feeling and humane mind must spontaneously respond to the sentiments of sympathy which had been expressed in favor of the Poles; but the feelings which himself and colleagues might entertain on the subject as individuals were a matter very different from voting away the public money in their capacity of ministers of the Crown. He (Lord Palmerston) was not at liberty to hold out any hope to the gallant colonel of government sanctioning any grant of money to the petitioners. The gallant colonel had referred to the case of the Spanish refugees and French emigrants; and contended, that because a former government had afforded these pecuniary relief, the present government ought to extend pecuniary assistance to the petitioners. The cases were quite different. The Spanish refugees were unlearned soldiers from this country were men who acted in concert with the armies of Great Britain during the Peninsular war; and it was because of their active cooperation with our troops that they were expelled their own country. The gallant colonel had grounded the claims of the petitioners to relief on the circumstances of an infraction by Russia of the treaty of Vienna, to which treaty this country was a party. The mere fact of this country being a party to the treaty of Vienna was not, he held, as synonymous without guaranteeing that there would be no infraction of it at treaty by Russia. He must repeat that, while there must be a feeling of sympathy in every heart in favor of the unfortunate Poles, government could not hold out any hope of extending pecuniary relief to them.

Mr. O'CONNELL had heard the speech of the noble lord with feelings of deep surprise and regret. The noble lord had said, that to grant relief to the Poles would be against precedent. It would not be against precedent, but the contrary. The visit of his wrath were, in so far as words were concerned, poured out on the head of Russia, but, in God's name, why did not our actions correspond with our words? Every man ought to feel it a degradation of his country that Poland had been suffered to become the victim of the contemptible and brutal despot of Russia. He (Mr. O'Connell) trusted that the national feeling on the subject of the wrong of Poland would yet be so strong as to drive the barbarian and ruffian of Russia out of the pale of society. The noble lord had said that the Spanish refugees had received pecuniary assistance from this country because they had been

our native allies in the Peninsular war. That was not the ground on which that relief was extended to them. They were relieved in the year 1823, not because of any sufferings they endured as a consequence of being our allies, but merely as an act of benevolence on the part of this country. The noble lord, in speaking of the relief which had been extended by a former government to the French emigrants, had stated the reason why such relief was granted to be, the circumstance of this country having encouraged them to revolt. That was the case with a small fraction of those emigrants, but not with the majority. The grant, as in the case of the Spanish refugees, was principally to be regarded as an act of benevolence. He (Mr. O'Connell) was an advocate for national economy, and he wished it were more attended to in that house than it generally was; but he was not for carrying his notions of national economy so far as to refuse assistance to poor distressed creatures, whose claims to our sympathy and aid were so strong. He would like to see a sum of money given by the government to the Poles, and thought it should be called Russian blood money. He (Mr. O'Connell) would like to see a cordial alliance between England and France, to oppose the ambition of the Court of St. Petersburg; but if he did not greatly mistake the signs of the times, the traitorous Louis Philippe did not in reality wish to keep up a good understanding with us, but was entering into an alliance with Russia, and that the two powers were meditating a joint crusade against European liberty. (Hear, hear.) That might yet be productive of good. Russia, in defiance of treaties of the most solemn and binding nature, had blotted out Poland from the map of Europe—had extinguished its language, and had banished its youth. The gallant people of that country were now trampled under the hoof of the brutal and sanguinary despot of St. Petersburg.

Mr. T. ATWOOD was surprised at the want of true English feeling exhibited on this occasion by the noble lord.

Sir S. WHALLEY heard with great regret, that the government did not intend to afford the required assistance, and he hoped that they would reconsider their determination.

Lord D. STUART observed that men of all parties were agreed in commiserating the condition of unhappy Poland, and in wishing that some effectual relief could be given to the emigrants at present in this country.

Mr. BUCKINGHAM also supported the prayer of the petition.

Mr. S. RICE objected to the running headlong into such a course as that which the advocates of the petitioners recommended without reflecting upon the consequences.

Colonel EVANS hoped that now, when no relief could be expected from the government, individuals would come forward for that purpose with the accustomed liberality of Englishmen.

The petition was then laid on the table.

Several petitions were presented, and the house adjourned at half-past ten o'clock.

HOUSE OF COMMONS—WEDNESDAY.
The Speaker took the chair at twenty minutes past twelve o'clock.

Mr. BUCKINGHAM gave notice that on Thursday, the 24th of April, he would move that an humble address be presented to the crown, praying that his Majesty would be graciously pleased to extend his royal bounty to the Polish exiles, now suffering under great privations in this country, and to pledge the house to make good such sum as his Majesty may be graciously pleased to appropriate to their relief.

CAMBRIDGE PETITION—ADJOURNED DEBATE.
The debate upon this petition was then resumed. Colonel WILLIAMS, as he had a motion on this petition, reserved his observations till he brought forward the motion.

Sir ROBERT H. INGLES deprecated the prolongation of a discussion upon a petition, but, at the same time, he might safely ask pardon of the house for following the example of other hon. members. There was a great fallacy in the use of the term national establishments, as applied to Universities. He asked what was meant by the term, national establishments? Was it meant in the same sense as the national debt? Was it meant to be implied that the Universities were endowed by the nation for the general good? (Cries of "Yes," from Mr. O'Connell and other members.) He was not to be tempted from his line of argument by that cheer. In what sense could the Universities be considered as national establishments? Did the nation endow them? Did the mere donation of £10 a year to a professor in each of the Universities authorize the Dissenters to claim admission? If not, he did not understand why they urged their admission. The college of Maynooth, in Ireland, was a more national institution than either the colleges of Cambridge or Oxford? One thousand and ten pounds were given annually to the College of St. Andrew's, £1,307 to Aberdeen, £560 to Glasgow, £1,890 to Edinburgh, while Oxford had but £200 which was but the seventh of what was granted to the academy of Belfast, which enjoyed an endowment of £1,500. The payments that were made to those Colleges (Cambridge and Oxford) were payments of right. Lords were settled on them in the reign of Henry VIII, and it was found more convenient to the Crown to give the equivalent in money than to make payments by crown rents. Why was it that the internal discipline of those colleges should be interfered with? Was it for the paltry sum of £40 a year—a mere pittance to professors? The situation of a regius professor was one which always attached more liberality to the person holding it than it brought emolument. The selection of the individual to fill that professorship was always creditable to his Majesty. But, for twenty times the sum granted to those colleges, they would not have their discipline interfered with by parliament. Now, as all Dissenters sought admission on general grounds, it was clear that the Roman Catholics had no claim. The hon. and learned member for Dublin, as well as other members had contended that as the legislature had interfered once, it had a right to interfere again; but he put it on the score of common honor and honesty

whether that would be the principle adopted by any member in private life—whether, having made a gift to a particular individual, he would call for it back again, because of its having been a gift. It was not a question with him whether Dissenters or Roman Catholics founded the colleges; the present possession was held by law, and a possession of 600 years, without any abuse being proved, ought not to be disturbed.

Mr. O'CONNELL did not require the apology that he might derive from the distant allusions of the honorable baronet to himself to rise to speak on that question. It was one which involved the cause of religion and the civil rights of all classes of Christians. It was one which related to freedom of conscience, and had the beneficial tendency to disconnect the exercise of a spiritual feeling from the influence of temporal advantages. It was a question upon which all members of that house should express themselves, and if he (Mr. O'Connell) had a better motive for rising than to disclaim any intention of discourtesy towards the honorable baronet, it was sufficient. There was not a gentleman in that house who he respected more for his invariably good deportment, and the perfect candor with which he expressed his opinions. But his praise should stop there. (A laugh.) The honorable baronet's theology was sound—his politics were not more sound, and his exclusiveness of principle—he (Mr. O'Connell) would not be discourteous enough to call it bigotry, but that was the name it would go by in any other place—that was what he considered worst of all. It was such as he should have expected to have found locked up in the cells of Salamanca during the days of the Inquisition; it was bad there, or here, or any where, and he did not think it improved, though delivered so charmingly by the hon. baronet himself. It stined at the legislative power over property. The hon. baronet argued, that what was granted as a gift by government to a public body, here applied to a private gift to an individual, certainly a gift to an individual could not be retained; but what analogy was there between such, and the transfer of property which was made from a Roman Catholic to a Protestant establishment? There was no comparison whatever between the two cases. He (Mr. O'Connell) should proceed to notice an objection brought by the hon. member (Mr. Collett) next him. Whatever came from him bore the mark of common sense, and was entitled to the highest respect. He argued, because Protestants were more wealthy than Dissenters, therefore the concession of the Dissenters' claims would be an advantage to them, because their poverty excluded them from enjoying the benefits of education. Yet the injustice was still the same because, in the event of the Dissenters becoming rich, they were debared from the advantages of opulence, while the rich Protestants were in full possession of all privileges. Again, if a poor Dissenter by industry accumulated wealth, and a poor Protestant did the same, the latter would meet the rewards of that industry, while the former was excluded from them, because of a legislative enactment. (Hear, hear.) Also, he (Mr. O'Connell) should ask, was not injustice at present done to the rich Dissenters, and was not an injustice to a rich man as reasonable as that done to a poor man; so that as every ground the honorable member's objection was invalidated? (Hear, hear.) The honorable baronet (Sir R. Inglis) indulged in arguments of quantity, without sufficiently adhering to the arguments of principle. He spoke of the property accumulated by the colleges of Oxford and Cambridge since the time of the reformation. What did that show? (Hear, hear.) The inference would be immediately drawn when it was known that in Catholic times Cambridge University had 14 colleges, and since then it had but three; Oxford, during Catholic times, had twelve colleges, and now it had but six. The question was one entirely of principle. Knowledge was a good thing in itself, because it led to the discovery of truth, and consequently to the establishment of principle; but separate knowledge from principle, and what would be the result? Why, it was knowledge without principle that banished the Lollards in the reign of Henry the Eighth, and banished both Catholics and Protestants during subsequent reigns. (Hear, hear.) Knowledge without principle had ever been the great scourge of the human race, and he was sorry to see that it had perjured and apostles even from among the clerics of those universities. There was no instance in which the temporal interests of the establishment did not influence the conduct of the clergy educated at these universities. They had preached up the doctrine of passive obedience and non-resistance, and continued Tories, in every change and phase of government, down to the passing of the reform bill—and now they opposed the admission of the Dissenters to the universities, as if they had something as powerful as the imposition of their taxes. The hon. baronet, when he had discussed the question of quantity, had introduced his religious opinions, and said he would undertake to prove that the Williams, and other founders of the universities, were not Roman Catholics; he would meet him upon that point. He would ask him, were not the Protestants of the established church of the present day placed in this dilemma? They contended for the right of deciding for themselves, but the moment any other professing Protestant attempted to decide for himself, they turned round on him and called him by some nickname of Dissenter, and denied to him his proper name of Protestant. (Laughter.) He would ask the hon. baronet whether Bishop Wickham did not say many every Sunday and every week-day at his chapel at Winchester? (Hear, and laugh.) He would ask him, did he not believe in the invocation of saints, and the doctrine of purgatory? and if Bishop Wickham believed all those things, he would make the honorable member a present of the title of Protestant. (Laughter, in which the hon. and learned gentleman himself joined.) It was evident that these institutions were founded on private endowments from grants made by private individuals, and for private purposes, viz., for offering prayers for the souls of the faithful departed; but all those private intentions for the disposal of private property had been overruled by the legislature. (Hear, hear.) He (Mr. O'Connell) requested in that arrange-

ment. It was property which had been given for a great public trust, and although he differed from those by whom that alteration was effected, he had not submitted to it, but he had enforced that submission against others. He contended that the nation had a right to dispose of that property—there was no statute of limitations, and if the parliament as the hon. baronet would maintain, had not the power, then it was robbery, and he called on the hon. and conscientious baronet to make restitution. The hon. baronet had then taken an excursion to Ireland. The college of Maynooth, he said, was entirely supported by the annual grant. He was quite sure that the honorable baronet thought the case was so; for he knew that he was incapable of making any assertion but one in which he believed—(hear, hear)—but in that he was mistaken. The college, by law, was prohibited from possessing property to the amount of more than £1,000 a year, but to that sum they were entitled; therefore, it was quite plain that only a part of the college was supported by that annual grant. (Hear.) That college had flourished in spite of the severe lines of the penal laws—in those times two acts had been passed in Ireland, one prohibiting Catholics from being educated at Maynooth under pain of transportation, the other forbidding them to go out of the country, in order to obtain education, under pain of imprisonment, total loss of goods and property. Now what was the effect of those laws? Why, that Catholic families sent their property to the continent, where their sons were allowed to receive the great blessings of education without fear. Even in his own person, in the University of Paris, he was entitled to 35 exhibitions, which were worth more than £1,000. There were many Catholic families in the same situation, and if government at the convention of 1814 and 1815, had taken as much care to have had a restitution of the ecclesiastical property belonging to subjects of this realm, as they had done to other kinds, they would now have had more than the parliament had ever voted towards the support of Maynooth. Then there was the university of Dublin, which was an exclusively Protestant establishment as it now stood; it was also a national institution as well as Maynooth. In the reign of Henry VIII, the Franciscan friars who inhabited it were turned out, and the revenues with which it was endowed, amounting to upwards of £50,000, devoted to Protestantism—yet in that university, Catholics were enabled to take degrees; and had the result proved advantageous to the university, or rather had it not proved most beneficial to it, in every sense of the word?—(hears)—and not only to itself, but also to the country generally. By the act of 1792, a Catholic might fill the medical chair in that university, and it was clear that it also intimated that Catholics should be eligible to scholarships, but after two or three had been admitted, the fellows had thought it necessary to require the oath of supremacy to be taken, which again excluded them; but it was clear that that was according to the practice, and not according to the law. (Hear, hear.) It was for the benefit of the country; his sons had met in that place in fellowship with the sons of those men who were most opposed to him—(hears)—and they formed private friendships, which might put an end to feuds that otherwise might have disturbed the country. (Hear, hear.) Besides, another argument that ought to weigh much with the hon. baronet, was that it was the fact that many had been won to the Protestant religion from their attendance in that college. (Hear, hear.) That was, therefore, a precedent of the highest class and of the first order, putting an end to all that was said of the great mischief which would accrue to the church, if the Dissenters were allowed to take degrees at the universities. One such fact was worth a million of prophesies—he had proved that the experiment had been made, and that it had been triumphantly successful. (Hear, hear.) The petition from Cambridge had been adhered to with great warmth by many members, as being a very important petition, emanating as it did from such a quarter. But he could not assent to all the praise which had been bestowed on it; he thought it a miserable and stingy petition, and that instead of its being profitable to the university, it was highly disadvantageous. It appeared that there were 17 heads of colleges, only two of whom signed it, 25 professors, and only 11 signed it, and 74 tutors, only 10 signed it. Alas! for those who did not sign it. (Hear, hear, and a laugh.) What was that at the present day? Salamanca was nothing to it. (Hear, and a laugh.) It seems that they allowed the Dissenters to be at the University as long as there was any money to receive—and then turned them out, with a mark that went to degrade them, below their Protestant fellow-subjects. (Hear, hear, hear.) In the name of the great principles of conscience, why did they not sign the petition? In his opinion they were degraded for not having done so.—(Hear, hear, hear.) He meant nothing offensive to them—they were most learned men, and most potent, grave, and reverend signers. Yes, with all the praise and congratulation that had been bestowed on the colleges, only a very few had signed it, and they were looked at the best, wisest, and gravest supporters of freedom of conscience; yet, they were—for themselves, but wise to those who were of a different opinion. But where was Oxford all this time? Oxford was left completely in the dark, for they refused altogether to enlighten the Dissenters. (Hear.) Hon. members might say that they were supporting the established church—but had an established church continued long in any country where the opinions of the educated and enlightened middle class had been attempted to be destroyed? No established church continued long, unless it possessed the sympathy and affections of the people. (Hear.) He asked, were they the friends of the established church, who left even him (Mr. O'Connell) to expose them, as it was in his power to do, by a statement of facts? If the Catholic church had continued to mix up political feelings with its religion, and had enlisted the principles of persecution—so-called Christianity, and so alien to every Christian church—if it had continued to do so, the banners of the Protestant church would long since have flourished over her; and if she had ex-

isted by temporal means, it was because the most sincere of her children were the most convinced of the right of every human being to worship his God according to the dictates of his conscience. He was afraid he had trespassed too long upon the house. He thanked them for the favorable hearing they had given him. He meant no disparagement to the hon. baronet, the member for the University of Oxford; but on the part of the Dissenters of this country—and for a moment he would consent to be called a Dissenter—he would not object to be so called, recollecting what a noble set of men the Dissenters were—what learning was amongst them, what talent, what principles, and, above all, what exertion for civil and religious liberty; only, therefore, declining to subscribe himself a Dissenter, however much he most respect the name, he would not object to be called a Dissenter for one moment, whilst he, on their behalf, asserted that religion was an affair between man and his Creator. (Cheers.) That God alone, who saw into the human heart, could know who was sincere, and it was a violation of what he thought the prerogative of the Lord, and the rights of man, to interfere by force, fraud, or temptation, between man and his God. (The hon. and learned member bowed amidst loud cheers.)

Mr. SHAW agreed with the hon. and learned member for Dublin, that the admission of Dissenters into the University of Dublin had been productive of great good. (Cheers.) The Roman Catholics, however, were not satisfied, for they were asked to be admitted to fellowships and professorships, and there was a notice to that effect upon the books, he believed, at this very moment.

Lord PALMERSTON said, that, having had the honour of representing the University of Cambridge for a considerable period, he was desirous of taking the present opportunity of expressing his delight at the petition which had been presented to that house. (Hear, hear.)

Sir R. PEEL considered that if civil disabilities were attached to the Dissenters, they should be removed. They were told, when they admitted Dissenters into parliament, that they must also admit them into office, otherwise they would be arrayed against the monarchy and the government.—(Hear.) Did not this same argument apply to the present case—for, he would ask, when they admitted Dissenters into the university, and had qualified them to take a share in the government, on what principle could they exclude them from the benefit of the corporation of the university? (Hear, hear.) He would take the case of fellowships—so that ground could they exclude Dissenters from fellowships before entering into orders—what prevented them from accepting fellowships?

Mr. S. RICE—They subscribe the articles.

Sir R. PEEL—Subscribe the articles—why you are going to relieve them from subscribing the articles. (Loud cheers.) This first concession would create the necessity for the remainder. It would be but a partial remedy, and only say "peace, peace, where there was no peace," and give Dissenters an opportunity of water-tailing the remainder.

The Speaker left the chair at three o'clock, and the debate consequently stands again adjourned.

ADJOURNED SITTING.
Sir J. GRAHAM, on the part of Lord Althorp, gave notice that on Thursday, the 17th of April, he (Lord Althorp) would introduce a bill to alter and amend the poor laws.

REPEAL OF THE UNION.
Mr. O'CONNELL presented two petitions—one from the hatters, and another from the operative hatters of Dublin, praying for a repeal of the legislative Union.

The hon. and learned member presented petitions from the parishes of Buhar, Kilmorr, Kenton, and Castle Island, praying for the total abolition of tithes.

Mr. O'CONNELL also presented a petition from the Vice-President of the Chamber of Commerce, to Dublin, complaining of the tea duties, and praying that the clause relating to the valuation of tea should be referred to a committee.

Mr. O'CONNELL presented a petition on from the corporation of Drogheda, praying that the house would take measures for the construction of a ship canal from Drogheda to Killybegs.

Mr. O'CONNELL presented a petition from Newcastle-upon-Tyne, complaining of the designs of Russia, and praying that the house would take measures to prevent the subjugation of the Turkish provinces by Russia.

FALCON PROPERTY BILL.
Mr. ROTCH moved the second reading of the felon's property bill, the object of which was to give power to the justices of assizes, and the magistrates in quarter sessions, to appropriate the property of felons, instead of allowing it, as now, to be retained by other parties. He trusted the house would allow the bill to go into committee.

Mr. ROEBUCK was adverse to the bill going into committee.

Mr. O'CONNELL hoped that the bill would be allowed to go into committee, if it were only in order to obtain a change of the law respecting the forfeiture of felons' property. In every other country criminals having property were made to pay the costs of prosecution; but in England the innocent inhabitants of a county were punished for the crimes of felons. The arrangement of the machinery of the bill certainly required consideration, but that could be bestowed upon it in committee. The view which he took of the question was this, that the property of a felon should, in the first place, be applied to defray the expense of the prosecution; secondly, to his maintenance in goal; and thirdly then the residue should be given to his family.

After some observations from Mr. Hardy, Mr. Wynne, Mr. H. Hughes, and Mr. Erskine, who all concurred in the propriety of legislating on this subject, the bill was read a second time, and ordered to be committed on the 18th of April.

The billery at Drogheda bill was through a committee, and the report was ordered to be received on the 14th of April.

HERTFORD DRAUGH BILLS.
Mr. BERNAL moved the further consideration of the report of the committee on this bill. He intended to move that the amendments be agreed to,

GENERAL JACKSON

The following account of General Jackson's interview with a deputation, to hear the report of the mechanics committee sent to Washington...

We repaired to his residence on the morning of the 14th, and were admitted at once to his presence. Two gentlemen were with him at the time...

We introduced each other and took seats. The President also sat down by a table, and signed several papers; after which he took up a letter, broke the seal, and read it very deliberately...

He answered, "Well, what do you want? What would you have me do? What do you come here for? Why don't you go to the United States Bank? Go to Nicholas Biddle?"...

What would you have me do? What do you come here for? Why don't you go to the United States Bank? Go to Nicholas Biddle?...

He answered, "Well, what do you want? What would you have me do? What do you come here for? Why don't you go to the United States Bank? Go to Nicholas Biddle?"...

He answered, "Well, what do you want? What would you have me do? What do you come here for? Why don't you go to the United States Bank? Go to Nicholas Biddle?"...

He answered, "Well, what do you want? What would you have me do? What do you come here for? Why don't you go to the United States Bank? Go to Nicholas Biddle?"...

He answered, "Well, what do you want? What would you have me do? What do you come here for? Why don't you go to the United States Bank? Go to Nicholas Biddle?"...

He answered, "Well, what do you want? What would you have me do? What do you come here for? Why don't you go to the United States Bank? Go to Nicholas Biddle?"...

He answered, "Well, what do you want? What would you have me do? What do you come here for? Why don't you go to the United States Bank? Go to Nicholas Biddle?"...

He answered, "Well, what do you want? What would you have me do? What do you come here for? Why don't you go to the United States Bank? Go to Nicholas Biddle?"...

He answered, "Well, what do you want? What would you have me do? What do you come here for? Why don't you go to the United States Bank? Go to Nicholas Biddle?"...

He answered, "Well, what do you want? What would you have me do? What do you come here for? Why don't you go to the United States Bank? Go to Nicholas Biddle?"...

THE EARL OF ALBOROUGH.

We have received the following letter from Mr. Tandy, in reply to one addressed to this journal by Lord Alborough, which appeared in the Messenger of the 23d January, and which was in answer to a previous communication from Mr. Tandy...

When Lord Alborough's denial of his marriage with my daughter induced me to address you on the 23d of November last, I endeavored to suppress the feelings which that denial was calculated to excite, and to confine myself to an assertion of the notorious fact of his marriage...

I perceive by a paragraph copied from your Messenger into some of the Dublin papers, that his Lordship, probably misled by my forbearance, has repeated his denial, and has, with a view to account for his having at one time admitted the marriage which he now finds it expedient to deny, referred to a letter from his deceased father...

The present Earl of Alborough was married to my daughter Cornelia, in August, 1804. He was then under age, and the marriage was celebrated in Scotland; he lived with her until the year 1810, and had issue by her four children, of whom two are living...

With this lady he lived till about the year 1828, when he formed a new attachment, and eloped a second time, deserting her and her children, and leaving them in a state of utter destitution; she has, I am informed since, perished miserably, and I apprehend, the helpless infancy of her children was left without bread...

Having this reasonable evidence that his Lordship's principles were of rather a yielding nature, I deemed it necessary to establish my daughter's marriage while the witnesses survived, and the result (which terminated in the sentence already sent you) was instituted for the purpose, in which his Lordship appeared by his Proctor. If such an admission of the marriage as his Lordship alludes to was ever extracted from him, and which I do not believe, it certainly did not form any part of the evidence by which the marriage was established.

In about a year and a half after this sentence was pronounced, the late and present Earl came to an arrangement for securing the latter an annuity during his father's life, and a deed was executed between the father, the son, and several trustees, on the 31st of July, 1828, by which all the family estates were resettled. An annuity was settled on the son, during the joint lives of the father and himself, to revert, upon certain contingencies, to Maria and Augustus, therein described as his two illegitimate children, and provision was made for his children by my daughter, therein described as Cornelia, his wife, and power is given to the said Cornelia, his wife, and after her death, to her executors or administrators to change the trustees.

Here is a solemn and deliberate act of the noble Lord's. An act incorporated with the title to his estates, executed a year and a half after the decree affirming his marriage with my daughter had been pronounced by the first tribunal in England, and when his admission or denial could trail nothing. He now asserts, forthwith, "that he had a wife at the time." This is no doubt an ingenious and creditable assertion; but, as he says—"I must rest with the law to decide the case!" to the law I leave it, merely stating that I refrain from sending you a copy of the deed of the 31st July, 1828, to which I allude on account of its bulk, but if you think its personal would gratify your readers, I will gladly send you a copy attested by the French consul in Dublin.

Were I to imitate the noble Lord's example, and substitute assertions for facts, I might at least expect that my assertion would command as much credit as his Lordship's seeing that he, in the act of having imposed himself on my daughter, as a bachelor, when if his assertion be true, he was a married man. That he was capable of such an imposition, I will not be so hardy as to deny. But I do deny that he ever was legally married before his marriage with my daughter—how often he has been married since I will not pretend to conjecture.

I have to apologise for trespassing so long upon your patience, and would wish to conclude with an assurance that nothing which can proceed from his Lordship's pen should induce me to trouble you again. But I find it so utterly impossible to foresee what fights the noble Lord's imagination may take, that I dare not flatter myself with the hope of being relieved from the painful necessity of appearing again in print. I am, Sir, your very obedient servant,

CHARLES H. TANDY.

CAUTION TO QUACKS. At the Cambridge Assizes, on Friday, John Coe was indicted for feloniously administering a drug, called saffron, to Henrietta Freeman, for the purpose of procuring a miscarriage. The prosecu- tor, who is only sixteen years old, was served to a Mr. Bennett. When she informed the prisoner, with whom she had been intimate, that she was excited, he said he would give her some stuff, to make her "well as she ought to be." She told him she would take anything he gave her, if it did not hurt herself. She accordingly received the saffron from him, and having swallowed a quantity, miscarriage followed. A surgeon, who was examined, said, that no drug whatever could be administered for the purpose of procuring a miscarriage, without endangering the life of the person by whom it was taken. Verdict, Guilty—Sentenced to seven years' transportation.

Between cholera and famine, upwards of 80,000 human beings perished in India last year.

MURDER OF A CAPTAIN AT SEA.

Wm. Erlington, late master of the brig Alexander, of London, was murdered by his first mate, John Coulson, on the night of the 31st December, between Montserrat and St. Domingo. The mate had ordered all hands to take in sail, which the Captain hearing came on deck, and was giving directions to the crew. The mate ran down the companion, and returning immediately struck the Captain (who was at the capstan), on the head with a large heavy iron mallet. The Captain fell without speaking, and the mate struck him again twice on the head as he lay on the deck. He then ran to the man at the wheel, saying, "I have finished the old man." The helmsman was alarmed and dodged away from him to the other side of the tiller. The mate immediately ordered all hands aft to throw the body overboard. After the lapse of an hour this was done, and the mate then assumed the command of the vessel. He told the people they must go to Virginia, where they would sell the cargo and vessel and share the profits. The crew would not agree to this, but at last came to this compromise. The mate was to take the vessel into Port Royal to discharge the cargo, and then go where he pleased, and the crew were to say that the Captain died in a fit. Both parties were insincere. The crew agreed among themselves to tell as soon as they got into port, and the mate steered for St. Domingo, telling them that it was Jamaica, and that Aux Cayes was Port Royal. The crew, however, discovered the cheat by making him drunk, when they got from him that he was going into Aux Cayes to take in water, intending to proceed to the United States. They then seized him and lashed him to the deck, and steering for Jamaica, made Mauthouzel on the 7th January.

On the night of the murder Coulson said that this was the third man he had killed; that he had once killed the Captain of a Liverpool vessel bound to the East Indies; that when he got to India he escaped, and shipped on board of a Yankee; was in the American service for some years. He said "I have always succeeded, and will do so this time if you will be true to me." He gave them a sovereign each not to tell. The last entry in the log-book is in the mate's handwriting—"The master died in a fit at midnight."

In accordance with the advice of Mr. Codrington, a magistrate, the ship was brought to anchor at Mauthouzel, and the depositions of the crew taken; after which the mate was committed to the county jail. Three of the crew and a black man, a native of St. Domingo, whose testimony was deemed the most material, were sent under the charge of constables to Kingston. The evidence was transmitted to the Attorney General, and the prisoner will be tried in the Vice Admiralty.

REV. A. JAMISON—PRESBYTERIAN UNCHARITABLENESS. We have just been informed, upon what we deem good authority, that at the interment of the late Mr. John S. Adams, on Saturday last, in the burial ground attached to the Presbyterian Meeting house, Boscawen-street, the Rev. Mr. Jamison would not permit the Rev. John Porter, who had been the minister of the young gentleman deceased, to perform a funeral service, within the meeting house, over his remains; and although the doors of the building were standing open at the time, compelled the procession to turn aside to the grave, under a heavy shower of rain, and then retreat to the funeral address. If this be the case, the Rev. A. Jamison may be reviled, but not surpassed, in bigotry, by any member of any church. Though Mr. Porter differed from him, on certain points of doctrine, yet he was not preaching to Mr. Jamison's congregation, but to those who attended at the funeral; and, surely, the walls of the building could not derive contamination from the presence of a heretic. Mr. Porter has given up his own pulpit, even at his stated hours of service, to accommodate a minister and congregation of the religious body to which Mr. Jamison belongs; and not, by way of returning the favour, Mr. Porter has the doors of a meeting house, belonging to the Synod of Ulster, shut in his face, at a time when no detriment could be done, and under circumstances when even foes forget their animosity.—Northern Whig.

A REV. INSOLVENT AND A BARBER. At the Rochester Court of Requests, on Friday last, Mr. H. Bliss, postmaster and barber of Green-lille, Kent, summoned the Rev. H. Deacon, late curate and schoolmaster of that place, but now of St. Andrew, Kent, for £2 18s. 6d., for shaving the rev. deacon, and cutting the hair of his pupils, &c. The case was adjourned from the preceding court day, in consequence of the defendant having then pleaded his discharge under the Insolvent Act, and being unable to produce his schedule; having obtained it, he now produced it to the court, and the plaintiff's claim being included in it, the case was dismissed. The court, however, considered that the reverend defendant had put the plaintiff to the expense of two journeys, by not producing his schedule in the first instance, and ought to pay the costs. To this the defendant objected, and said that there had been a subscription by the inhabitants of Greenlille to pay the expense of the plaintiff for coming to Rochester to sue him. The court was, however, inexorable, and the rev. defendant was mulcted in costs.

DI-INTERESTED PHILANTHROPY.—Extract from the letter of a private in a Dragon regiment serving in India, dated last November, 1833:—"The last treaty of peace (in July, 1813) with the Allies for twenty years, will be out in the end of 1835, when I am afraid all Europe will again be in arms and bloodshed as heretofore.—I speak from no authority but mere prognostication. May God send them to be quiet till we get retired, and then I don't care how soon they commence hostilities; as I want to see a little; and still should be sorry to see or hear of my own dear country being the seat of war, or embroiled in any of its sad effects. Take my word, Old England cannot do without a war much longer, having an increase of four millions of souls since 19th June, 1813. Every part of India is at perfect peace with the Hon. Company, and I am afraid it will keep so, as nothing good is doing in time of peace."

(Gas.—For the total annual supply of gas to the metropolis, there are required 200,000 chaldrons of coal, yielding 3,400,000 cubic feet of gas; the gas weighing 75,000,000 lbs. The light thus produced is equal to 180,000,000 lbs of mould candles, of six to the pound; the bulk of the coal is equal to 10,800,000 cubic feet, or 400,000 cubic yards; or to a cube of 222 feet in the side, or of 74 yards.—London Paper.

The Carlou Independent Club have voted an Address of congratulation to Mr. Shell.

ATTORNEY'S CERTIFICATES.

Why should an attorney be compelled to pay the income tax of £12 a year in 1833 and £8 in the country, for liberty to practice the profession, when learned counsel, like Sir James Scarlett and Sir Edward Sugden, who make £10,000 per annum each, plead without paying anything? It costs an attorney £1000 before he can earn a farthing, and a counsel not a tenth of the sum.—Really the Lord Chancellor is doing all he can for the briefless barristers, by appointing them to some sort of commissioners or other places, and every thing against the attorneys. And the judges now have diminished their fees on debts under £20 above forty per cent, whilst Lord Ellenborough and the Duke of Grafton, and all other legal securities placemen, charge and receive as much for sealing the legal process as ever they did. As your paper is chiefly read by professional and literary gentlemen, please to notice this; perhaps it may obtain the notice of O'Connell or Whittle Harvey, and thereby of parliament.—Correspondent of the Examiner.

[In Ireland an attorney has a heavy annual tax to pay for practicing his profession—the barrister pays nothing. In justice to the attorneys of both countries, who have enormous fees to pay before they are admitted, they ought to be relieved from the burden now imposed upon them.]

THE PARLIAMENTARY SESSION. The temper of the Lords is not as yet fully ascertained; but, unless there be some intrigue in contemplation for the embarrassment of the government, it is believed that the session will close by the end of the month of June. Well-founded doubts are entertained on the question of their lordships' agreeing to the disfranchisement of the freeholders of Liverpool and Huxford, and to the measures adopted with reference to Warwick and Stafford; but as the government have previously determined not to produce a collision between the houses, or risk their own existence by making the matter a cabinet question, the division on the first of these bills will probably determine the fate of all, and add little, therefore, to the probable duration of the labours of the Lords.—London Sunday Observer.

PEASE versus O'CONNELL. We perceive that Mr. O'Connell has presented to the House of Commons the petition entrusted to him for presentation by the spirited inhabitants of West Auckland. We hope that Joseph Pease, silent, cautious, Joseph, was present, to observe this proof of the estimation in which the great man whom he slandered, is held by so spirited and discriminating a portion of his constituency.—Newcastle Press.

DISTILLERS—SCOTLAND. A return of the duties paid by the licensed distillers in Scotland, during the year 1833, distinguishing the amount levied on spirits distilled from malt from that paid by the raw grain distillers during the same period.—Malt, £956,052 8s. 10d. Grain, £250,988 4s. 8d. Total £1,207,040 10s. 6d.

THE DUKE OF DEVONSHIRE. His grace intends passing a fortnight in Paris with his brother-in-law, Earl Granville, and will be home in time for the celebration of his own birthday, and which is the 21st of May. Every year a ball and supper are given in what are called "the summer apartments" to the domestics, and to which are invited all the tradesmen and their families.

EARL FITZWILLIAM. We find by letters received from this nobleman, that he is favourable to the redress of the Dissenters' grievances, except on two very important points, viz, their exemption from church rates, and the admission to graduates at the universities. We regret that this excellent nobleman should not see the propriety of relieving Dissenters from an unjust and vexatious burden, and of admitting them to the advantages of the great national seats of learning.—Lords Mercury.

CLIMATES. The rapid change in the climate of England is to be attributed to the clearing of the forests of Canada, and the Northern States of the American Union. The increasing prevalence and more increasing warmth of the westerly winds over the North Atlantic Ocean, is attributable to the wide openings effected by the axe, in recent years, in the woods of our Canadian dominions. The north-westerly wind of the Continent of America, hitherto passing over immeasurable tracts of forest country, has never been tempered by the warmth given out by the earth, shaded from all accumulation of solar warmth in the summer months. Though lying in latitudes parallel to the general climate of the Mediterranean sea, yet have the winters of America till the extensive openings of the woods in the last quarter of the century, been of a severity unknown in European latitudes full twelve degrees nearer to the north. Within this period, however, extraordinary changes have been observed to take place; and now, once a barrier for months, has now fallen in greatly diminished abundance, and now and rain are of frequent occurrence in districts of Canada where all interruption of the rigors of winter was formerly unknown. The St. Lawrence river now closes annually later in the winter, and opens earlier in the spring. Cotton, Indian corn, the mulberry and the vine can be cultivated in districts where, within a quarter of a century, such productions were entirely unthought of, the mean temperature of the year. The abruptness of the bergs in the Atlantic Ocean, a phenomenon of the last quarter of a century, are also to be traced to the accumulations of heat in Canada, and the circumference of heat in Canada, and the changes in the climate of the continent of America demitition of the woods, by the compound increase of labor, by increasing emigration, and increasing population, more rapid still, will now annually be the increasing mildness of the winters of Canada; nor will another century pass away, till the great St. Lawrence river will never close at all.—Athens.

Messrs. Bond, of the Athenæum Club, London, are bound in heavy recognizances to appear at Middlesex Sessions, for keeping a gambling table in that concern. Capt. Forbes has preferred the indictment.

John Fuller, Esq. of Keech-bill, near London, has given £3,333 to endow a Professorship of Physiology in the Royal Institution, and £2,000 more for the benefit of the society.

ENGLISH ASSIZES.

WESTERN CIRCUIT—EXETER. The Assizes were opened at the Castle of Exeter on Thursday evening. The learned Judges, Mr. Justice Bosanquet and Mr. Baron Williams, entered the town soon after six o'clock, and proceeded immediately to the Castle, to open the commission. The chief case of interest in the Civil Court is one of crim. con., Johnson v. Franke, the damages of which are laid at the trifling amount of £200,000, for which a special jury has been summoned.

TRIAL OF SIR J. JEFFCOCK, FOR THE LATE FATAL DUEL WITH DR. HENNIS. Soon after five o'clock Mr. Pollett entered the Criminal Court, and having, in conjunction with Mr. Tyrall, consulted with the learned judge, the clerk of assizes directed Mr. Cole to bring up Sir John Jeffcock. Sir John immediately entered the dock, accompanied by his brother and another gentleman.

The Clerk of Arraignment—Sir John William Jeffcock, you are indicted for the wilful murder of Peter Henais, Esq. Doctor of Medicine, in the parish of Weston, on the 26th day of May last. Are you guilty or not guilty? Sir John Jeffcock—Not guilty. The Jury were then sworn, and the Clerk of Arraignment repeated the indictment.

Mr. Bore then rose and addressed the jury as follows:—Gentlemen of the jury, you are all probably aware of the transaction to which this indictment alludes, which was a fatal duel which took place in this neighbourhood in the spring of last year, and you are probably aware that the circumstances of this transaction underwent a long examination in this court in the winter following. At that time Sir John Jeffcock had left the country, in fact he had left before the death of Dr. Henais, for the purpose of fulfilling the duties of his official station, and that account for his not being here. Since that period the friends of Dr. Henais have had an opportunity of inquiring into all the circumstances of that transaction and particularly as to the share which Sir John had in it, and the result has been, that I am to-day to offer you no evidence on the part of the prosecution.

Gentlemen, certain expressions were implied to Dr. Henais, which led to this unhappy affair, and I have every reason to believe that some words were implied to Dr. Henais which he had used, and which he decided in a written declaration, and I believe after that written declaration, those words were not ascertained any doubt as to the truth of his denial. But, unfortunately, the written statement to which I allude was never seen by Sir John Jeffcock; for if it had been, most probably none of the fatal circumstances could have taken place. Under these circumstances the friends of Dr. Henais are justified, and they believe the justice of the country is satisfied.

He believes the part that Sir John Jeffcock has taken in that unhappy transaction was such of not to reflect in the slightest degree on his character as a man of honor or a man of feeling. They believe that no one more deeply regrets that calamitous event than Sir John Jeffcock, and they are quite sure that the former investigation has fully satisfied the ends of public justice as it has the friends of Dr. Henais.

The Learned Judge—Gentlemen of the jury, there being no evidence offered to sustain this case, of course you will return a verdict of not guilty. Clerk of Arraignment—You say Sir John William Jeffcock is not guilty? Foreman of the jury—Not guilty. The court was then adjourned till eight o'clock on Saturday morning.

The court then adjourned till eight o'clock on Saturday morning. The court then adjourned till eight o'clock on Saturday morning. The court then adjourned till eight o'clock on Saturday morning.

EXTRAORDINARY CASE OF BIGAMY.—A MAN WITH FOUR WIVES.—John Stuchman, who resides in St. Andrew's Wood, was apprehended with four wives, and late a waiter at the Hotel de la Ville, in the city of London, was indicted for bigamy, viz, for marrying Ann Hesterly, an interesting young female, on the 1st of December last, his former wife being still living. The prisoner, who appeared in a well-torn and ragged dress, had no less than four wives, all of whom were in court during his trial, which excited considerable interest—and laughter. The case was fully proved; and the prisoner, in his defence, said that he was induced to marry Hesterly in consequence of the ill usage he met experienced from his wife, who after having made away with all his property, deserted him to embrace the arms of another man. The jury found the prisoner guilty, and he was sentenced to 12 months' imprisonment and hard labour.

The Dublin Evening Post states, that in several places of the County Tipperary the tenants have refused the payment of rates. 7,000 officers of the Ordnance and Army have died since the peace, making a saving of £1,500,000 to government.

The Grand Council of Berne, in its sitting of Feb. 25, abolished all the stamp duties on the Journals, and every other species of periodical publications; and further decreed that such Journals and writings should be conveyed by the post throughout the nation without any charge whatever for postage.

CUTTING TEETH.—A person was mentioned the other day the remarkable fact of a gentleman aged seventy-six having cut his new teeth. "Dad!" exclaimed his old lady, "who did you say?" "I cut all mine more than three years ago!"

SUNSHINE.—If the most important people the most apt to enter at all, they had had their own esteem, and had hope of rising in their own esteem, but by lowering their neighbourhood. The 'strange' cities are always those who have either never attempted, or who have failed in, original compositions.—Hastings.

LAUGHTER.—If we consider the frequent relief we receive from laughter, and how often it breaks the gloom which is apt to depress the mind, we would take care not to grow too wise for a great pleasure of life.—Addison.

Printed and Published for the Proprietor, at the Office King-street, next door to the Chamber of Commerce, and within One House of the Post-Office, St. Paul's Church-yard, 25 No. 36. Published by the printers of Tuesday, Thursday, and Saturday.

WILL BE...

Wholesale of the London Directory...

Privately printed by...

London, Printed...

The railway bill...

proved the aff...

The railway bill...

The railway bill...

The railway bill...

The railway bill...

The railway bill...

The railway bill...

The railway bill...

