

THE SENTINEL.

AND NEW BRUNSWICK GENERAL ADVERTISER.

VOL. III

FREDERICTON, SATURDAY, APRIL 13, 1840.

No. 16.

THE SENTINEL.

IS PUBLISHED EVERY SATURDAY MORNING
By Edmund Ward.
Office.—Phoenix or Tank House.—Fredericton
AND CONTAINS,
The Decisions of the Executive, and Notices of
Sales of Crown Lands.
During the sitting of the Legislature THE SENTINEL is published twice each week, and in it are inserted
The Debates of the House of Assembly.

TERMS.—10s. per annum, exclusive of Postage
Half in advance.
No paper will be discontinued until all arrears are paid.

ADVERTISEMENTS not exceeding twelve lines will be inserted for four shillings and sixpence the first, and one shilling and sixpence for each succeeding insertion. Larger in proportion.

PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS.

CENTRAL BANK OF NEW BRUNSWICK.—Wm. J. Bedell, Esq. President. Saml. W. Babbitt, Esq. Cashier. Discount Days, Tuesdays and Fridays. Bills or Notes offered for Discount must be left at the Bank, enclosed and directed to the Cashier, before two o'clock on Mondays and Thursdays. Director next week, J. F. TAYLOR.

COMMERCIAL BANK OF NEW BRUNSWICK.—FREDERICTON BRANCH.—Asa Coy, Esq. Chairman of Directors. Archibald Scott, Esq. Cashier. Discount days, Mondays and Thursdays. Hours of business from 10 to 3. Notes or Bills for discount are to be left at the Bank, enclosed to the Cashier before three o'clock on Saturdays and Wednesdays. Director next week, B. WOLHAUPTER.

BANK OF BRITISH NORTH AMERICA.—Fredericton Branch.—Alfred Smithers, Esq. Manager. Discount Days, Wednesdays and Saturdays. Hours of business from 10 to 3. Notes and Bills for discount to be left before 3 o'clock on the days preceding the Discount Days. Director next week, J. TAYLOR.

SAVINGS'S BANK.—Trustee for next week, J. T. SMITH.

CENTRAL FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY.—B. Wolhaupter, Esq. Office open every day, at Mr. Minchin's Brick House, opposite the Parade, (Sundays excepted.) from 11 to 2 o'clock. Committee for the present month, F. E. BECKWITH and W. A. McLEAN.

ALMS HOUSE AND WORK HOUSE.—Commissioner, till Thursday next, THOMAS MURRAY.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SENTINEL.

SIR,—I have perused the second letter of your correspondent "Justin;" and it is with feeling of pain I perceive that he still persists in asserting, that the Christian Sabbath is merely a civil institution. Such an assertion as this no man ought to make, either in public or in private, lightly and inconsiderately. Unless he is thoroughly assured, that he has the facts and arguments at hand fully to bear him out in what he asserts; or in other words unless he is deeply convinced, that he can substantiate his allegation by the clearest evidence and the most conclusive reasoning, he wondrously inflicts an injury on the community to which he belongs, of the gravest and most perilous nature.

Your correspondent however, conceives that he has discovered in two Scripture passages, which he quotes, the necessary and indispensable support which his favourite position requires. But it happens unfortunately for his cause, that he has altogether mistaken the import of the said passages, as well as the object the Apostle had in view when he perused them. In the first of the two, St. Paul is addressing the Gentile converts at Colosse, on whom the converts from Judaism, who resided in that city, or the Judaizing teachers, who had repaired thither—still bigotedly attached to the Mosaic ritual—would impose, agreeable to that ritual, abstinence from certain kinds of meat, together with the observance of the various religious festivals enjoined by it. "Let no man," says he, "judge you (Gentile Christians) in meat or in drink, or in respect of a holy-day, or of the new moon, or of the Sabbath-days."

But here I must be allowed to inquire, before I proceed farther, why does Justin, in quoting this passage employ the term *Sabbath*, instead of Sabbath-days? What authority has he for altering the sacred text? As I have no desire, however, to be otherwise than perfectly civil and courteous towards your correspondent, I shall regard his misquotation, although it affects the argument considerably, as simply an oversight.

I go on then, to remark that the expression, "*Sabbath-days*," (which is a correct translation of the term in the original) plainly shows, that the seventh-day Sabbath is not meant by the Apostle, but merely the ordinary holidays of the Jews. And this observation is amply corroborated by the connexion in which the term is found in the passage before us—classified and associated as it is "with meats and drinks, festivals and new-moons," which are all ceremonial institutions—as well as by the fact, that the Apostle is speaking, in the preceding context, concerning the abrogation, by the advent and death of the Saviour, of the ritual law of Moses, which he styles "the handwriting of ordinances."

The conclusion therefore, is unavoidable, that as the observance of the seventh-day Sabbath constituted a precept of the Moral Law, and as the Apostle, in the passage under consideration, uses the plural term (*Sabbath-days*) and not the singular term (*Sabbath*), nothing more is intended by the phrase, "*Sabbath-days*," than besides the holidays and new-moons, the other festivals of the Jewish Church. And in this sense, we find the term used in *Leviticus*, 19: 3, where it is said, "Keep my Sabbaths," that is, my feasts, as the feasts of Tabernacles, the Passover, &c.; and in this sense also, we find it used in several other places of the Old Testament. The Apostle therefore, may be supposed as saying to the Gentile Christians at Colosse—"Now that the ceremonial law is abolished, let not any man who bears a bigoted attachment to it, rule over you in matters of meat and drink prohibited by it, nor in respect to a holy day enjoined by it, or to a new moon, or to any other feast or festival whatever." All these I add, were Sabbaths in the ceremonial acceptation of the term, or days of solemn rest.

But granting for the sake of argument, that the Apostle did mean the Jewish Sabbath in the passage quoted above, what will this admission avail your correspondent? Does he not know that the term *Sabbath* is not a New Testament term? The Christian Sabbath is spoken

of there only, as "the first day of the week," and "the Lord's day." Now since this is the case, what has the abrogation of the Jewish Sabbath to do with that day, which was substituted, in its room, by the inspired Apostles of our Lord, to whom on one occasion he said—"Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven?" Will the abrogation of the seventh-day Sabbath, include, in any possible way, the repeal of that day, which St. John, in the Revelation, emphatically calls "the Lord's Day;" or in other terms, will such abrogation comprise the repeal of "the first day of the week," on which the Apostles invariably met with the disciples for the public exercises of God's worship? And in short will not the disregard of the day, thus styled "the Lord's day," be esteemed by the Almighty as a sin?

The other passage, which your correspondent regards as incontrovertibly supporting his position, I shall very speedily discuss. The words are—"One man esteemeth one day above another: another esteemeth every day alike.—Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind."

The members of the Church at Rome, to whom these words were addressed, consisted partly of converted Gentiles, and partly of converted Jews. As might be presumed, there was a dispute amongst them concerning the distinction of meats and days. With respect to days (for it is with these only we have to do at present), the Jewish disciples (still thinking that they were somewhat bound by the Ceremonial Law) considered, that they ought to esteem some days above others—such as the times of the passover of pentecost; such as the new-moons, and the feast of tabernacles. Hence, says the Apostle—"One man," that is the converted Jew, "esteemeth one day above another: another," that is the converted Gentile, "esteemeth every day alike;" or what amounts to the same thing, has no respect whatever for these ceremonial institutions. What then it may be imagined, has this passage to do with the point in question? Both converted Jews and Gentiles did, at that very period, unanimously observe the Lord's day—a fact which is abundantly verified by the following quotation from the "*Apology of Justin Martyr*," who lived at hardly the space of fifty years from the time of the Apostle John: "On the day, called Sunday," says he, "is an assembly of all, who live in the city or country; and the memoirs of the Apostles, and the writings of the Prophets," that is, the Old and New Testaments, "are read." And for this he assigns the reasons of the Christians, viz. "that it was the day, on which the creation of the world began, and on which Christ arose from the dead." To all which it may be added, that, from the resurrection of our Saviour down to the present era, this particular day has been consecrated by Christians of all ages and in all countries, to the especial service of the Divine Being.

I now take leave, Mr. Editor, of this subject and of Justin, once and altogether—consigning the opinions of Sir William Blackstone to gentlemen of the legal profession to be dealt with as they may judge expedient, and regarding the meagre lucubrations of the Editor of the Popular Encyclopaedia as not of a feather's weight in the argument. Nothing I beg to assure you and the public, but a sense of duty could have induced me to notice the epistle of your correspondent, being decidedly of opinion that the columns of a newspaper are not a proper place for discussing such grave subjects. It was therefore solely to prevent such of your readers, as had not duly considered this question, from stumbling and being led astray by the specious argumentation of Justin (who I sincerely trust, will yet come to regard the Sabbath in the same light as I do myself,) that I penned the above in reply. I am, sir,

Respectfully yours,

J. BIRKMYRE.

Fredericton, April 9, 1840.

P. S. Since the above was written, I have seen, by favour of a friend, the IV. volume of the commentaries of Sir William Blackstone on the Laws of England. Had your correspondent given in full, (as he ought to have done) the observations of that eminent Lawyer on the Sabbath, it appears to me, that no one would conclude, that he esteemed that sacred day to be merely a civil institution, or the profanation of it to be merely a civil offence. To satisfy your readers on these points, I shall quote a passage or two from the beginning of his dissertation on the Sabbath—referring them for farther information to Volume IV. page 62, of his commentaries. Sir William observes—"Profanation of the Lord's day, vulgarly (but improperly) called *Sabbath-breaking*, is a ninth offence against God and Religion, punished by the municipal Law of England. For, besides the notorious indecency and scandal of permitting any secular business to be transacted on that day in a country professing christianity, and the corruption of morals which usually follows its profanation, the keeping one day in seven holy as a time of relaxation and refreshment, as well as for Public Worship, is of admirable service to a state, considered merely as a civil institution." Let your readers, therefore, weigh this paragraph well, and then decide, as to what is the opinion of Sir W. Blackstone on the point in question.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE SENTINEL.

SIR.—The enmity against our Provincial University would appear rather excessive, had even your correspondent ascertained that some one of the Students had furnished an occasion for its unhappy ebullition in your last number. But the author of the communication which has given him offence, and the publication in which it appeared, were, I believe, alike unknown in the College.—Of the merits of either I acknowledge myself still in total ignorance.

The "Old Resident" strangely errs in his allusion to Students "obtaining education" from the "pious and charitable intentions of the founders of that institution, under pretext of being educated for the Church." For, not only is the College open to all without regard to their prospective professions; but the Scholarships founded by it have always been, as they are now stated in public advertisements, proposed to candidates from all quarters, without reference even to their religious denomination.

If there be an institution which ought to have been held exempt from such an imputation as that of "persecution of talent and

genius in the more humble and ordinary walks of life," it surely must be King's College at Fredericton; the Principal and Professors of which have long since offered gratuitous instructions to all the young men of the Province, who might desire to improve their qualifications for popular education; nor, I venture to say, have they ever withheld their assistance from any, to whom it could be properly and beneficially extended.

But, sir, I do not expect that the facts which I have now adduced will silence obloquy or disarm hostility. Enough to provoke some unhappy dispositions, may be found in the power with which the College is endowed; but its most persevering foes will probably be persons, who cannot endure the liberality with which that power has been constantly exercised. I am, sir,

A SENATOR.

(HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY.)

FREDERICTON, April 13, 1840.

Mr. FISHER called the attention of the House to the 6th Section of the Bill, restraining the provision of the Civil List Bill, which authorised the Lieutenant Governor with the advice of Council, to grant a remission of the purchase money of land to such retired Naval and Military officers as might require the same for actual settlement upon a certain graduated scale therein prescribed; such officers making it appear that they required the land for actual settlement. From the return before the House, upwards of 31,000 acres of the most valuable land in the Province, much of it lying along the Boundary Line, had been granted to these officers, and not one had actually settled on it. Indeed many of them were out of the Province, and the whole was a mere speculation. Since the passing of the Civil List Bill in 1837, upwards of 7,900 acres had been granted, and he was informed that a grant of 1500 to 2000 acres was that moment passing through the office to a gentleman now in England, this grant alone comprised land enough for a whole settlement. There was the grant to Capt. Eccles shortly after the passing of the Civil List Bill. Now it was notorious that this was ostensibly obtained for a speculation, and the land had been sold at a large price before the grant passed the allotment in eleven or fourteen tracts, some on Tobique, some on the Salmon River, and in different places, this was a complete prostitution of the benevolent intentions of the Legislature, and in the mouth of every one it was notorious. Mr. Fisher read from the land return the names of a number of other officers who had received grants of land, and who were with a very few exceptions out of the Province. In any of these Grantees happened to be in a situation to say so no doubt they would contend that the details of the Bill to tax wild lands were imperfect, and he desired to produce a perfect Bill for them. The learned gentleman then stated that as the making of such grant was a branch of the prerogative, and there could be but one opinion in the House of their impropriety, he would move a resolution which would convey to the Government the advice of the House, relative to the exercise of that branch of the prerogative which he believed was perfectly constitutional and proper. Mr. F. then moved the following Resolution:

Whereas, and by the sixth section of the Act, to restrain the provisions of an Act to support the Civil Government of the Province, His Excellency the Lieutenant Governor or Commander in Chief for the time being, is authorised by and with the advice and consent of the Executive Council, to grant a remission of the purchase money or any part thereof, to certain officers of the army and navy desirous of purchasing land, and who shall make it appear to the satisfaction of the Lieutenant Governor, that such land is for actual settlement by such officers. And whereas large tracts of land, have been granted to sundry officers of the army and navy, who have made no improvement whatsoever on the same, and whose sole object in obtaining such grant, appears to have been private speculation and not a desire to improve the country. And whereas the making of such grants retards the settlement of the country and is in other respects highly injurious to the interests of the Province, and tends to defeat the benevolent intentions of the Legislature.

Therefore Resolved, that a humble address be presented to His Excellency the Lieutenant Governor, praying that his Excellency will be pleased in future to withhold grants from such applicants, until they have actually settled on the land for which they seek to have the purchase money remitted.

Hon. Mr. JOHNSTON said the learned member could not attain the object he had in view by his Resolution; the evil he complained of had occurred before the passing of the Civil List Bill. The return contained grants of land since 1837, but most of them had been ordered before that period. The grant to Captain Eccles was no doubt what it had been called a prostitution, and the Council had inquired into it; but it was discovered that it was too late, as the title had passed to these lands. The grant now passing to Colonel McQueen, was under an order from the Home Government, made long before the surrender of the casual Revenues.

Mr. L. A. WILMOT hoped his learned colleague would withdraw his resolution; if he did not he Mr. W. would be compelled to move an amendment. It was an attempt to repeal the Civil List Bill by Resolution. He had read the 6th Section of that Bill and then stopt; but let him read a little further. Mr. W. then read another section, relative to contracts made by the Crown before the passing of the Bill; the resolution was directly contrary to this section, and it was necessary that both branches of the Legislature should concur in such an amendment. If his learned friend would draw a bill prescribing settlement conditions, he would assist, as he thought such grantee should be compelled to improve; but it must be done by law. The Resolution was a reflection upon the Executive.

Mr. HILL did not see the difficulty the learned member for York (Mr. Wilmot) had mentioned. The Resolution did not affect the sixth section at all: in cases of that kind the law would take its course, and unless the House wished to see the vacant land wasted, some such course as pointed out in the Resolution was necessary. It could do no harm; and if no evil had arisen, it might prevent one. Certainly the return excited alarm, for not one lot granted had been settled on; and the law mentions actual settlement. It would only be an expression of the opinion of the House, and the Executive could give what weight to it they thought it entitled to. If it contained any thing

objectionable, it could be amended. It appeared to him merely to state facts.

Mr. BROWN was of opinion something should be done; and if the Resolution was objectionable, it could be withdrawn and amended; he saw the information of the hon. member for Queen's had put a different face on the return. He had always been opposed to these large grants, and saw the evil effects of them.

Mr. END said they had not time to spare now to discuss the subject; the Resolution could do no good, it was only taking up the time of the House unnecessarily, at this late hour of the session. The learned mover had declared war against all these large land holders. He thought they must trust to the Executive till another Session, when they would have more time.

Mr. WILSON said no great evil could arise by letting it stand over for another year, particularly after the assurance of the future intention of Council; and he believed the learned member for York intended to withdraw it; tho' he was satisfied it contained no reflection, and he was sure his learned friend meant none.

Mr. TAYLOR made some remark relative to Eccles' grant which we did not distinctly catch from the noise.

Mr. FISHER said least by possibility the resolution might contain any reflection, he would withdraw it, for he meant none. The Resolution merely expressed the opinion of the House, as to the exercise of a branch of the prerogative, which was of every day occurrence. It had no repealing effect at all. The Governor was not required by the law to make the grant to applicants, but had a discretion; the Resolution if passed would advise the Executive in the exercise of that discretion. He would now bring in a Bill with settlement conditions; when he brought in a Bill it would be to repeal the whole section; as it was unjust and never should have been in the statute book. Most intelligent farmers had lately expressed their surprise to him, that any such provision had received the sanction of the Legislature. He thought the Lieutenant Governor would be pleased at the Resolution, it would save a deal of trouble; for when applied to for grants of land, he could say the Representatives of the people have requested me to confine my grants to actual settlers; and that was what the act meant. There should be some criterion and none better could be found, than to withhold the grant till the applicant settled. Hon. members a few days since, when he was urging his Bill for the sale of land by instalment to actual settlers, was greatly alarmed about the £14,500; but now when one man paid nothing to the Revenue for land enough for a whole settlement, it was not worth talking about. The land granted in this way with ten years included in the return, would settle more than 300 families under the instalment Bill. He had seen the most of it in Carleton, it was the best land in the Province, and lying on the frontier, should be settled. He was glad to hear the information afforded by the hon. member for Queen's, relative to the 700 acres granted since the Civil List Bill passed. He hoped next year there would be no objection respecting the section.

FROM THE LONDON SPECTATOR.

The *Sheffield Independent* contains a long address from the "working men of Sheffield to the working mechanics, artisans, and agricultural labourers of Great Britain and Ireland." The object of the address is to establish a general combination for the repeal of the Corn-laws; and it will be seen from the subjoined extracts, that much of it is written with truth as well as force. The injurious operation of the Corn-laws on the foreign commerce of the country and upon the condition of the poorer classes in England is pointed out

"These laws have greatly impeded our commercial interests with the United States, and have forced the Americans to become manufacturers to their own injury. Their capital has been diverted from agricultural and commercial pursuits. To encourage this misapplication of capital, in retaliation for these laws, their government has raised the duties on the importation of British manufacturers, compelling the landowners and agricultural population to pay a dearer price for all the articles of our manufacturing industry, thus checking their consumption. While thousands of our fellow-countrymen are living upon potatoes, and scarcely ever taste bread, the Americans have great quantities of corn to spare, which if allowed to be imported in this country, to feed our starving population, would soon enable them to remove their present commercial embarrassments, and furnish abundant employment for thousands of our workmen who are wandering about in wretchedness and rags, and would also strengthen the ties arising from our consanguinity as brethren, and speaking the same language."

Gold was gone out of the country to pay for wheat, and the consequences were ruinous to the home trade.

"All local trades—shopkeepers, drapers, grocers, butchers—all feel its effects; yet their suffering is but trifling in comparison with that of the millions who depend for subsistence on labour. From the low state of wages, thousands are compelled to do double the work they ought to do, to enable them to earn the means to obtain the most common articles of food; and it is scarcely possible for them cheap as clothing is, to obtain sufficient to cover them from the inclemency of the seasons. It is an assertion of the landlords that it is beneficial to the working classes that the high price of bread should be kept up, to enable the rich to spend a great deal more than they could if rents and produce were low. They say that trade is always good when corn is high in price. Even supposing that thirty thousand landlords are enabled to spend twice as much from this cause as they otherwise would, yet this extra expenditure must first be taken from the labour of the poorer and the middle classes. And how will it bear comparison with what would be the expenditure, if the labouring classes of this kingdom, containing five millions of families, were enabled, by the repeal of these laws, to spend two shillings per week extra in cottons, woollens, hardware, &c.? Why, they would consume the value of fourteen millions yearly, in addition to what they now do; and this money freely circulating, would enable the middle classes to spend a great deal more. This, with the impulse to our foreign trade, would imply repay us for that portion of profit retained on the extra sums spent by the great landowners."

It has been truly said by Mr. Ward, that the Poor-law and the Corn-law could not exist together—

"What is the situation of the honest, industrious artisan, after working for thirty or forty years, paying, during that period, forty per cent of his wages in taxation, and who has also paid all kinds of local rates? Yet how is he treated when driven by fatal necessity, and by circumstances over which he has no control, to seek relief from that source to which he has contributed through a long life of incessant labour? He and the partner of his cares and toils are allowed for their maintenance the small pittance of three shillings per week, to provide them with food, raiment, fuel, and shelter, or they are forced into an union bastille. Nor is this all; he is forced to break stones on the turnpike-road, or sweep the streets in the most inclement season—he who all his life has been used to the warm rooms of a factory. And can he fail to contrast the difference in the reward of his labour with the treatment the patrician receives—a man possessing his fifty or one hundred thousand pounds a year, who, when called to fill any of the great offices of the state, receives thousands for his labours, and when he retires, after a few years' service, obtains a pension that would pay all the casual poor of a town like Sheffield, where hundreds are denied the opportunity of labour by the operation of the Corn-laws? Can he fail to contrast his situation with that of other classes in the state? He sees that the cost of a British army of 90,000 men is as great as that of France for 440,000 men, 57,000 horses, and noneffective force of a million of men, and three times the expense of the Russian army, whose numerous forces keep the rest of Europe in continual dread of her colossal power. And while the British artisan has remained at home supporting a numerous family by his toil, adding to the reputation of his country's manufactures by his genius, and to her revenues, riches, and resources, by taxes he has paid, he sees a brother or relative, who has been the sole trouble of his family; and has become a soldier, return home in the prime of life, without ever firing a shot at an enemy, with a pension equal to three, four, or five times the weekly allowance of the parish to himself and his wife—is it possible that he can think of these things and be contented? And as our Representative observed, is it possible these two laws can exist together?"

There was a prospect of obtaining the repeal of the Corn-laws by combination for that purpose of all the classes injured by them. Besides, many landowners were becoming sensible of the necessity of relinquishing the present system—

"Hundreds of our landowners, and some of them of the highest order, know that if our manufacturing and commercial interest is sacrificed, their lands will not long retain their present value. They also know that if our commercial superiority be once lost, it is probable that it will never be regained, and that some future Gibbon will date the decline of this once mighty and flourishing state from the determination on the part of the landowners to support these unjust laws. Do we not see daily, men of all parties joining the ranks of the Anti-Corn-law Association? Does not the present state of the monetary system press the necessity of some great alteration upon the attention of all classes? Have we not the acknowledgement of Lord John Russell, the most efficient Minister in her Majesty's Cabinet, that these laws are injurious, in their present form, to all parties? Did not the late Chancellor of the Exchequer declare, that it was to these laws we owe our embarrassments, and the drain of gold?"

The agitation should be peaceable, though firm—

"To those who are Chartists, and who are anxious for a great extension of the suffrage, to redress the many evils we labour under, we could say—why oppose the agitation for the repeal of these laws, which all acknowledge as a great evil? Your opposition has already caused great numbers to desert your ranks, and no doubt will cause numbers more to do so. Is it a proof of your liberal sentiments that you will suffer no question to be agitated but that of the Charter? But as our townsman Mr. Elliot observed, 'I was a Chartist before many of you were born; and because you are come over to my opinion on one great subject, am I to have no opinion but yours on any other?' This is a subject which is imperiously forcing itself on the attention of all ranks and classes of men in these kingdoms: and if the House of Commons reject their petitions, and refuse to listen to their just complaints, it will show the necessity of an essential alteration in the constitution of that House, and of a great extension of the suffrage, and no doubt but it will cause thousands and tens of thousands to join the ranks of those who are labouring for the extension of the political rights of the people. We therefore hope that all will join in petitioning for this great object; and that your petitioners may no longer be subject to the scoffs of the ignorant and proud, and that they may be considered the *bona fide* petitioners of a suffering and injured people, we recommend that each person giving his signature should add also his trade and residence."

Anti-Corn-Law Circular.—The millions of England, the millions of Scotland, and the millions of Ireland, are about to be as one man in this great and glorious struggle for liberty to live! The union of the wise and good, as of the hungry and the naked, of the three component kingdoms of this great empire, is at hand. The serried phalanx of a band of brothers is preparing to advance against the tottering walls of their feudal oppressors. Woe to the madmen who shall resist the claims of men frantic for famine, and reckless from despair! The starving population of her teeming towns have spoken aloud for the determination of England. The intelligent masses of enlightened Scotland have borne ample testimony to the untiring perseverance of her undaunted sons—Galloway to wit. And Ireland has now taken the field, in the very nick of time, and in right good earnest. The mawkish defiance of a Lord Mountcashel has been answered by the men of Drogheda. The assembled thousands of her industrious and ardent inhabitants have proclaimed themselves the advocates of "total and unqualified repeal." We have ever laboured in hope; and now that we have this pledge of Irish fraternization, we shall labour in confidence—in the certainty of speedy success.

At the Guildhall, on Tuesday, a young man was brought up raving mad, through being overworked (as his brother stated) in getting up the bride-cake and confectioinary for the late nuptial festivals! He was remanded till he can be removed to Bedlam.